

---

---

# *Discourse and Social Change*

NORMAN  
FAIRCLOUGH

---

---

Copyright © Norman Fairclough 1992  
The right of Norman Fairclough to be identified as author of this work has been asserted in accordance with the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

First published in 1992 by Polity Press in association with Blackwell Publishing Ltd.  
First published in paperback 1993

Reprinted 1994, 1995, 1996, 1998, 1999, 2000, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2006

Polity Press  
65 Bridge Street  
Cambridge, CB2 1UR, UK

Polity Press  
350 Main Street  
Malden, MA 02148, USA

All rights reserved. Except for the quotation of short passages for the purposes of criticism and review, no part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the publisher.

Except in the United States of America, this book is sold subject to the condition that it shall not, by way of trade or otherwise, be lent, re-sold, hired out, or otherwise circulated without the publisher's prior consent in any form of binding or cover other than that in which it is published and without a similar condition including this condition being imposed on the subsequent purchaser,

ISBN 0-7456-0674-1  
ISBN 0-7456-1218-0 (pbk)

A CIP catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library and the Library of Congress.

Typeset in 11 on 12 pt Garamond  
by Graphicraft Typesetters Ltd., Hong Kong  
Printed and bound in Great Britain by Marston Book Services Limited, Oxford  
**This book is printed on acid-free paper.**

For further information on Polity, visit our website: [www.polity.co.uk](http://www.polity.co.uk)

Con

*Preface*

*Acknowledgements*

Introduction

- 1 Approaches to Discourse Analysis
- 2 Michel Foucault and the Analysis of Discourse
- 3 A Social Theory of Discourse
- 4 Intertextuality
- 5 Text Analysis: Constructing the Self
- 6 Text Analysis: Constructing the Subject
- 7 Discourse and Social Change
- 8 Doing Discourse Analysis

*References*

*Index*

---

## Preface

The idea of writing this book came from discussions with a number of colleagues at Lancaster University about discourse analysis as a method in social research, in particular sociologists Paul Bagguley, Scott Lash and Celia Lury, Mick Dillon of the Politics Department, and Susan Condor of the Psychology Department. I have also benefited from the encouragement and enthusiasm of colleagues and students in Linguistics, especially Romy Clark, Roz Ivanic, Hilary Janks, Stef Slembrouk, and Mary Talbot. Mary Talbot also provided the conversational narrative sample in chapter 5. I am grateful to Gunther Kress and John Thompson for their very helpful comments on an earlier draft. Last but by no means least, I have had invaluable support and tolerance during the writing process from Vonny, Simon and Matthew.

## Acknowledgements

The newspaper article on p. 10 is a reproduction of a section of *The Sun*. I am grateful to Or S. Levinson for permission to reproduce it. I am also grateful to Lancaster University for permission to reproduce the article on pp. 212-13 and to MGN Limited for permission to reproduce the article on p. 111.

---

# Intro

Today individuals working in a  
to recognize the ways in which c  
to wider social and cultural pro  
appreciate the importance of usi  
for studying social change. But  
of language analysis which is  
practically usable. My main obje  
develop an approach to language  
filling this gap - an approach wh  
investigating change in language  
social and cultural change.

To achieve this, it is necessa  
analysing language developed  
studies, and social and political  
adequate social theory of langua  
work within various branches o  
tics, grammar), pragmatics, and  
that has been developed recent  
ous senses of 'discourse' and '  
shortly); and I include among  
Gramsci, Louis Althusser, Mich  
Anthony Giddens (see reference  
due, but there are various facto  
being satisfactorily achieved so  
guage studies from other social  
linguistics by formalistic and co

traditional lack of interest in language on the part of other social sciences, and a tendency to see language as transparent: while linguistic data such as interviews are widely used, there has been a tendency to believe that the social **content** of such data can be read off without attention to the language itself. These positions and attitudes are now changing. Boundaries between social sciences are weakening, and a greater diversity of theory and practice is developing within disciplines. And these changes **have** been accompanied by a 'linguistic turn' in social theory, which **has** resulted in language being accorded a more central role within social phenomena.

Previous attempts at synthesizing language studies and social theory have thus had limited success. For, **example**, a **group** of linguists in Britain in the 1970s developed a 'critical linguistics' by combining the theories and methods of text analysis of 'systemic linguistics' (Halliday 1978) with theories of ideology. Somewhat earlier in France, Michel Pecheux and his associates began to develop an approach to discourse analysis which drew especially upon work by the linguist Zellig Harris, and Althusser's reworking of a Marxist theory of ideology. Both of **these** attempts suffer from an imbalance between the social and linguistic elements of the synthesis, though they have complementary strengths and weaknesses: in the former, the linguistic analysis and the treatment of language texts is well developed, but there is little social theory and the concepts of 'ideology' and 'power' are used with little discussion or explanation, whereas in Pecheux's work the social theory is more sophisticated but linguistic analysis is treated in very narrow, semantic terms. Moreover, both attempts are based upon a static view of power relations, with an over-emphasis upon how the ideological shaping of language texts contributes to reproducing existing power relations. Little attention is paid to struggle and transformation in power relations and the role of language therein. There is similar **emphasis upon the** description of texts as finished products, and **little** attention to processes of text production and interpretation, or the tensions that characterize these processes. As a consequence, these attempts at synthesis are not suitable for investigating language dynamically, within processes of social and cultural change. (See chapter 1 for a more detailed discussion of these approaches, and some reference to more recent attempts to improve and develop them.)

The synthesis that I shall discuss is Pecheux's, centre around 'discourse analysis' or 'discourse'. Discourse is a difficult concept because there are so many conflicting and overlapping definitions drawn from various theoretical and methodological perspectives (see Dijk 1985; McDonnell 1986, for a survey). The term 'discourse' is sometimes used to refer to spoken dialogue, in **contrast** with written text, and 'discourse analysis' in this sense refers to the analysis of the limitation of linguistic analysis to formal units; instead, they focus on the conversational properties of **dialogue** (e.g. turn-taking, conversational openings and closings). In the analysis of the structure of a crime report in the 1970s, however, 'discourse' is used in a different sense: samples of either spoken or written text are analysed, preserving the emphasis upon **hi**erarchical structure. In this sense of 'discourse' emphasis is placed on the relationship and addressee or between writer and reader, and on the processes of producing and interpreting text within the situational context of language use. In the latter view of discourse, one dimension of discourse is the process of text production and interpretation (for a view of discourse, see Widdowson 1983). The term is also used for different types of social situation (e.g. 'narrative discourse', 'classroom discourse', 'consultations').

On the other hand, 'discourse analysis' and analysis, for example in the 1970s, refers to different ways of structuring language in practice. Thus the discourse of the dominant one in the practice of language with various wholistic 'alternatives' (e.g. homeopathy and acupuncture) is analysed. Discourses in this sense refer to the ways of using language and other symbols (see Thompson 1990). Discourse analysis refers to social entities and relations, the ways in which different discourses constitute social relations. 'citizenship' or 'literacy' are

people in different ways as social subjects (e.g. as doctors or patients), and it is these social effects of discourse that are focused upon in discourse analysis. Another important focus is upon historical change: how different discourses combine under particular social conditions to produce a new, complex discourse. A contemporary example is the social construction of the AIDS disease, in which various discourses (e.g. discourses of venereology, of cultural 'invasion' by 'aliens', of pollution) are combined to constitute a new discourse of AIDS. This more social-theoretical sense of discourse will be discussed further in chapter 2.

My attempt at drawing together language analysis and social theory centres upon a combination of this more social-theoretical sense of 'discourse' with the 'text-and-interaction' sense in linguistically-oriented discourse analysis. This concept of discourse and discourse analysis is three-dimensional. Any discursive 'event' (i.e. any instance of discourse) is seen as being simultaneously a piece of text, an instance of discursive practice, and an instance of social practice. The 'text' dimension attends to language analysis of texts. The 'discursive practice' dimension, like 'interaction' in the 'text-and-interaction' view of discourse, specifies the nature of the processes of text production and interpretation, for example which types of discourse (including 'discourses' in the more social-theoretical sense) are drawn upon and how they are combined. The 'social practice' dimension attends to issues of concern in social analysis such as the institutional and organizational circumstances of the discursive event and how that shapes the nature of the discursive practice, and the constitutive/constructive effects of discourse referred to above.

I should add that 'text' is used in this book in a sense which is quite familiar in linguistics but not elsewhere, to refer to any product whether written or spoken, so that the transcript of an interview or a conversation, for example, would be called a 'text'. The emphasis in this book is upon language and therefore linguistic texts, but it is quite appropriate to extend the notion of discourse to cover other symbolic forms such as visual images, and texts which are combinations of words and images, for example in advertising (see Hodge and Kress 1988). I shall use the term 'discourse' without an article to refer to language use seen in the above three-dimensional way (e.g. 'the positioning of social subjects is achieved in discourse'), and I shall also refer to 'dis-

course types' which are drawn upon in discourse, meaning conventionalized types of discourse. In chapter 4 I shall also begin to use the term 'discourse' with an article ('a discourse', 'discourses') to refer to something like the social-theoretical sense of discourse types or conventions. I shall also refer to 'discursive practices' of particular institutions or social practices in contrast to 'discursive practice' in the more social-theoretical dimension of discourse).

The case for the multidimensional approach to discourse analysis sketched out in Chapter 1 is a survey of approaches to discourse analysis which are linguistically-oriented, that is, which are oriented towards linguistic analysis. I shall argue that the multidimensional approach draws attention to important social aspects of discourse which needs to draw upon social theory and social perspectives upon discourse in order to be fully understood. A social theorist who has been a major influence on my view of discourse analysis as a form of social analysis is to argue that greater attention to social aspects would increase the value of discourse analysis in social research. Chapter 3 of this book is devoted to the approach as a synthesis of social theory and social perspectives upon discourse, moving towards a 'social theory of discourse'. This approach is elaborated in later chapters on various sorts of discourse in later chapters.

I suggested at the beginning of this book that changes in language use are an important part of social change. This is increasingly true in the modern world. Explanation and justification. Changes in language are not new. Social theory has given language a more central place in social analysis. Firstly, within Marxist theory (see pp. 30-5 below; by 'reproduction', and others such as 'discourse' as the pre-eminent line of analysis (see pp. 30-5 below; by 'reproduction' through which societies shape social relations over time). Secondly, the importance of teaching and learning has been highlighted the importance of teaching and learning.

power, and it is clear that these are centrally instantiated in language (see pp. 51-4 below). Thirdly, Habermas (1984) has focused upon the colonization of the 'lifeworld' by the 'systems' of the economy and the state, which he sees in terms of a displacement of 'communicative' uses of language - oriented to producing understanding - by 'strategic' uses of language - oriented to success, to getting people to do things. The elevation of language and discourse within the social sphere is variously reflected in work on, for example, gender relations (Spender 1980) or the media (van Dijk 1985b) which focuses upon language, and sociological research which takes conversation as its data (Atkinson and Heritage 1984).

What is open to question is whether such theory and research recognizes an importance that language has always had in social life but which has previously not been sufficiently acknowledged, or actually reflects an increase in the social importance of language. Although both may be true, I believe that there has been a significant shift in the social functioning of language, a shift reflected in the salience of language in the major social changes which have been taking place over the last few decades. Many of these social changes do not just involve language, but are constituted to a significant extent by changes in language practices; and it is perhaps one indication of the growing importance of language in social and cultural change that attempts to engineer the direction of change increasingly include attempts to change language practices. Let me give some examples.

Firstly, in many countries there has recently been an upsurge in the extension of the market to new areas of social life: sectors such as education, health care and the arts have been required to restructure and reconceptualize their activities as the production and marketing of commodities for consumers (Urry 1987). These changes have profoundly affected the activities, social relations, and social and professional identities of people working in such sectors. A major part of their impact comprises changes in discourse practices, that is, changes in language. In education, for example, people find themselves under pressure to engage in new activities which are largely defined by new discourse practices (such as marketing), and to adopt new discourse practices within existing activities (such as teaching). This includes 'rewordings' of

activities and relationships, for 'consumers' or 'clients', course also includes a more subtle re-orientation of practices of education - the types of discourse which are used in it - and a 'colonization' of discourse from outside, including advertising, counselling, and counselling.

Again, industry is moving to 'flexible' production (Bagguley and Fordist' production (Bagguley and Fordist) which workers no longer function within repetitive routines within an inviolable team in a flexible relation to a traditional employee-firm relationship as dysfunctional in the workplace. Attempts to transform workplace institutions which place emphasis on a relation with management, such as these changes as 'cultural' is not just cultural values, workers who are now and, as Rose (MS) has put it, 'organization and culture are transformed by discourse practices. Language used as a means of production and communication. More specifically, workers are now face-to-face and group interaction. Almost all job descriptions in the lowest levels, now stress communication. People's social identities as workers in terms that have traditionally been associated with belonging to the sphere of private life. Changes of this sort is that they are now management and devices such as 'flexible' from more economically successful sectors. Changes in the discourse practices of education, partly international character. This is thus characterized by widespread international imported practices.

There are many other examples of changes between doctors and patients, between

between women and men in workplaces and in the family, all of which are partly constituted by new discourse practices. Moreover, the increasing salience of discourse in social transformations is being matched as I suggested above by a concern to control discourse: to bring about changes in discourse practices as part of the engineering of social and cultural change. We are witnessing a 'technologization of discourse' (Fairclough 1990b), in which discursive technologies as a type of 'technologies of government' (Rose and Miller 1989) are being systematically applied in a variety of organizations by professional technologists who research, redesign, and provide training in discourse practices. Social psychologists involved in 'skills training' were an early example of this development (see Argyle 1978). Discursive technologies such as interviewing or counselling are coming to be treated as context-free techniques or skills which can be applied in various different domains. And institutional discourse practices are being widely subjected to simulation: in particular, conversational discourse practices which traditionally belong in the private sphere are being systematically simulated within organizations. (For further discussion of discourse technologization see pp. 215-18 below.)

My objective, then, is to develop an approach to discourse analysis which could be used as one method amongst others for investigating social changes such as those referred to above. For a method of discourse analysis to be useful in such contexts, it would need to fulfil a number of minimum conditions. I shall comment on four of these, and in the process elaborate a little on the sketch of my approach that I gave earlier. Firstly, it would need to be a method for multidimensional analysis. My three-dimensional approach enables relationships between discursive and social change to be assessed, and detailed properties of texts to be related systematically to social properties of discursive events as instances of social practice.

Secondly, it would need to be a method for multifunctional analysis. Changing discourse practices contribute to change in knowledge (including beliefs and common sense), social relations, and social identities; and one needs a conception of discourse and a method of analysis which attends to the interplay of these three. A good starting point is a systemic theory of language (Halliday 1978) which sees language as multifunctional, and sees texts as

simultaneously representing and establishing identities. This is combined with the emphasis upon the role of discourse in social-theoretic Foucault's.

Thirdly, it would need to be a method for discursive analysis. Discourse analysis should focus on the processes in the construction of 'orders of discourse' (constitution of 'orders of discourse' of discursive practices in part of the whole society). On the level of 'intertextuality' (see below) texts are constructed through particular ways, ways which depend on circumstances. On the level of 'orders of discourse' among and boundaries between discursive practices or the wider society are particular ways which accord with directions of social change.

Fourthly, it would need to be a method for discursive analysis between discursive, social and cultural change. It would be transparent for the people involved in discursive change. 'Critical' implies a concern with what is hidden; it also implies providing resources for those who are involved in change. In this connection, it would see discursive change as a unilinear process, rather than a struggle over the structuring of texts, which people may resist or appropriate, as well as merely go along with (see below).

To conclude this introduction, I shall return to the treatment of discursive change. This section presents my synthesis of social change and discourse. My account of a discursive practice centres upon the concept of analysis in the dimension of social change, which centres upon the concepts of 'orders of discourse' in the sense of a mode of social organization, alliances, the incorporation of discursive practices, and the generation of consent. Hegemony



and institutions and at a societal level are produced, reproduced, contested and transformed in discourse. Moreover, the structuring of discourse practices in particular ways within orders of discourse can be seen, where it comes to be naturalized and win widespread acceptance, as itself a form of (specifically cultural) hegemony. It is the combination of the concepts of intertextuality and hegemony that makes the framework of chapter 3 a useful one for investigating discursive change in relation to social and cultural change. Which prior texts and text types are drawn upon in a given instance (a particular 'discursive event'), and how they are articulated, depends upon how the discursive event stands in relation to hegemonies and hegemonic struggles - whether, for example, it is contesting existing hegemonic practices and relations, or on the contrary taking them as given. The approach to discursive change set out in chapter 3 combines a view of text and discursive practice which derives from Bakhtin via Kristeva's concept of intertextuality (Bakhtin 1981 and 1986; Kristeva 1986a), and a view of power which derives from Gramsci's theory of hegemony (Gramsci 1971; Buci-Glucksmann 1980).

The framework of chapter 3 is elaborated in the chapters which follow. Chapter 4 takes up the concept of intertextuality in terms of a distinction between 'manifest' intertextuality (the explicit presence of other texts in a text) and 'interdiscursivity' (the constitution of a text from a configuration of text types or discourse conventions). I suggest a way of differentiating and relating 'genres', 'discourses', 'styles' and 'activity types' as different sorts of discourse conventions. The chapter also discusses intertextuality in relation to the social distribution of texts and the transformations they undergo, and in relation to the construction of social identity in discourse. In chapters 5 and 6 the emphasis is upon text analysis. These chapters address aspects of the vocabulary, grammar, cohesion, text structure, force, and coherence of texts (see p. 75 below for these terms). They also develop the view of discourse analysis as multifunctional: chapter 5 is mainly concerned with the function of discourse in constituting social identities and social relations, whereas the focus in chapter 6 is upon constituting, reproducing and changing systems of knowledge and belief in discourse. In chapter 7 the emphasis is upon the social practice dimension of discourse, and specifically upon certain broad tendencies of change affecting contemporary

orders of discourse (the 'democratization' and 'technologization' of discourse) and social and cultural changes.

The analyses of change in chapters 5 and 6, and institutions, with detailed examples, are in chapter 7. One issue addressed in chapter 7 is how new media are shifting the boundaries between spheres of social life. This not only concerns the matter in media discourse, such as the blurring of private life as (**public**) news, but also the mixing of discourse practices between those of the public sphere, with those of the media use a stereotypical vocabulary. One issue is the pressure on service users to buy commodities and their clients to buy services. The mixing of the discourse practices of advertising. In chapter 5 I discuss the interaction of professional workers and their clients, and the interaction between them, focusing on the ways they suggest that changes in doctor-patient relations are discursively realized in a shift from traditional views to more conversational ones. Chapter 6 discusses how to incorporate the discourse practices of traditional medicine. Chapter 6 discusses prenatal care booklets which exemplify the changing of antenatal processes. I go on to discuss semantic change as part of an analysis of a text referring specifically to speech therapy. Chapter 7 turns to the theme of communication in the context of information-giving and advertising. Chapter 8 discusses education, using the example of a text about education.

One of the aims of this book is to provide a framework for discourse analysis. One of the aims of this book is to provide them with the resources to do this. In the book, chapter 8, draws together the chapters 3-7 in the form of a summary of discourse analysis. These guidelines deal with the analysis and coding of texts, and with the analysis of discourse.

## Approaches to Discourse Analysis

My objective in this chapter is to describe briefly a number of recent and current approaches to discourse analysis, as a context and basis for the elaboration of my approach in chapters 3-8. Discourse analysis has now become a very diverse area of study, with a variety of approaches in each of a number of disciplines (some of the variety is represented in van Dijk 1985a). The survey of approaches in this chapter is therefore necessarily selective. I have chosen approaches which in some degree combine close analysis of language texts with a social orientation to discourse. This accords with my aim in later chapters to achieve an effective and usable combination of textual analysis and other modes of social analysis. I have also treated approaches selectively, focusing upon aspects of them which are closest to my priorities in this book.

The approaches surveyed can be divided into two groups according to the nature of their social orientation to discourse, distinguishing 'non-critical' and 'critical' approaches. Such a division is not absolute. Critical approaches differ from non-critical approaches in not just describing discursive practices, but also showing how discourse is shaped by relations of power and ideologies, and the constructive effects discourse has upon social identities, social relations and systems of knowledge and belief, neither of which is normally apparent to discourse participants. The approaches I have designated as basically non-critical are: the framework for describing classroom discourse in Sinclair and Coulthard (1975); ethnomethodological work in 'Conversation

analysis'; the model for therapy developed by Fraser (1977); and a recent approach by social psychologists Potter and Shiffrin (1977). Approaches I have included are also found in Sinclair and Coulthard (1975), and in Sinclair et al. (1979), and the French approach developed on the basis of A. Pêcheux (Pêcheux 1982). The survey of key issues in discourse analysis will serve as a point of departure for the approach in chapter 3.

### Sinclair and Coulthard

Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) developed a general descriptive model of classroom discourse. They decided to focus upon the situation whose discourse practices they wanted to describe. They set out clear rules. Their descriptive system was assumed to be in the same relationship to the early forms of systemic grammar as the 'scale' of units, with units of higher rank below. So, in general, clauses, which are made up of one or more sentences, which are made up of clauses, which are made up of phrases, which are made up of words. On the classroom discourse scale, the smallest unit is a phrase, which is made up of words.

Sinclair and Coulthard have developed a model of classroom discourse. They do suggest a clear structure. Their model consists of exchanges. They distinguish 'boundary exchanges' which contain with or without other moves, and 'information exchanges' which contain a 'focusing' move which specifies what will be about. Between the boundary and the information exchange is a sequence of 'informing', 'deleting', 'correcting', which respectively statements, questions, and questions are asked.

Let us look at the structure of the

eliciting exchange. It typically consists of three moves: 'initiating', 'response' and 'feedback'. For example:

- TEACHER: Can you tell me why do you eat all that food?  
 Yes.  
 PUPIL: To keep you strong.  
 T: To keep you strong. Yes. To keep you strong.  
 Why do you want to be strong?

The teacher's first contribution is an initiating move, the pupil's contribution is a response, and the first line of the teacher's second contribution is feedback; the second line is another initiating move. Notice that one contribution ('utterance') can consist of more than one move. The consistent presence of feedback presupposes that teachers have the power to evaluate pupils' contributions (one would rarely risk doing that outside a learning situation), and shows that much of classroom discourse is concerned with testing what pupils know, and training them to say things which are relevant according to criteria laid down by the schools.

A move consists of one or more acts. Sinclair and Coulthard distinguish 22 acts for classroom discourse, some of which (such as 'bid', when a child asks for the right to respond, perhaps by raising a hand) are quite specific to this discourse type. Others are less so: the initiating move of an eliciting exchange includes an 'elicitation', for example, while the initiating move of a directing exchange includes a 'directive'.

Acts are functional rather than formal categories, and a major issue is the relationship between them and the formal categories of grammar (this issue has received much attention within pragmatics, see Levinson 1983; Leech and Thomas 1989). It is well known that there are no simple correspondences. For example, an interrogative sentence (a 'grammatical question') can be a directive as well as an elicitation (e.g. 'Can you close the curtains?'), and a declarative sentence ('grammatical statement') can be either of these or an 'informative' act (e.g. 'The curtains aren't closed' can be asking for confirmation, requesting someone to close them, or just giving information). Sinclair and Coulthard refer to what they call 'situation' and 'tactics' for determining what function a sentence has in a particular piece of discourse. The former brings in situational factors which are relevant: for

example, if children know talk is a declarative sentence from the teacher's perspective, it can be interpreted as a command (see below), Sinclair and Coulthard's 'tactics' which take account of both the situational factors. 'Tactics' depend on the sequential position of a sentence in the discourse. For example, a declarative sentence is different from the woman's position in a series of eliciting exchanges (she expects an initiating move), is like a question despite the fact that most direct questions are most elicitation are interrogative.

The strength of the Sinclair and Coulthard pioneering way in which it draws attention to the organizational properties of dialogue is that it shows them. Its limitations are the absence of attention to discourse, and insufficient attention to the social context. These limitations can be related to the way in which they concentrate upon a traditional type of classroom discourse, and their data does not include a range of classroom practices. This makes the model more homogeneous than it actually is, and obscures practices by making them appear to be simply 'there' and available for use, having been put there through the influence of alternative practices, and as a result of the influence of (see below) with particular ideological assumptions (see below), and as helping to sustain a particular status within society. In short, the model lacks a developed social orientation, and the relations of power have shaped the way in which to situate classroom discourse in the context of struggle and change. A striking feature of classroom practice is its divergence from traditional classroom discourse, and what is at stake.

The homogeneity of the data is a result of the ambivalence of classroom discourse, and the possible interpretations. Consider the following example (1977: 108):

- TEACHER:** What kind of person do you think he is?  
Do you - what are you laughing at?
- PUPIL:** Nothing.
- T:** Pardon?
- P:** Nothing.
- T:** You're laughing at nothing, nothiog at all?
- p:** **No.**  
It's funny really 'cos they don't think as though they were there they might not like it and it sounds rather a pompous attitude.

Sinclair and Coulthard see this in terms of the pupil misinterpreting the situation, and so taking the teacher's question about laughter as disciplinary rather than dialogical in intent. But such examples also point to the potential heterogeneity of classroom discourse, the co-existence in schools of a repertoire of classroom discourses, which producers and interpreters of text need to take account of. This implies attention to discourse processes, both interpretation and production, whereas the emphasis in Sinclair and Coulthard is on texts as discourse products (though the category of 'tactics' implies some attention to interpretation). This also makes their position as analysts problematical, since analysts interpret texts rather than just describe them. In claiming to describe their data are not Sinclair and Coulthard actually interpreting it in a teacher-oriented way, for example, by seeing the pupil as 'misinterpreting' the teacher rather than, perhaps, being non-committal in response to an ambivalent question from the teacher? After all, 'nothing' is also ambivalent: it could mean 'I can't tell you what's making me laugh here.' This raises another problem with the framework: it forces decisions about the functions of utterances, whereas utterances are often really ambivalent for interpreters, rather than just ambiguous, as recent work in pragmatics has shown (see Levinson 1983), that is, their meanings are not clearly decidable.

### Conversation Analysis

Conversation analysis (CA) is an approach to discourse analysis which has been developed by a group of sociologists who call themselves 'ethnomethodologists'. Ethnomethodology is an inter-

pretative approach to sociology as a skilled accomplishment, and for it (Garfinkel 1952). Ethnomethodologists tend to a

or use of concepts such as of central concern to mainstream sociologists take a particular in-  
1111:thods conversationalists use (Sacks 1978; Atkinson and Leavin 1978). Conversation analysts have concentrated mainly on interactions between equals (e.g. telephone calls). Recent work has shifted to institutional interactions where power asymmetries are more obvious. This contrasts with the Sinclair and Coulthard approach to classroom discourse processes, and contributes to interpretation as well as to production. Interpretation and process is a central concern, as I argue below, and CA is comparable to the Sinclair and Coulthard orientation to discovering structure.

Conversation analysts have identified several aspects of conversation: conversational topics are established, conversational stories in the course of conversation are 'formulated' (e.g. 'I'm going to the bank' imply). Work on turn-taking, especially in taking turns at speaking, has been influential. Sacks, Schegloff and Seargoth have developed a powerful set of turn-taking rules. The completion of a 'turn-constructional unit' (TCU) build their turns with units such as a word, a sentence, a phrase, even a word or a syllable determine what this unit is and what it can do with great accuracy. The rules allow a speaker to select the next speaker; (2) a speaker may 'self-select' by starting to produce a TCU; (3) a speaker may continue. Sacks, Schegloff and Seargoth's rules account for many of the transitions that overlaps between speakers and a great many transitions between speakers, overlaps, and so forth. Despite

allow for considerable variation in such features as the order and length of turns.

CA has laid considerable emphasis upon the 'sequential implicativeness' of conversation - the claim that any utterance will constrain what can follow it. 'Adjacency pairs' such as question-and-answer or complaint-and-apology are particularly clear examples: a question produced by one speaker sequentially implicates an answer from another. Evidence for x sequentially implicating y includes (i) the fact that whatever occurs after x will be taken as y if at all possible (for instance, if 'Is that your wife?' is followed by 'Well, it's not my mother', the latter is likely to be taken as an implied positive answer; and (ii) the fact that if y does not occur, its absence is noticed, and is commonly grounds for an inference (for example, if teachers fail to give feedback to learners' responses, this may be taken as implicitly rejecting them). According to Atkinson and Heritage (1984: 6), 'virtually every utterance occurs at some structurally defined place in talk: One implication of this is that turns display an analysis of prior turns, giving constant evidence in the text of how utterances are interpreted.

Another implication is that the sequential position alone of an utterance is enough to determine its meaning. Yet this is highly questionable, on the twin grounds that (i) the effects of sequence upon meaning vary according to discourse type, and (ii), as I suggested in discussing Sinclair and Coulthard, a variety of discourse types may be drawn upon during an interaction, with participants as producers and interpreters constantly having to negotiate their positions in relation to this repertoire. Consider this extract from a medical interview which I analyse in chapter 5 (pp. 144-9 below):

PATIENT: and I think. that's one of the reasons why I drank  
s[o much you [know - [and em  
DOCTOR: hm hm hm hm are you  
you back are you back on it have you started  
drinking [again  
P: no  
D: oh you haven't (un[clear)  
P: no . but em one thing that  
the lady on the Tuesday said to me

I shall suggest in my analysis it is a mixture of medical inte  
mixture, what does sequenc  
tor's question in his first tu  
interview, a doctor's questi  
alluded to a possibly danger  
ing) would probably be take  
attention from Iboth particip  
question might be taken in a  
showing that the counsellor  
lems. Here the patient seen  
perfunctory one-word answe  
doctor's acknowledgement  
answer, and changes the sub  
events. To make such an inte  
more than information abou  
ments about the nature of th  
between herself and the do  
implies a view of discourse p  
more complex than that gen  
can accommodate, for exampl  
tiating their way within repe  
ple also suggests that analysi  
and therefore a contentious  
little sense of this in CA.  
analysts tend to interpret dat  
among participants to a sing  
son and Lee 1981). One eff  
and co-operative picture of

There is also a neglect of  
the processes of negotiation  
typically have more muscle  
discourse (e.g. classroom dis  
for turn-taking where partic  
tions, but an asymmetrical  
select, to interrupt, to 'hold  
obligations (e.g. to take a t  
cases it is evident that produ  
cesses of producing social  
identities; yet much CA in i

between equals gives the impression that producing discourse is an end in itself.

Despite different disciplinary starting points and theoretical orientations, the Sinclair and Coulthard and CA approaches have rather similar strengths and limitations: both have made important contributions to a new appreciation of the nature of structures in dialogue, but both have an undeveloped social orientation to discourse (in this respect CA suffers from the same inadequacies as Sinclair and Coulthard), and neither provides a satisfactory account of discourse processes and interpretation, though CA gives considerable insight into certain aspects of interpretation.

### Labov and Fanshel

Labov and Fanshel (1977) is a study by a linguist and a psychologist of the discourse of the psychotherapeutic interview. Unlike Sinclair and Coulthard and CA, Labov and Fanshel assume the heterogeneity of discourse, which they see as reflecting the 'contradictions and pressures' (p. 35) of the interview situation. They agree with Goffman (1974) that shifts between 'frames' are a normal feature of conversation, and identify in their data a configuration of different 'styles' associated with different frames: 'interview style', 'everyday style' used in patients' narratives about 'life since the last visit' (N, for 'narrative', below) and 'family style' (F below), the style usually used in family situations, for expressing strong emotions.

Interviews are divided into 'cross-sections', corresponding approximately in extent to Sinclair and Coulthard's 'exchanges', though cross-sections can also be parts of monologues. The analysis of cross-sections emphasizes the existence of parallel verbal and paralinguistic 'streams of communication', the latter covering such features as pitch, volume, and voice qualifiers such as 'breathiness', and carrying implicit meanings which are 'deniable'. One variable between discourse types is the relative importance of the paralinguistic channel: in therapeutic discourse, contradictions between the explicit meanings of the verbal channel and the implicit meanings of the paralinguistic channel are a key feature.

The analysis produces an 'expansion' of each cross-section, a

formulation of the text which is achieved by providing referents for particular meanings of the paralinguistic channel. Material from other parts of the text is shared knowledge of the participants, and can be elaborated in the text analysed in terms of styles, and

<NAnd so-when-I called my mother-when you plan t'come home?>F>N

<NWhen I called my mother to tell her I was home  
<F'Well, in regard to the subject of the house where {2} your obligation is to be returning as I am asking you to return, your obligations are being neglected, so {HEAD-MO} head of our household

The symbols in curly brackets are recurrently taken as given. So {1} is a particular interaction; others such as {2} 'the head of the household', {3} 'culture for role obligations'; and {4} 'assumptions of therapy (e.g. 'what to do') or the culture of the patient (oneself)'. Propositions are rarely the main issue in an interaction may be an instance of some proposition which substitute implicit connections between propositions important for its coherence.

The cross-section is then analysed as an 'action which affects the relationship' and the utterance is assumed to be similar to a set of actions which are hierarchical and are performed by means of a relationship marked by 'thereby' because (I have simplified the Labov and Fanshel

Rhoda (the patient) continues the conversation to support her assertion that she

Rhoda requests information on the time her mother intends to come home, and thereby requests indirectly that her mother come home, thereby carrying out the suggestion {S}, thereby challenging her mother indirectly for not performing properly her role as head of the household, simultaneously admitting her own limitations, simultaneously asserting again that she carried out the suggestion.

The proposition {S} is the (therapist's) suggestion that one should express one's needs to other people. Such representations are based upon discourse rules proposed by Labov and Fanshel for interpreting the surface forms of utterances as particular sorts of action. For example, there is a 'rule of indirect requests' which specifies the conditions under which questions ('requests for information') are taken as requests for action. The analysis is completed with 'sequencing rules' for combining cross-sections together.

Labov and Fanshel refer to their approach as 'comprehensive' discourse analysis, and its exhaustiveness is certainly impressive, though also, as they point out, very time-consuming. They themselves identify a number of problems with it: paralinguistic cues are notoriously difficult to interpret, expansions can be endlessly expanded and there is no obviously motivated cut-off point, and expansions have the effect of flattening out important differences between foregrounded and backgrounded elements in discourse. I want, however, to focus my discussion upon two important insights in their approach which need to be taken further,

The first is the view that discourse may be stylistically heterogeneous due to contradictions and pressures in the speech situation. In the case of therapeutic discourse, for example, the suggestion is that use of 'everyday' and 'family' style is part of a patient strategy to establish some parts of the talk as immune to the intrusive expertise of the therapist. I have mentioned above the similarity of this to Goffman's concept of frames. The principle of the heterogeneity of discourse is a central element in my discussion of 'inertextuality' (pp. 84-5 below). I shall mention here just two differences between my position and Labov and Fanshel's. First, the embedding of one style within another, as in the sample above, is only one form of heterogeneity, and it often takes more complex forms where styles are difficult to

separate. Secondly, their view of therapeutic discourse as a style does not analyse heterogeneity in configurations of styles. The principle seems to lie in investigating wider social and cultural characteristics (elaboration of this perspective).

The second insight is that discourse is a mechanism for negotiating illicits which are taken as requests for action and which underpin its coherence. This is a principle whose potential and implications are discussed by Labov and Fanshel. In particular, it is the ideological character of some of the obligations associated with the individualistic ideology of the self-interest in the care of oneself - Or to the extent of reducing them without challenge, as in the case of therapy as a mechanism for negotiating traditional social roles. In other words, the need for a critical analysis of therapy as a valuable analytical resource for

### Potter and

As a final example of a non-critical analysis, I shall discuss Potter and Wetherell's analysis as a method in social psychology. In the present context, first because it can be used to study issues which have not been approached with other methods, and secondly because the question of whether discourse analysis is a method with the 'form' or the 'content' is a central issue (Thompson (1984: 106-8) of Sacks' 'formalistic' and neglecting the

Potter and Wetherell's advocacy of this method for social psychologists is a method which is successively applied to a range of psychological research. The an-

psychology has misconceived and indeed 'suppressed' key properties of the language materials it uses as data; that discourse is 'constructive' and hence 'constitutes' objects and categories; and that what a person says does not remain consistent from one occasion to another, but varies according to the functions of talk. The argument is first applied to research on attitudes: traditional research assumed people have consistent attitudes to 'objects' such as 'coloured immigrants', whereas discourse analysis shows not only that people produce different and even contradictory evaluations of an object according to the context, but also that the object itself is constructed differently depending upon its evaluation (so 'coloured immigrants' is a construction which many people would reject). The argument is then applied to the study of how people use rules, how people produce explanatory accounts (excuses, justifications, etc.) of their behaviour, and so forth, arguing in each case for the superiority of discourse analysis over other methods, such as experimental methods.

Potter and Wetherell contrast the prioritization of content in their approach with a prioritization of form in social-psychological 'speech accommodation theory'. The latter is concerned with how people modify their speech according to who they are talking to, and thus with the variability of linguistic form according to context and function; whereas in the former they are concerned with the variability of linguistic content. In some cases, the focus is the propositional content of utterances - for example, in researching attitudes, what New Zealand respondents say about whether Polynesian immigrants ought to be repatriated - and upon the sorts of argument within which such propositions function. In other cases, the focus is upon vocabulary and metaphor - for example, the predicates (verbs, adjectives) and metaphors used in association with 'community' in media reports of the inner-city disturbances in Britain in 1980.

In fact the form-content distinction is not as clear as it may appear to be. There are aspects of content which clearly edge over into matters of form; for example, metaphor may be a question of fusing different domains of meaning, but it is also a question of what words are used in a text, which is an aspect of its form. And, conversely, aspects of form edge over into content: the mixture of styles in therapeutic discourse identified by Labov and Fanshell is on one level a mixture of forms (they refer for example

to intonational contours which are also significant in terms of content construction of the patient as a person. Potter and Wetherell's analysis, in comparison with other approaches, is limited to a few aspects of the 'ideational' course, which leaves untouched the dimensions of meaning and association 'ational' and 'interpersonal' meanings (pp. 64-5 below.) It is in Potter's 'the self' that these analytical lines. In contrast with traditional social psychology, they adopt a construction that sizes the variable constitution of the self, unable properly to operationalize the analysis, because (as I argue below) are implicitly signalled through the features of verbal (as well as bodily) richer analytical apparatus than they have them.

Like other approaches referred to, it is insufficiently developed in, its **There** is a one-sided individualistic strategies of speakers in their discourse. The self is an apparent exception to the self emphasizes ideology and discourse, but this theory fits the (orientation of the book and its analysis, Finally, there is a tendency to activity of the self in using categories alternative to the subjection of the self be seen in a dialectical synthesis of this view).

## Critical L

'Critical linguistics' was the approach at the University of East Anglia in 1979; Kress and Hodge 1979). The



linguistic text analysis with a social theory of the **functioning** of language in political and ideological processes, **drawing** upon the functionalist linguistic theory associated with Michael Halliday (1978, 1985) and known as 'systemic linguistics'.

In view of its disciplinary origins, it is not surprising that critical linguistics was eager to distinguish itself from mainstream linguistics (then more heavily dominated by the Chomskyan paradigm than it is now) and sociolinguistics (see Fowler et al. 1979: 185-95). Two 'prevalent and related dualisms' in linguistic theory are rejected: the treatment of language systems as autonomous and independent of the 'use' of language, and the separation of 'meaning' from 'style' or 'expression' (or 'content' from 'form'). Against the first dualism, critical linguistics asserts with Halliday that 'language is as it is because of its function in social structure' (Halliday 1973: 65), and argues that the language that people have access to depends upon their position in the social system. Against the second dualism, critical linguistics supports Halliday's view of the grammar of a language as systems of 'options' amongst which speakers make 'selections' according to social circumstances, assuming that formal options have contrasting meanings, and that choices of forms are **always meaningful**. Sociolinguistics is criticized for merely establishing correlations between language and society rather than looking for deeper causal relations, including the effects of language upon society: 'language serves to confirm and consolidate the organizations which shape it' (Fowler et al. 1979: 190).

The quotation from Halliday in the last paragraph reads more fully: 'language is as it is because of its function in the social structure, and the organization of behavioural meanings should give some insight into its social foundations' (Halliday 1973: 65). Kress suggests (1989: 445) that critical linguistics developed the claim in the second part of the quotation but not really that in the first: it 'attempted to "read off" structurings of "social foundations" from "the organization of behavioural meanings"' in texts. Critical linguistics again takes a Hallidayan position, in contrast with the practice of mainstream linguistics and sociolinguistics, in taking complete texts (spoken or written) as the object of analysis. The 'Sapir-Whorf hypothesis' that languages embody particular world-views is extended to varieties within a language; particular texts embody particular ideologies or theories, and the

aim is the 'critical interpretation of meanings expressed in discourse structures in the light of their interaction' (Fowler et al. 1979: 195-6). The **critical** method which is usable by political historians rather than specialists.

For textual analysis, critical linguistics **draws** work in 'systemic grammar' **using** concepts from other theories of 'textual organization'. Critical linguistics **draws** the attention it gives to the grammatical structure. There is much reference to 'transformations' of a clause or sentence that is, the way it represents reality. **Transitivity**, see pp. 177-85 below, different 'process types' and associated **systematic** selection of a particular grammatical form. For example, *Morning Star* (21 April 1980) headline: 'health service union day of action' **workers** ('northerners') as the hundreds of northerners.' This is a 'relational' process in which the **action** is less prominent (e.g., 'action by hundreds of northerners').

Another related focus is **transformation** looked at either transformations associated with the newspaper over a period of days or more abstractly, for example when related as a clause ('x criticized y') transformed way as a 'nominalization' (Nominalization is the conversion of a verb or noun, here 'criticism' from a verb to a noun). Nominalization is the conversion of a verb into a passive clause (e.g., the headline 'Police criticized' rather than 'Police criticized') transformations may be associated with features of texts such as the syntactic structure both allow the agent of a clause

A further focus is upon aspects of clause grammar which have to do with its interpersonal meanings, that is, a focus on the way social relations and social identities are marked in clauses. This is the grammar of 'modality' (see pp. 158-62 below for examples and discussion). The approach to vocabulary is based upon the assumption that different ways of 'lexicalizing' domains of meaning may involve ideologically different systems of classification, so there is an interest in how areas of experience may come to be 'relexicalized' on different classificatory principles, for example in the course of political struggle. (See p. 194 below for more detail.)

In critical linguistics, there tends to be too much emphasis upon the text as product, and too little emphasis upon the processes of producing and interpreting texts. For example, although the aim of critical linguistics is said to be critical *interpretation* of texts, little attention is given to the processes and problems of interpretation, either those of the analyst-interpreter or those of the participant-interpreter. Thus in analysis, the relationship between textual features and social meanings tends to be portrayed as straightforward and transparent: despite an insistence that 'there is no predictable one-to-one association between any one linguistic form and any specific social meaning' (Fowler et al. 1979: 198), in practice values are attributed to particular structures (such as passive clauses without agents) in a rather mechanical way. But texts may be open to different interpretations depending on context and interpreter, which means that the social meanings (including ideologies) of discourse cannot simply be read off from the text without considering patterns and variations in the social distribution, consumption and interpretation of the text. It may be that 'ideology is linguistically mediated and habitual for an acquiescent, uncritical reader' (Fowler et al. 1979: 190), but readers are often critical. Once critical linguistics has established ideological meanings for a text, it tends to take their ideological effects for granted.

Another limitation of critical linguistics is that it places a one-sided emphasis upon the effects of discourse in the social reproduction of existing social relations and structures, and correspondingly neglects both discourse as a domain in which social struggles take place, and change in discourse as a dimension of

wider social and cultural change. In my comments in the last part of this process in which the meanings of the sources deployed and the social relations one can construe texts as meaning upon a passive recipient only if. What is at Issue more generally, of power and ideology in critical an emphasis one finds also in the Pêcheux group (discussed below) change, social structures rather than production rather than social theory of discourse based on dualisms as poles in relationships for one member of each pair were mutually exclusive.

A final comment is that the narrowness of the focus in critical linguistics other than grammar and vocabulary, significance, for example the overall structure of a text. Secondly, critical with written monologue, and hence ideologically important aspects of dialogue (such as turn-taking), pragmatic dimensions of utterances (see pp. 162-6 below). Thirdly, (of) processes of interpretation, the realization of ideologies in texts, sense in which processes of interpretation making assumptions which are not have an ideological nature (see Fairclough 1989b has a fuller discussion).

Critical linguists have recently criticized some of the assumptions of earlier work (Kress 1990) of those I have voiced above, and have been closely involved in developing a different approach (Hodge and Kress 1988) which they call 'social semiotics'. In critical linguistics, there is a concern with

including language, and with the interplay between language and visual semiosis. Discourse processes of text production and interpretation have become a central concern, and there is more attention to developing a social theory of discourse, with an orientation to struggle and historical change in discourse which is centred in an attempt to develop a theory of genre.

### Pecheux

Michel Pecheux and his collaborators (Pecheux et al. 1979; Pecheux 1982) have developed a critical approach to discourse analysis which, like critical linguistics, attempts to combine a social theory of discourse with a method of text analysis, working mainly on written political discourse. Their research has been consciously linked to political developments in France, especially the relationship between the Communist and Socialist parties in the 1970s, and a comparison of their political discourse.

The major source for Pecheux's approach in social theory was Althusser's Marxist theory of ideology (1971). Althusser emphasized the relative autonomy of ideology from the economic base, and the significant contribution of ideology to reproducing or transforming economic relations. He also argued that ideology, far from being just disembodied 'ideas', occurs in material forms. Furthermore, ideology works through constituting ('interpellating') persons as social subjects, fixing them in subject 'positions' while at the same time giving them the illusion of being free agents. These processes take place within various institutions and organizations such as education, the family, or the law, which in Althusser's view function as ideological dimensions of the state - what he called 'ideological state apparatuses' (ISAs).

Pecheux's contribution to this theory has been to develop the idea of language as one crucially important material form of ideology. He uses the term 'discourse' to stress the ideological nature of language use. Discourse 'shows the effects of ideological struggle within the functioning of language, and, conversely, the existence of linguistic materiality within ideology' (Pecheux, quoted in Courtine 1981). An ISA can be conceived of as a complex of interrelated 'ideological formations', each corresponding roughly to a class position within the ISA. Pecheux suggests

that each such position incorporates (DF), a term he borrowed from a given ideological formation ... *be said*" , (Pecheux 1982: 111, or in **specifically** semantic terms: according to the positions of the al; 1979: 33). Further, although tions may have certain words. Relationships between these and differ in the two cases, and so shared words or expressions, but others that determines their meanings different things in trade- be a synonym of 'activist' and right-wing conservative discourse of 'subversive' and an antonym subjects are constituted in relation meanings; these DFs are, according of "domains of thought" ... so form of points of stabilization simultaneously *along with him* stand, do, fear and hope' (Pecheux).

DFs are positioned within context as 'interdiscourse', and the specific determined 'from outside' by its relation to discourse. The particular 'state' of a DF (what DFs are contained within) depends upon the state of ideology. However, this external determination subjects are typically not aware of themselves mistakenly as the source of the fact they are their effects. Pecheux suggests **ready-formed** elements which are perceived as what is 'given' or 'fixed' for participants, whereas they actually constitute interdiscourse. An example would be the **war** increase in living standards across from one DF to another and with their presuppositions (that there is a threat).

An important qualification is that subjects do not always totally identify with a DF. Subjects may distance themselves from a DF by using metadiscursive markers (see p. 122 below) such as 'the so-called x', 'what you call an x', and the 'x', Pecheux calls this 'counter-identification' - distancing oneself from existing practices without replacing them with new ones. Where such a replacement does occur, we have the more radical situation of 'disidentification', which involves 'the "overthrow-rearrangement" of the complex of ideological formations (and of the discursive formations which are imbricated with them)' (Pecheux 1982: 159). However, Pecheux sees the possibility of disidentification as specifically tied to the revolutionary theory and practice of Marxism-Leninism, in the organizational form of the Communist Party.

The method of analysis is called 'automatic analysis of discourse' because part of the procedure is computerized in order to identify DFs in a corpus of texts. Pecheux et al. (1979: 33) note that the composition of a corpus itself embodies 'a hypothesis about the existence of one or more DFs' which 'dominate' its constituent texts, and suggest that such a hypothesis ought to come from specialist disciplines such as history or sociology rather than discourse analysts themselves, to avoid circularity. Putting a corpus together on the basis of a hypothesis is tantamount to imposing homogeneity upon the domain of texts, and the corpus is further homogenized through the exclusion of parts of texts whose 'conditions of production' (hence whose dominating DFs) are different from the main ones.

The first part of the procedure is a linguistic analysis of the text into clauses (i.e. simple sentences) using the 'transformational' procedures of the linguist Zellig Harris (1963). For example, 'I regret her departure' would be analysed as two clauses, 'I regret', '(that) she has departed'. Graphs are produced which show what sort of relationships there are between the clauses (co-ordination, subordination, complementation, etc.). These graphs are then subjected to a second, computerized, procedure to determine which words and expressions are in a relationship of 'substitution', that is, which can occur in the same positions in clauses which are similar in their grammatical structure and which are similarly related to other clauses. For example, 'militants' and 'subversives' are in a relationship of substitution in 'We should

Approaches to

watch out for militants who d  
guard against subversives who  
words or expressions are placed  
a text, semantic relationships a  
relationships of synonymy (A  
implication (A implies B, but  
likely to be distinctive for the  
iated. The procedure focuses u  
exceptional social or political s  
tical discourse). (For a more c  
of analysis, see Maingueneau  
Finally, the results of the anal  
preted, though little attention is  
interpretation, and the method

The strength of Pecheux's ap  
ing it as critical, is that it mar  
with linguistic methods of text  
of texts is unsatisfactory. As I  
genized before analysis through  
(Courtine and Marandin 1981)  
transformational procedures to  
is to obliterate distinctive featu  
over, these procedures allow f  
texts, which means that sente  
effectively the objects of analy  
ducts, just as they are by cri  
processes of text production  
attention. They are analysed in  
is||| I also directed at Potter an  
focus upon 'key words': only  
are attended to, while interspers  
vith social relations and social  
of the meaning of utterances in  
more abstract meaning relation  
organization of texts which  
Ignored. In sum, rather than t  
grips with what is distinctive  
event, texts are treated as evid  
DFs. There is a similar tenden  
emphasize reproduction - ho

formations and how ideological domination is secured – at the expense of transformation – how subjects may contest and progressively restructure domination and formations through their practice. I suggested a similar emphasis occurs in critical linguistics. Correspondingly, there is a one-sided view of the subject as positioned, as an effect; the capacity of subjects to act as agents, and even to transform the bases of subjection themselves, is neglected. The theory of 'disidentification' as change externally generated by a particular political practice is an implausible alternative to building the possibility of transformation into one's view of discourse and the subject.

'Second generation' discourse analysis in the Pecheux tradition has altered the approach in fundamental ways, partly in response to criticisms and partly under the influence of political changes in France (Maldidier 1984: xi-xiv). Some studies of political discourse (e.g. Counine 1981) have highlighted discursive strategies of alliance, and combinations of different DFs which make discourse highly heterogeneous and ambiguous. These properties are not easily accommodated in the earlier vision in which monolithic DFs have static relationships of opposition. Discourse has come to be characterized as possessing 'constitutive heterogeneity' (Authier-Revuz 1982), having inherent properties of 'dialogism' and 'intertextuality' in the terms of a different theoretical tradition (see Bakhtin 1981; Kristeva 1986a; and pp. 84-5 below), and earlier work was seen along the lines of my criticism above as procedures for imposing homogeneity. Interdiscourse has come to be seen as 'a process of constant restructuring' in which the delimitation of a DF is 'fundamentally unstable, being not a permanent boundary separating an interior and an exterior, but a frontier between different DFs which shifts according to what is at stake in ideological struggle' (Counine 1981: 24). Given the constitutive heterogeneity of discourse, particular parts of a text will often be ambivalent, raising questions for the interpreter about which DFs are most relevant to their interpretation, and, as Pecheux observes in one of his last papers (1988), giving discourse analysis the character of an interpretative rather than a straightforwardly descriptive discipline. At the same time, there is an abandonment of the 'theoreticist illusion' that radical transformations of interdiscourse are 'authorized by the existence of Marxism-Leninism' (Pecheux 1983: 32). With a new focus upon the particular discursive 'event', a dialectical view of discourse

emerges, and the possibility of t  
in the heterogeneous and contra  
given discourse is the potential  
;oeioh1stonical filiations of Iden  
tutes, at the same time, a result  
... of displacement within their

## Conc

I want to conclude this survey  
issues so far in the form of a  
regarded as desiderata for an a  
course analysis. This will giv  
approach I begin developing in  
tensionship to those already discus  
identify areas in which the lin  
discourse analysis reviewed in  
developed, and in which it need  
upon accounts of language and

1 The object of analysis is li  
in terms of their own specificity  
texts to represent a particular d  
the diversity of practices is re  
Coulthard) and avoid homogeni

2 In addition to texts as 'pro  
duction and interpretation, thes  
lysed (compare Sinclair and Co  
and see the approach to critica  
(198.8) for detailed attention to  
itself is seen as interpretation, an  
their own interpretative tenden  
(compare Sinclair and Coulthard  
linguistics).

J Texts may be heterogeneo  
urations of different discourse  
producing and interpreting the  
Conversation analysis, 'first gen

4 Discourse is studied histor  
of shifting configurations of di  
cesses, and in terms of how s

wider processes of social change ('second generation' Pecheux group, social semiotics; compare Labov and Fanshel, 'first generation' Pecheux group, Critical linguistics).

5 Discourse is socially constructive (Critical linguistics, Pecheux, Potter and Wetherell), constituting social subjects, social relations, and systems of knowledge and belief, and the study of discourse focuses upon its constructive ideological effects (Pecheux, Critical linguistics; compare Labov and Fanshel),

6 Discourse analysis is concerned not only with power relations in discourse (compare Conversation analysis), but also with how power relations and power struggle shape and transform the discourse practices of a society or institution ('second generation' Pecheux group; compare non-critical approaches, Critical linguistics).

7 Analysis of discourse attends to its functioning in the creative transformation of ideologies and practices as well as its functioning in securing their reproduction (compare Pecheux, Critical linguistics).

8 Texts are analysed in terms of a diverse range of features of form and meaning (e.g. properties of dialogue and text structure as well as vocabulary and grammar) appertaining to both the ideational and interpersonal functions of language (compare Potter and Wetherell, Pecheux).

What is envisaged is a discourse analysis focused upon variability, change, and struggle: variability between practices and heterogeneity within them as a synchronic reflex of processes of historical change which are shaped by struggle between social forces. Although points 4, 5 and 6 receive some support especially within the critical approaches to discourse analysis I have discussed above, we need to go to social theory to find full and explicit developments of them. Foucault provides valuable insights on all of them, as I shall argue in chapter 2. However, neither the critical tradition in linguistically-oriented discourse analysis nor Foucault deal satisfactorily with point 7 - the way in which discourse contributes both to the reproduction and to the transformation of societies. This duality of discourse is of central importance in the framework I present in chapter 3, and the neglect of it in Foucault's writings is associated with major theoretical and methodological weaknesses in his work.

## Michel Foucault of Dis

Has not the practice of revolution  
course over the past two hundred  
that words are wind, an external  
one has difficulty in hearing i  
Michel Foucault

Foucault has had a huge influence on the humanities, and the popularization of discourse analysis as a method is a result of that influence. It is important to consider, for two reasons. Firstly, Foucault's work is widely referred to as a model for social analysis, advocating a different approach to the study of social and cultural change, and the reasons why needs to be made clear. There are many texts textually- (and therefore implicitly) on discourse analysis (henceforth abbreviated as 'discourse analysis'). Foucault's more abstract approach to social analysis, why social scientists should consider it at the end of the chapter that discusses social analyses.

The second reason for a chapter on Foucault alluded to: the development of a social theory which is theoretically adequate to the study of society requires a synthesis of linguistic and social theory. The insights of recent social theory and Foucault's work makes an im-

theory of discourse in such areas as the relationship of discourse and power, the discursive construction of social subjects and knowledge, and the functioning of discourse in social change. As I pointed out at the end of chapter 1, these are areas where linguistically-oriented approaches are weak and undeveloped.

However, given that Foucault's approach to discourse and the intellectual context within which it developed are so different from my own, one cannot simply 'apply' Foucault's work in discourse analysis; it is, as Courtine says, a matter of 'putting Foucault's perspective to work' (1981: 40) within TODA, and trying to operationalize his insights in actual methods of analysis. The prominence given to discourse in Foucault's earlier work is a consequence of positions which he took up in relation to the conduct of research in the human sciences. He opted for a focus upon discursive practices in an effort to move beyond the two major alternative modes of investigation available to social research - structuralism and hermeneutics (Dreyfus and Rabinow 1982: xiii-xxiii). Foucault is concerned with discursive practices as constitutive of knowledge, and with the conditions of transformation of the knowledge associated with a discursive formation into a science.

This intellectual context helps to explain major differences between Foucault's discourse analysis and that of TODA. In the first place, Foucault was concerned in some phases of his work with a quite specific sort of discourse - the discourse of the human sciences, such as medicine, psychiatry, economics, and grammar. TODA, on the other hand, is in principle concerned with any sort of discourse - conversation, classroom discourse, media discourse, and so forth. Secondly, as I have already indicated, whereas the analysis of spoken and written language texts is a central part of TODA, it is not a part of Foucault's discourse analysis. His focus is upon the 'conditions of possibility' of discourse (Robin 1973: 83), upon 'rules of formation' which define the possible 'objects', 'enunciative modalities', 'subjects', 'concepts' and 'strategies' of a particular type of discourse (these terms are explained below). Foucault's emphasis is upon the domains of knowledge which are constituted by such rules.

I quoted above Courtine's view that we should 'put Foucault's perspective to work' within TODA. The notion of 'Foucault's perspective', however, can be misleading, given the shifts of

emphasis within Foucault's work (1986). In his earlier 'archaeological' discourse ('discursive formation' constituting areas of knowledge. In his later work, the emphasis shifted to relationships between the individual and the social. And in the work of Foucault's later period, the emphasis is on 'how' the individual is supposed to be a 'subject' of his own actions' (Rabinow 1982). The question of discourse remains a concern throughout his work, and so do the implications of these changes.

In this chapter I shall first discuss the changes in Foucault's conceptions of discourse in his earlier work (especially Foucault 1972), and then discuss the changes in his later work (focusing upon Foucault 1979). In these sections will be to identify the changes and insights into discourse, which ought to be integrated into TODA, and where appropriate operationalized. I shall conclude, however, by discussing the implications of Foucault's work which limit its value for TODA, and how they help strengthen social analysis within the Foucaultian tradition. What is the value of Foucault's work from a particular point of view? The accounts and critiques are available in Rabinow 1982; Hoy 1986; Dev

### Foucault's 'Archaeology'

Foucault's earlier 'archaeological' work (particularly to Foucault 1972) includes a concern about discourse which need to be integrated into TODA. The first is a constitutive view of discourse as actively constituting social subjects and forms of social relations in various dimensions: discourse constituting social subjects and forms of social relations in various conceptual frameworks. The second is a concern with the dependency of the discourse practices upon the texts always draw upon and tr

historically prior texts (a property commonly referred to as the 'intertextuality' of texts - see p. 84 below), and any given type of discourse practice is generated out of combinations of others, and is defined by its relationship to others (a perspective recognized by Pecheux in the primacy he ascribed to 'interdiscourse' - see p.31 above). Although the focus of Foucault (1972) is upon the discursive formations of the human sciences, his insights are transferable to all types of discourse.

What does Foucault mean by 'discourse' and 'discourse analysis' in his 'archaeological' works? He sees discourse analysis as concerned with analysing 'statements' (the usual translation of French 'énoncés'; it is somewhat misleading in implying that 'énoncés' are only assertions, as opposed to questions, orders, threats, and so forth). According to one formulation (Foucault 1972: 107-8), the analysis of statements is one of a number of ways of analysing 'verbal performances'. The others are 'a logical analysis of propositions, a grammatical analysis of sentences, a psychological or contextual analysis of formulations'. The discursive analysis of statements does not replace these other types of analysis, but nor can it be reduced to them. One consequence is that for Foucault, discourse analysis is not to be equated with linguistic analysis, nor discourse with language. Discourse analysis is concerned not with specifying what sentences are possible or 'grammatical', but with specifying sociohistorically variable 'discursive formations' (sometimes referred to as 'discourses'), systems of rules which make it possible for certain statements but not others to occur at particular times, places and institutional locations. The conception of linguistic analysis that Foucault is appealing to is dated (Foucault 1972 was written in 1969), and the sort of rules he is concerned with would seem to be what sociolinguists working in the 1970s came to call 'sociolinguistic rules', social rules of language use. However, Foucault's perspective is very different from any found in sociolinguistics; part of this difference is the lack of concern with language texts referred to above.

A discursive formation consists of 'rules of formation' for the particular set of statements which belong to it, and more specifically rules for the formation of 'objects', rules for the formation of 'enunciative modalities' and 'subject positions', rules for the formation of 'concepts', and rules for the formation of 'strategies' (Foucault 1972: 31-9). These rules of formation are constituted

by combinations of prior discourses (examples are given below), and the combination of these elements makes discourse a specific expression 'discursive practice'). In turn, giving a summary of the following, briefly its potential interest in analysis.

### The Formation

The essential insight in respect of the 'objects' of discourse are constituted according to the rules of formation, rather than existing independently or talked about in a particular way. This means objects of knowledge, the disciplines or sciences recognize which they take as targets for their 'objects' can be extended beyond the sciences to the entities recognized in the example of the constitution of discourse of psychopathology inwards; other examples might be 'race', or 'freedom' and 'enterprise' (1990) in contemporary media and 'agency' in educational discourse. A madness was constituted by all that named it, divided it up, described it. Moreover, madness is not a static entity but a continuous transformation both between and within a given discursive formation. The formation needs to be defined in terms of the transformation of its objects, the unity of a discourse is based not on the uniqueness of an object as on the emergence and are continuously transformed.

What is of major significance in the view of discourse as constitutive of transformation, and reproduction shall see shortly, the subjects)



---

sample content of Discourse and Social Change

- [read online Friction](#)
- [Mentor: A Memoir pdf, azw \(kindle\), epub](#)
- [click A Comparative History of World Philosophy: From the Upanishads to Kant book](#)
- [read \*Beyond the Hole in the Wall: Discover the Power of Self-Organized Learning\*](#)
- [click \*\*The PTSD Workbook: Simple, Effective Techniques for Overcoming Traumatic Stress Symptoms pdf, azw \(kindle\)\*\*](#)
- [On the Edge pdf, azw \(kindle\), epub, doc, mobi](#)
  
- <http://dpsam.org.my/freebooks/Friction.pdf>
- <http://weddingcellist.com/lib/Effective-Treatments-for-PTSD--Practice-Guidelines-from-the-International-Society-for-Traumatic-Stress-Studies--2nd>
- <http://schroff.de/books/A-Comparative-History-of-World-Philosophy--From-the-Upanishads-to-Kant.pdf>
- <http://musor.ruspb.info/?library/Since-the-Layoffs.pdf>
- <http://paulbussman.com/ebooks/Craft-Beer-Bar-Mitzvah--How-It-Took-13-Years--Extreme-Jewish-Brewing--and-Circus-Sideshow-Freaks-to-Make-Shmaltz>
- <http://econtact.webschaefer.com/?books/On-the-Edge.pdf>