

Bernard McKenna

CRITICAL DISCOURSE STUDIES: WHERE TO FROM HERE?

This paper surveys critical discourse studies to the present and claims that, to avoid lapsing into comfortable orthodoxy in its mature phase, CDS needs to reassert its transformative radical teleology. The initial part of the paper reasserts the need for a strong social theory given the materialist and context-bound nature of discourse in daily activity. From this basis, the paper then characterizes the "new times" in which contemporary discourse occurs, and briefly surveys those issues typically analyzed, namely political economy, race and gender, and critical literacy. By considering people's ordinary lives, the paper then suggests that subject and agency, and calculative technologies of management deserve, and new modalities need, more research. Transdisciplinarity is encouraged, particularly with social psychology and critical management studies.

Keywords critical discourse; Marxism; poststructuralism; postmodernism; materialism; historicity; constructionism; social psychology; subject; interdiscursivity; Foucault; interdisciplinary

In his famous "Letter to Arnold Ruge," published in the *Rheinische Zeitung* in 1844, Karl Marx pronounced himself in favor of a "ruthless critique of everything existing." It seems to me that this program is timelier than ever. We thus return to the primary historical mission of critical thought, which is to serve as a solvent of doxa, to perpetually question the obviousness and the very frames of civic debate so as to give ourselves a chance to think the world, rather than being thought by it, to take apart and understand its mechanisms, and thus to reappropriate it intellectually and materially.

Loic Wacquant (2001)

Now that critical discourse studies (CDS) has reached the mature stage of incorporation into intellectual discourse, has it weakened the capacity to challenge and confront inequality? Billig (2002) has asked this question of critical discourse analysis (CDA), in particular, wondering whether it may be developing into the very institutionalized academic enterprise that it set out to challenge. This paper asks whether and how the foundational principles of critical studies — democracy, equality, fairness, and justice — can be re-affirmed in practice. I firstly summarize the principles of CDS; then, I survey the most prominent issues of critical



Critical Discourse Studies Vol. 1, No. 1 April 2004, pp. 9–39

ISSN 1740-5904 print/ISSN 1740-5912 online © 2004 Taylor & Francis Ltd

<http://www.tandf.co.uk/journals> DOI: 10.1080/17405900410001674498

10 CRITICAL DISCOURSE STUDIES

analysis, and suggest future areas of research. Then I consider promising areas of interdisciplinarity.

Theoretical and methodological framework

Theoretical framework

Critical discourse studies emerged largely from the Frankfurt and neo-Marxian tradition (Marx, Gramsci, Althusser), anthropological linguistics (for example, Gumperz, Gal, and Silverstein), critical discourse analysis (for example, van Dijk and Fairclough), literacy studies (for example, Cole, Wertsch and Gee), gender studies (for example, Cameron and Tannen), and Foucault. CDS does not attach itself to a particular social theory, but to "a field of critical research" (Chouliaraki & Fairclough, 1999, p. 75). Fundamentally, a critical discourse approach is characterized by its consideration of the relationship between language and society in order to understand "the relations between discourse, power, dominance, [and] social inequality" (van Dijk, 1993, p. 249). Thus, the vector of CDS is formed by the intersection of language, discourse, and social structure. Following are eight characteristics that broadly define CDS.

1. *Teleology.* CDS has a teleological commitment to justice, democracy, equality, and fairness: it should take "an explicit sociopolitical stance" (van Dijk, 1993, p. 252), distinguishing it from conversation analysis, which focuses "on language and communication in real-life situations, and the goal is to analyse, understand or solve problems relating to practical action in real-life contexts" (Gunnarsson, 1997, p. 285).¹ Its commitment is evident in the analysis of "opaque as well as transparent structural relationships of dominance, discrimination, power and control as manifested in language" (Wodak, 1997a). CDS provides "the basis for political action to bring about radical and emancipatory social change" using approaches that, above all, "unify theory and practice" (Hammersley, 1997, p. 238). Thus, although Foucaultian approaches to analysis may be critical in analyzing power, there is no commitment to social change. By contrast, neo-Marxists have contributed the major conceptual foundations of CDS, notably the "twin aspirations of emancipation and exposure" (Billig & Simons, 1994, p. 1); in fact, Fairclough and Wodak (1997) claim that linguistic critical analysis originated in Western Marxism. Alternatively, the Habermasian project of revivifying the life world through the structural transformation of the public sphere (Habermas, 1989) is intrinsically liberal (Poster, 1995) rather than liberatory. A more socially transformative teleology is proposed by Wodak (1996), who argues that critical discourse approaches address social problems by revealing how discourse does ideological work, and "provide[s] instruments for a less authoritarian discourse... [that] may... lead to emancipation" (Wodak, 1996, p. 37). Such a view coincides with Mouffe's (1993, p. 54) definition of politics as an "ensemble of practices, discourse, and institutions that seek to establish a certain order and organize human existence in conditions that are always potentially conflictual".

2. *Theory of discourse.* The predominant Marxian and neo-Marxian critical discourse approaches (incorporating the Frankfurt School, Gramsci, and Althusser) were ruptured by the Foucaultian revolution and, contemporaneously, feminist theory

(postcolonial theory appears to have had little impact on CDS).² Critical theory appears now to be ending its ambivalence about power that came about because of the Foucaultian attack on structuralism and what is essentially the distraction of extremely relativist postmodernism, which Billig and Simons (1994, p. 9) conclude is "definitionally incoherent and even contradictory." It is now clear that Foucaultian poststructuralism and neo-Marxian theory can co-exist and draw usefully from each other. As a result, texts are analyzed within a discursive framework, distinguishing critical discourse analysis from mere text analysis. Intertextuality reveals how texts draw upon, incorporate, recontextualize, and dialogue with other texts as well as those that are left out. Interdiscursivity is particularly useful in understanding how textual instantiations draw upon "the socially available repertoires" (Fairclough, 2003) of discourses within orders of discourse. As Lemke (1995, p. 10) points out, each community "has its own system of intertextuality: its own set of important and valued texts, its own preferred discourses, and particularly its own habits of deciding which texts should be read in the context of which others, and why, and how." This is the dialogic nature of texts drawn from consonant discourses explained above, and which is known as heteroglossia, defined in Bakhtinian terms by Lemke (1995) as "the diversity of social languages ... [that] are systematically related to one another" (p. 38), through which it constructs its "beliefs, opinions and values" (p. 24; cf. Bannet, 1989, p. 164; Foucault, 1972, p. 191). On the other hand, Scollon (2001, p. 16) uses the term "nexus of practice" to describe the action of focusing on "the multiple and various linkages among practices"; he uses it to distinguish this term from "community of practice", which focuses on "individual persons as a group which is formed within a bounded entity of membership, of inclusion and exclusion."

3. *Materialism.* A materialist conception of discourse underlies most critical discourse studies to the extent that social context relates to textual production. Fairclough, for example, asserts that that language and context are "imbricated" in social relations (1995a, p. 73; Gee, 1999), a notion that draws upon Marxian theory, Bakhtinian language theory, and Foucaultian discourse theories. This is consistent also with Volosinov's (1994) conclusion that verbal communication can be understood only through its interaction with concrete situations. In other words, language acquires life and evolves "in concrete verbal communication, and not in the abstract linguistic system of language forms, nor in the individual psyche of speakers" (1994, p. 59). More recently, Scollon (1998, p. 5) theorizes his concept of mediated action on the assumption that "mediated discourse is chained or linked mediated actions within communities of practice". Foucault's theory of discourse is also materialist, given his assertion that a statement occurs in an "enunciative field in which it has a place and a status, which arranges for its possible relations with the past, and which opens up for its possible future" (Foucault, 1972, p. 99). It is a set of social practices, "a group of rules that are immanent in a practice, and define it in its specificity" (p. 46). This has become virtually axiomatic for critical discourse theory.

The crucial element of discourse that separates it from a simple speech act, or communicative event, says van Dijk (1997b, p. 2), is that these acts or events happen "as part of more complex social events." In other words, discourse as social action occurs "within a framework of understanding, communication and interaction which is in turn part of broader sociocultural structures and processes" (1997b, p. 21; see also Wodak, 1996).

19 CRITICAL DISCOURSE STUDIES

4. *Historicity.* The historicity of discourse is a necessary concept because it provides for the spatio-temporality of any textual production and accommodates the diachronicity of discourse. Foucault's discourse theory states that knowledge is "empirically grounded in historical conditions" (Barnet, 1989, p. 159). Similarly, from a neo-Marxian perspective, heteroglossia is diachronic, as language "at any given moment of its historical existence... represents the co-existence of socio-ideological contradictions between the present and the past, between differing epochs of the past, between different socio-ideological groups in the present" (Gardiner, 1992, p. 291).

Research in which the historical nature of discourse is important includes van Leeuwen and Wodak (1999), whose discourse-historical methodology explores how certain types and genres of discourse are subject to diachronic change. Adapting Foucault (1972), Fairclough (1992) uses the concept of field to track the diachronic shifts in the "objective" world from text to text by looking at the "truth" attributed to texts over time. Texts are classified as belonging to a field of presence, concomitance, and memory (McKenna, 1999, extensively develops the notion as an analytical device).

5. *Constructionism and constructivism.* Epistemological analysis by social psychologists adopting Gergen's social constructionism and Wittgenstein's "meaning is use" maxim has strongly influenced discourse theory, although as Terwee (1995, p. 193) points out, both were often misunderstood or misapplied to draw the conclusion "that we are free to construct any meaning we like." Although it could be generally said that CDS adopts a social constructionist account of societal epistemology and ontology, the theoretical foundations of constructionism³ are not well elaborated or contested (Stubbs, 1996). Such theorizing tends to be assumed rather than asserted. For example, Gee (1999, p. 82) states that there is "a reciprocity between language and 'reality': language simultaneously reflects reality ('the way things are') and constructs (construes) it to be a certain way." Thus, language is both constituting and constitutive (Fairclough, 1989; Thompson, 1984).⁴ Allied to this is Bourdieu's constructivist structuralism in which field explains how "a particular distribution of capital... endows that field with its own specific practical logic" (Chouliaraki & Fairclough, 1999, p. 101). He replaces static structuralism with the notion of "spaces of struggle in the course of which they can be restructured, and the boundaries which separate them from other fields redefined, strengthened or weakened" (p. 101). This is what Laclau and Mouffe (1985) describe as articulation. Because it also incorporates the corporeal features of personal habitus, this type of theorization also acknowledges the significance of a reflexively constructed subject, with a degree of agency, negotiating their own social trajectory. However, not all critical theorists would necessarily embrace Bourdieu, not least Hasan (1999) who trenchantly criticizes Bourdieu's view of language in social analysis laid out in *The Production and Reproduction of Legitimate Language* (1992). Hasan argues that Bourdieu "fails to present a convincing model of the relations of language and society" (p. 29). Her strongest concern is the "distinction between a representational and a constructivist view of language... The difference is the measure of the power of language as a means of structuring the perception which social agents have of the social world" (p. 53).⁵

6. *Theories of subject.* Because the concept of subject incorporates issues of agency and constructedness, it is a crucial aspect of critical discourse studies. Foucault's

break with Marxist structuralism led to the understanding that there is an external and an internal form of subjectivity (Dreyfus & Rabinow, 1982, p. 212), and that power is a political technology geared to producing productive and subjective bodies (Bannet, 1989). Thus, power is exercised within discourses in the ways in which they constitute and govern individual subjects.

The indebtedness to Althusser is rarely acknowledged, although he provided two important insights: the materiality of ideology and the notion of interpellation. That is, ideology has a material existence: an ideology "always exists in an apparatus, and its practice, or practices" (Althusser, 1971, p. 166). These practices are "governed by the rituals in which these practices are inscribed, within the material existence of an ideological apparatus" (p. 168). Also, Althusser argued that ideology "functions" in such a way that it "recruits" subjects by interpellation or "hailing" (p. 174). Evidence of the continuing usefulness of this notion is Enstad's (1998) analysis, which uses Althusser's concept of interpellation to show how ladyhood is enacted as a cultural practice.

7. *Ideology*. For Althusser, individuals became agents of ideology through the construction of their subjectivity. Thus social practice manifests discursively constructed ideology. Neo-Marxists assert that, by infusing thought and practice, dominating ideologies maintain vested interests (cf. Horkheimer and Adorno). Yet, as Fairclough and Graham (2002) point out, Marx's original notion of ideology (Marx, 1846/1972) is not the eviscerated reductionist theory adopted by some enthusiastic neo-Marxists; for, in *The German Ideology*, Marx asserts that societies reproduce themselves "materially, socially, relationally, consciously, economically, and linguistically" (p. 201).

Foucault's theorization of power and discourse assumes "an open, mobile, and dynamic 'field' of interrelations in which power is everywhere and comes from everywhere" (Bannet, 1989, p. 168) to avoid the "deterministic clichés" of Althusser precluding the more structural concept of ideology (Merquior, 1985, p. 34). Hence Foucault warned that the notion of ideology "cannot be used without circumspection" (1980, p. 118; for more on this see Pennycook, 1994). It is the facility of taken-for-granted "common-sense" that provides ideology with its strongest ideological effect. This is best defined by Bourdieu as doxa (Bourdieu & Fagleton, 1992) or the "spontaneous belief or opinion [that]... would seem unquestionable and natural" (p. 112) or "things people accept without knowing" (p. 114). Applied to contemporary times, it is generally dominated by neo-liberal assumptions and the rampant commodification of all things, or as Wacquant (2001, p. 4) states: "the crushing of everything by the Moloch of the market, starting with the crushing of thought and all the forms of cultural expression." Where this produces and legitimates unequal personal capital, symbolic violence occurs (Bourdieu & Fagleton, 1992). As Everett (2002) sums up: "Symbolic violence is implacably exerted through the order of things, through the logic of practice, through complicity and interior defeat, suggesting that the symbolically dominated conspire and commit isolated treasons against themselves" (pp. 66-67). However, doxa infuse not only the economic domain, but social life in general. To paraphrase, an ideology is a concept that is "suffused with the political and moral issues pervading" in a field, and which is "subject to the interests of their bearers' social position" (Irvine & Gal, 2000, p. 35).

14 CRITICAL DISCOURSE STUDIES

8. *Power.* The tension between Foucaultian and neo-Marxist approaches to discourse is especially important in relation to power. Foucault's discourse theories have to be negotiated in critical discourse theory, but his failure to theorize effectively about power limits the value of his work.⁶ That is, his ambiguity about the institutional sources of discursive power, while rejecting the structuralist notions (state apparatus and ideological state apparatuses), has caused inertia in critical thinking for some time. Critical discourse theory has adopted three useful Foucaultian notions. The capacity of discourse to produce positive and negative outcomes (Luke, 2002) is one. The concept that power is acted out in the "capillaries" based on Foucault's understanding that power relations "are rooted in the system of social networks" (Foucault, 1982, p. 224) is also useful, and not antithetical to more structuralist accounts. The third significant concept that Foucault contributed, although already articulated in speech act theory (Austin, 1962; Searle, 1969; Wittgenstein, 1963) and in pragmatics (Mey, 1985), is the understanding that speaking subjects cannot enter the order of discourse if they do not meet certain requirements or if they are not qualified (Foucault, 1981). Various knowledges and disciplines intrinsic to social institutions and practices prohibit, limit, valorize, and exclude various utterances. This ability to prohibit, to limit, and to fix implies a link between discourse and power (Foucault, 1981), and between power and knowledge (Foucault, 1986).

Neo-Marxian approaches often incorporate these Foucaultian concepts. For example, Wodak (1996) identifies the importance of discipline in producing conforming people, or "docile bodies" (p. 26). Essentially there are three important theoretical adaptations for discourse theory, apart from, but related to, the issue of power: archaeology, genealogy, and the personal construction of subjectivity (ethics). Examples of this incorporation of Foucaultian theory into critical discourse studies can be readily seen. For example, van Dijk (1997a, p. 23) adopts a Foucaultian approach to discourse and power by saying that "Instead of straightforward top-down coercion or persuasion, we find various patterns of sharing, negotiating, colluding with, and hence dividing power among powerful groups." Casey (2000, p. 63) argues that alienation and the loss of human agency "is now normalized in postmodern conditions," and seeks out a new ethic of "creative, generative emancipation." Mumby and Stohl (1991, p. 316) assert that "power is conceived not as simple coercion, but rather as the process through which consensual social relations are articulated within the context of certain meaning systems." In other words, material and discursive relations of power can no longer be reductively theorized, but at the same time, critical theory restates the significance of the structural foundations of power that Foucault seemed never to have accounted for effectively.

Summing up discourse in critical discourse theory

Critical discourse theories assume that discourses establish relations among people and provide people with a range of utterance possibilities within various discursive sites. Each discursive formation (such as science, law, medicine, engineering) puts limits on the epistemic, subjective, and ethical bases within which a range of possible statements is possible. This is the constructedness of discourse. Furthermore, every statement takes place within a history of statements (Bakhtin, 1986), and indeed can

make sense only in that history. That is: a discourse has a history; is a product of a community; has boundaries that determine what can be said; has characteristic ways of saying things; sometimes gets conventionalized into genres; and often uses specialized lexis and grammar (Halliday, 1978; Halliday & Martin, 1993; Martin, 1992). A phenomenologically objective world of reality is created through discourse. In this way communities develop and advance their activities; maintain commonality; and distinguish their boundaries of knowledge and/or faith. This objective world, or episteme, provides the practices, systems, knowledge, and rationality of a discourse community. The epistemic boundaries of powerful discourses provide firm institutional bases. In Bakhtin's (1986, p. 133) words, they have "sacrosanct, impenetrable boundaries". Nevertheless, discourse is diachronous because it changes over time. Monologic discourses, where social relations are exclusionary, experience little change. However, where discourse is dialogic, the discourse evolves as it responds to exchanges in the order of discourse. By contrast, dialectical discourses are conflictual as oppositional epistemes or ideologies compete. Essentially CDS investigates how discourse constructs and maintains the relations of power in society. It also has a political teleology to reduce inequality, particularly by affecting the nature of discourse, its participants, and the material conditions of existence, and so is normative (Luke, 2002; Luke & Freebody, 1997).

Methodologies

Various methodologies are used in CDS, making analysis "more akin to political, epistemic stances: principled reading positions and practices for the critical analysis of the place and force of language, discourse, text, and image" (Luke, 2002, p. 97). Luke implies that CDA deals not only with language and non language text, but is also implicitly sociological in analysis, as it questions the ontological, epistemological, and axiological aspects of discourse. Luke also implies that CDA is interdisciplinary (Chiapello & Fairclough, 2002). A useful summary of methodological approaches used in CDA is provided by Meyer (2001).⁷ Martin-Rojo (2001) collapses the current interdisciplinarity to three trends: ethnomethodological conversation analysis; sociolinguistic ethnography and interactional sociolinguistics; and discursive social psychology and critical discourse analysis. Sociolinguistic, ethnographic and ethnomethodological approaches are discussed throughout this paper, and a call is made for greater links with discursive social psychology (see the section on interdisciplinarity below). Blommaert and Bulcaen (2000) assert that the methodological weaknesses of CDA would be remedied if it were situated within a wider panorama of common concerns, questions, and approaches.

A dominant method employed is linguistic analysis: in fact, ethnographically oriented text analyses frequently use lexico-syntactic analyses (Gal, 1989). Hallidayan linguistics, or systemic functional linguistics (SFL),⁸ is widely used. Although the SFL sociolinguistic model (Halliday, 1978; Martin, 1992) claims that writing is "socially embedded" and "socially constructive" (Martin, 1992, p. 56), there is nothing intrinsically critical about it as a tool of social analysis. However, because the lexico-grammar realizes and redounds with the contextual variables as it configures meaning in text (Martin, 1992), its capacity for textually revealing the relations of power within the social context is self-evident.

The major methodological criticisms of CDS are the text-context link and the selection and size of a linguistic corpus. The claim that language realizes the social context has been strongly challenged by Widdowson (1997, 1998), who argues that, while grammatical description, including SFL, can be used as a descriptive tool, it does not provide explanatory adequacy (1997). Similarly, Blommaert and Bulcaen (2000) regard the treatment of context in CDA as its biggest methodological challenge. Stubbs (1996) argues that CDA analysts "take too much for granted in the way of method and of context" (p. 102): if language is socially constitutive, how do the micro-macro links among language, ideology, relations of power, and cognition actually work? Critical discourse studies negotiate the extra-discursive domain through the concept of context, which was initially defined through fairly structuralist sociological notions such as class in particular (Bernstein, 1971, 1973), gender (for good overviews of gender discourse studies see Bucholz, 2003; McElhinny, 2003; Wodak, 1997c), and ethnicity/racism (for example, van Dijk, Ting-Toomcy, Smitherman, & Troutman, 1997; van Leeuwen & Wodak, 1999). The influence of poststructuralism and cultural studies has certainly helped to develop more sophisticated analyses by forcing more complex sociocultural analysis dealing with discursive diachronicity and heteroglossia, subjectivity, and micro-level relations of power.

This methodological link to the extra-discursive domain is important, say Fairclough, Jessop, and Sayer (2001). Scollon's (2001) notion of mediated discourse assumes that "social action and discourse are inextricably linked" (p. 1) such that there is an "unresolvable dialectic between action and the material means which mediate all social action" (p. 3).

The other concern that Stubbs (1996) raises is whether the selection of text is representative. Widdowson (1998) is far more scornful. Criticizing Fowler's defence of small corpus linguistic analysis, Widdowson says such an approach is "a kind of ad hoc bricolage which takes from theory whatever concept comes usefully to hand" (p. 137).

Gee (1999) states that CDA can assert its validity by responding to four elements related to the categories of discourse he devises. These four elements are convergence, agreement, coverage, and linguistic detail. By convergence, Gee means that the more the answers to questions about the categories of discourse converge to provide compatible and convincing answers, the more valid is the analysis. Agreement infers that the more convincing analysis will rely on native speakers of the discourse. Coverage is achieved the more it can be applied to related sorts of data. Finally, linguistic details should tie the text tightly to the details of linguistic structure. By this set of criteria it could be argued that the fundamentals of CDA are sound for language-based text. The strongest foundation of CDA is its materialist conception of language (Chouliaraki & Fairclough, 1999; Foucault, 1972; Volosinov, 1986), which Fairclough usefully characterizes as language "imbricated" in everyday practice (1995b, p. 73).

Where to from here?

Although now an established intellectual tradition, if CDS is to maintain its critical edge, then it needs to consider which issues are fundamental to the transformative

politics to which it adheres. Of course, this review has already been occurring. For example, Chouliaraki and Fairclough (1999) see the major future themes as hybridity, globalization, identity, reflexivity and commodification, dealing with such issues as the growth of bureaucratic and technocratic language; hegemonic globalization; and the technologization of discourse. From a broader perspective, however, critical discourse theorists will be confronting the context of "new times," predominantly characterized by neo-liberal hegemony, hypercapitalism, and technologies and technocratic control.

Neo-liberal hegemony

The neo-liberal hegemony in Western culture is very close to absolute (Brenner & Theodore, 2002; Tickell & Clark, 2001); even terrorism events can be marketized (Courson & Turnham, 2003). It infuses discourses and social practices at all levels of public and social organization, no matter how inappropriate, operating within the discursive constraints set by organizations such as the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank (Jessop, 2000; Swyngedouw, 2000).

Hypercapitalism

Graham's (2000, 2002) characterization of hypercapitalism is a useful starting point. One characteristic is the operationalization and inculcation of knowledges as social practices. Another characteristic is that surplus value is increasingly being built on "self-valorizing things" or phenomenological capital, what Bauman (1998, p. 44) refers to as the "the illusion of wealth." Other important features of hypercapitalism are its technocratic hegemony (see below) and its operation as a knowledge economy (hypermediated compilation, storage and application of data; increasingly technologized modalities of social interaction; the dominance of the culture industry, with its attendant simulacra, over traditional industries).

Technologies and technocratic control

The impact of technologies on daily life and work (see sections on modalities and also workplace, below) and technocratic control raise questions regarding the relationships between new technologies and work organization; the extent to which organizational change is technologically determined; the new forms of collaboration that develop around these new technologies and forms of work organization (such as outsourcing, downsizing, "flexible" work arrangements); the role of discourse in creating new ontologies and axiologies surrounding the new organizational and management patterns; and the global/local impacts of technologies in a "free-trade" world.

The technocracy could be seen as the "catalysts of the Third Industrial Revolution and the ones responsible for keeping the high-tech economy running" (Rifkin, 1996, p. 175). Discursively it presents itself as "above the fray," supplying disinterested "facts" that must be taken into account in policy formulation (Lemke, 1995, p. 70), which is disingenuous because it depoliticizes political questions, primarily of distribution (Bewes, 1997). Its main discursive marker is to

"ventriloquate" scientific discourse (Lenke, 1995, p. 77), reinforcing its claims to objectivity and action based on reason and fact; but these are "parodies of the worst of the scientific dialects" (Saul, 1997, p. 49). It is an undemocratic discourse, a closed discourse that treats opposition as incorrect propaganda (Marcuse, 1968). From a Habermasian perspective (Habermas, 1987), the "system world" of systematized technocratic rationality colonizes the life-world by imposing technocratic understanding and imperatives on practice. The effect of technocracy is to entrench class-based inequality by recommending and implementing social policies based on neo-classical economics and neo-liberal individualist assumptions that infuse contemporary technocratic discourse (cf. McKenna & Graham, 2000).

The issues

In this section, I briefly survey the major issues of critical discourse studies – racism, pedagogy, and gender – while acknowledging that it omits the work of critical linguistic anthropologists such as Susan Gal, Michael Silverstein, Bambi Schieffelin, and Paul Kroskrity. Although this paradigm provides one of the headwaters of CDS, their work tends to be associated with linguistics rather than critical discourse. Nevertheless, enormous synergies and insights will be gained by closer collaboration and incorporation.

Racism

Discourses of race, ethnicity, and nationalism have been analyzed for quite some time. These were originally based on the notions of cultural differences (for example Gudykunst, 1991; Hofstede, 1984) and face (for example, Ting Toomey, 1988), often within a business communication context, and were largely bereft of concerns about power and racism. However, this has changed. For example, van Dijk et al. (1997) look at intercultural communication from the perspective of face negotiation theory based on Ting-Toomey's (1988) theory of facework.

The rise of European racism has been critically documented (van Leeuwen, 1996; van Leeuwen & Wodak, 1999). Important in these analyses is how national identity is constructed through narratives of the past "in schoolbooks, films and documentation, in exhibitions, in political speeches, in a multitude of visual symbols" (Wodak, 2003, p. 11). Another effective method shows how political rhetoric strategically constructs categories, such as indigenes and farmers, with associated political and economic entitlements (LeCouteur, Rapley, & Augoustinos, 2001). This is not unlike Wetherell and Potter's (1992) definition of racist discourse as that which categorizes, allocates and discriminates to sustain and legitimate a dominant group.

Pedagogy

Critical discourse studies of pedagogy have led to critical literacy being one of the few social policies actually implemented. Critical literacy asks "what kinds of literate practices, for whom, fitted for what kinds of social and economic formations should be constructed and sanctioned through teaching" (Luke & Freebody, 1997, p. 2)?

A significant contribution to critical approaches to language in education was provided by Bernstein (1971, 1973). As well as characterizing class traits (for example, working class children do not defer gratification), his empirical language research led him to conclude that language "codes" structurally order beliefs and relationships, and that this occurs at the level of family class. Although wrongly attributed to him, the deficit model of education in which students would acquire more powerful discourses to replace their restricted code was criticized by such left-liberals as Labov (1972) and some critical theorists who urged resistance, rather than acquiescence, to dominant discourses. For example, Lee (1997) questions whether the genre approach to writing and systemic functional grammar is "theoretically and politically naive" (p. 416) because it is "a de facto endorsement of the official discourses of schooling, a reification. . . genres of writing" (p. 417). Lemke (2003b), by contrast, sees advanced literacy as "a social process of enculturation into the values and practices of some specialist community". From a postcolonial perspective, Faraclas (1997, p. 155) asserts that the "products of the Papua New Guinea education system are designed to promote and perpetuate Cargo development in the country" (Schieffelin, 2000 is typical of social anthropological research on indigenous literacy). Faraclas claims that critical literacy will allow colonized people to understand how dominant discourses "hold sway over people's minds wherever these discourses are not consciously and vigorously challenged and deconstructed" (p. 162).

Clearly, Bernstein had alerted educationists to the significance of dominant and marginalized discourses, and their effect on reproducing class inequality. However, there is little agreement on how that might be countered. Initially, this concern with class and educational outcomes occurred at about the same time as both liberal, child-centred education with strong tendencies to individualism and choice (cf. Rogers, 1969), and dramatic workforce changes (Gee, Hull, & Lankshear, 1996). In a sense, neo-liberal pedagogy now uses the discourse of personal choice and freedom to obscure the structural inequalities of education (Chouliaraki, 1998), and to make a specious link between education and the possibility of full-time work. Although Bernstein (1990) is partly correct in identifying "choice" as but "a thin cover for the old stratification of schools and curricula" (p. 63), the more important issue is, as Apple (2001) states, for critical discourse theorists to understand how the discourse of education has been commodified ("client," "product") and used as to create the new self-reliant citizen of the enterprise culture. Furthermore, discourses of education are used to construct "globalization as an inexorable force of change to which nations and individuals must be prepared to adapt" while obfuscating the realities of the capitalist system (Mulderigg, 2003). As a result, the possibility of an egalitarian education-- "a conscious collective attempt to name the world differently, to positively refuse to accept dominant meanings, and to positively assert the possibility that it could be different" (Apple, 1996, p. 21) is largely negated.

Increasingly, literacy means a capability with multimedia genres, particularly in science (Jewitt, Kress, Ogborn, & Charalampos, 2001). Luke and Elkins (2000) see literacy as being "about complex ecological and social relations between adolescents and their symbol-, language-, and discourse-rich environments" (p. 397). Adolescent literacies need to "provide critical engagements with globalized flows of information, image, text, and discourse" (Luke, 2003, p. 20). The calls for new literacies

to engage multimodalities have been promoted for quite some time by Kress and van Leeuwen (see, for example, Kress & van Leeuwen, 1992; the definition of literacy incorporating multimodality was formally affirmed by the New London Group, 1996, 2000). To date, however, empirical research into multimodality is fairly inconclusive. Clearly, our cultural expression and modes of social interaction are multisemiotic and multimodal to the extent there is a definable form of a new hyperlinked, interactive, and multimedia cyberculture. Literacy, then, needs to meet these new conditions by helping not just students, but more marginal groups, to attain competencies in these practices in contexts that are governed by rules and conventions. However, two impulses need to be restrained: the tendency to uncritical technophilia and the belief that computer-mediated education is necessarily efficacious (McKenna, 2002).

Gender issues

Because trying to limit gender analysis to that in the critical discourse domain is virtually impossible, this brief survey must be necessarily limited. Generally, critical discourse studies have tended to incorporate gender issues into wider considerations of power. Two criticisms of gender studies relevant to a CDS approach are: its considerable emphasis "on white, middle-class heterosexuals speaking English in Western societies" (West, Lazar, & Kramarac, 1997, p. 120), and the need to re-formulate their critique in the light of post-feminist studies, particularly in literary studies, so that women are understood as agentive beings capable of resistant readings (Mills, 1995, 1998). Language and discourse changes in the third wave of feminism raise new areas of interest in gender-oriented critical discourse studies, according to Cameron (2003) because not only has gender-inclusive language now been institutionalized, but also a new form of feminine discourse in the new globalized services sector has been commodified. That is, masculinized public discourse has now been replaced by a Princess Diana speech style that connotes "sincerity and emotional openness" (Cameron, 2003, p. 196).

From the perspectives of political economy and organization studies, the most significant research orientations are the instrumentalization of the aesthetic (Gagliardi, 1996; Hancock & Tyler, 2000), and the embodiment of the feminine in organizational logic (Grosz, 1994). Whether the partial feminization of organizations has been politically liberatory is questioned by Gherardi (2003) who asks whether this is just "another ideological device to co-opt white women by means of 'organizational seduction'" (p. 220). Theoretically, Gherardi (1994) and Calas and Smircich (1996, 1997, 1999) argue, feminist theorists may "have been tourists in the land of postmodernism and may not wish to settle there permanently" (Calas & Smircich, 1999, p. 665). Instead, there appears to be a deconstructionist turn that has shifted "attention from the subject 'woman' . . . to the relationship between discourses and institutional forms which create forms of power backed by knowledge claims" (Gherardi, 2003, p. 226). This has led to studies of the discursive links between men and managerialism and organizational sexuality. For example, Brewis and Sinclair (2000) consider the way that women's bodies "might be understood as complicated sites which powerful discourses inform, affect and construct in various ways" (p. 211). Yet, for all this, overt commodification of women's bodies still

occurs. Hancock and Tyler's (2000) study of female airline flight attendants reveals how the instrumentalization of the sexualized feminine aesthetic provides a sophisticated vicarious sexual attention for male airline passengers as an essential marketing tool. This required the attendants to perform as "aesthetic artefacts," and that they interpellate "essentialized understanding of their embodied capacity for aesthetic communication as a natural outcome of their feminine gender" (p. 115).

Ordinary lives: identity and the worker-subject

Critical discourse is ultimately concerned with improving the lives of ordinary people by making transparent the relationships of power that oppress and diminish. Given the neo-liberal ascendancy, the consumer identity culture, new modalities, and brutal economic displacements (Benner, 2002, provides details of this even among high-skill Silicon Valley IT workers), the issues of identity, agency, social fragmentation, and the workplace must be an important locus of study.

Worker identity and subjectivity

Political freedom implies agency to control the circumstances of our lives and to reflexively form our subjectivity. Perhaps the most pervasive of these subject roles in hypercapitalism is that of worker-consumer. Simple structuralist accounts of the worker in terms of class fail to identify the contradictions of the worker construed as a consumer. Responding to capitalism's growth imperative (Jameson, 1991), where consumption is presented as an act of choice (Rose, 1992), workers shed their class role and become actors maximizing quality of life through choosing goods and services that determine a lifestyle and cultural signification (Bourdieu, 1984; DuGay, 1996a,b; Featherstone, 1991).

The major political implication of this is that the "individualistic self-ethic is likely to undermine the psychological valiancy of the relational 'other directed,' moral fabric" that is implied in active citizenship (Heelas, 1991, p. 85; DuGay, 1996a). Consequently class identity as a worker, and solidarity in collective organizations such as unions are supplanted by the self-orientation of consumption.

More broadly, the issue of social fragmentation is a significant political issue at the macro level (society and politics) and at the micro level (individuals, relationships, families). The two factors that most contribute to this phenomenon are globalization at the macro level and increasing "choice" at the micro level. The intensified space-time distantiating of globalization disembods "social relations from particular places and contexts" and "de-traditionalizes" societies (Giddens, 1994, p. 80). However, Giddens' rather phlegmatic conclusion that social life is enhanced through greater reflexivity needs scrutiny. At the micro level, Beck (1992; Beck & Beck-Gernsheim, 2002) identifies how mutating choice, particularly in life paths and individualist ethics, have produced a dilemma of "individualization". Social fabric is lost as a result, deferring often to "the efficacy of expert systems" (Chouliaraki & Fairclough, 1999, p. 81). It is appropriate, then, that CDS research, as Luke (2002) asserts, contend with blended and hybrid forms of representation and identity, and new spatial and

22 CRITICAL DISCOURSE STUDIES

temporal relations generated by the technologically enhanced flows of bodies, capital, and discourse that characterize economic and cultural globalization.

The place of work

Surprisingly, the workplace as a site of study has been motivated more by management and organizational scholars adopting critical methods than by critical discourse scholars choosing this as a site. This process began as an "interpretive turn" from the 1980s considering how "meaning systems are manifested in discursive practices" (Mumby & Stohl, 1991, p. 315). Initially, organizational narrative, metaphor, and myth were examined. For example, using the Barthesian notion of myths, Mumby's (1988) study of organizational culture incorporated symbolic analysis of myths, stories, and legends using ethnographic techniques. Out of these methods, discourse came to be seen as "the primary vehicle through which social relations are produced and reproduced", and ideology as "grounded materially in day-to-day discursive processes" (p. 316). Thus, the organization was viewed as "a site of struggle between numerous competing groups" (Deetz & Mumby, 1990, p. 29), and discourse seen as "both medium and product of the power relations" (p. 41). Concurrent with the earlier interpretive studies, Alvesson (1985) and a more anthropologically-oriented Deetz (1982) were driving management and organization studies to the critical (see Iedema & Wodak's 1999 overview of the development of organizational studies).

Critical management theorists are not duped by this libertarian spin on post-modern perspectives that describes the postmodern organization as having "no centrally organized system of authority" (Crook, Pakulski, & Waters, 1992, p. 187) or as a boundary-less organization undermining bureaucratic hierarchy (Mead & Mead, 1992). As Dale and Burrell (2000) point out, notwithstanding Foucault, power does centralize in definable clusters (around capital and gender in particular). The new age organization "often...disguises a widening of the boundaries of the organization, again in space and time, through homework or the expectations of professionals and managers to deal with 'work' issues whenever and wherever" (pp. 27-28). A critical focus on how the discursive distribution of power normalizes particular subject positions, regulates space and time, and surveils to ensure conformity will continue to provide insight into contemporary relations of power.

Calculative technologies

Organizations have been "transformed into aggregations of accountable spaces" (Rose, 1999b, p.152), obliterating well-established and functioning bureaucratic and professional norms. Ethical considerations are no longer used to authorize action, but rather to measure "service" and "output" delivery (Rose, 1999b, p. 151) according to a strategic plan. Processes are rendered calculable through a process of inscription, which translates "the world into material traces: written reports, drawings, maps, charts and pre-eminently numbers" (Rose, 1999a, p. 6). These calculative technologies dominate the discourses of enterprises, bureaucracies, hospitals, educational institutions, and the like, by requiring participants to

"work out 'where they are', calculate themselves in relation to 'where they should be' and devise ways of getting from one state to the other" (Rose & Miller, 1992, p. 187).

Subject

This corporate culturalism, Willmott (1993) says, systematizes and legitimizes modes of control "that purposefully seek to shape and regulate the practical consciousness and, arguably, the unconscious strivings of employees" (p. 524). The cultural strength of an organization is signified by the degree to which "the content of employees' purposiveness [aligns] with the normative framework laid down by the cultural engineers of the corporation" (p. 523). Through a process of "technocratic informalism" employees are lured into "a complex process of 'social engineering'" through training, planning, and learning programs, and the using of various human resource management techniques. It is no longer just the labour output that is to be regulated, because an "army of experts of the soul" (Miller & O'Leary, 1994, p. 106) operates on the complete subject, blurring the private and workplace boundaries. Through auditing practices (Dean, 1996), workers reshape their conduct to conform to organizational norms. In this way, "partners" and "stakeholders" become "enwrapped in webs of knowledge and circuits of communication through which their actions can be shaped and steered and by means of which they can steer themselves" (Rose, 1999b, p. 147; see also Miller & O'Leary, 1994). Given that subjectivity, or identity, "is constructed through its enmeshment in social and communicative practices" (Mumby & Stohl, 1991, p. 316), the workplace strongly influences the construction of the subject.

As corporate culture now "seeks to control the hearts as well as the minds of the employees" (Hassard, Holliday, & Willmott, 2000, p. 6), the subject increasingly becomes infused with the logic, the episteme, and the ethic of corporations. This corporate culture, therefore, extends the entrepreneurial disposition to the worker, and transfers organizational purpose to the individual. By linking the individual worker to the enterprise, the interests of capitalism are better served because workers align personal goals with ideals of individualism, rather than with those of group solidarity as worker (Miller & Rose, 1995). Maintaining class solidarity, of course, would be highly improbable within this culture.

Corporeality and habitus

The concept of bodily inscription is also part of the Bourdieuan project (Coupland & Gwyn, 2003; Hassard et al., 2000). Fundamental to this research is the concept of habitus, which is described as involving mental and corporeal schemata; it is fluid in the sense that it represents a relatively fixed personal identity and a more variable occupational identity (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992). Habitus might also be defined as the semi-conscious dispositions that people develop as they interact socially and materially within their environment, particularly as part of their social field (Bourdieu, 2000), predisposing people to particular discourses and styles (Bourdieu, 1991).

The time is right, it would appear, for a revitalized sociology (Casey, 2002) that acknowledges the role of the body in evaluating the potential for change.

24 CRITICAL DISCOURSE STUDIES

Conceptually, the theoretical and methodological resources are there. For example, Bourdieu's habitus and the Foucaultian subject are compatible (Everett, 2002) and immensely valuable concepts. More recently, Ron Scollon (2001) states that his conceptual framework of mediated discourse action (MDA) incorporates habitus in tracking the ontogenesis of mediated action assuming that discourse and action are inextricably linked: in fact, Suzanne Scollon (2002) asserts that MDA differs from CDA in the degree to which the former focuses on action.

The concept of habitus has at least two possible applications within critical discourse studies. First, as Casey (2000) suggests, is a sociology that incorporates the body as a site within which discourse is materialized and embodied. Second, related to this, particularly in the organizational structures of society, is how the body is physically incorporated through daily practice and through texts into the "new rationalities and technologies for the government of conduct" (Rose, 1996, p. 312). If Rose is correct in claiming that this aspect of modernity "destroyed the fixed social and cultural formations of community and kinship, which had defined the identity of subjects from outside" (p. 301), then the social, political, and cultural implications are profound indeed.

Critical management and organization studies have been growing significantly outside the realm of critical discourse studies, as I have outlined it, yet there could be considerable scope for collaboration with untapped discipline areas. Fruitful areas of research include the construction of the worker-subject, and the ideological function of new management (cf. Chiapello & Fairclough, 2002). Mumby and Clair (1997) suggest that critical studies of organizational discourse are developing in two related directions: those concerned with understanding and critiquing the relationships among discourse, ideology and power (such as Helmer, 1993), and critical feminist studies (such as Gherardi, 1994; Martin, 1990).

Modalities

Kress (2000) argues that, increasingly, contemporary texts cannot be thought of only as linguistic artefacts, because various other modalities are also present in the text. Extensions of the notion of text have been developed (see van Leeuwen, 1998; 1999 for applications to music); however agreement about what constitutes text is evasive. Nevertheless, useful works are available. Kress, Leite Garcia, and van Leeuwen (1997) assert that the concept of multimodality opens up "a vast new field of research" dealing with the "cognitive, cultural and political potentials of different modes" (p. 286). However, these writers seem to imply that social semiotics may not be a completely satisfactory framework for doing this. Nevertheless, Martin (1999, 2002) has been developing multimodal critical analyses using an SFL framework. Although the descriptive and analytical tools for dealing with non-verbal texts are being developed, the methodological robustness and validity still needs considerable work.

Potential interdisciplinarity

The preliminary overview of theory and methodology, above, establishes the wide range of disciplines from which critical discourse studies draws. One area, organiz-

ational studies, has adopted as one analytical device, literary and anthropological techniques of deconstructive, symbol, and narrative analysis (Grant & Oswick, 1996; D. Morgan, 1996; G. Morgan, 1980). Two major influences are the literary-philosophical work of Ricoeur (1977) and the linguistic philosophical work of Lakoff and Johnson (1980) dealing with metaphors. A network of metaphors, Ricoeur says, produces an array of "intersignifications." Lakoff and Johnson state that, because metaphors regulate our thinking by structuring our understanding, they strongly determine the way that we apprehend our life. Mumby (1988) sees organizational culture as crucial to creating "shared meaning" and "sense making" (cf. Wodak, 1996). Elsewhere Wodak (1997b) states that power is a structural phenomenon, "constituted and reproduced through the structure of organizational symbolism, [particularly] ... in the establishment of the symbols" (pp. 336-337).

Although deconstructive techniques in organizational theory lack the complexity of literary theory, they have been useful in directing attention to the absences of marginality; for example, Mumby and Stohl (1991, p. 330) look for the "'signified absence' as a site of organizational struggle". In this way, marginalized and disempowered discourses are prised out and the reasons for their absence examined for why the text is "forbidden to say certain things" (Fagleton, 1976, pp. 34-35). Analyzing organizational narrative and storytelling analysis occurs in literature and anthropology, especially in organizational studies (Beech, 2000; Boje, 1994; Boyce, 1996; Vaara, 2002).

Social psychology

Social psychology is a significant seedbed of interdisciplinary research with critical discourse studies. Although much social psychology is descriptive rather than normative, the linkages with critical discourse studies are quite strong, as evidenced by the pioneering work of van Dijk and Wodak. More recently Augoustinos, a social psychologist, has considered Australian racism using various methodologies: information processing theory (Augoustinos & Innes, 1997); discursive psychology and a blend of ethnomethodology and CA (LeCouteur et al., 2001); and another using the CDA of Fairclough, Wodak, and van Dijk with rhetoric and social psychology (Augoustinos, LeCouteur, & Soyland, 2002).

The social psychological concepts of schema, cognition, and social identity share similar concepts with critical discourse theory. A common root is the Lurian-Vygotskian understanding that: "One must seek the origins of conscious activity and 'categorical' behavior not in the recesses of the human brain or in the depths of the spirit, but in the external conditions of life" (quoted in Wertsch, 1998, p. 8).

In essence, Vygotsky (1978) claims that social interaction shapes the unique consciousness of each person. There is a dialectical unity of the biological and the cultural: that is, the cognitive and language development of humans involves the "interaction between changing social conditions and the biological substrata of behaviour" (p. 122). These strong foundations would seem to negate Stubbs' (1996) criticism that the link of language and thought in CDS - schemata being identified linguistically through cohesion in Hallidayan linguistics - is vague. Also, this form of transdisciplinarity can serve only to enhance the validity of the language-thought-social link.

As Kashima (2000) points out, the concept of culture as a process of production and reproduction of meanings in actors' concrete practices within particular spatio-temporal contexts is shared by: psychologists such as Cole (1996), Lave and Wenger (1991), and Wertsch (1998, 2002); contemporary Marxist theories (Fairclough & Graham, 2002); and "neo-Geertzian, approaches" (such as Atkinson, 1992).

Schema and cognition

Schema theory is well established in psychological literature (Bartlett, 1932; Fiske & Taylor, 1991; Rumelhart, 1980; Schank & Abelson, 1977). Schema can be defined as organized knowledge structures (Fiske & Taylor, 1991) that provide useful shortcuts for explaining observed outcomes (Rhee & Cappella, 1997). More simply, Cohen, Kiss and Le Voi (1993) explain schemas as "packets of information stored in memory representing general knowledge about objects, situations, events, or actions" (p. 28). Empirical studies using schema theory that socially constructs our ontological reality include: interpreting intercultural differences (Nishida et al., 1998); understanding young people's cultural models of romance and love (Bachen & Illouz, 1996); and studying the impact of domestic violence on police officers' schemata (Robinson, 2000). These real-world issues involve relations of power among and between social groups; they are bound within such discursive formations as race and ethnicity, romance, and gender-based violence; and they have significant ideological implications. This intersection of the social with the individual (or subject) links the psychology of mental schema and discursively constructed schema. Indeed, Moscovici (Moscovici & Markova, 1998) is particularly alert to the social context in which individual schemata are developed.¹⁰ This sensitivity is evident in Morgan and Schwalbe's (1990) research showing that schemata are modified according to the individual's ongoing social experience. Such interdisciplinarity is also evident in Dooley and Levinson's (2001) analyzing discourse, which asserts that "mental representations are not limited to understanding discourse, but are basic tools of human cognition" (p. 50).

Potential interdisciplinary developments include the link between schema, organizational tacit knowledge, and the schematic organization of collective memory. Perhaps the best definition of tacit knowledge is provided by Nonaka and Takeuchi's (1995) cognitive tacit knowledge model, which consists of "schemata, mental models, beliefs, and perceptions that are so ingrained that we take them for granted" (p. 8). The implications of this in analyzing the ontological and epistemological questions about tacit knowledge in knowledge management are quite profound, according to Rooney and Schneider (2002).

More generally, cognition can be understood using a social semiotic approach to discourse (Lemke, 2003a). Drawing on systems theory (Prigogine & Stengers, 1997), Lemke asserts that people play their parts in micro-ecologies, and are dependent to a large degree "on what the other parts do to us, and us to them, but [also] on what these doings mean for us."¹¹ Through participation we change our "identity-in-practice." We do this by moving from discourse to discourse, "from one activity to another, and as participants in one community of practice or another," while at the same time constructing continuities for ourselves across these contexts.

Schema and collective memory

The point at which the social schemata intersect with the personal, particularly the degree of agency that individuals have in shaping their own schema, is a significant issue. In Wertsch's (2002) analysis of this issue, he acknowledges "the processes of contestation and negotiation that characterize collective memory" (p. 35), thereby implying the relations of power that a critical discourse approach must incorporate. A useful line of analysis that this approach delivers is narrative, for underlying narrative are "the particular cultural, historical, and institutional settings in which we live" (p. 57). Narrative methodologies have already been used extensively in organizational communication studies to examine the collective memory of organizations (see, for example, Boje, 1994; Czarniawska-Joerges, 1997; Mumby, 1987).

Conclusion

If critical discourse studies is to remain true to its stated aim of dealing with real world issues of injustice, suffering, and inequality then it must not do so from the safe cyrie of increasingly abstract theory. Bourdieu emphasized "local interactions as sites of struggle of competing and contradictory representations with a potential to change dominant classifications" (quoted in Chouliaraki & Fairclough, 1999, p. 105). And this is where we must doggedly operate if we are to respond to Wodak's (1996) question of whether it is possible to realize the emancipatory claims we make. Theoretical contestation is vital to the intellectual vigour of any discipline, especially one such as critical discourse studies that has so many tributaries. It is probably best that empirical research be the most common site within which theory and method are contested, for two reasons. First, critical studies must avowedly deal with the lived experiences of our times, reporting on and interpreting various sites of a complex arrangement of socio-political and cultural ecosystems. Second, given that linguistics, sociology, political economy, history, anthropology, and psychology -- the tributaries -- each has its own methodological and epistemological concerns, it is hardly likely that CDS can provide other than broad methodological stipulations.

Notes

- 1 Typically these included studies of legislative language and law (such as Bhatia, 1987; Candlin, Bhatia, & Jensen, 2002) and legal texts (such as Gunnarsson, 1984), and English in academic settings (EAS) (Swales, 1990), which were largely descriptive and "to find more adequate writing strategies and to reform language" (Gunnarsson, 1997, p. 290).
- 2 Gal (1989, p. 348) points out that dissatisfaction with "the abstraction and determinism of French structural Marxism" also stimulated an interest in culture from anthropologists interested in political economy.
- 3 I use the term constructionism to refer to social psychological (Gergen, 1994; Harré, 1986), anthropological (Deetz, 1994), and sociological (Berger & Luckmann, 1966) accounts of social reality. Constructivism, which I do not deal with here, I take to

28 CRITICAL DISCOURSE STUDIES

- mean as the way that individuals' mental categories provide the means for interpreting the world (Delia, 1987).
- 4 Fairclough and Graham (2002) later elaborate this constitutive notion: "The constitutive work of discourse is not viewed idealistically as ideas being realized in material reality: the value relation as an 'abstraction' is already material language is the 'matter' which the mind is 'burdened with,' as the German Ideology put it – and the 'abstraction' is 'objectified' as a 'symbol,' itself a synthesis of idea and matter."
 - 5 It should be pointed out that following a rejoinder by Collins (1999) he acknowledges Bourdieu's weak view of language, but says that Hasan was attacking a fairly dated essay from the 1970s. Furthermore, he found it curious that Hasan had failed to mention the link between habitus and capital that Bourdieu draws.
 - 6 I do not go so far as Camille Paglia, who regards Foucault's theory of power as "foggy and paranoid" (see <http://www.neoliberalismo.com/Foucault.htm>)
 - 7 However, conversation analysis (CA) has had a difficult time assimilating into CDA. In an exchange of articles Schlegoff (1997), regarded as the founder of CA, Wetherell (1998), and Billig (1999), Schlegoff argues that CA and CDA are compatible provided they stick to the rules, as it were (see Mey, 2001). However, the rules themselves are rather contested. CA, says Schlegoff (1997), means that the text is analyzed using the tools of analysis that exclude contextual factors and the relations of power, letting the text "speak for itself." Wetherell (1998) rejects this, saying that the narrow focus of CA attention itself imposes "one narrow understanding of participants' orientations and relevance on the field as a whole" (pp. 404–405). Similarly, Billig (1999) questions the notion of letting the facts speak for themselves because the "response should not be to seek to discard all sociological assumptions, as if a pure empiricism were possible" (p. 556). Nonetheless, CA has been used by Iedema (1999), analysing scientific-technical discourses to show how conversational participants in a technical situation use structured exchange to recontextualize the meaning of the phenomenon before them. From a critical feminist perspective, Stokoe and Smithson (2001, p. 237) assert that "CA's analytic aims are compatible with those of feminist researchers whose goals include focusing on the subjective experience of their participants" (see also Kitzinger, 2000; Kitzinger & Frith, 1999).
 - 8 For more on the incorporation of SFL into the methodology of CDA see Wodak (2001).
 - 9 The literature, of course, is large. However, recent significant writings (such as Alvesson & Willmott, 1992; Chan & Garrick, 2002; Collinson, 1994; Du Gay, Salaman, & Rees, 1996; Garsten & Grey, 1997; Knights & Morgan, 1991; Morgan & Sturdy, 2000; Townley, 1993; Yenhoula & Weitz, 2000) provide a small representation of the possible lines of inquiry.
 - 10 There are, of course, limitations on the collaboration. In particular, Mosecovici tends to see conflict in interpersonal and group terms (Galan & Mosecovici, 1994), rather than as resulting from imbalances of power.
 - 11 This ecological metaphor of discourse resonates with Gregory Bateson (1972). Scollon (2001) also speaks of "the ecological unit of analysis" as one of his theoretical principles of mediated discourse analysis.

References

- Althusser, I. (1971). Ideology and ideological state apparatuses (Notes towards an investigation). In *Lenin and philosophy and other essays* (pp. 127–186). New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Alvesson, M. (1985). A critical framework for organizational analysis. *Organization Studies*, 6, 117–138.
- Alvesson, M., & Willmott, H. (1997). *Critical management studies*. London: Sage.
- Apple, M. W. (1996). *Cultural politics and education*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Apple, M. W. (2001). *Educating the "right way": Markets, standards, God, and inequality*. New York: Routledge & Falmer.
- Atkinson, P. (1992). *Understanding ethnographic texts*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Augoustinos, M., & Innes, J. M. (1997). Affect and evaluation in nationalistic advertising. *Australian Journal of Social Research*, 3, 3–16.
- Augoustinos, M., LeCouteur, A., & Soyland, J. (2002). Self-sufficient arguments in political rhetoric: Constructing reconciliations and apologizing to the Stolen Generations. *Discourse & Society*, 13, 105–142.
- Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to do things with words*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bachen, C. M., & Illouz, E. (1996). Imagining romance: Young people's cultural models of romance and love. *Critical Studies in Mass Communication*, 13, 279–308.
- Bakhtin, M. M. (1986). *Speech genres and other late essays* (V. W. McGee, Trans.). Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Bannet, E. T. (1989). *Structuralism and the logic of dissent: Barthes, Derrida, Foucault, Lacan*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Bartlett, F. C. (1932). *Remembering*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Bateson, G. (1972). *Steps to an ecology of mind*. New York: Ballantine Books.
- Bauman, Z. (1998). On glocalization: Or globalization for some, localization for others. *Thesis Eleven*, 54, 37–49.
- Beck, U. (1992). *Risk society: Towards a new modernity* (M. Ritter, Trans.). London: Sage.
- Beck, U., & Beck-Gernsheim, F. (2002). *Individualization: Institutionalized individualism and its social and political consequences*. London: Sage.
- Beech, N. (2000). Narrative styles of managers and workers: A tale of star-crossed lovers. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 36, 210–228.
- Benner, C. (2002). *Work in the new economy: Flexible labor markets in Silicon Valley*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Berger, P., & Luckmann, T. (1966). *The social construction of reality: A treatise in the sociology of knowledge*. New York: Doubleday.
- Bernstein, B. (1971). *Class, codes and control: Theoretical studies towards a sociology of language* (Vol. 1). London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Bernstein, B. (1973). *Class, codes and control: Applied studies towards a sociology of language* (Vol. 2). London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Bernstein, B. (1990). *Class, codes and control: The structuring of pedagogic discourse* (Vol. 4). London: Routledge.
- Bewes, T. (1997). *Cynicism and postmodernity*. London: Verso.
- Bhatia, V. K. (1987). *Analysing genre: Language use in professional settings*. London: Longman.

30 CRITICAL DISCOURSE STUDIES

- Billig, M. (1999). Whose terms? Whose ordinariness? Rhetoric and ideology in conversation analysis. *Discourse and Society*, 10, 543-558.
- Billig, M. (2002). Critical discourse analysis and rhetoric of critique. In G. Weiss & R. Wodak (Eds.), *Critical discourse analysis: Theory and interdisciplinarity* (pp. 35-46). Houndsmill: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Billig, M., & Simons, H. W. (1994). Introduction. In H. W. Simons (Ed.), *After postmodernism: Reconstructing ideology critique* (pp. 1-11). London: Sage.
- Blommaert, J., & Bulcaen, C. (2000). Critical discourse analysis. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 29, 447-466.
- Boje, D. M. (1994). Organisational storytelling: The struggles of pre modern, modern and postmodern organisational learning discourses. *Management Learning*, 25, 433-462.
- Bourdieu, P. (1984). *Distinction: A social critique of the judgement of taste* (R. Nice, Trans.). London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and symbolic power* (G. Raymond & M. Adamson, Trans.). Cambridge, UK: Polity Press in association with Basil Blackwell.
- Bourdieu, P. (2000). *Pascalian Meditations*. London: Verso.
- Bourdieu, P., & Wacziarg, T. (1992). Doxa and common life: In conversation. *New Left Review*, 191, 111-121.
- Bourdieu, P., & Wacziarg, T. J. D. (1992). *An invitation to reflexive sociology*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Boyce, M. E. (1996). Organisational story and storytelling: A critical review. *Journal of Organisational Change Management*, 9, 5-26.
- Brenner, N., & Theodore, N. (Eds.). (2002). *Spaces of neoliberalism*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Brewis, J., & Sinclair, J. (2000). Exploring embodiment: Women, biology and work. In J. Hassard, R. Holliday, & H. Willmott (Eds.), *Body and organization* (pp. 192-214). London: Sage.
- Bucholz, M. (2003). Theories of discourse as theories of gender: Discourse analysis in language and gender studies. In J. Holmes & M. Meyerhoff (Eds.), *The handbook of language and gender* (pp. 43-68). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Calas, M. B., & Smircich, L. (1996). From the women's point of view: Feminist approaches to organization studies. In S. Clegg, C. Hardy, & W. Nord (Eds.), *Handbook of organization studies* (pp. 218-257). London: Sage.
- Calas, M. B., & Smircich, L. (1997). *Postmodern management theory*. Aldershot: Dartmouth Publishing.
- Calas, M., & Smircich, L. (1999). Past postmodernism? Reflections and tentative directions. *The Academy of Management Review*, 24, 649-671.
- Cameron, D. (2003). Gender issues in language change. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 23, 187-201.
- Candlin, C. N., Bhatia, V. K., & Jensen, C. H. (2002). Developing legal writing material for English second language learners: Problems and perspectives. *English for Specific Purposes*, 21, 299-320.
- Casey, C. (2000). Sociology sensing the body: Revitalizing a dissociative discourse. In J. Hassard, R. Holliday, & H. Willmott (Eds.), *Body and organization* (pp. 52-70). London: Sage.
- Casey, C. (2002). *Critical analysis and organizations: Theory, practice, revitalization*. London: Sage.
- Chan, A., & Garrick, J. (2002). Organization theory in turbulent times: The traces of Foucault's ethics. *Organization*, 9, 683-701.

- Chiapello, E., & Fairclough, N. (2002). Understanding the new management ideology: A transdisciplinary contribution from critical discourse analysis and new sociology of capitalism. *Discourse and Society*, 13, 185–208.
- Chouliaraki, L. (1998). Regulation in 'progressivist' pedagogic discourse: Individualized teacher-pupil talk. *Discourse & Society*, 9, 5–32.
- Chouliaraki, L., & Fairclough, N. (1999). *Discourse in late modernity: Rethinking critical discourse analysis*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Cohen, G., Kiss, G., & Le Voi, M. (1993). *Memory: Current issues (2nd ed.)*. Philadelphia, PA: Open University Press.
- Colic, M. (1996). *Cultural psychology: A once and future discipline*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Collins, J. (1999). Comment on R. Hasan's "The disempowerment game: Bourdieu and language in literacy". *Linguistics and Education*, 10, 391–398.
- Collinson, D. L. (1994). Strategies of resistance: Power, knowledge and subjectivity in the workplace. In J. Jermier, W. Nord, & D. Knights (Eds.), *Resistance and power in organizations* (pp. 25–68). London: Routledge.
- Coupland, J., & Gwyn, R. (Eds.). (2003). *Discourse, the body and identity*. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Courson, P., & Turnham, S. (2003, July 30). Amid furor, Pentagon kills terrorism futures market. Retrieved 5 October 2003 from <http://www.cnn.com/2003/ALLPOLITICS/07/29/terror.market/>
- Crook, S., Pakulski, J., & Waters, M. (1992). *Postmodernization*. London: Sage.
- Czarniawska-Joerges, B. (1997). *Narrating the organization: Dramas of institutional identities*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Dale, K., & Burrell, G. (2000). What shape are we in? Organization theory and the organized body. In J. Hassard, R. Holliday, & H. Willmott (Eds.), *Body and organization* (pp. 14–30). London: Sage.
- Dean, M. (1996). Putting the technological into government. *History of the Human Sciences*, 9, 47–68.
- Deetz, S. (1982). Critical interpretive research in organizational communication. *The Western Journal of Speech Communication*, 46, 131–149.
- Deetz, S. (1994). Future of the discipline: the challenges, the research, and the social contribution. In S. Deetz (Ed.), *Communication Yearbook 17* (pp. 565–600). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Deetz, S., & Mumby, D. (1990). Power, discourse and the workplace. In J. Anderson (Ed.), *Communication Yearbook 13* (pp. 18–47). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Delia, J. (1987). Interpersonal cognition, message goals, and organization of communication: Recent constructivist research. In D. L. Kincaid (Ed.), *Communication theory: Eastern and Western perspectives* (pp. 255–274). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Dreyfus, H. L., & Rabinow, P. (1982). *Michel Foucault: Beyond structuralism and hermeneutics*. Brighton, Sussex: Harvester Press.
- Du Gay, P. (1996a). *Consumption and identity at work*. London: Sage Publications.
- Du Gay, P. (1996b). Organizing identity: Entrepreneurial governance and public management. In S. Hall, & P. du Gay (Eds.), *Questions of cultural identity* (pp. 151–169). London: Sage.
- Du Gay, P., Salaman, G., & Rees, B. (1996). The conduct of management and the management of conduct: Contemporary managerial discourse and the constitution of the 'Competent Manager'. *Journal of Management Studies*, 33, 263–282.

32 CRITICAL DISCOURSE STUDIES

- Eagleton, T. (1976). *Marxism and literary criticism*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Enstad, N. (1998). Fashioning political identities: Cultural studies and the historical construction of political subjects. *American Quarterly*, 50, 745-782.
- Everett, J. (2002). Organizational research and the praxeology of Pierre Bourdieu. *Organizational Research Methods*, 5, 56-80.
- Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and power*. London: Longman.
- Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and social change*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Fairclough, N. (1995a). *Critical discourse analysis: Papers in the critical study of language*. Harlow, UK: Longman.
- Fairclough, N. (1995b). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. London and New York: Longman.
- Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analysing discourse and text: Textual analysis for social research*. London: Routledge.
- Fairclough, N., & Graham, P. (2002). Marx as a critical discourse analyst: the genesis of a critical method and its relevance to the critique of global capital. *Estudios de Sociolingüística*, 3, 185-229.
- Fairclough, N., Jessop, B., & Sayer, A. (2001). *Critical realism and semiosis*. Paper presented at the International Association for Critical Realism Annual Conference, Roskilde, Denmark, August.
- Fairclough, N., & Wodak, R. (1997). Critical discourse analysis. In T. van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse studies: A multidisciplinary introduction* (pp. 258-284). London: Sage.
- Faracías, N. (1997). Critical literacy and control in the new world order. In S. Muspratt, A. Luke, & P. Freebody (Eds.), *Constructing critical literacies: Teaching and learning textual practice* (pp. 141-172). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press Inc.
- Featherstone, M. (1991). *Consumer culture and postmodernism*. London: Sage Publications.
- Fiske, S. T., & Taylor, S. E. (1991). *Social cognition* (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Foucault, M. (1972). *The archaeology of knowledge*. London: Tavistock.
- Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/knowledge - Selected interviews and other writings 1972-1977* (C. Gordon, Ed.; C. Gordon, L. Marshall, J. Mepham, & K. Soper, Trans.). Brighton: Harvester Press.
- Foucault, M. (1981). The order of discourse. In R. Young (Ed.), *Untying the text: A post-structuralist reader* (pp. 48-78). Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Foucault, M. (1982). The subject and power. In H. L. Dreyfus & P. Rabinow (Eds.), *Michel Foucault: Beyond structuralism and hermeneutics* (pp. 208-226). Brighton: Harvester.
- Foucault, M. (1986). *The history of sexuality* (Vol. 1). New York: Pantheon Books.
- Gagliardi, P. (1996). *Exploring the aesthetic side of organizational life*. In S. Clegg, C. Hardy, & W. Nord (Eds.), *Handbook of organization studies* (pp. 565-580). London: Sage.
- Gal, S. (1989). Language and political economy. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 18, 345-367.
- Galam, S., & Moscovici, S. (1994). Towards a theory of collective phenomena II: Conformity and power. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 24, 481-495.
- Gardiner, M. (1992). *The dialogics of critique: M.M. Bakhtin and the theory of ideology*. London: Routledge.
- Garsten, C., & Grey, C. (1997). How to become oneself: Discourses of subjectivity in post-bureaucratic organizations. *Organization*, 4, 211-288.

- Gee, J. G., Hull, G., & Lankshear, C. (1996). *The new work order: Behind the language of the new capitalism*. Sydney: Allen & Unwin.
- Gee, J. P. (1999). *An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method*. New York: Routledge.
- Gergen, K. J. (1994). *Realities and relationships: Soundings in social construction*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Gherardi, S. (1994). The gender we think, the gender we do in our everyday organizational lives. *Human relations*, 47, 591-610.
- Gherardi, S. (2003). Feminist theory and organization theory: A dialogue on new bases. In H. Tsoukas & C. Knudsen (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of organization theory* (pp. 210-236). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Giddens, A. (1994). *Beyond left and right*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Graham, P. (2000). Hypercapitalism: A political economy of informational idealism. *New Media and Society*, 2, 131-156.
- Graham, P. (2002). Hypercapitalism: New media, language, and social perceptions of value. *Discourse & Society*, 13, 227-249.
- Grant, D., & Osrick, C. (1996). *Metaphor and organizations*. London: Sage.
- Grosz, E. (1994). *Volatile bodies: Towards a corporeal feminism*. Sydney: Allen & Unwin.
- Gudykunst, W. B. (1991). *Bridging differences: Effective intergroup communication*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Gunnarsson, B. L. (1997). Applied discourse analysis. In T. A. van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse studies: A multidisciplinary introduction - Discourse as social interaction* (Vol. 2, pp. 285-312). London: Sage.
- Gunnarsson, B.-L. (1984). Functional comprehensibility of legislative texts: Experiments with a Swedish act of parliament. *Text*, 4, 71-105.
- Habermas, J. (1987). *The theory of communicative action: Lifeworld and system: A critique of functionalist reason* (Vol. 2, T. McCarthy, Trans.). Boston: Beacon Press.
- Habermas, J. (1989). *The structural transformation of the public sphere* (T. B. F. Lawrence, Trans.). Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1978). *Language as social semiotic: The social interpretation of language and meaning*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Halliday, M. A. K., & Martin, J. R. (1993). *Writing science: Literacy and discursive power*. London: Falmer Press.
- Hammersley, M. (1997). On the foundations of critical discourse analysis. *Language & Communication*, 17, 237-248.
- Hancock, P., & Tyler, M. (2000). "The look of love": Gender and the organization of aesthetics. In J. Hassard, R. Holliday, & H. Willmott (Eds.), *Body and Organization* (pp. 108-129). London: Sage.
- Harré, R. (1986). An outline of the social constructionist viewpoint. In R. Harré (Ed.), *The social construction of emotions* (pp. 2-14). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Hasan, R. (1999). The disempowerment game: Bourdieu and language in literacy. *Linguistics and Education*, 10, 25-87.
- Hassard, J., Holliday, R., & Willmott, H. (Eds.). (2000). *Body and organization*. London: Sage.
- Heelas, P. (1991). Reforming the self: Enterprise and the characters of Thatcherism. In R. Keat & N. Abercrombie (Eds.), *Enterprise culture* (pp. 72-92). London: Routledge.
- Helmer, J. (1993). Storytelling in the creation and maintenance of organizational tension and stratification. *The Southern Communication Journal*, 59, 34-44.

34 CRITICAL DISCOURSE STUDIES

- Holstede, G. (1984). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values* (Abridged ed.). Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.
- Iedema, R. (1999). Formalizing organizational meaning. *Discourse & Society*, 10, 49–65.
- Iedema, R., & Wodak, R. (1999). Introduction: Organizational discourses and practices. *Discourse & Society*, 10, 5–19.
- Irvine, J. T., & Gal, S. (2000). Language ideology and linguistic differentiation. In P. V. Kroskrity (Ed.), *Regimes of language: Ideologies, politics, and identities* (pp. 35–84). Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research Press.
- Jameson, F. (1991). *Postmodernism, or, the cultural logic of late capitalism*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Jessop, R. (2000). The crisis of the national spatio-temporal fix and the ecological dominance of globalising capitalism. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 24, 323–360.
- Jewitt, C., Kress, G., Ogborn, J., & Charalampos, T. (2001). Exploring learning through visual, actional and linguistic communication: The multimodal environment of a science classroom. *Educational Review*, 53, 5–18.
- Kashima, (2000). Conceptions of culture and person for psychology. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 31, 14–32.
- Kitzinger, C. (2000). Doing feminist conversation analysis. *Feminism & Psychology*, 10, 163–193.
- Kitzinger, C., & Frith, H. (1999). Just say no? The use of conversation analysis in developing a feminist perspective on sexual refusal. *Discourse & Society*, 10, 293–316.
- Knights, D., & Morgan, G. (1991). Strategic discourse and subjectivity: Towards a critical analysis of corporate strategy in organizations. *Organization Studies*, 12, 251–273.
- Kress, G. (2000). Multimodality: Challenges to thinking about language. *TESOL Quarterly*, 34, 337–340.
- Kress, G., Leite-Garcia, R., & van Leeuwen, T. (1997). Discourse semiotics. In T. van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse studies: A multidisciplinary introduction: Discourse as structure and process* (Vol. 1, pp. 256–289). London: Sage.
- Kress, G., & Van-Leeuwen, T. (1992). Structures of visual representation. *Journal of Literary Semantics*, 21, 91–117.
- Labov, W. (1972). *Language in the inner city: Studies in the Black English vernacular*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Laclau, E., & Mouffe, C. (1985). *Hegemony and socialist strategy: Towards a radical democratic politics*. London: Verso.
- Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 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, A. (1997). Questioning the critical: Linguistics, literacy and pedagogy. In S. Muspratt, A. Luke, & P. Freebody (Eds.), *Constructing critical literacies: Teaching and learning textual practice* (pp. 409–432). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press Inc.
- Lenke, J. L. (1995). *Textual politics*. London: Taylor & Francis.
- Lenke, J. L. (2003a). Cognition, context, and learning: A social semiotic perspective. *A chapter for situated cognition theory: Social, neurological, and semiotic perspectives*.

- (D. Kirshner & J. A. Whitson, ed.). Retrieved 12 October 2003 from <http://www-personal.umich.edu/~jaylemke/papers/sit-cog.htm>
- Lemke, J. L. (2003b). Multimedia genres for science education and scientific literacy. Retrieved 13 October 2003 from <http://academic.brooklyn.cuny.edu/education/jlemke/webs/nasa/Davis-NASA.htm>
- Luke, A. (2002). Beyond science and ideology critique: Developments in critical discourse analysis. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 22, 96–110.
- Luke, A. (2003). Literacy education for a new ethics of global community. *Language Arts*, 81, 20–22.
- Luke, A., & Elkins, J. (2000). Re/mediating adolescent literacies. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*, 13, 396–398.
- Luke, A., & Freebody, P. (1997). Critical literacy and the question of normativity: An introduction. In S. Muspratt, A. Luke, & P. Freebody (Eds.), *Constructing critical literacies: Teaching and learning textual practice* (pp. 1–18). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press Inc.
- Marcuse, H. (1968). *One dimensional man*. London: Sphere Books.
- Martin, J. (1990). Deconstructing organizational taboos: The suppression of gender conflict in organizations. *Organization Science*, 1, 339–359.
- Martin, J. R. (1992). *English text: System and structure*. Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamin.
- Martin, J. R. (1999). Grace: The logogenesis of freedom. *Discourse Studies*, 1, 79–86.
- Martin, J. R. (2002). Voicing the other: Reading and writing indigenous Australians. In G. Weiss & R. Wodak (Eds.), *Critical discourse analysis: Theory and interdisciplinarity* (pp. 199–219). Houndsmill: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Martin-Rojo, L. (2001). New developments in discourse analysis: Discourse as social practice. *Folia Linguistica*, 33, 41–78.
- Marx, K. (1972). The German ideology. In R. C. Tucker (Ed.), *The Marx-Engels reader* (pp. 110–166). New York: W.W. Norton. (Original work published 1846).
- McElhinny, B. (2003). Theorizing gender in sociolinguistics and linguistic anthropology. In J. Holmes & M. Meyerhoff (Eds.), *The handbook of language and gender* (pp. 21–42). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- McKenna, B. J. (1999). Critical discourse method of field: Tracking the ideological shift in Australian governments 1983–1986. Paper presented at the Annual meeting of the British Association for Applied Linguistics, University of Edinburgh.
- McKenna, B. J. (2002). Hype about hypertext. In C. N. Candlin (Ed.), *Research and practice in professional discourse* (pp. 609–637). Kowloon: City University of Hong Kong.
- McKenna, B. J., & Graham, P. (2000). Technocratic discourse: A primer. *Journal of Technical Writing and Communication*, 30, 219–247.
- Mead, W., & Mead, J. (1992). *Management for a small planet*. London: Sage.
- Merquior, J. G. (1985). *Foucault*. London: Fontana.
- Mey, I. (2001). The CA/CDA controversy. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 33, 609–615.
- Mey, J. L. (1985). *Whose language?: A study in linguistic pragmatics*. Amsterdam: J. Benjamins Publishing.
- Meyer, M. (2001). Between theory, method, and politics: Positioning of the approaches to CDA. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (pp. 14–31). London: Sage.
- Miller, P., & O'Leary, T. (1994). Governing the calculable person. In A. G. Hopwood (Ed.), *Accounting as social and institutional practice* (pp. 98–115). Cambridge, UK, and New York: Cambridge University Press.

36 CRITICAL DISCOURSE STUDIES

- Miller, P., & Rose, N. (1995). Production, identity and democracy. *Theory and Society*, 24, 427-467.
- Mills, S. (1995). *Feminist stylistics*. London: Routledge.
- Mills, S. (1998). Post-feminist text analysis. *Language and Literature*, 7, 235-252.
- Morgan, D. F. (1996). Rational choice and material relations: A rejoinder to Paul Hirst [Associative democracy: A comment on David Morgan]. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Sociology*, 32, 27-30.
- Morgan, D. L., & Schwalbe, M. L. (1990). Mind and self in society: Linking social structure and social cognition. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 53, 148-164.
- Morgan, G. (1980). Paradigms, metaphors and puzzle-solving in organization theory. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 25, 605-622.
- Morgan, G., & Sturdy, A. J. (2000). *Beyond organisational change - Discourse, structure and power in UK financial services*. Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- Moscovici, S., & Markova, I. (1998). Presenting social representations: A conversation. *Culture and Psychology*, 4, 371-410.
- Mouffe, C. (1993). *The return of the political*. London: Verso.
- Mulderrig, J. (2003). Consuming education: A critical discourse analysis of social actors in New Labour's education policy. *The Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies (e-journal)*, 1. Retrieved 6 November 2003 from <http://www.jceps.com/?pageID=article&articleID=7>.
- Mumby, D. K. (1987). The political function of narrative in organizations. *Communication Monographs*, 54, 113-127.
- Mumby, D. K. (1988). *Communication and power in organizations*. New York: Academic Press.
- Mumby, D. K., & Clair, R. P. (1997). Organizational discourse. In T. van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse studies: A multidisciplinary introduction - Discourse as social interaction* (Vol. 2, pp. 181-205). London: Sage.
- Mumby, D., & Stohl, C. (1991). Power and discourse in organization studies: Absence and the dialectic of control. *Discourse & Society*, 2, 313-332.
- New London Group. (1996). A pedagogy of multiliteracies: Designing social futures. *Harvard Educational Review*, 66, 60-92.
- New London Group. (2000). A pedagogy of multiliteracies designing social futures. In B. Cope & M. Kalantzis. (Eds.), *Multiliteracies: Literacy learning and the design of social futures* (pp. 9-37). South Yarra: Macmillan.
- Nishida, H., Hammer, M. R., & Wiseman, R. L. (1998). Cognitive differences between Japanese and Americans in their perceptions of difficult social situations. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 29, 499-524.
- Nonaka, I., & Takeuchi, H. (1995). *The knowledge creating company: How Japanese companies create the dynamics of innovation*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Pennycook, A. (1994). Incommensurable discourses? *Applied Linguistics*, 15, 115-118.
- Poster, M. (1995). *CyberDemocracy: Internet and the public sphere*. Irvine: University of California.
- Prigogine, I., & Stengers, I. (1997). *The end of certainty: Time, chaos, and the new laws of nature*. New York: Free Press.
- Rhee, J. W., & Cappella, J. N. (1997). The role of political sophistication in learning from news: measuring schema development. *Communication Research*, 24, 197-233.
- Ricoeur, P. (1977). *The rule of metaphor: Multi-disciplinary studies in the creation of meaning* (R. Czerny, Trans.). Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

- Rifkin, J. (1996). *The end of work: The decline of the global labor force and the dawn of the post-market era*. New York: Putnam.
- Robinson, A. L. (2000). The effect of a domestic violence policy change on police officers' schemata. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 27, 600-624.
- Rogers, C. R. (1969). *Freedom to learn*. Columbus, OH: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company.
- Rooney, D., & Schneider, U. (2002). *An ontological study of tacit knowing: Towards an inter-relational model of organizational knowledge*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Rose, N. (1992). Governing the enterprising self. In P. Heelas & P. Morris (Eds.), *The values of the enterprise culture: The moral debate* (pp. 141-164). London: Routledge.
- Rose, N. (1996). Authority and the genealogy of subjectivity. In P. Heelas, S. Lash & P. Morris (Eds.), *Detraditionalization* (pp. 294-327). Blackwell: Oxford.
- Rose, N. (1999a). *Governing the soul: The shaping of the private self* (2nd ed.). London: Free Association Press.
- Rose, N. (1999b). *Powers of freedom: Reframing political thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rose, N., & Miller, P. (1992). Political power beyond the state: Problematics of government. *British Journal of Sociology*, 43, 173-205.
- Rumelhart, D. E. (1980). Schemas: The building blocks of cognition. In R. J. Spiro, B. C. Bruce, & W. F. Brewer (Eds.), *Theoretical issues in reading comprehension* (pp. 33-58). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Saul, J. R. (1997). *The unconscious civilization*. Ringwood, Vic.: Penguin.
- Schank, R. C., & Abelson, R. P. (1977). *Scripts, plans, goals, and understanding: An inquiry into human knowledge structures*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Schieffelin, B. (2000). Introducing Kaluli literacy: A chronology of influences. In P. V. Kroskrity (Ed.), *Regimes of language: Ideologies, politics, and identities* (pp. 293-328). Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research Press, James Currey.
- Schlegel, E. A. (1997). Whose text? Whose context? *Discourse & Society*, 8, 165-187.
- Scollon, R. (1998). *Mediated discourse as social interaction: A study of news discourse*. London: Longman.
- Scollon, R. (2001). *Mediated discourse: The nexus of practice*. London: Routledge.
- Scollon, S. (2002). Political and somatic alignment: Habitus, ideology and social practice. In G. Weiss & R. Wodak (Eds.), *Critical discourse analysis: Theory and interdisciplinarity* (pp. 167-198). Houndsmill: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Scarle, J. R. (1969). *Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Stokoe, E. H., & Smithson, J. (2001). Making gender relevant: Conversation analysis and gender categories in interaction. *Discourse & Society*, 12, 217-244.
- Stubbs, M. (1996). Whorf's children: Critical comments on critical discourse analysis (CDA). Paper presented at the British Association of Applied Linguistics: Evolving Models of Language, University of Wales, Swansea.
- Swales, J. M. (1990). *Genre analysis: English in academic and research settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Swyngedouw, E. (2000). Authoritarian governance, power, and the politics of rescaling. *Environment and Planning D: Society & Space*, 18, 63-76.
- Terwee, S. J. S. (1995). Deconstructing social constructionism. Paper presented at the Fifth Biennial Conference of the International Society for Theoretical Psychology, Saclay, France.

38 CRITICAL DISCOURSE STUDIES

- Thompson, J. B. (1984). *Studies in the theory of ideology*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Tickell, A., & Clark, G. I. (2001). New architectures or liberal logics? Interpreting global financial reform. Unpublished manuscript.
- Ting-Toomey, S. (1988). Intercultural conflict styles: A face-negotiation theory. In Y. Y. Kim, & W. B. Gudykunst (Eds.), *Theories in intercultural communication* (pp. 13–38). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Townley, B. (1993). Foucault, power/knowledge, and its relevance for human resource management. *Academy of Management Review*, 18, 518–545.
- Vaara, E. (2002). On the discursive construction of success/failure in narratives of post-merger integration. *Organization Studies*, 23, 211–248.
- van Dijk, T. (1993). Principles of critical discourse analysis. *Discourse & Society*, 4, 249–283.
- van Dijk, T. (1997a). Discourse as interaction in society. In T. van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse studies: A multidisciplinary introduction – Discourse as social interaction* (Vol. 2, pp. 1–37). London: Sage.
- van Dijk, T. (1997b). The study of discourse. In T. van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse as structure and process* (Vol. 1, pp. 1–34). London: Sage.
- van Dijk, T., Ting-Toomey, S., Smitherman, G., & Troutman, D. (1997). Discourse, ethnicity, culture and racism. In T. van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse studies: A multidisciplinary introduction – Discourse as social interaction* (Vol. 2, pp. 144–180). London: Sage.
- van Leeuwen, T. (1996). The representation of social actors. In C. R. Caldas-Coulthard & M. Coulthard (Eds.), *Texts and practices: Readings in critical discourse analysis* (pp. 32–70). London: Routledge.
- van Leeuwen, T. (1998). Music and ideology: Notes toward a sociosemiotics of mass media music. *Popular Music and Society*, 22, 25–54.
- van Leeuwen, T. (1999). *Speech, music, sound*. Houndmills: MacMillan.
- van Leeuwen, T., & Wodak, R. (1999). Legitimizing immigration control: A discourse-historical analysis. *Discourse-Studies*, 1, 83–118.
- Volosinov, V. N. (1986). *Marxism and the philosophy of language* (L. Matejka & I. R. Titunik, Trans.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Volosinov, V. N. (1994). Marxism and the philosophy of language. In P. Morris (Ed.), *The Bakhtin reader: Selected writings of Bakhtin, Medvedev, Voloshinov* (pp. 50–61). London: Edward Arnold.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes* (M. Cole, Trans.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Wacquant, L. (2001). Critical thought as solvent of doxa. Retrieved 3 November 2003 from <http://sociology.berkeley.edu/faculty/wacquant/criticaldoxa.pdf>.
- Wertsch, J. V. (1998). *Mind as action*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Wertsch, J. V. (2002). *Voices of collective remembering*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- West, C., Lazar, M. M., & Kramarac, C. (1997). Gender in discourse. In T. A. van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse studies: A multidisciplinary introduction – Discourse as social interaction* (Vol. 2, pp. 119–143). London: Sage.
- Wetherell, M. (1998). Positioning and interpretative repertoires: Conversation analysis and post-structuralism in dialogue. *Discourse & Society*, 9, 386–412.
- Wetherell, M., & Potter, J. (1992). *Mapping the language of racism: Discourse and the legitimation of exploitation*. Harvester Wheatsheaf: Hemel Hempstead.

- Widdowson, H. (1997). The use of grammar, the grammar of use. *Functions of Language*, 4, 145-168.
- Widdowson, H. (1998). The theory and practice of critical discourse analysis. *Applied Linguistics*, 19, 136-151.
- Willmott, H. (1993). Strength is ignorance; Slavery is freedom: Managing culture in modern organizations. *Journal of Management Studies*, 30, 515-552.
- Wittgenstein, L. (1963). *Philosophical investigations* (G. E. M. Anscombe, Trans., 2nd ed.). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Wodak, R. (1996). *Disorders of discourse*. London: Longman.
- Wodak, R. (1997a). Critical discourse analysis and the study of doctor-patient interaction. In B. L. Gunnarsson, P. Linell, & B. Nordberg (Eds.), *The construction of professional discourse* (pp. 173-200). London: Longman.
- Wodak, R. (1997b). "I know, we won't revolutionize the world with it, but...": Styles of female leadership in institutions. In H. Kotthoff & R. Wodak (Eds.), *Communicating gender in text* (pp. 335-370). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Wodak, R. (Ed.). (1997c). *Gender and discourse*. London: Sage Publications.
- Wodak, R. (2001). What CDA is about - a summary of its history, important concepts and its developments. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (pp. 1-13). London: Sage Publications.
- Wodak, R. (2003). *Diskurs, Politik, Identität. Wien: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft, Universität Wien*.
- Yenhouda, S., & Weitz, E. (2000). The roots of uncertainty in organizations: An historical constructivist analysis. *Organization*, 7, 373-401.

Bernard McKenna is a Senior Lecturer and the Communication Program Director in the UQ Business School. Prior to his appointment in 2002 he was in QUT's Business Faculty for nine years. His academic teaching background covers communication theory, corporate and scientific communication, political communication, organizational communication, and business ethics. His research interests include technical, political, and managerialist discourse; professional writing; communicating community; and ethical wisdom in managing the new economy. *Address:* University of Queensland - Ipswich, 11 Salisbury Road, Ipswich Q 4305, Australia. [email: b.mckenna@uq.edu.au]



3 4067 02981 0834