Analysing Discourse

Textual analysis for social research

Norman Fairclough

Contents

PART IV
Styles and identities 157

Acknowledgements

1 Introduction

This book is written with two main types of reader in mind: students and researchers in social science and humanities who have little if any background in language analysis (e.g. in Sociology, Political Science, Education, Geography, History, Social Administration, Media Studies, Cultural Studies, Women's Studies); and students and researchers specializing in language.

People working in various areas of social science are often confronted with questions about language, and are often working with language materials – written texts, or conversation, or research interviews. However, my experience in teaching discourse analysis (for instance in the Faculty of Social Science research training programme at Lancaster University) indicates that there is widespread uncertainty about how to analyse such language material. I find that research students in Social Sciences often see the need to say more detailed things about their language data than they feel equipped to do. The prospect of following courses or reading books in Linguistics is generally daunting to them – not least because much of contemporary Linguistics is quite unsuitable for their purposes (especially the 'formal linguistics' which is concerned with abstract properties of human language, and has little to offer in the analysis of what people say or write). This book aims to provide a useable framework for analysing spoken or written language for people in social sciences and humanities with little or no background in language study, presented in a way which suggests how language analysis may enhance research into a number of issues which concern social scientists.

The book can also be seen as an introduction to *social* analysis of spoken and written language for people who already have some background in language analysis. There have been significant moves towards analysing language socially within Linguistics in recent decades – sociolinguistics and discourse analysis are now well-established parts of the field. But there are two limitations in most of this work which in this book I hope to begin to correct. The first is that themes and issues which interest social researchers have been taken up only to a rather limited extent. The second is that it is difficult to think of a relatively detailed presentation of

a framework for linguistic analysis in the existing literature which indicates how that framework might fruitfully be used to address a range of issues in social research. That is my aim in this book.

I envisage the book being used in a variety of ways. It is suitable for use as a coursebook for second or third year undergraduates, MA students and research students both in courses in research methods in social science departments, and in courses in analysis of language use in language departments. But it could also be used outside the context of a course by research students and academics in social science and humanities who are looking for a socially-oriented introduction to analysis of spoken and written language.

Given that readers are likely to vary considerably in their familiarity with the concepts and categories I draw from social research and discourse and text analysis, I have included glossaries of key terms and key people (pages xxx – xxx), and references for them which in some cases extend the sources I have referred to in the main text of the book. Terms included in the glossaries are printed in **bold** at the point where they are first used.

Social analysis, discourse analysis, text analysis

I see this book as extending the work I have previously published in the area of discourse analysis in the direction of more detailed linguistic analysis of texts (Chouliaraki and Fairclough 1999, Fairclough 2001b, 1992, 1995a, 2000a). My approach to discourse analysis (a version of 'critical discourse analysis') is based upon the assumption that language is an irreducible part of social life, dialectically interconnected with other elements of social life, so that social analysis and research always has to take account of language. ('Dialectical' relations will be explained in chapter 2.) This means that one productive way of doing social research is through a focus on language, using some form of discourse analysis. This is not a matter of reducing social life to language, saying that everything is discourse – it isn't. Rather, it's one analytical strategy amongst many, and it often makes sense to use discourse analysis in conjunction with other forms of analysis, for instance ethnography or forms of institutional analysis.

There are many versions of discourse analysis (Van Dijk 1997). One major division is between approaches which include detailed analysis of texts (see below for the sense in which I am using this term), and approaches which don't. I have used the term 'textually oriented discourse analysis' to distinguish the former from the latter (Fairclough 1992). Discourse analysis in social sciences is often strongly influenced by the work of Foucault (Foucault 1972, Fairclough 1992). Social scientists working in this tradition generally pay little close attention to the linguistic features of texts. My own approach to discourse analysis has been to try to transcend the division between work inspired by social theory which tends not to analyse

texts, and work which focuses upon the language of texts but tends not to engage with social theoretical issues. This is not, or should not be, an 'either/or'. On the one hand, any analysis of texts which aims to be significant in social scientific terms has to connect with theoretical questions about discourse (e.g. the socially 'constructive' effects of discourse). On the other hand, no real understanding of the social effects of discourse is possible without looking closely at what happens when people talk or write.

So, text analysis is an essential part of discourse analysis, but discourse analysis is not merely the linguistic analysis of texts. I see discourse analysis as 'oscillating' between a focus on specific texts and a focus on what I call the 'order of discourse', the relatively durable social structuring of language which is itself one element of the relatively durable structuring and networking of social practices. Critical discourse analysis is concerned with continuity and change at this more abstract, more structural, level, as well as with what happens in particular texts. The link between these two concerns is made through the way in which texts are analysed in critical discourse analysis. Text analysis is seen as not only linguistic analysis; it also includes what I have called 'interdiscursive analysis', that is, seeing texts in terms of the different discourses, genres and styles they draw upon and articulate together. I shall explain this more fully in chapter 2 (see Fairclough 2000a).

My focus in this book, however, is on the linguistic analysis of texts. But what I want to make clear is that this is not just another book on linguistic analysis of texts, it is part of a broader project of developing critical discourse analysis as a resource for social analysis and research. The book can be used without reference to that broader project, but I would like readers to be aware of it even if they do not subscribe to it. I include a brief 'manifesto' for the broader project at the end of the Conclusion. Some readers may wish to read this broader framing of the book (pages 202–11) at this point.

Terminology: text, discourse, language

I shall use the term text in a very broad sense. Written and printed texts such as shopping lists and newspaper articles are 'texts', but so also are transcripts of (spoken) conversations and interviews, as well as television programmes and web-pages. We might say that any actual instance of language in use is a 'text' – though even that is too limited, because texts such as television programmes involve not only language but also visual images and sound effects. The term 'language' will be used in its most usual sense to mean verbal language – words, sentences, etc. We can talk of 'language' in a general way, or of particular languages such as English or Swahili. The term **discourse** (in what is widely called 'discourse analysis') signals the particular view of language in use I have referred to above – as an element of social life which is closely interconnected with other elements. But, again, the term

can be used in a particular as well as a general, abstract way – so I shall refer to particular 'discourses' such as the 'Third Way' political discourse of New Labour (Fairclough 2000b).

Language in new capitalism

The examples I use throughout the book to illustrate the approach will be particularly focused upon contemporary social change, and especially changes in contemporary capitalism and their impact on many areas of social life. The set of changes I am referring to are variously identified as 'globalization', post- or late-'modernity', 'information society', 'knowledge economy', 'new capitalism', 'consumer culture', and so forth (Held *et al*. 1999). I shall use the term **new capitalism**, meaning the most recent of a historical series of radical re-structurings through which capitalism has maintained its fundamental continuity (Jessop 2000). My reason for focusing on it is that a great deal of contemporary social research is concerned with the nature and consequences of these changes. And, quite simply, because no contemporary social research can ignore these changes, they are having a pervasive effect on our lives. A more specific reason for focusing on new capitalism is that this is now developing into a significant area of research for critical discourse analysts. There is a web-site devoted to it (http://www.cddc.vt.edu/host/lnc/) and the journal *Discourse and Society* has recently devoted a special issue to the theme (13 (2), 2002). I should add, however, that using the term 'new capitalism' does not imply an exclusive focus on economic issues: transformations in capitalism have ramifications throughout social life, and 'new capitalism' as a research theme should be interpreted broadly as a concern with how these transformations impact on politics, education, artistic production, and many other areas of social life.

Capitalism has the capacity to overcome crises by radically transforming itself periodically, so that economic expansion can continue. Such a transformation towards new capitalism is taking place now in response to a crisis in the post-Second World War model (generally known as 'Fordism'). This transformation involves both 're-structuring' of relations between the economic, political and social domains (including the commodification and marketization of fields like education – it becomes subject to the economic logic of the market), and the 're-scaling' of relations between the different levels of social life – the global, the regional (e.g. the European Union), the national, and the local. Governments on different scales, social democratic as well as conservative, now take it as a mere fact of life (though a 'fact' produced in part by inter-governmental agreements) that all must bow to the emerging logic of a globalizing knowledge-driven economy, and have embraced or at least made adjustments to 'neo-liberalism'. Neo-liberalism is a political project for facilitating the re-structuring and re-scaling of social relations in accordance with the demands of an unrestrained global capitalism (Bourdieu 1998). It has been

imposed on the post-socialist economies as the (allegedly) best means of rapid system transformation, economic renewal, and re-integration into the global economy. It has led to radical attacks on universal social welfare and the reduction of the protections against the effects of markets that welfare states provided for people. It has also led to an increasing division between rich and poor, increasing economic insecurity and stress even for the 'new middle' classes, and an intensification of the exploitation of labour. The unrestrained emphasis on growth also poses major threats to the environment. It has also produced a new imperialism, where international financial agencies under the tutelage of the USA and its rich allies indiscriminately impose restructuring on less fortunate countries, sometimes with disastrous consequences (e.g. Russia). It is not the impetus to increasing international economic integration that is the problem, but the particular form in which this is being imposed, and the particular consequences (e.g. in terms of unequal distribution of wealth) which inevitably follow. All this has resulted in the disorientation and disarming of economic, political and social forces committed to radical alternatives, and has contributed to a closure of public debate and a weakening of democracy (Boyer and Hollingsworth 1997, Brenner 1998, Crouch and Streek 1997, Jessop 2000).

Readers will find in the Appendix a set of texts which I have used for illustrative purposes throughout the book. In the main, I have selected these texts on the basis of their relevance to a number of research issues arising in a range of disciplines from the transformations of new capitalism. In some cases, I have taken examples from previous research to try to show how the approach adopted in this book might enhance existing methods of analysis.

The approach to text analysis

My main point of reference within existing literature on text analysis is Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL), a linguistic theory and associated analytical methods particularly associated with Michael **Halliday** (Halliday 1978, 1994). In contrast with the more influential Chomskyan tradition within Linguistics, SFL is profoundly concerned with the relationship between language and other elements and aspects of social life, and its approach to the linguistic analysis of texts is always oriented to the social character of texts (particularly valuable sources include Halliday 1994, Halliday and Hasan 1976, 1989, Hasan 1996, Martin 1992, Van Leeuwen 1993, 1995, 1996). This makes it a valuable resource for critical discourse analysis, and indeed major contributions to critical discourse analysis have developed out of SFL (Fowler *et al.* 1979, Hodge and Kress 1988, 1993, Kress 1985, Kress and Van Leeuwen 2001, Lemke 1995, Thibault 1991).[1]

But the perspectives of critical discourse analysis and SFL do not precisely coincide, because of their different aims (for a critical dialogue between the two,

see Chouliaraki and Fairclough 1999). There is a need to develop approaches to text analysis through a **transdisciplinary** dialogue with perspectives on language and discourse within social theory and research in order to develop our capacity to analyse texts as elements in social processes. A 'transdisciplinary' approach to theory or analytical method is a matter of working with the categories and 'logic' of for instance sociological theories in developing a theory of discourse and methods of analysing texts. This is inevitably a long-term project which is only begun in a modest way in this book, for instance in the discussion of 'genre chains' (chapter 2), 'dialogicality' (chapter 3), 'equivalence and difference' (chapter 5), and the representation of time and space (chapter 8). Van Leeuwen's work on representation (referred to above) can also be seen as developing text analysis in this transdisciplinary way. Another concern I have had is to try to make the analytical categories as transparent as possible for social analysis of discourse, moving away to an extent from the often forbidding technical terminology of Linguistics.

I should also briefly mention corpus analysis, though I shall not be dealing with it at all in this book (De Beaugrande 1997, McEnery and Wilson 2001, Stubbs 1996). The sort of detailed text analysis I introduce is a form of 'qualitative' social analysis. It is rather 'labour-intensive' and can be productively applied to samples of research material rather than large bodies of text. Though the amount of material that can be analysed depends on the level of detail: textual analysis can focus on just a selected few features of texts, or many features simultaneously. But this form of qualitative analysis can usefully be supplemented by the 'quantitative analysis' offered by corpus linguistics, as De Beaugrande (1997) and Stubbs (1996) argue. The packages available (such as Wordsmith, which I make some use of in Fairclough 2000b) allow one, for instance, to identify the 'keywords' in a corpus of texts, and to investigate distinctive patterns of co-occurrence or **collocation** between keywords and other words. Such findings are of value, though their value is limited, and they need to be complemented by more intensive and detailed qualitative textual analysis.

Critical discourse analysis can in fact draw upon a wide range of approaches to analysing text. I have chosen in this book to place the main emphasis on grammatical and semantic analysis because while this form of analysis can, I believe, be very productive in social research, it is often difficult for researchers without a background in Linguistics to access it. The are other approaches to analysis which are more familiar and more accessible (conversation analysis is a good example) which I have not dealt with in this book (for an overview, see Titscher *et al.* 2000). That does not mean that they cannot be drawn upon in critical discourse analysis – indeed I have made some use of them in earlier publications (Fairclough 1992, for example).

Social research themes

Each chapter of the book will address one or more social research themes, and I shall signal these at the beginning of the chapter. The aim will be to show how the particular aspects of text analysis dealt with in the chapter might productively be drawn upon in researching these themes. The themes include: the government or **governance** of new capitalist societies, **hybridity** or the blurring of social boundaries as a feature of what some social theorists call 'postmodernity', shifts in '**space–time**' (time and space) associated with '**globalization**', **hegemonic** struggles to give a '**universal**' status to particular discourses and representations, **ideologies**, citizenship and 'public space', social change and change in communication technologies, the **legitimation** of social action and social orders, the dominant **character** types of contemporary socities (including the manager and the therapist), **societal 'informalization'** and the shift away from overt hierarchies. (All the terms in bold are included in the glossary.)

From the perspective of a social scientist, the set of themes addressed and the social theorists and researchers I have drawn upon will no doubt seem rather disparate. Although I have selected themes and sources which I find generally helpful in addressing the theme of Language in New Capitalism, these should be seen as no more than illustrative with respect to my general aim: on the one hand, to consider how social research and theory might inform the approach to text analysis, and on the other hand, how text analysis might enhance social research. In a sense, the diversity of sources and themes is advantageous, because it may help to make the point that the relationship I am advocating between text analysis and social research is a general one which is not limited to particular theories, disciplines or research traditions in social science. Although I have chosen to focus on the research theme of Language in New Capitalism, this should not be taken to imply that textual analysis is *only* relevant to social research oriented to this theme. And of course a single book cannot possibly begin to show all the areas of social research which might be enhanced by text analysis.

I have drawn on the work of a number of social theorists. Again, this selection of sources should not be regarded as in any way exhaustive or exclusive – they are theorists with whom I have found it fruitful to conduct a dialogue when working within critical discourse analysis. They all, in one way or another, raise questions about language and discourse, though none of them use the resources for detailed analysis which, I am suggesting, can enhance such theoretical projects and associated research. See the glossary of the main social theorists to whom I refer.

A systematic discussion of the relationship between critical discourse analysis and social theory can be found in Chouliaraki and Fairclough (1999), which can be seen as complementary to this book. It includes extended discussion of the relationship of critical discourse analysis to the main social theories I refer to here, as well a

detailed account of critical discourse analysis. Readers will find in Fairclough 2000b an extended application of critical discourse analysis to a particular case, the language of the 'New Labour' government in the UK.

Social effects of texts

Texts as elements of social events (see chapter 2) have causal effects – i.e. they bring about changes. Most immediately, texts can bring about changes in our knowledge (we can learn things from them), our beliefs, our attitudes, values and so forth. They also have longer-term causal effects – one might for instance argue that prolonged experience of advertising and other commercial texts contributes to shaping people's identities as 'consumers', or their gender identities. Texts can also start wars, or contribute to changes in education, or to changes in industrial relations, and so forth. Their effects can include changes in the material world, such as changes in urban design, or the architecture and design of particular types of building. In sum, texts have causal effects upon, and contribute to changes in, people (beliefs, attitudes, etc.), actions, social relations, and the material world. It would make little sense to focus on language in new capitalism if we didn't think that texts have causal effects of this sort, and effects on social change. Though as I shall argue below, these effects are mediated by meaning-making.

We need, however, to be clear what sort of causality this is. It is not a simple mechanical causality – we cannot for instance claim that particular features of texts automatically bring about particular changes in people's knowledge or behaviour or particular social or political effects. Nor is causality the same as regularity: there may be no regular cause–effect pattern associated with a particular type of text or particular features of texts, but that does not mean that there are no causal effects.[2] Texts can have causal effects without them necessarily being regular effects, because many other factors in the context determine whether particular texts actually have such effects, and can lead to a particular text having a variety of effects, for instance on different interpreters (Fairclough *et al*. 2002).

Contemporary social science has been widely influenced by 'social constructivism' – the claim that the (social) world is socially constructed. Many theories of social constructivism emphasize the role of texts (language, discourse) in the construction of the social world. These theories tend to be idealist rather than realist. A realist would argue that although aspects of the social world such as social institutions are ultimately socially constructed, once constructed they are realities which affect and limit the textual (or 'discursive') construction of the social. We need to distinguish 'construction' from 'construal', which social constructivists do not: we may textually construe (represent, imagine, etc.) the social world in particular ways, but whether our representations or construals have the effect of changing its construction depends upon various contextual factors – including the

way social reality already is, who is construing it, and so forth. So we can accept a moderate version of the claim that the social world is textually constructed, but not an extreme version (Sayer 2000).

Ideologies

One of the causal effects of texts which has been of major concern for critical discourse analysis is ideological effects – the effects of texts in inculcating and sustaining or changing ideologies (Eagleton 1991, Larrain 1979, Thompson 1984, Van Dijk 1998). Ideologies are representations of aspects of the world which can be shown to contribute to establishing, maintaining and changing social relations of power, domination and exploitation. This 'critical' view of ideology, seeing it as a modality of power, contrasts with various 'descriptive' views of ideology as positions, attitudes, beliefs, perspectives, etc. of social groups without reference to relations of power and domination between such groups. Ideological representations can be identified in texts (Thompson 1984 glosses ideology as 'meaning in the service of power'), but in saying that ideologies are representations which can be shown to contribute to social relations of power and domination, I am suggesting that textual analysis needs to be framed in this respect in social analysis which can consider bodies of texts in terms of their effects on power relations. Moreover, if ideologies are primarily representations, they can nevertheless also be 'enacted' in ways of acting socially, and 'inculcated' in the identities of social agents. Ideologies can also have a durability and stability which transcends individual texts or bodies of texts – in terms of the distinctions I explain in chapter 2, they can be associated with discourses (as representations), with genres (as enactments), and with **styles** (as inculcations).

Let us take an example: the pervasive claim that in the new 'global' economy, countries must be highly competitive to survive. One can find this claim asserted or assumed in many contemporary texts. And one can see it (and the neo-liberal discourse with which it is associated) enacted in, for example, new, more 'business-like' ways of administering organizations like universities, and inculcated in new managerial styles which are also evident in many texts. We can only arrive at a judgement about whether this claim is ideological by looking at the causal effects it and related claims have in particular areas of social life (e.g. whether people come to believe that countries must be highly competitive to survive), and asking whether they and their enactments and inculcations contribute to sustaining or changing power relations (e.g. by making employees more amenable to the demands of managers). Notice that even if we did conclude that such a claim is ideological, that would not make it necessarily or simply untrue: we might for instance argue that contemporary economic relations do indeed impose greater competitiveness, though point out that this is not the inevitable 'law of nature' it is often represented

as being, but the product of a particular economic order which could be changed. I return to the discussion of ideologies in chapter 3, with respect to ideological assumptions in particular, and in chapter 4, with respect to argumentation.

Text, meanings and interpretations

Part of what is implied in approaching texts as elements of social events is that we are not only concerned with texts as such, but also with interactive processes of meaning-making. In the case of a face-to-face conversation, the text is a transcript of what is said, and to a degree one can see meaning-making going on by looking at how participants respond to each other's conversational turns. Let us take a very simple example (from Cameron 2001):

1 *Customer*: Pint of Guiness, please.
2 *Bartender*: How old are you?
3 *Customer*: Twenty-two.
4 *Bartender*: OK, coming up.

In turns 2 and 3, the Bartender and the Customer are interactively establishing that the preconditions for ordering an alcoholic drink in a bar are met, i.e. that the Customer is (in the case of Britain) over the age of 18. The Customer in turn 3 shows his or her understanding that this legal constraint is at issue, and the Bartender's purpose of resolving the legal issue in asking the question, by collaboratively providing what may on the face of it seem irrelevant information in the context of ordering a drink. The Customer is able to recognize that the Bartender's question in 2 is relevant not only on the basis of his or her knowledge of the licensing laws, but also because of the position of the question – if a request (turn 1 in this case) is answered with a question, that tends to mean responding to the request is conditional upon the answer to the question.

This example suggests that there are three analytically separable elements in processes of meaning-making: the production of the text, the text itself, and the reception of the text. The production of the text puts the focus on producers, authors, speakers, writers; the reception of the text puts the focus on interpretation, interpreters, readers, listeners.[3] Each of these three elements has been given primacy at different points in the recent history of theories of meaning: first the intentions, identity etc. of the author, then the text itself, then more recently the interpretative work of the reader or listener. But it seems clear that meanings are made through the interplay between them: we must take account of the institutional position, interests, values, intentions, desires etc. of producers; the relations between

elements at different levels in texts; and the institutional positions, knowledge, purposes, values etc. of receivers. It is very difficult to be precise about the processes involved in meaning-making for the obvious reason that they are mainly going on in people's heads, and there are no direct ways of accessing them. When we move from spoken dialogue to, for instance, published texts, the problems are compounded because we no longer have the ongoing negotiation of meaning within dialogue, which at least gives us some evidence of how things are being intended and interpreted. And a published text can figure in many different processes of meaning-making and contribute to diverse meanings, because it is open to diverse interpretations.

It is clear from the example above that meaning-making depends upon not only what is explicit in a text but also what is implicit – what is assumed. So we might say that the Bartender's question in turn 2 makes the assumption that alcoholic drinks can only be served if customers are over a certain age. What is 'said' in a text always rests upon 'unsaid' assumptions, so part of the analysis of texts is trying to identify what is assumed (see chapter 3).

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

The focus in this book is quite particular: it is on analysing texts, with a view to their social effects (discussed below). The social effects of texts depend upon processes of meaning-making – we might want to say that the social effects of texts are mediated by meaning-making, or indeed that it is meanings that have social effects rather than texts as such. But one resource that is necessary for any account of meaning-making is the capacity to analyse texts in order to clarify their contribution to processes of meaning-making, and my primary concern in this book is with providing that resource. So I shall not give a developed overall account of

the process of meaning-making, though my approach does assume the need for such an account. However, I shall be looking at texts dynamically, in terms of how social agents make or 'texture' texts by setting up relations between their elements. This means that my approach to text-analysis will move further towards the production of texts than towards the reception and interpretation of texts. But what I have said above should hopefully make it clear that this does not imply any minimization of reception and interpretation.

Texts and authors

I shall refer to the 'author' of a text. Goffman (1981) differentiates the 'principal', the one whose position is put in the text, the 'author', the one who puts the words together and is responsible for the wording, and the 'animator', the person who makes the sounds or the marks on paper. In the simplest case, a single person simultaneously occupies all these positions, but in principle this may not be so – for instance, a spokesman may be simply the 'mouthpiece' for others in an organization (i.e. just the 'animator'), or a news report may be authored by a journalist while the principal may be some politician, for instance, whose position is being implicitly supported. There are various further possible complications: authorship can be collective without that necessarily being clear from a text (various hands for example may contribute to a news report). There are also objections to placing too much weight on authorship from a structuralist and post-structuralist point of view, but these are often linked to an excessive playing down of agency (see chapter 2 for my position on this question). When I refer to 'authors', I shall do so without getting too much into these complications, and I shall be primarily referring to whoever can be seen as having put the words together, and as taking on commitments to truth, obligations, necessity and values by virtue of choices in wording (see chapter 10).

Forms, meanings and effects

The analysis of texts is concerned with the linguistic forms of texts, and the distribution of different linguistic forms across different types of texts. One might attribute causal effects to particular linguistic forms (or more plausibly to a strong tendency to select one form in preference to other alternative forms in a significant body of texts), but again one has to be cautious and avoid any suggestion that such effects work mechanically or in a simple, regular way. They depend upon meaning and context. For example, a linguistic form which is heavily used in accounts or narratives about the 'global economy' is **nominalization** (which is discussed in chapter 8): instead of representing processes which are taking place in the world as processes (grammatically, in clauses or sentences with verbs), they are represented

as entities (grammatically, through nominalization, i.e. transforming a clause into a nominal or noun-like entity). A simple example from a text of Tony Blair's: 'change' is a nominalization in 'The modern world is swept by change'. One common consequence of nominalization is that the agents of processes, people who initiate processes or act upon other people or objects, are absent from texts. For instance, a different way in which others might formulate the process Blair is referring to is: 'Multinational corporations in collaboration with governments are changing the world in a variety of ways'. In this case, agents ('multinational corporations', 'governments') are textualized.

However, it is not only nominalizations that elide agents, so too, for example, do passive verbs (e.g. 'can be made . . . and shipped') and what we might call passive adjectives ('mobile') as in this other sentence of Blair's: 'Capital is mobile, technology can migrate quickly, and goods can be made in low cost countries and shipped to developed markets'. Another relevant linguistic feature here is the intransitive verb 'migrate' where a transitive verb might have been used (e.g. 'corporations can move technology around quickly'), and the metaphor of 'migration'. It is also significant that one finds nominalizations like 'change' and inanimate nouns like 'capital' and 'technology' as the agents of verbs, rather than human agents. In thinking about the social effects of texts here, one might say that nominalization contributes to what is, I think, a widespread elision of human agency in and responsibility for processes in accounts of the 'new global economy', but it is clear that it is not nominalization alone that contributes to this effect but a configuration of different linguistic forms (Fowler *et al*. 1979).

Moreover, whether nominalization contributes to such effects depends upon meaning and context. One would not I think attribute such effects to the nominalizations 'house-cleaning' and 're-organization' in this sentence from a horoscope: 'It could even be a good time for house-cleaning and domestic re-organization'. As to context, it is only because this sort of account of the 'new global economy' is widespread in a particular type of text that we might ask whether nominalization contributes to the elision – and, to take it further, we might say thereby to the mystification and obfuscation – of agency and responsibility. These include very influential texts produced by international agencies such as the World Trade Organization and the World Bank, national governments, and so forth. We can measure the influence of such texts by looking at their wide international and national distribution, their extensive and diverse readership, and the extent to which they are 'intertextually' incorporated in other texts (e.g. in the media). We would also need to take account of how such texts are interpreted by people who read them and how they enter processes of meaning-making.

Summing up, we can attribute causal effects to linguistic forms, but only through a careful account of meaning and context.

Critical analysis and 'objectivity'

I see analysis of texts as part of social science, and I should say something about the view of social science which informs this book – the philosophy of social science. The position I take is a realist one, based on a realist ontology: both concrete social events and abstract social structures, as well as the rather less abstract 'social practices' which I discuss in chapter 2, are part of reality. We can make a distinction between the 'potential' and the 'actual' – what is possible because of the nature (constraints and allowances) of social structures and practices, as opposed to what actually happens. Both need to be distinguished from the 'empirical', what we know about reality. (These distinctions are a reformulation of those in **Bhaskar** 1979, see also Sayer 2000.) Reality (the potential, the actual) cannot be reduced to our knowledge of reality, which is contingent, shifting, and partial. This applies also to texts: we should not assume that the reality of texts is exhausted by our knowledge about texts. One consequence is that we should assume that no analysis of a text can tell us all there is to be said about it – there is no such thing as a complete and definitive analysis of a text. That does not mean they are unknowable – social scientific knowledge of them is possible and real enough, and hopefully increasing, but still inevitably partial. And it is extendable: the 'transdisciplinary' approach I argued for earlier aims to enhance our capacity to 'see' things in texts through 'operationalizing' (putting to work) social theoretical perspectives and insights in textual analysis.

Textual analysis is also inevitably selective: in any analysis, we choose to ask certain questions about social events and texts, and not other possible questions. For example, I might have focused in this book on a number of quantitative features of texts, comparing different types of text in terms of the average number of words per text, the average number of words per sentence, the relative frequencies of different parts of speech such as nouns, verbs, prepositions, etc. I might have perfectly good reasons for such a focus – perhaps because I am interested in texts from a pedagogical point of view, in the relative difficulty of texts for young children or people learning a foreign language. The general point is that there are always particular motivations for choosing to ask certain questions about texts and not others. My actual motivation for asking the sorts of questions I shall ask in this book is the belief that texts have social, political, cognitive, moral and material consequences and effects, and that it is vital to understand these consequences and effects if we are to raise moral and political questions about contemporary societies, and about the transformations of 'new capitalism' in particular.

Some readers may be concerned about the 'objectivity' of an approach to text analysis based upon these motivations. I don't see this as a problem. There is no such thing as an 'objective' analysis of a text, if by that we mean an analysis which simply describes what is 'there' in the text without being 'biased' by the 'subjectivity' of

the analyst. As I have already indicated, our ability to know what is 'there' is inevitability limited and partial. And the questions we ask necessarily arise from particular motivations which go beyond what is 'there'. My approach belongs broadly within the tradition of 'critical social science' – social science which is motivated by the aim of providing a scientific basis for a critical questioning of social life in moral and political terms, e.g. in terms of social justice and power (Chouliaraki and Fairclough 1999, Morrow 1994). Conversely, much social research can be seen as motivated by aims of making existing forms of social life work more efficiently and effectively, without considering moral or political questions at all. Neither approach is 'objective' in a simple sense, both approaches are based in particular interests and perspectives, but that does not prevent either of them being perfectly good social science. Nor does it mean that the social import and effects of particular research are transparent: social research may have outcomes which are far from what was intended or expected.

Doing social scientific analysis of social events and texts entails shifting away from our ordinary experience of them. Human beings are reflexive about what they do in their practical social life – they have ways of talking about it, describing it, evaluating it, theorizing it. For example, we might describe what someone says as 'long-winded', or 'wordy', or say that someone is 'too fond of his (or her) own voice'. These are some of the categories we have for talking about texts. We also have categories when we do social scientific analysis of texts ('noun', 'sentence', 'genre', and so forth), but they are specialist categories which are different from the ones we use in our ordinary social interaction. These social scientific categories, unlike practical categories, allow particular texts to be seen in relation to elaborated general theories. But if we assume that our knowledge of texts is necessarily partial and incomplete as I have suggested, and if we assume that we are constantly seeking to extend and improve it, then we have to accept that our categories are always provisional and open to change.

The limits of textual analysis

Textual analysis is a resource for social research which can enhance it provided that it is used in conjunction with other methods of analysis. By itself, textual analysis is limited. I discussed above the involvement of texts in meaning-making, the causal effects of texts, and the specifically ideological effects of texts. None of these can be got at through textual analysis alone. To research meaning-making, one needs to look at interpretations of texts as well as texts themselves, and more generally at how texts practically figure in particular areas of social life, which suggests that textual analysis is best framed within ethnography. To assess the causal and ideological effects of texts, one would need to frame textual analysis within, for example, organizational analysis, and link the 'micro' analysis of texts to the 'macro'

analysis of how power relations work across networks of practices and structures. Textual analysis is a valuable supplement to social research, not a replacement for other forms of social research and analysis.

There is a superficially plausible argument that we should produce descriptions of texts first, and only then social analysis and critique. For a version of this argument from the perspective of conversational analysis, see Schegloff (1997), and the replies in Wetherell (1998) and Chouliaraki and Fairclough (1999). This presupposes analytical categories and frameworks which are adequate for text description (and analysis of conversation) independently of particular research projects and problems. The objection to this position is that it precludes what I have referred to as a transdisciplinary process in which perspectives and categories from outside textual analysis or discourse analysis can be operationalized as ways of analysing texts which enhance insight into the textual aspect of the social practices, processes and relations which are the focus of the particular research project. An example is the discussion in chapter 8 of Example 1, Appendix (pages 229–30) in terms of the social research question of how people simultaneously inhabit different 'space–times' (e.g. 'global' and 'local' space–times) and routinely move between them. The description of how time and space are represented is an attempt to work textually with the social research question in a way which one would not arrive at by simply describing the text in terms of what grammars of English say about the representation of time and space.

Texual description and analysis should not be seen as prior to and independent of social analysis and critique – it should be seen as an open process which can be enhanced through dialogue across disciplines and theories, rather than a coding in the terms of an autonomous analytical framework or grammar. We can relate this to the distinction between 'actual' and 'empirical' which I drew above. We cannot assume that a text in its full actuality can be made transparent through applying the categories of a pre-existing analytical framework. What we are able to see of the actuality of a text depends upon the perspective from which we approach it, including the particular social issues in focus, and the social theory and discourse theory we draw upon.

The organization of the book

The book is organized into four Parts and an Introduction and a Conclusion, eleven chapters in all. Part 1 (chapters 2–3) provides a framing for the strictly 'internal' analysis of texts, locating text analysis in its relationship to discourse analysis and social analysis. This has partly been done in this introductory chapter, and will be developed in chapter 2, where I shall look at texts as elements of concrete **social events**, which are both shaped by and shape more abstract and durable **social structures** and **social practices**. Chapter 3 moves closer towards the text itself,

but focuses on how the 'outside' of a text is brought into the text, as we might put it. This is partly a matter of **intertextuality** – how texts draw upon, incorporate, **recontextualize** and dialogue with other texts. It is also partly a matter of the **assumptions** and presuppositions people make when they speak or write. What is 'said' in a text is always said against the background of what is 'unsaid' – what is made explicit is always grounded in what is left implicit. In a sense, making assumptions is one way of being intertextual – linking this text to an ill-defined penumbra of other texts, what has been said or written or at least thought elsewhere.

The next three Parts are centred respectively on genres, discourses, and styles. Part II is concerned with **genres**, and with text as action. A genre is a way of acting and interacting linguistically – for example, interview, lecture and news report are all genres. Genres structure texts in specific ways – for instance, news reports have a characteristic generic structure of: headline + lead paragraph (summarizing the story) + 'satellite' paragraphs (adding detail). These are the concerns of chapter 4. The nature of the **semantic** and grammatical relations between sentences and **clauses** depends on genre (chapter 5), as do the type of '**exchange**' (e.g. giving information, eliciting action), **speech function** (e.g. statements, offers, demands) and the **grammatical mood** (declarative, interrogative, imperative), which are dealt with in chapter 6.

Part III's in concerned with **discourses**, and with text as representation. A discourse is a particular way of representing some part of the (physical, social, psychological) world – there are alternative and often competing discourses, associated with different groups of people in different social positions (chapter 7). Discourses differ in how social events are represented, what is excluded or included, how abstractly or concretely events are represented, and how more specifically the processes and relations, social actors, time and place of events are represented (chapter 8).

Part IV is concerned with styles, and with text as identification, i.e. texts in the process of constituting the social identities of the participants in the events of which they are a part (chapter 9). One aspect of identification is what people commit themselves to in what they say or write with respect to truth and with respect to obligation – matters of '**modality**'. Another is **evaluation** and the values to which people commit themselves. These are the focuses of chapter 10.

The aim in the Conclusion is twofold. First, synthesis – to pull together the various analytical concerns which have been discussed through the book and apply them to a single example, Example 7 (Appendix, pages 239–41). Second, to frame the focus on textual analysis in this book within the wider perspective of critical discourse analysis by offering a brief 'manifesto' for the latter as a resource which can contribute to social research and to social change in the direction of greater social justice.

Notes

1   Other work which I have found useful includes: Cameron (2001), De Beaugrande (1997), De Beaugrande and Dressler (1981), Gee (1999), Hoey (1983), (2001), Hunston and Thompson (2000), Lehtonen (2000), Stillar (1998), Stubbs (1996), Swales (1990), Titscher, Meyer, Wodak and Vetter (2000), Toolan (1998), Verschueren (1999).
2   The reduction of causality to regularity is only one view of causality – what is often referred to as Humean causality, the view of causality associated with the philosopher David Hume (Sayer 2000, Fairclough, Jessop and Sayer 2002).
3   Goffman (1981) has suggested that producer and receiver are both complex roles. In the case of producer, for instance, the person who actually puts the words together (author) may or may not be the same as the person whose words they are (principal).

Part I

Social analysis, discourse analysis, text analysis

2 Texts, social events and social practices

Text analysis issues

Main types of meaning: action, representation, identification
Genres, discourses, and styles
Genre chains and chains of texts
Genre mixing
Interdiscursive analysis

Social research issues

Structure and agency
Social structures, social practices, social events
Dialectics of discourse
Globalization and new capitalism
Mediation
Recontextualization
Governance
Hybridity and 'postmodernity'

Texts are seen in this book as parts of social events. One way in which people can act and interact in the course of social events is to speak or to write. It is not the only way. Some social events have a highly textual character, others don't. For example, while talk certainly has a part in a football match (e.g. a player calling for the ball), it is a relatively marginal element, and most of the action is non-linguistic. By contrast, most of the action in a lecture is linguistic – what the lecturer says, what is written on overheads and handouts, the notes taken by people listening to the lecture. But even a lecture is not just language – it is a bodily performance as

well as a linguistic performance, and it is likely to involve physical action such as the lecturer operating an overhead projector.

In chapter 1, I discussed the causal effects of the textual elements of social events on social life. But events and texts themselves also have causes – factors which cause a particular text or type of text to have the features it has. We can broadly distinguish two causal 'powers' which shape texts: on the one hand, social structures and social practices; on the other hand, social agents, the people involved in social events (Archer 1995, Sayer 2000). The earlier cautionary note about causality applies also here: we are not talking about simple mechanical causality or implying predictable regularities.

In this chapter I shall focus on the relationship between texts, social events, social practices and social structures, after some preliminary comments on the agency of participants in events, a theme we shall return to, especially in the final chapter. A number of social research themes are relevant here, and I shall refer in particular to: the political economy of new capitalism (Jessop 2000), theorizing discourse within a 'critical realist' philosophy of science (Fairclough, Jessop and Sayer 2000), theories of **globalization** (Giddens 1991, Harvey 1990) and media/**mediation** (Silverstone 1999); research on shifts in government and '**governance**' in new capitalism (Bjerke 2000, Jessop 1998, forthcoming a); the concept of 'recontextualization' developed by **Bernstein** in his educational sociology (Bernstein 1990), and the work on the '**hybridity**' or blurring of boundaries which some social theorists associate with 'postmodernity' (e.g. Harvey 1990, Jameson 1991). I shall also discuss the concepts of 'genre' and 'discourse', both of which have received extensive attention in social research and theory ('genre' for instance in Media Studies, 'discourse' in the work of **Foucault** especially).

Texts and social agents

Social agents are not 'free' agents, they are socially constrained, but nor are their actions totally socially determined. Agents have their own 'causal powers' which are not reducible to the causal powers of social structures and practices (on this view of the relationship between **structure and agency**, see Archer 1995, 2000). Social agents texture texts, they set up relations between elements of texts. There are structural constraints on this process – for instance, the grammar of a language makes some combinations and orderings of grammatical forms possible but not others (e.g. 'but book the' is not an English sentence); and if the social event is an interview, there are genre conventions for how the talk should be organized. But this still leaves social agents with a great deal of freedom in texturing texts.

Take the following extract from Example 1 (see Appendix, pages 229–30) as an example, where a manager is talking about the 'culture' of people in his native city of Liverpool:

'They are totally suspicious of any change. They are totally suspicious of anybody trying to help them. They immediately look for the rip-off. They have also been educated to believe that it is actually clever to get "one over on them". So they are all at it. And the demarcation lines that the unions have been allowed to impose in those areas, because of this, makes it totally inflexible to the point where it is destructive. I know it. I can see it.'

'And how does this relate to what is happening here?'

'Well, I was going to say, how do you change this sort of negative culture?'

Notice in particular the semantic relation which is set up between 'negative culture' and being 'totally suspicious' of change, 'looking for the rip-off', trying to 'get one over on them', 'demarcation lines', 'inflexible' and 'destructive'. We can see this as the texturing of a semantic relation of 'meronymy', i.e. a relation between the whole ('negative culture') and its parts. No dictionary would identify such a semantic relation between these expressions – the relation is textured by the manager. We can attribute this meaning-making to the manager as a social agent. And notice what the making of meaning involves here: putting existing expressions into a new relation of equivalence as co-instances of 'negative culture'. The meaning does not have a pre-existing presence in these words and expressions, it is an effect of the relations that are set up between them (Merleau-Ponty 1964).

Social events, social practices, social structures

We shall come back to agency later, but I want to focus for the moment on the relationship between social events, social practices and social structures. The approach reflects recent work I have done in collaboration with sociological theorists on discourse within a 'critical realist' philosophy of science (Fairclough, Jessop and Sayer 2002).

Social structures are very abstract entities. One can think of a social structure (such as an economic structure, a social class or kinship system, or a language) as defining a potential, a set of possibilities. However, the relationship between what is structurally possible and what actually happens, between structures and events, is a very complex one. Events are not in any simple or direct way the effects of abstract social structures. Their relationship is mediated – there are intermediate organizational entities between structures and events. Let us call these 'social practices'. Examples would be practices of teaching and practices of management in educational institutions. Social practices can be thought of as ways of controlling the selection of certain structural possibilities and the exclusion of others, and the

retention of these selections over time, in particular areas of social life. Social practices are networked together in particular and shifting ways – for instance, there has recently been a shift in the way in which practices of teaching and research are networked together with practices of management in institutions of higher education, a 'managerialization' (or more generally 'marketization', Fairclough 1993) of higher education.

Language (and more broadly 'semiosis', including for instance signification and communication through visual images) is an element of the social at all levels. Schematically:

Social structures: languages
Social practices: orders of discourse
Social events: texts

Languages can be regarded as amongst the abstract social structures to which I have just been referring. A language defines a certain potential, certain possibilities, and excludes others – certain ways of combining linguistic elements are possible, others are not (e.g. 'the book' is possible in English, 'book the' is not). But texts as elements of social events are not simply the effects of the potentials defined by languages. We need to recognize intermediate organizational entities of a specifically linguistic sort, the linguistic elements of networks of social practices. I shall call these **orders of discourse** (see Chouliaraki and Fairclough 1999, Fairclough 1992). An order of discourse is a network of social practices in its language aspect. The elements of orders of discourse are not things like nouns and sentences (elements of linguistic structures), but discourses, genres and styles (I shall differentiate them shortly). These elements select certain possibilities defined by languages and exclude others – they control linguistic variability for particular areas of social life. So orders of discourse can be seen as the social organization and control of linguistic variation.

There is a further point to make: as we move from abstract structures towards concrete events, it becomes increasingly difficult to separate language from other social elements. In the terminology of Althusser, language becomes increasingly 'overdetermined' by other social elements (Althusser and Balibar 1970). So at the level of abstract structures, we can talk more or less exclusively about language – more or less, because 'functional' theories of language see even the grammars of languages as socially shaped (Halliday 1978). The way I have defined orders of discourse makes it clear that at this intermediate level we are dealing with a much greater 'overdetermination' of language by other social elements – orders of discourse are the *social* organization and control of linguistic variation, and their elements (discourses, genres, styles) are correspondingly not purely linguistic

categories but categories which cut across the division between language and 'non-language', the discoursal and the non-discoursal. When we come to texts as elements of social events, the 'overdetermination' of language by other social elements becomes massive: texts are not just effects of linguistic structures and orders of discourse, they are also effects of other social structures, and of social practices in all their aspects, so that it becomes difficult to separate out the factors shaping texts.

Social practices

Social practices can be seen as articulations of different types of social element which are associated with particular areas of social life – the social practice of classroom teaching in contemporary British education, for example. The important point about social practices from the perspective of this book is that they articulate discourse (hence language) together with other non-discoursal social elements. We might see any social practice as an articulation of these elements:

> Action and interaction
> Social relations
> Persons (with beliefs, attitudes, histories etc.)
> The material world
> Discourse

So, for instance, classroom teaching articulates together particular ways of using language (on the part of both teachers and learners) with the social relations of the classroom, the structuring and use of the classroom as a physical space, and so forth. The relationship between these different elements of social practices is dialectical, as **Harvey** argues (Fairclough 2001a, Harvey 1996a): this is a way of putting the apparently paradoxical fact that although the discourse element of a social practice is not the same as for example its social relations, each in a sense contains or internalizes the other – social relations *are* partly discoursal in nature, discourse *is* partly social relations. Social events are causally shaped by (networks of) social practices – social practices define particular ways of acting, and although actual events may more or less diverge from these definitions and expectations (because they cut across different social practices, and because of the causal powers of social agents), they are still partly shaped by them.

Discourse as an element of social practices: genres, discourses and styles

We can say that discourse figures in three main ways in social practice. It figures as:

Genres (ways of acting)
Discourses (ways of representing)
Styles (ways of being)

One way of acting and interacting is through speaking or writing, so discourse figures first as 'part of the action'. We can distinguish different genres as different ways of (inter)acting discoursally – interviewing is a genre, for example. Secondly, discourse figures in the representations which are always a part of social practices – representations of the material world, of other social practices, reflexive self-representations of the practice in question. Representation is clearly a discoursal matter, and we can distinguish different discourses, which may represent the same area of the world from different perspectives or positions. Notice that 'discourse' is being used here in two senses: abstractly, as an abstract noun, meaning language and other types of semiosis as elements of social life; more concretely, as a count noun, meaning particular ways of representing part of the world. An example of a discourse in the latter sense would be the political discourse of New Labour, as opposed to the political discourse 'old' Labour, or the political discourse of 'Thatcherism' (Fairclough 2000b). Thirdly and finally, discourse figures alongside bodily behaviour in constituting particular ways of being, particular social or personal identities. I shall call the discoursal aspect of this a style. An example would be the style of a particular type of manager – his or her way of using language as a resource for self-identifying.

The concepts of 'discourse' and 'genre' in particular are used in a variety of disciplines and theories. The popularity of 'discourse' in social research owes a lot in particular to Foucault (1972). 'Genre' is used in cultural studies, media studies, film theory, and so forth (see for instance Fiske 1987, Silverstone 1999). These concepts cut across disciplines and theories, and can operate as 'bridges' between them – as focuses for a dialogue between them through which perspectives in the one can be drawn upon in the development of the other.

Text as action, representation, identification

'Functional' approaches to language have emphasized the 'multi-functionality' of texts. Systemic Functional Linguistics, for instance, claims that texts simultane-ously have 'ideational', 'interpersonal' and 'textual' functions. That is, texts

simultaneously represent aspects of the world (the physical world, the social world, the mental world); enact social relations between participants in social events and the attitudes, desires and values of participants; and coherently and cohesively connect parts of texts together, and connect texts with their situational contexts (Halliday 1978, 1994). Or rather, people do these things in the process of meaning-making in social events, which includes texturing, making texts.

I shall also view texts as multi-functional in this sort of sense, though in a rather different way, in accordance with the distinction between genres, discourses and styles as the three main ways in which discourse figures as a part of social practice – ways of acting, ways of representing, ways of being. Or to put it differently: the relationship of the text to the event, to the wider physical and social world, and to the persons involved in the event. However, I prefer to talk about three major **types of meaning**, rather than functions:

Major types of text meaning

Action
Representation
Identification.

Representation corresponds to Halliday's 'ideational' function; Action is closest to his 'interpersonal' function, though it puts more emphasis on text as a way of (inter)acting in social events, and it can be seen as incorporating Relation (enacting social relations); Halliday does not differentiate a separate function to do with identification – most of what I include in Identification is in his 'interpersonal' function. I do not distinguish a separate 'textual' function, rather I incorporate it within Action.

We can see Action, Representation and Identification simultaneously through whole texts and in small parts of texts. Take the first sentence of Example 1: 'The culture in successful businesses is different from in failing businesses'. What is represented here (Representation) is a relation between two entities – 'x is different from y'. The sentence is also (Action) an action, which implies a social relation: the manager is giving the interviewer information, telling him something, and that implies in broad terms a social relation between someone who knows and someone who doesn't – the social relations of this sort of interview are a specific variant of this, the relations between someone who has knowledge and opinions and someone who is eliciting them. Informing, advising, promising, warning and so forth are ways of acting. The sentence is also (Identification) an undertaking, a commitment, a judgement: in saying 'is different' rather than 'is perhaps different' or 'may be different', the manager is strongly committing himself. Focusing analysis of texts

on the interplay of Action, Representation and Identification brings a social perspective into the heart and fine detail of the text.

There is, as I have indicated, a correspondence between Action and genres, Representation and discourses, Identification and styles. Genres, discourses and styles are respectively relatively stable and durable *ways* of acting, representing and identifying. They are identified as elements of orders of discourse at the level of social practices. When we analyse specific texts as part of specific events, we are doing two interconnected things: (a) looking at them in terms of the three aspects of meaning, Action, Representation and Identification, and how these are realized in the various features of texts (their vocabulary, their grammar, and so forth); (b) making a connection between the concrete social event and more abstract social practices by asking, which genres, discourses, and styles are drawn upon here, and how are the different genres, discourses and styles articulated together in the text?

Dialectical relations

I have so far written as if the three aspects of meaning (and genres, discourses and styles) were quite separate from one another, but the relation between them is a rather more subtle and complex one – a dialectical relation. Foucault (1994: 318) makes distinctions which are very similar to the three aspects of meaning, and he also suggests the dialectical character of the relationship between them (though he does not use the category of **dialectics**):

> These practical systems stem from three broad areas: relations of control over things, relations of action upon others, relations with oneself. This does not mean that each of these three areas is completely foreign to the others. It is well known that control over things is mediated by relations with others; and relations with others in turn always entails relations with oneself, and vice versa. But we have three axes whose specificity and whose interconnections have to be analyzed: the axis of knowledge, the axis of power, the axis of ethics . . . How are we constituted as subjects of our own knowledge? How are we constituted as subjects who exercise or submit to power relations? How are we constituted as moral subjects of our own actions?

There are several points here. First, Foucault's various formulations point to complexity within each of the three aspects of meaning (which correspond to Foucault's three 'axes'): Representation is to do with knowledge but also thereby 'control over things'; Action is to do generally with relations with others, but also 'action on others', and power. Identification is to do with relations with oneself, ethics, and the 'moral subject'. What these various formulations point to is the possibility of enriching our understanding of texts by connecting each of the three

aspects of meaning with a variety of categories in social theories. Another example might be to see Identification as bringing what **Bourdieu** (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992) calls the 'habitus' of the persons involved in the event into consideration in text analysis, i.e. their embodied dispositions to see and act in certain ways based upon socialization and experience, which is partly dispositions to talk and write in certain ways.

Secondly, although the three aspects of meaning need to be distinguished for analytical purposes and are in that sense different from one another, they are not *discrete*, not totally separate. I shall say, rather differently from Foucault, that they are dialectically related, i.e. there is a sense in which each 'internalizes' the others (Harvey 1996a). This is suggested in the three questions at the end of the quotation: all three can be seen in terms of a relation involving the persons in the event ('subjects') – their relation to knowledge, their relation with others (power relations), and their relation with themselves (as 'moral subjects'). Or we can say for instance that particular Representations (discourses) may be enacted in particular ways of Acting and Relating (genres), and inculcated in particular ways of Identifying (styles). Schematically:

Dialectics of discourse

Discourses (representational meanings) enacted in genres (actional meanings)
Discourses (representational meanings) inculcated in styles (identificational meanings)
Actions and identities (including genres and styles) represented in discourses (representational meanings)

For instance, Example 14, from an 'appraisal training' session, can be seen as including a discourse of appraisal (i.e. a particular way of representing one aspect of the activities of university staff), but it also specifies how the discourse is to be enacted in an appraisal procedure which is made up of genres such as the appraisal interview, and it suggests associated ways of people identifying themselves within appraisal-associated styles. So we might say that the discourse of appraisal may be dialectically 'internalized' in genres and styles (Fairclough 2001a). Or, turning it around, we might say that such genres and styles presuppose particular representations, which draw upon particular discourses. These are complex issues, but the main point is that the distinction between the three aspects of meaning and between genres, discourses and styles, is a necessary analytical distinction which does not preclude them from 'flowing into' one another in various ways.

Mediation

The relationship between texts and social events is often more complex than I have indicated so far. Many texts are 'mediated' by the 'mass media', i.e. institutions which 'make use of copying technologies to disseminate communication' (Luhmann 2000). They involve media such as print, telephone, radio, television, the Internet. In some cases – most obviously the telephone – people are co-present in time but distant in space, and the interaction is one-to-one. These are closest to ordinary conversation. Others are very different from ordinary conversation – for instance, a printed book is written by one or a small number of authors but read by indefinitely many people who may be widely dispersed in time and space. In this case, the text connects different social events – the writing of a book on the one hand, and the many and various social events which include reading (glancing at, referring to, etc.) the book – a train journey, a class in a school, a visit to a bookshop, and so forth.

Mediation according to Silverstone (1999) involves the 'movement of meaning' – from one social practice to another, from one event to another, from one text to another. As this implies, mediation does not just involve individual texts or types of text, it is in many cases a complex process which involves what I shall call 'chains' or 'networks' of texts. Think, for example, of a story in a newspaper. Journalists write newspaper articles on the basis of a variety of sources – written documents, speeches, interviews, and so forth – and the articles are read by those who buy the newspaper and may be responded to in a variety of other texts – conversations about the news, perhaps if the story is a particularly significant one further stories in other newspapers or on television, and so on. The 'chain' or 'network' of texts in this case thus includes quite a number of different types of text. There are fairly regular and systematic relationship between some of them – for instance, journalists produce articles on the basis of sources in fairly regular and predictable ways, transforming the source materials according to quite well-established conventions (e.g. for turning an interview into a report).

Complex modern societies involve the networking together of different social practices across different domains or fields of social life (e.g. the economy, education, family life) and across different scales of social life (global, regional, national, local). Texts are a crucial part of these networking relations – the orders of discourse associated with networks of social practices specify particular chaining and net-working relationships between types of text. The transformations of new capitalism can be seen as transformations in the networking of social practices, which include transformations in orders of discourse, and transformations in the chaining and networking of texts, and in 'genre chains' (see below). For instance, the process of 'globalization' includes the enhanced capacity for some people to act upon and shape the actions of others over considerable distances of space and time (Giddens 1991, Harvey 1990). This partly depends upon more complex processes of textual

mediation of social events, and more complex chaining and networking relations between different types of text (facilitated through new communication technologies, notably the Internet). And the capacity to influence or control processes of mediation is an important aspect of power in contemporary societies.

'**Genre chains**' are of particular significance: these are different genres which are regularly linked together, involving systematic transformations from genre to genre. Genre chains contribute to the possibility of actions which transcend differences in space and time, linking together social events in different social practices, different countries, and different times, facilitating the enhanced capacity for 'action at a distance' which has been taken to be a defining feature of contemporary 'globalization', and therefore facilitating the exercise of power.

Genre chains

The extracts in Example 3 (taken from Iedema 1999) give some sense of a genre chain. The example relates to a project planning the renovation of a mental hospital. The extracts are from an interview with the 'architect-planner' responsible for drawing up a written report on the basis of consultation between 'stakeholders' in the project, from a meeting of 'stakeholders', and from the report. What is basically going on is that stakeholders are choosing amongst possible ways of carrying out the project, and finding compelling arguments for their choice to put in the report. The stakeholder meeting and the written report are elements of the genre chain in this case.

Iedema's analysis shows two things: first, that the language of the stakeholder meeting is 'translated' into the language of the report in quite systematic ways – a translation which reflects the difference in genre. Second, however, that this translation is anticipated in the meeting itself – different contributions at different stages (represented in the extracts) begin the process of translation, moving us towards the language of the report. Participants in the meeting build up to the well-argued, formal logic of the report – a characteristic of the official report genre.

In Extract 1 from the meeting, we see the informal decision-making characteristic of such meetings as the project manager elicits arguments in support of the favoured option. In Extract 2, the architect-planner begins to build up the logic of the report, though still in a conversational and personal way which interprets stakeholders' reasons for supporting the favoured option (e.g. 'I think we were happy that is why the solution that came out was staggered'). Extract 3 makes an important further move towards the report by transforming the arguments for the option into reported speech (e.g. 'what you're saying is *that option D is preferred because it's the most compact* . . .'). See chapter 3 on reported speech. Finally, the extract from the report itself shows an impersonal logic in which the logical connectors (e.g. 'This means', 'The solution', 'In this way') are foregrounded by being located initially in sentences

and clauses ('thematized' in a terminology I shall introduce later). These comments on the logic of the argument illustrate how moving along a genre chain entails transforming the language in particular ways.

We can also see Example 1 as part of a genre chain. It is an extract from an ethnographic interview between an academic researcher and a business manager. The example is taken from a book whose main genre is academic analysis. Moreover, there is an Appendix to the book containing 'A Scheme of Management Competencies' produced for the company by the author on the basis of his research, a management education genre. We can thus see the ethnographic interview as part of a chain of genres. More specifically, it can be seen as a generic device for accessing the language of practical management, part of a chain of genres which transform it into the language of academic analysis, and transform that in turn into the language of management education – a language which enters into the governance of business organizations. This way of describing it brings out the significance of genre chains in the networking of social practices (in this case, business and academic research) and in action across different networks of social practices.

Genres and governance

Genres are important in sustaining the institutional structure of contemporary society – structural relations between (local) government, business, universities, the media, etc. We can think of such institutions as interlocking elements in the governance of society (Bjerke 2000), and of such genres as genres of governance. I am using 'governance' here in a very broad sense for any activity within an institution or organization directed at regulating or managing some other (network of) social practice(s). The increasing popularity of the term 'governance' is associated with a search for ways of managing social life (often referred to as 'networks', 'partnerships' etc.) which avoid both the chaotic effects of markets and the top-down hierarchies of states. Though, as **Jessop** points out, contemporary governance can be seen as combining all of these forms – markets, hierarchies, networks (Jessop 1998). We can contrast genres of governance with 'practical genres' – roughly, genres which figure in doing things rather than governing the way things are done. It may seem on the face of it rather surprising to see the ethnographic interview of Example 1 as a genre of governance, but the case for claiming this becomes clearer when we locate the ethnographic interview as above in a chain of genres. This shows in a relatively concrete way what is often discussed more abstractly – the extensive incorporation of academic research into networks and processes of governance.

The genres of governance are characterized by specific properties of recontextualization – the appropriation of elements of one social practice within another, placing the former within the context of the latter, and transforming it in particular ways in the process (Bernstein 1990, Chouliaraki and Fairclough 1999).

'Recontextualization' is a concept developed in the sociology of education (Bernstein 1990) which can be fruitfully operationalized, put to work, within discourse and text analysis. In the case of Example 1, the practices (and language) of managing are recontextualized (and so transformed) within academic practices (and language), which are in turn recontextualized within the business organization in the form of management education. For example, the conclusion to the manager's argument in the interview ('any business has got to keep faith with all those it deals with if it is going to deserve to survive') is recontextualized in the academic analysis as evidence that managers appreciate the need for 'trust and reciprocity', which it is suggested may be enacted in 'a form of practice in which there is a mutual recognition of one another as interdependent subjects'. One guideline in the Scheme of Management Competencies formulates such an enactment as follows: 'Good mangers are sensitive to the attitudes and feelings of all those they work with; they treat others and their ideas with respect; they listen carefully to the ideas and viewpoints of others, working actively to elicit positive contributions from them.' Of course the guideline is presumably based on what many managers have said, not just this one claim in this extract. But we might represent this as a movement of appropriation,transformation, and colonization – a terminology which brings into focus the social relations of power in governance of which these recontextualizations are a part.

Genres of governance include promotional genres, genres which have the purpose of 'selling' commodities, brands, organizations, or individuals. One aspect of new capitalism is an immense proliferation of promotional genres (see Wernick 1991) which constitutes a part of the colonization of new areas of social life by markets. Example 2 illustrates this: within new capitalism, individual towns and cities need to promote themselves to attract investment (see 'Genre mixing' below for discussion of this example).

Another point to note about Example 1 is that the movement from manager talk in the ethnographic interview to 'A Scheme for Management Competencies' is a move from the local towards the global. We can see so-called 'globalization' as actually a matter of changes in the *relationships* between different scales of social life and social organization (Jessop 2000). So this is a move in 'scale', in the sense that research in a specific business organization leads to precepts (e.g. 'Good managers seek and create opportunities, initiate actions and want to be "ahead of the game"') which might apply to any business organization anywhere in the world. And indeed the resources for management education produced by academics do have an international circulation. Genres of governance more generally have this property of linking different scales – connecting the local and particular to the national/regional/global and general. What this indicates is that genres are important in sustaining not only the structural relations between, for example, the academy and business, but also scalar relations between the local, the national, the regional

(e.g. the European Union) and the 'global'. So changes in genres are germane to both the restructuring and the rescaling of social life in new capitalism.

Example 3 is a further illustration: the stakeholder meeting is a local event, yet one effect of the recontextualization of that into the report is a shift towards a global scale – such reports filter out what is specific to local events and situations in their move to an impersonal logic which can accommodate endless specific local events and cases. Reports of this sort can circulate nationally, regionally (e.g. within the EU) and globally, and in that way link local and global scales. Part of the 'filtering' effect as we move along genre chains is on discourses: discourses which are drawn upon in one genre (e.g. meetings) may be 'filtered out' in the movement to another (e.g. report), so that the genre chain works as a regulative device for selecting and privileging some discourses and excluding others.

Much action and interaction in modern societies is 'mediated', as I pointed out above. Mediated (inter)action is 'action at a distance', action involving participants who are distant from one another in space and/or time, which depends upon some communication technology (print, television, the Internet etc.). The genres of governance are essentially mediated genres specialized for 'action at a distance' – both of the examples above involve mediation through print, an academic book and a written report. What are usually referred to as 'the mass media' are, one might argue, a part of the apparatus of governance – a media genre such as television news recontextualizes and transforms other social practices, such as politics and government, and is in turn recontextualized in the texts and interactions of different practices, including, crucially, everyday life, where it contributes to the shaping of how we live, and the meanings we give to our lives (Silverstone 1999).

Genre mixing

The relationship between texts and genres is a potentially complex one: a text may not be 'in' a single genre, it may 'mix' or hybridize genres. Example 2, a promotional feature from the English-language *Budapest Sun* for the Hungarian town of Békéscsaba, is an example of **genre mixing**. As I said above, one aspect of the transformations associated with new capitalism is that individual towns and cities (rather than just national governments) now need to actively promote and 'sell' themselves, as in this case. This change in the relationship between cities and business corporations involves the chaining of genres – a chain linking the genres of local government to business genres, in which texts like Example 2 are a crucial mediating link. The change manifests itself partly in the emergence of a new genre within the genre chain, through the mixing of existing genres. We can see the genre in this case is a mixture of a journalistic feature article, corporate advertising (extended to local government), and tourist brochure. This hybridity is immediately evident in the layout and organization of the page: the headline ('Festival town flourishes') and

the quotation from the City Mayor in bold at the bottom are characteristics of newspaper articles; the three photographs at the top of the page might be found in a tourist brochure; but the style of the photograph of the Mayor at the bottom of the page is that of corporate advertising. Other features of the three genres combined here include: alternation between report and quotation or indirect representation of the words of significant sources such as the Mayor (characteristic of newspaper articles); the predominance of self-promotion in positive self evaluations (e.g. 'A capable workforce, improving infrastructure and flexible labour is readily available') in the quotations (characteristic of corporate advertising); a description of Békéscsaba in the report which is thematically organized according to the conventions of tourist literature (buildings, squares etc. of architectural or historical interest, geographical location, cultural life, etc.).

A genre within a chain characteristically enters both 'retrospective' and 'prospective' relations with the genres 'preceding' and 'following' it in the chain, which may progressively lead to hybridization of the genre through a sort of assimilation to these preceding and following genres. In this case, the incorporation of corporate advertising into a local authority genre can be seen as a form of prospective **interdiscursivity** – the local authority anticipating the practices of business within which it hopes its publicity will be taken up. Another widespread example is the 'conversationalization' of various genres such as radio talks or broadcast news – they take on certain features of the conversational language within the (anticipated) contexts in which they are listened to or watched (typically in the home). (See Scannell 1991 on this aspect of the history of broadcast talk.)

A number of social researchers and theorists have drawn attention to ways in which social boundaries are blurred in contemporary social life, and to the forms of 'hybridity' or mixing of social practices which results. This is widely seen for instance as a feature of 'postmodernity', which writers such as Jameson (1991) and Harvey (1990) view as the cultural facet of what I am calling new capitalism. One area of social life where hybridity has received particularly intense attention is media – the texts of mass media can be seen as instantiating the blurring of boundaries of various sorts: fact and fiction, news and entertainment, drama and documentary, and so forth (McLuhan 1964, Silverstone 1999). The analysis of interdiscursive hybridity in texts provides a potentially valuable resource for enhancing research based upon these perspectives, offering a level of detailed analysis which is not achievable within other methods.

Relational approach to text analysis

I shall adopt a relational view of texts, and a relational approach to text analysis. We are concerned with several 'levels' of analysis, and relations between these 'levels':

Social structures

Social practices

Social events
   Actions and their social relations
   Identification of persons
   Representations of the world

Discourse (genres, discourses, styles)

Semantics

Grammar and vocabulary

Phonology/graphology

We can distinguish the 'external' relations of texts and the 'internal' relations of texts. Analysis of the 'external' relations of texts is analysis of their relations with other elements of social events and, more abstractly, social practices and social structures. Analysis of relations of texts to other elements of social events includes analysis of how they figure in Actions, Identifications, and Representations (the basis for differentiating the three major aspects of text meaning). There is another dimension to 'external' relations which will be the concern of chapter 3: relations between a text and other ('external') texts, how elements of other texts are 'intertextually' incorporated and, since these may be 'other people's' texts, how the voices of others are incorporated; how other texts are alluded to, assumed, dialogued with, and so forth.

Analysis of the 'internal relations' of texts includes analysis of:

● *Semantic relations*

   Meaning relations between words and longer expressions, between elements of clauses, between clauses and between sentences, and over larger stretches of text (Allan 2001, Lyons 1997).

● *Grammatical relations*

   The relationship between 'morphemes' in words (e.g. 'sick' and 'ness' in 'sickness'), between words in phrases (e.g. between definite article ('the'), adjective ('old') and noun ('house') in 'the old house'), between phrases within clauses (see chapters 6 and 8), and between clauses in sentences (e.g. clauses

may be **paratactically** or **hypotactically** related (see chapter 5) – i.e. have equal grammatical status, or be in a superordinate/subordinate relationship) (Eggins 1994, Halliday 1994, Quirk *et al*. 1995).

● *Vocabulary (or 'lexical') relations*

Relations of collocation, i.e. patterns of co-occurrence between items of vocabulary (words or expressions). For example, 'work' collocates with 'into' and 'back to' more than with 'out of' in the texts of Blair's 'New Labour' party in the UK, whereas in earlier Labour texts the pattern was reversed – 'into work', 'back to work', 'out of work' (Fairclough 2000b, Firth 1957, Sinclair 1991, Stubbs 1996).

● *Phonological relations*

Relations in spoken language, including prosodic patterns of intonation and rhythm; graphological relations in written language – eg relations between different fonts or type sizes in a written text. I do not deal with phonological or graphological relations in this book.

Internal relations are both, in a classical terminology, 'relations *in praesentia*' and relations '*in absentia*' – syntagmatic relations, and paradigmatic relations. The examples I have just given are examples of syntagmatic relations, relations between elements which are actually present in a text. Paradigmatic relations are relations of choice, and they draw attention to relations between what is actually present and what might have been present but is not – 'significant absences'. This applies on different levels – the text includes certain grammatical structures and a certain vocabulary and certain semantic relations and certain discourses or genres; it might have included others, which were available and possible, but not selected.

The level of discourse is the level at which relations between genres, discourses and styles are analysed – 'interdiscursive' relations as I call them. The level of discourse is an intermediate level, a mediating level between the text *per se* and its social context (social events, social practices, social structures). Discourses, genres and styles are both elements of texts, and social elements. In texts they are organized together in interdiscursive relations, relations in which different genres, discourses and styles may be 'mixed', articulated and textured together in particular ways. As social elements, they are articulated together in particular ways in orders of discourse – the language aspects of social practices in which language variation is socially controlled. They make the link between the text and other elements of the social, between the internal relations of the text and its external relations.

The relations between the discourse, semantic, and grammatical and vocabulary levels are relations of 'realization' (Halliday 1994). That is, interdiscursive relations between genres, discourses and styles are realized, or instantiated, as semantic relations, which are realized as ('formal') grammatical and vocabulary relations.

Summary

We have seen that texts are parts of social events which are shaped by the causal powers of social structures (including languages) and social practices (including orders of discourse) on the one hand, and social agents on the other. There are three main aspects of meaning in texts, Action and Social Relation, Representation, and Identification, which correspond to the categories of Genres, Discourses and Styles at the level of social practices. These aspects of meaning and categories are analytically separate without being discrete – they are dialectically related.

   The central sections of the chapter have shown us that:

1   The forms of action and interaction in social events are defined by its social practices and the ways in which they are networked together.
2   The social transformations of 'new capitalism' can be seen as changes in the networking of social practices, and so change in the forms of action and interaction, which includes change in genres. Genre change is an important part of the transformations of new capitalism.
3   Some genres are relatively 'local' in scale, associated with relatively delimited networks of social practices (e.g. within an organization such as a business). Others are specialized for relatively 'global' (inter)action across networks, and for governance.
4   Change in genres is change in how different genres are combined together, and how new genres develop through combination of existing genres.
5   A chain of events may involve a chain or network of different, interconnected texts which manifest a 'chain' of different genres. Genre chains are significant for relations of recontextualization.
6   A particular text or interaction is not 'in' a particular genre – it is likely to involve a combination of different genres, genre hybridity.

Finally, we have considered a relational view of texts and text analysis, in which the 'internal' (semantic, grammatical, lexical (vocabulary)) relations of texts are connected with their 'external' relations (to other elements of social events, and to social practices and social structures) through the mediation of an 'interdiscursive' analysis of the genres, discourses and styles which they draw upon and articulate together.

3 Intertextuality and assumptions

<div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 1em;">

Text analysis issues

Intertextuality and reported speech
Assumptions and implicit meaning
Dialogicality

Social research issues

Social difference
Hegemony, the universal and the particular
Ideology
The public sphere

</div>

At the end of chapter 2, I drew a distinction between the 'external' and 'internal' relations of a text, and briefly referred to the aspect of the 'external' relations of texts which is the focus of this chapter: relations between one text and other texts which are 'external' to it, outside it, yet in some way brought into it. The 'intertextual' relations of a text. I shall take a very broad view of intertextuality. In its most obvious sense, intertextuality is the presence of actual elements of other texts within a text – quotations. But there are various less obvious ways of incorporating elements of other texts. If we think, for instance, of reported speech, writing or thought, it is possible not only to quote what has been said or written elsewhere, it is possible to summarize it. This is the difference between what is conventionally called 'direct speech' (which may quote writing and purported thoughts as well as speech – e.g. 'She said, "I'll be late"') and forms of 'indirect speech' (e.g. 'She said she'd be late'). The former claims to reproduce the actual words used, the latter does not; a summary may reword what was actually said

or written. Reported speech, writing or thought attributes what is quoted or summarized to the persons who said or wrote or thought it. But elements of other texts may also be incorporated without attribution. So intertextuality covers a range of possibilities (see Fairclough 1992, Ivanic 1998).

But I am also going to link assumptions to intertextuality. I use the general term 'assumptions' to include types of implicitness which are generally distinguished in the literature of linguistic pragmatics (Blakemore 1992, Levinson 1983, Verschueren 1999) as presuppositions, logical implications or entailments, and implicatures. My main concern is with presuppositions, but I shall briefly discuss these distinctions at the end of this chapter. Texts inevitably make assumptions. What is 'said' in a text is 'said' against a background of what is 'unsaid', but taken as given. As with inter-textuality, assumptions connect one text to other texts, to the 'world of texts' as one might put it. The difference between assumptions and intertextuality is that the former are not generally attributed or attributable to specific texts. It is a matter rather of a relation between this text and what has been said or written or thought elsewhere, with the 'elsewhere' left vague. If, for example, I had begun this book with 'The intertextual relations of a text are a significant part of it', I would be assuming that texts have intertextual relations, committing myself to this as some-thing which has been said or written elsewhere, and to the belief that readers have heard or read it elsewhere. I am not alluding to any specific text or set of texts, but I am nevertheless alluding to the world of texts.

Both intertextuality and assumption can be seen in terms of claims on the part of the 'author' – the claim that what is reported was actually said, that what is assumed has indeed been said or written elsewhere, that one's interlocutors have indeed heard it or read it elsewhere. Such claims may or may not be substantiated. People may mistakenly, or dishonestly, or manipulatively make such implicit claims – assertions may for instance be manipulatively passed off as assumptions, statements may mistakenly or dishonestly be attributed to others.

This chapter will address in particular three themes in social research. The first is 'difference'. One important aspect of recent transformations in social life is that **social difference**, the salience of particular social identities (be it those of women, of lesbians, of ethnic groups, and so forth), has become more pronounced (Benhabib 1996, Butler 1998, Fraser 1998). For instance the 'universal' class-based politics of an earlier period has largely given way to political struggles based around the interests and identities of such particular groups. I shall suggest a broad framework for dealing with different orientations to difference in texts which may be used as a resource for researching ways in which difference is accentuated, negotiated, bracketed or suppressed. (I shall refer particularly to the question of the '**public sphere**'.) The second, connected, theme is: the universal and the particular (Butler, Laclau and Zizek 2000). The issue here is how particulars come to be represented as universals – how particular identities, interests, representations come under

certain conditions to be claimed as universal. This issue can be framed within questions of hegemony – of the establishment, maintenance and contestation of the social dominance of particular social groups: achieving hegemony entails achieving a measure of success in projecting certain particulars as universals. But this is in part a textual achievement, and textual analysis can again enhance research on these issues. The third theme, also connected to the other two, is ideology, which I have already discussed in chapter 1: in particular, the ideological significance of assumptions in texts.

Difference and dialogicality

An important contrast between intertextuality and assumption is that the former broadly opens up difference by bringing other 'voices' into a text, whereas the latter broadly reduces difference by assuming common ground. Or to put it differently, the former accentuates the dialogicality of a text, the dialogue between the voice of the author of a text and other voices, the latter diminishes it. The term 'voice' is in part similar to the way I use the term 'style' (meaning ways of being or identities in their linguistic and more broadly semiotic aspects), but it is useful in also allowing us to focus on the co-presence in texts of the 'voices' of particular individuals (Bakhtin 1981, Ivanic 1998, Wertsch 1991). People differ in all sorts of ways, and orientation to difference is fundamental to social interaction. **Giddens** suggested in one of his earlier books that 'the production of interaction has three fundamental elements: its constitution as "meaningful"; its constitution as a moral order; and its constitution as the operation of relations of power' (1993:104). Orientation to difference is central to the account of these three elements which he went on to give. The production of interaction as meaningful entails active and continual 'negotiation' of differences of meaning; the 'norms' of interaction as a moral order are oriented to and interpreted differently by different social actors, and these differences are negotiated. Power in its most general sense of 'the transformative capacity of human action', the capacity to 'intervene in a series of events so as to alter their course', depends upon 'resources or facilities' which are differentially available to social actors; and power in the 'relational' sense of 'the capability to secure outcomes where the realization of these outcomes depends upon the agency of others' is also differentially available to different social actors.

But social events and interaction vary in the nature of their orientation to difference, as do texts as elements of social events. We can schematically differentiate five scenarios at a very general level:

(a) an openness to, acceptance of, recognition of difference; an exploration of difference, as in 'dialogue' in the richest sense of the term;

(b)   an accentuation of difference, conflict, polemic, a struggle over meaning, norms, power;

(c)   an attempt to resolve or overcome difference;

(d)   a bracketing of difference, a focus on commonality, solidarity;

(e)   consensus, a normalization and acceptance of differences of power which brackets or suppresses differences of meaning and norms

This is not a typology of actual social events and interactions; social events, and texts, may combine these scenarios in various ways.

Kress suggested a number of years ago that it is productive to see texts in terms of orientation to difference: 'difference is the motor that produces texts' (1985). However, Kress's view of difference is rather limited, focusing in particular on scenario (c) above, the resolution of differences. As Kress points out, difference is most immediately accessible in actual dialogue, text which is co-produced by two or more people, and the five scenarios above provide a basis of comparison between dialogues in terms of how difference is oriented to. But difference is no less central in 'monological' texts, including written texts – most obviously because all texts are addressed, have particular addressees and readers in view, and assume and anticipate differences between 'author' and addressees. On one level, orientation to difference can be understood as a matter of the dynamics of the interaction itself. But differences are not only or even mainly occasioned, local effects of specific encounters. This is clear from Kress's focus upon differences between people as differences between discourses. Discourses are durable entities which take us to the more abstract level of social practices, and we must clearly include the question of how longer-term orientations to difference at this level are instantiated in particular social events – and interactionally worked upon, for, as I have already stressed, events (and hence texts) are shaped by the agency of participants as well as social structures and social practices.

Orientation to difference brings into focus degrees and forms of **dialogicality** in texts. What I am referring to here is an aspect of **Bakhktin**'s 'dialogical' theory of language: 'a word, discourse, language or culture undergoes "dialogization" when it becomes relativized, de-privileged, aware of competing definitions for the same things. Undialogized language is authoritative or absolute' (Holquist 1981: 427). Texts are inevitably and unavoidably dialogical in the sense that 'any utterance is a link in a very complexly organized chain of other utterances' with which it 'enters into one kind of relation or another' (Bakhtin 1986a: 69). But as the Holquist quotation suggests, texts differ in their orientation to difference, i.e. in respect of 'dialogization'. Bakhtin points to such differences in noting that the relation of an utterance to others may be a matter of 'building on' them, 'polemicizing with' them,

or simply 'presuming that they are already known to the listener' (1986a: 69). And as Holquist suggests, one option is 'undialogized language', corresponding to scenario (e) above: excluding dialogicality and difference.

Let us look at some examples. Example 1 (see Appendix, pages 229–30) is from an ethnographic interview, a form of dialogue. The orientation to difference in the dialogue itself can be seen a particular version of scenario (d): any differences between interviewer and interviewee are bracketed, for the interviewer is concerned only to elicit the views of the interviewee. But the interviewee, the manager, does show some openness to difference (scenario (a)) in the intertextuality of his talk. He quotes 'an operator', and 'the union people' (though the latter is what they might say rather than what they have said). He also accentuates difference (scenario (b)), setting the summarized voice of the managers (himself included) who 'preach this flexibility, this personal and business development' against the quoted voice of the operator. But the main polemic is directed against the senior management – notice that their voice is not represented in the text. But while relations between senior management, middle management (represented by the interviewee himself) and workers are dialogized, other issues are not. For example it is assumed that a business is (can be seen as) a 'culture', and it is assumed that the unions have taken power away from the managers and the workforce – that both of them once had power (an assumption which is triggered by 'give it *back*'). The latter in particular is scenario (e) – an assumed consensus which suppresses actual difference. We have a situation which is common in texts: some things are dialogized, others are not; there is an orientation to difference in some respects but not in others.

Example 4 (see Appendix, page 236) is different. This is a paragraph from a policy paper produced by the European Union Competitiveness Advisory Group, a committee with representatives of employers and trade unions as well as some politicians and bureaucrats. The text is the final version of a paragraph which went through a number of earlier drafts. It is a negotiated text, the outcome of a process of negotiation about which voices should be included in the text and in what relation. For instance, sentences 5–7 were missing from the initial draft. They represent the voice of the trade unions, an emphasis on social cohesion and implicitly on the risk to the social welfare state, seen not as a burden but as a source of efficiency (the example is taken from Wodak 2000, where there is a detailed analysis). Yet this is not a dialogical text: the process of producing a policy paper is a process of moving 'from conflict to consensus' (the title of Wodak's paper), to a text where there is no intertextualizing of different voices. What we have is categorical assertions (statements of fact and, in sentence 9, a prediction) about globalization and the 'adjustments' which it 'imposes', and about social cohesion which are grounded in a set of assumptions. The assertions are 'categorical' in the sense that they are not modalized (see chapter 10) – for instance in sentence 4 we have 'it imposes', not 'it may impose', in sentence 5 we have 'social cohesion is threatened', not 'social

cohesion is perhaps threatened'. The assumptions about 'globalization' (pronomi-nalized as 'it' in the first sentence) are that it exists, it is a reality, that it is a 'process' (sentence 1), that it constitutes 'economic progress' (sentence 2 – to make a coherent link in meaning between the first and second sentences, one must assume that globalization *is* economic progress). It is also assumed that 'social cohesion' is a reality, though under threat. All of these assumptions are contentious: there are those who would say that globalization is a myth to cover up a new imperialism, that the economic changes it registers are not things that are just happening (a 'process') and therefore inevitable but strategic decisions by powerful agents, and that the consequences for large parts of the world are economic regress rather than 'progress', and that it is a myth that 'social cohesion' has existed in the social welfare state. Yet the divergent voices of employers and trade unions are smoothed into an apparent consensus in the coexistence of these assumptions. One might see this as scenarios (c) and (d), attempting to resolve difference and focus on commonality, yet one can also see such texts in terms of scenario (e), as suppressing difference. Compare this with Example 3, which was discussed in chapter 2, where again one can see the process of producing an apparently consensual text.

The public sphere

Example 8 is taken from a TV 'debate' (this is how the programme was represented) on the future of the monarchy in Britain. One can see Extract 1 of Example 8 as basically scenario (b), a polemical accentuation of the differences between members of the panel. TV 'debate' often takes this form (Fairclough 1995b, Livingstone and Lunt 1994). Speakers are selected to represent different 'views', and the 'debate' is orchestrated by the journalist (Roger Cook) to set these 'views' against each other.

   One might consider this way of dealing with difference in terms of the 'public sphere' (Arendt 1958, Calhoun 1992, Fairclough 1999, Habermas 1989). The public sphere is in **Habermas**'s terms (1984) a zone of connection between social systems and the 'lifeworld', the domain of everyday living, in which people can deliberate on matters of social and political concern as citizens, and in principle influence policy decisions. The contemporary status of the public sphere has attracted a great deal of debate, much of it about the 'crisis' of the public sphere, its prob-lematic character in contemporary societies in which it tends to get 'squeezed out', especially by the mass media. One limitation of 'debates' like that in Example 8 from this perspective is that they don't go beyond confrontation and polemic. One might see effective public sphere debate or dialogue as reasonably including an element of polemic, but also incorporating elements of scenarios (a) and (c), and exploration of differences, and a move towards resolving them so as to reach agree-ment and form alliances. Without that element it is difficult to see how 'debates'

can influence the formation of policy. The same might be said of Extract 2, where a journalist gathers 'views' from the audience but in a way which separates and fragments them, leaving no possibility of dialogue between them. This is one illustration of how analysis of the treatment of difference in texts can contribute to issues in social research. I shall discuss Example 8 more fully in relation to the public sphere in chapter 4.

Hegemony, universal and particular

The concept of 'hegemony' is central to the version of Marxism associated with Antonio Gramsci (Gramsci 1971). In a Gramscian view, politics is seen as a struggle for hegemony, a particular way of conceptualizing power which amongst other things emphasizes how power depends upon achieving consent or at least acquiescence rather than just having the resources to use force, and the importance of ideology in sustaining relations of power. The concept of 'hegemony' has recently been approached in terms of a version of discourse theory in the 'post-Marxist' political theory of Ernesto **Laclau** (Laclau and Mouffe 1985). The hegemonic struggle between political forces can be seen as partly a contention over the claims of their particular visions and representations of the world to having a universal status (Butler *et al.* 2000).

Representations of 'globalization' and especially of global economic change are a good example. Let us go back to Example 4, the European Union text. It is similar to many other contemporary texts in representing global economic change as a process without human agents, in which change is nominalized ('globalization', see chapter 8) and so represented as itself an entity which can act as an agent (it 'imposes deep and rapid adjustments'), a process in a general and ill-defined present and without a history (it is just what 'is') which is universal (or, precisely, 'global') in terms of place, and an inevitable process which must be responded to in particular ways – an 'is' which imposes an 'ought', or rather a 'must' (Fairclough 2000c). One can see the hegemonic aspirations of neo-liberalism as partly a matter of seeking universal status for this particular representation and vision of economic change. Of course it is indeed particular and contentious. There are other representations in which 'globalization' is a result of human agency and strategy (e.g. the progressive removal of barriers to the free movement of goods and finance through inter-governmental agreements dominated by the USA and other powerful states), with a particular history, which excludes large areas of the world (e.g. much of Africa), is in no sense inevitable, and need not therefore close down the political space by making certain policies also inevitable.

Such representations of 'globalization' vary in the extent to which they are asserted or assumed, in the balance between assertion and assumption. The European Union text is relatively assertive – there are, as I have pointed out, certain grounding

assumptions, but much of this vision of global economic change is explicit, asserted. In many texts however one finds the whole vision as part of an assumed and taken-for-granted background. Take, for instance, the following short extract from a leaflet produced by the British government Department for Education and Employment on changes in the post-16 curriculum. The leaflet is identified as a 'guide to parents'.

> Many European students take a broader study package and have a more demanding study schedule – typically 30 hours of teaching a week, compared to 18 in the UK. These are the students with whom our young people must compete for jobs and university places in a global marketplace.

The only reference in the leaflet to the global economy is in the second sentence, which assumes that there is a global marketplace, and that our young people must compete for jobs and university places within it (what is asserted is with whom – these 'European students'). A measure of the successful universalization of such a particular representation is the extent to which it figures in this way as a background assumption (and one might say as an ideology – see below) in a wide variety of texts.

I suggested in chapter 2, discussing genres of governance, that Example 1 can be seen as positioned in a genre chain which facilitates a move from the local to the global – general precepts for managers which might apply anywhere are produced (in the 'scheme of management competencies' in the Appendix to Watson's book) on the basis of the local experience of managers in a specific company. But this can simultaneously be seen in terms of hegemony as a universalization of a particular – universal claims are made for one view of management amongst others.

Coming back to representations of globalization in Example 4, we can refine the claim I made earlier that intertextuality opens up difference, whereas assumptions reduce difference. The most dialogical option would be to explicitly attribute representations to sources, to 'voices', and to include much of the range of voices that actually exists. A less dialogical option is one I briefly alluded to above: modalized assertion (see chapter 10). If for example sentence 4 in the European Union text were to be worded as, 'It may impose deep and rapid adjustments', i.e. if the statement of fact were to be reworded as a statement of possibility, that would at least be dialogically open to other possibilities. An even less dialogical option is the categorical, non-modalized assertions which we actually have in the text, which leave no room for other possibilities. And the least dialogical option is assumption, simply taking this vision of the global economy for granted, as in the extract from the Department of Education and Employment leaflet which I quoted above (see also White 2001). Schematically:

Most dialogical: Attribute, quote
　　　　　　　　　Modalized assertion
　　　　　　　　　Non-modalized assertion
Least dialogical: Assumption

Intertextuality

We can begin by noting that for any particular text or type of text, there is a set of other texts and a set of voices which are potentially relevant, and potentially incorporated into the text. It may not be possible to identify these sets with great precision, and they may be rather extensive and complex. But it is analytically useful to begin with some rough idea of them, for a significant initial question is: which texts and voices are included, which are excluded, and what significant absences are there? I noted above, for instance, that in the case of Example 1, the ethnographic interview, the manager does not incorporate the voice of the senior management even though he is mainly talking about the senior management: he represents what senior management do, but not what they say, whereas the voices of a worker and of trade-unionists are incorporated (though the latter in terms of what they 'would' say).

Where other texts are intertextually incorporated in a text, they may or may not be attributed. For instance, Example 5, an extract from Tony Blair's speech following the attack on the World Trade Centre in September 2001, includes quite a lot of non-attributed intertextuality, and this is true of the speech as a whole. One example is:

> In the world of the Internet, information technology and TV, there will be globalization. And in trade, the problem is not that there's too much of it; on the contrary there's too little of it. The issue is not how to stop globalization. The issue is how we use the power of the community to combine it with justice.

There is a repeated pattern here of denial followed by assertion – negative clause followed by positive clause. Denials imply the assertion 'elsewhere' of what is being denied – in this case, that someone has asserted that there is too much globalization in trade, and that the issue is how to stop globalization. In the context from which this extract comes, Blair has been referring to people who 'protest against globalization'. What he is implying is that these people do assert or have asserted these things, but he is not actually attributing these assertions to them. In fact, many who 'protest against globalization' are not claiming that there is 'too much' of it in

trade or that it should be 'stopped', but rather that there is a need to redress imbalances of power in the *way* in which international trade in increasing.

When intertextuality is attributed, it may be specifically attributed to particular people, or non-specifically (vaguely) attributed. Elsewhere in the same speech, for instance, Blair says:

> Don't overreact some say. We aren't. We haven't lashed out. No missiles on the first night just for effect.
>
> Don't kill innocent people. We are not the ones who waged war on the innocent. We seek the guilty.
>
> Look for a diplomatic solution. There is no diplomacy with Bin Laden or the Taliban regime.
>
> State an ultimatum and get their response. We stated the ultimatum, they haven't responded.
>
> Understand the causes of terror. Yes, we should try, but let there be no moral ambiguity about this: nothing could ever justify the events of 11 September, and it is to turn justice on its head to pretend it could.

This is a simulated dialogue in which Blair does not so much represent a critical voice as dramatically enact a dialogue with such a voice, which appears as a series of injunctions (grammatically, imperative sentences, see chapter 6). Yet he does attribute the words of his imaginary interlocutor, though vaguely, to 'some'. One can see this vagueness as giving Blair a licence to represent what critics of the war were saying in a way which a more specific attribution would make it easier to challenge. The final sentence is the significant one in this regard. It begins with a qualified acceptance of the injunction to 'understand the causes of terror' (we should 'try'), but this is followed by an objection which rests upon the implication that those who call for an understanding of causes are thereby seeking to justify the events of September 11. Notice that, as with the previous example, there is a denial ('nothing could ever justify the events of September 11') which implies the assertion 'elsewhere' that 'terror' may be justified by its 'causes'. Of course, calling for a better understanding of why people resort to terrorism does not imply, and did not imply for critics of the policies of Bush and Blair at the time, that terrorism is justified so long as the causes are sufficiently compelling.

When the speech or writing or thought of another is reported, two different texts, two different voices, are brought into dialogue, and potentially two different perspectives, objectives, interests and so forth (Volosinov 1973). There is always likely to be a tension between what is going on in the reporting text, including the

work which the reporting of other texts is doing within that text, and what was going on in the reported text. I earlier suggested a broad contrast between intertextuality and assumption in terms of the openness of the former, but not the latter, to difference and dialogicality. The form of intertextuality I particularly had in mind is direct reporting, quoted speech or writing (see below). But as soon as we get into the detail of how the speech and writing and thought of others can be reported, the diverse possible forms that it can take, it becomes clear that the picture is more complicated – that reporting, as a form of intertextuality, itself subsumes much of the range of orientations to difference which I summed up in the five scenarios above.

One important contrast in reporting is between reports which are relatively 'faithful' to what is reported, quoting it, claiming to reproduce what was actually said or written, and those which are not. Or, to put it differently, reports which keep a relatively strong and clear boundary between the speech or writing or thought that is reported and the text in which they are reported, and those which do not (Fairclough 1988, Volosinov 1973). This is the difference between 'direct' and 'indirect' reporting. We can differentiate four ways of reporting (see Leech and Short 1981 for a fuller account):

- **Direct reporting**

    Quotation, purportedly the actual words used, in quotation marks, with a reporting clause (e.g. She said: 'He'll be there by now').

- **Indirect reporting**

    Summary, the content of what was said or written, not the actual words used, no quotation marks, with a reporting clause (e.g. She said he'd be there by then). Shifts in the tense ('he'll' becomes 'he'd') and deixis ('now' becomes 'then') of direct reports.

- **Free indirect reporting**

    Intermediate between direct and indirect – it has some of the tense and deixis shifts typical of indirect speech, but without a reporting clause. It is mainly significant in literary language (e.g. Mary gazed out of the window. *He would be there by now*. She smiled to herself.).

- **Narrative report of speech act**

    Reports the sort of speech act without reporting its content (e.g. She made a prediction).

In Example 2 ('Festival Town Flourishes'), two voices are included, both local official ones, representing respectively local government and business – the Mayor, and the Managing Director of the local entrepreneurs' centre. Other voices (e.g. representing the cultural community, or inhabitants of the town giving their experience of what it's like to live there) might have been included but are not. It would seem that the feature has been written on the basis of interviews with the two officials. Some information about the town is included in the author's account, some is attributed to the officials, sometimes as direct report (quotation), sometimes as indirect report (summary). Since it is likely that most of the information came from the interviews, one might wonder what dictates its distribution between authorial account, direct report, and indirect report. The answer would seem to be: genre. This text is 'mixed' in terms of genre, as I pointed out in chapter 2, but its intertextuality is typical of press reports. The pattern is an alternation between authorial accounts and indirect reports, backed up or substantiated with direct quotations. Even if, as seems likely in this case, all the information about the town emanates from other voices, the genre of press report favours this distribution of information between the authorial voice and attributed voices.

The relationship between authorial account and attributed speech is rather straightforward in this case, showing none of the tension I alluded to above, or the associated issues of orientation to difference. These issues do arise however in the following extract from the British New Labour government's Green Paper on Welfare Reform (1998):

There will be a full, independent evaluation of the first phase of the New Deal for Lone Parents, available in autumn 1999. Early indications are encouraging. *Lone parent organisations, employers, and lone parents themselves have all welcomed this New Deal*, and *the staff responsible for delivering the service have been particularly enthusiastic. The staff have welcomed the opportunity to become involved in providing practical help and advice*. The first phase of this New Deal has aroused considerable interest: *lone parents in other parts of the country are asking if they can join in*.

This document is remarkable overall for its lack of dialogicality, one indication of which is that there are very few instances in the whole document of reported speech or writing. Other voices hardly appear. This extract is one of the few exceptions. I have italicized those parts which I take to be representing other voices (lone parents, staff, etc.). There is only one instance here which is obviously reported speech, the indirect report ('lone parents in other parts of the country are asking if they can join in') at the end. The other instances imply things that have been said

or written without actually reporting them – if lone parents' organizations and so forth 'have welcomed this New Deal', then presumably they have said or written positive things about it, but all that is represented here are generalized attitudes (welcoming, being enthusiastic) which abstract away from specific statements or evaluations. It is representation of thought (and, specifically, attitude) rather than of speech or writing, but it can only be based upon speech or writing. Other voices are brought into the document at this point, but in a way which abstracts away from what must surely be the diverse things that have actually been said or written, and which reduces difference. One might ask what these generalized representations of attitude are based upon. There is no indication of this, but the most obvious answer is some form of opinion survey. Of course, if the results of such surveys had been explicitly given, it would have been in the form of percentages, but that would undermine the impression of consensus (cf. scenario (d)). The strategic and rhetorical motivation for the form of reporting in this extract is clear enough, and one can locate it broadly within the functioning of 'public opinion' in contemporary politics and governance (see further in Fairclough 2000a, 2000b).

Both of the last two examples show that intertextuality is a matter of recontextualization (a concept introduced in chapter 2) – a movement from one context to another, entailing particular transformations consequent upon how the material that is moved, recontextualized, figures within that new context. So in the case of reported speech, writing or thought, there are two interconnected issues to address:

(a)   the relationship between the report and the original (the event that is reported);

(b)   the relationship between the report and the rest of the text in which it occurs – how the report figures in the text, what work the reporting does in the text.

The interconnection of the two is clear from the examples: one function of reports in the 'Festival Town Flourishes' text is to substantiate authorial claims, which makes sense of the emphasis on quoting and the implicit claim to faithfulness to the original. By contrast, the reports in the Green Paper contribute to legitimizing policy, and the emphasis is correspondingly on producing an impression of consensus through generalizing away from specific evaluations or statements in a way which reduces difference.

Example 6[1] is a report from a radio news broadcast (*Today*, BBC Radio 4, 30 September 1993) on the extradition of two Libyans accused of responsibility for the Lockerbie bombing in 1988, when an aircraft exploded near the town of Lockerbie in Scotland killing all those on board (see Fairclough 1995b).

'Headlines': *Newsreader*:   Libya has now told the United Nations that it is willing to see the two men accused of the Lockerbie bombing stand trial in Scotland, but it cannot meet the deadline to hand them over.

Newsreader: Libya has told the United Nations that it's willing to let the two men accused of the Lockerbie bombing come to Scotland to stand trial. The position was spelt out in New York last night by the Foreign Minister, OM, when he emerged from a meeting with the Secretary-General, Dr Boutros-Ghali.

OM: The answers we have received from the UK and the US though the Secretary-General are very acceptable to us and we see them as a positive e: answer and enough guarantees to secure a fair . trial for these two suspects once they submit themselves to e: such jurisdiction.

Newsreader: Libyan officials at the UN, faced by the threat of more sanctions, said they wanted more time to sort out the details of the handover. Relatives of the 270 people who died on Flight 103 in December 1988 are treating the statement with caution. From the UN, our correspondent John Nian.

Correspondent: Western diplomats still believe Libya is playing for time. However on the face of it Libya does appear to be inching closer to handing over the two suspects. If this initiative is only a delaying tactic, its aim would be to persuade the waverers on the Security Council not to vote for the new sanctions, in what is likely to be a close vote. However the UN Secretary-General is reported to have been taking a tough line with Libya, demanding that it specify exactly when the two suspects would be handed over. The Libyan Foreign Minister has promised a reply on that point later today, but he's asked for more time to arrange the handover. Meanwhile the West has maintained the pressure on Libya. The Foreign Secretary Douglas Hurd, and the American Secretary of State Warren Christopher, have both reiterated the threat of sanctions. Western diplomats say that unless the two suspects are handed over immediately, a new resolution will be tabled tomorrow.

The main voices represented here are: the Libyan government (Libyan officials, the Libyan Foreign Minister, OM), western governments, politicians and diplomats (the UK, the US, western diplomats, the UK Foreign Minister, the US Secretary of State), the UN Secretary-General, and relatives of the people who died. There are also the journalistic voices of the Newsreader and the Correspondent. Apart from the recorded statement by the Libyan Foreign Minister, reported speech and thought are indirect. A superficial measure of 'balance' might appear quite positive: the voice of the Libyan government is as prominent as the voice of western governments. Yet if we look at the text in terms of recontextualization, and in particular in terms of

how the different voices are textured together in the text, the report seems more problematic, and less favourable to the Libyan government.

One issue is 'framing': when the voice of another is incorporated into a text, there are always choices about how to 'frame' it, how to contextualize it, in terms of other parts of the text – about relations between report and authorial account. For example, the report that the Libyans 'said they wanted more time to sort out the details of the handover' is framed with 'faced by the threat of more sanctions', and one might see this framing as conducive to a rather negative interpretation of what the Libyan officials are reported to have said as, for instance, 'stalling' – indeed the Correspondent does later hypothesize about 'a delaying tactic'. Another example: 'the UN Secretary-General is reported to have been taking a tough line with Libya, demanding that it specify exactly when the two suspects would be handed over'. Part of the framing here is the choice of 'demand' as the reporting verb – it is highly improbable that the Secretary-General said 'I demand that . . .', so 'demand' rather than, for example, 'ask' would seem to be a framing conducive to an interpretation which casts the Libyans in an unfavourable light: if the supposedly impartial UN is getting tough with Libya, they must be in the wrong. One report is in this case also framed by another – the 'demand' is framed by the report that the Secretary-General 'has been taking a tough line with Libya'. So there is a build-up of framing which is heavily conducive to an interpretation unfavourable to Libya.

Framing also brings in questions about the ordering of voices in relation to each other in a text. But to address that issue here, we also need to consider one aspect of the reports being predominantly indirect. It is the question of how the process of extradition (or, more neutrally, the movement of the accused from Libya to Scotland to stand trial) is represented. In the recorded statement of the Libyan Foreign Minister, it is represented as the men 'submitting themselves' to jurisdiction. In the Newsreader's opening account which precedes that statement, it is represented as the men 'coming to Scotland to stand trial'. Otherwise, it is represented, six times, as the men being 'handed over' (or 'the handover'). This representation casts both the accused and the Libyan government in a different and more negative light: a country 'hands over' for instance a fugitive or a prisoner rather than its citizens, and one 'hands over' people or objects under duress rather than, for instance, in fulfilment of one's legal obligations. Yet this representation appears in the indirect reports of not only what western diplomats have said but also of what the Libyans and the UN Secretary-General have said, as well as in the account of (and the voice of) the Correspondent. Given that this is the representation generally adopted through the report, the representation which one imagines others may have been 'translated' into, whose representation is it? It is difficult to be sure, but it is clearly a 'western' representation rather than a Libyan one.

Returning to framing with this in mind, notice that this representation occurs in the salient position of the headline (headlines in this type of news report are all read

at the beginning of the broadcast), as well as in the also salient position of what is sometimes called the 'wrap-up' (the final part of the report which brings us back to the present, initiated here by 'meanwhile'). Moreover, if we look at the way in which voices are ordered in relation to each other in the Correspondent's report, there seems to be a covert 'antagonist–protagonist' structuring which effectively sets the 'good guys' (western diplomats and politicians) against the 'bad guys' (the Libyans). Libyan voices are more prominent in the earlier part of the report, whereas in the second half of the report, from the BBC UN correspondent, the voices of 'the West' and the UN – both portrayed as critical of the Libyan position – are dominant. The last three sentences, from 'meanwhile', wrap up the report with western voices, with the last sentence summarizing what is implicitly a western dismissal of the Libyan overture, and containing a threat. Sentence connectors ('however', 'meanwhile') and a conjunction ('but') are markers of the ordering of voices in the BBC UN correspondent's report. The first and second sentences are linked with 'however'. This sets up a contrast between what western diplomats believe Libya is doing and what Libya appears to be doing. The second and third sentences are interesting. The second sentence is the correspondent's voice, not a representation of another voice. Reporters' statements are generally authoritative, but this one is doubly hedged ('on the face of it', 'appear to be'), so there is little conviction expressed that Libya is actually moving towards a 'handover'. Sentences 2 and 3 are also in a contrastive relationship though there is no marker of it, in that there is an implicit shift in sentence 3 back to the voice of the western diplomats in the formulation of Libya's 'aim' ('to persuade the waverers on the Security Council not to vote for new sanctions'). 'However' in sentence 4 sets the 'tough' voice of the UN Secretary-General against the hypothetical manipulative 'aim' of Libya. Sentence 5 is the only one in the Correspondent's report that represents a Libyan voice, though the 'but' in the sentence implicitly contrasts positive and negative sides of the Libyan Foreign Minister's response to the UN Secretary-General – his 'promise' and his request for more time. Finally 'meanwhile' draws a line between these diplomatic moves and what 'the West' is doing, using the latter to frame and to minimize the former.

The representation of the movement of the accused from Libya to Scotland to stand trial as 'handing over' is a matter of selecting a particular discourse which I have made some comments on above. There are two points to make here. First, that the difference between different voices reported in a text may include the fact that that different voices draw upon different discourses. Second, that voices can be represented more or less concretely or abstractly, ranging from the direct reporting of what was actually said or written within some particular concrete event, to an indirect summary of what was said or written within a particular event, to the sort of generalized representation in the Blair speech discussed above of what a group of people typically say (or are purported to typically say) which is detached from

particular events, to the evocation of a voice simply through drawing upon a discourse which is recognisably associated with that voice. An example of the latter is in the extract from the Department of Education and Employment leaflet which I discussed earlier: 'These are the students with whom our young people must compete for jobs and university places in a global marketplace.' I said earlier that it is assumed that there is a global marketplace. But there is more to it than that: the expression 'global marketplace' belongs to the dominant neo-liberal economic and political discourse which is associated with the nationally and internationally dominant voices in the economic and political fields, voices which are evoked through the fragmentary presence of this discourse in the text.

Let me finally point out that intertextuality is inevitably selective with respect to what is included and what is excluded from the events and texts represented. Take for instance this sentence from the radio news report: 'The position was spelt out in New York last night by the Foreign Minister, OM, when he emerged from a meeting with the Secretary General, Dr Boutros-Ghali.' This includes the place of the event, the time of the event, and its positioning in relation to another event (the meeting with the UN Secretary General). None of the other reports in the text includes so much detail. One explanation is that such detail becomes important for potentially politically significant statements by important people. But selectivity relates to genre. How something was said is much more likely to be specified in a representation of speech in a novel (for example, 'Go on up and see for yourself,' I said, trying to keep the agony out of my voice. Raymond Chandler, *Farewell my Lovely*) than in a news report, where the focus is likely to be more exclusively on the representational meaning, or content, of what people say.

Assumptions

Implicitness is a pervasive property of texts, and a property of considerable social importance. All forms of fellowship, community and solidarity depend upon meanings which are shared and can be taken as given, and no form of social communication or interaction is conceivable without some such 'common ground'. On the other hand, the capacity to exercise social power, domination and hegemony includes the capacity to shape to some significant degree the nature and content of this 'common ground', which makes implicitness and assumptions an important issue with respect to ideology.

We can distinguish three main types of assumptions:

Existential assumptions: assumptions about what exists
Propositional assumptions: assumptions about what is or can be or will be the case
Value assumptions: assumptions about what is good or desirable

Each of these may be marked or 'triggered' (Levinson 1983) by linguistic features of a text, though not all assumptions are 'triggered'. For example, existential assumptions are triggered by markers of definite reference such as definite articles and demonstratives (the, this, that, these, those). Factual assumptions are triggered by certain verbs ('factive verbs') – for instance 'I *realized* (*forgot*, *remembered*) that managers have to be flexible' assumes that managers have to be flexible. Value assumptions can also be triggered by certain verbs – for instance, 'help' (e.g. 'a good training programme can *help* develop flexibility') assumes that developing flexibility is desirable.

Let us go back to Example 4, the extract from a European Union policy paper, to illustrate these types of assumption.

1   But (globalization) is also a demanding process, and often a painful one.
2   Economic progress has always been accompanied by destruction of obsolete activities and creation of new ones.
3   The pace has become swifter and the game has taken on planetary dimensions.
4   It imposes deep and rapid adjustments on all countries – including European countries, where industrial civilization was born.
5   Social cohesion is threatened by a widespread sense of unease, inequality and polarization.
6   There is a risk of a disjunct between the hopes and aspirations of people and the demands of a global economy.
7   And yet social cohesion is not only a worthwhile social and political goal; it is also a source of efficiency and adaptability in a knowledge-based economy that increasingly depends on human quality and the ability to work as a team.
8   It is more than ever the duty of governments, trade-unions and employers to work together
    •   to describe the stakes and refute a number of mistakes;
    •   to stress that our countries should have high ambitions and they can be realized; and
    •   to implement the necessary reforms consistently and without delay.
9   Failure to move quickly and decisively will result in loss of resources, both human and capital, which will leave for more promising parts of the world if Europe provides less attractive opportunities.

Existential assumptions include the assumption that there are such things as globalization (pronominalized as 'it' in sentence 1) and as social cohesion (sentence 5);

that there is a widespread sense of unease, inequality and polarization (sentence 5); that there is a global economy (sentence 6) and a knowledge-based economy (sentence 7). Propositional assumptions include the assumption that globalization is a process (in sentence 1 – what is asserted is the *sort* of process that it is, i.e. 'demanding'); that globalization is or constitutes economic progress (sentences 1 and 2); that people have hopes and aspirations and that the global economy makes demands (sentence 6); that social cohesion is a worthwhile social and political goal and that the knowledge-based economy does increasingly depend on human quality and the ability to work as a team (sentence 7); that reforms are necessary (sentence 8). The assumption that globalization constitutes economic progress is an example of the relationship between assumptions and coherence of meaning: we can talk about 'bridging assumptions', assumptions which are necessary to create a coherent link or 'bridge' between parts of a text, so that a text 'makes sense'. In this case, it is a bridging assumption which allows a coherent semantic connection to be made between sentences 1 and 2. There is also a propositional assumption associated with 'obsolete activities' in sentence 2: that (economic) activities can become obsolete.

Texts may include explicit evaluation ('That's wonderful/excellent!'), but most evaluation in texts is assumed (see chapter 10 for a fuller discussion of evaluation). Value assumptions are triggered by 'threatened' in sentence 5 and by 'risk' in sentence 6. If X threatens (is a threat to) Y, there is an assumption that 'X' is undesirable and 'Y' is desirable; similarly if there is a risk that X, there is assumption that 'X' is undesirable. In this case, social cohesion is assumed to be desirable, a widespread sense of unease, inequality and polarization to be undesirable; and a disjunct between hopes and demands to be undesirable. But value assumptions are not necessarily triggered. There is no need for a trigger such as 'threaten' for 'a sense of unease, inequality and polarization' to be implicitly undesirable, one can interpret it as such on the basis of one's knowledge and recognition of the value system which underlies the text. In sentence 7, it is clear that within the value system of the text social cohesion is being represented as desirable – as is anything which enhances 'efficiency and adaptability'. Notice that one can as a reader recognize the value system and therefore the assumed meaning without accepting or agreeing with it – critics of the new 'global economy' do not accept that efficiency and adaptability are unconditional goods, but they are still likely to be able to recognize that assumption. The corollary is that one's interpretation of texts in terms of values depends upon one's knowledge and recognition of such value systems.

Questions of implicitness and assumptions take us into territory which is conventionally seen as that of linguistic pragmatics (Blakemore 1992, Levinson 1983, Mey 1993, Verschueren 1999). Linguistic pragmatics is the study of 'language in relation to its users' (Mey 1993). It focuses on meaning, but the making of meaning in actual communication, as opposed to what is often seen as the concern of linguistic semantics with semantic relations which can be attributed to a language

as such, in abstraction from actual communication. Linguistic pragmatics has produced valuable insights about assumptions (presuppositions, implicatures), speech acts, and so forth which have been drawn upon in critical discourse analysis (e.g. Fairclough 1992), but it is also (at least in its Anglo-American as opposed to continental European versions) sometimes problematic in overstating social agency and tending to work with isolated (often invented) utterances (Fairclough 2001b).

Ideologies and assumptions

Value systems and associated assumptions can be regarded as belonging to particular discourses – a neo-liberal economic and political discourse in the case of the assumption that anything which enhances 'efficiency and adaptability' is desirable. Existential and propositional assumptions may also be discourse-specific – a particular discourse includes assumptions about what there is, what is the case, what is possible, what is necessary, what will be the case, and so forth. In some instances, one might argue that such assumptions, and indeed the discourses they are associated with, are ideological. Assumed meanings are of particular ideological significance – one can argue that relations of power are best served by meanings which are widely taken as given. The ideological work of texts is connected to what I said earlier about hegemony and universalization. Seeking hegemony is a matter of seeking to universalize particular meanings in the service of achieving and maintaining dominance, and this is ideological work. So for instance texts can be seen as doing ideological work in assuming, taking as an unquestioned and unavoidable reality, the factuality of a global economy (e.g. assuming the existence of a 'global marketplace' in the sentence referred to in the discussion of hegemony: 'These are the students with whom our young people must compete for jobs and university places in a global marketplace'). Similarly in the European Union text, both the assumption that globalization is a reality and the assumption that globalization is economic progress might be seen as doing ideological work.

   To make such claims, however, one needs to go beyond textual analysis. Let us take a very different example, an extract from a horoscope (*Lancaster Guardian*, 23 November 2001).

> *Virgo*
>
> Spiritual growth will be more important to you than outer ambition for a few weeks. Rather inward looking, you would like to feel more in touch with your soul. If you can push heavier chores at work to one side for a few weeks it will help. Though it may not be easy since you will be fizzing at points. Think about

anger as blocked assertion and you can see why it is better to constantly put forward what you need and don't need. If you don't assert yourself in small ways, the resentment builds up, and then suddenly you let fly.

A number of propositional assumptions can be identified here. First, there is a the 'dualist' and religious assumption that the 'spirit' stands in contrast with the body, the inner self with the 'outer' self. Second, it is assumed that focusing on 'spiritual growth' means being 'inward looking' and 'feeling in touch with your soul', a bridging assumption which is necessary for a coherent semantic relation between the first two sentences. There is also an existential assumption that there are such things as 'souls' – or that people have souls. Third, there is an assumption that if one is 'fizzing', it is difficult to 'push heavier chores to one side'. Fourth, that thinking about things in certain ways allows one to understand things, that it's better to constantly put forward what you need and don't need, that you need some things and you don't need others. Fifth, that when resentment builds up, people are liable to suddenly let fly.

One might argue that the 'dualist' and religious assumption of a contrast between an inner, spiritual self and an outer self is ideological. This is the classic argument about religion as ideology, as the 'opiate of the masses' in Marx's famous phrase. But to claim that it is an ideological assumption, one would need a plausible argument that it is indeed effective, along with other related propositions and beliefs, in sustaining relations of power. This would need to be based upon a complex social scientific analysis of the relationship between religious beliefs and power relations, and of course such a claim would be controversial. The analysis would have to go beyond texts, though a textual analysis showing that such religious dualism is pervasively assumed, taken for granted, could be seen as a significant part of the analysis. Certainly one cannot simply look at a text, identify assumptions, and decide on textual evidence alone which of them are ideological.

Other types of assumptions

What I have been calling 'assumptions' are one of the types of implicitness generally distinguished in linguistic **pragmatics** – presuppositions. Verschueren (1999) differentiates four (I have changed his terminology somewhat):

Presuppositions (what I am calling 'assumptions')
Logical implications

Standard conversational implicatures
Non-standard conversational implicatures

Logical implications are implicit meanings which can be logically inferred from features of language – for example, 'I have been married for twenty years' implies that I am (still) married (because of the perfect aspect, 'have been'), or 'he is poor but honest' implies that poor people can be expected to be dishonest (because of the contrastive meaning of 'but'). Standard conversational implicatures are implicit meanings which can conventionally be inferred on the basis of our normal assumption that people are adhering to what Grice (1975) called conversational 'maxims'. The four maxims are:

Quantity: Give as much information, and no more information than is required in the context;
Quality: Try to speak the truth;
Relevance: Be relevant;
Manner: Be clear.

For example, if I ask 'Is there anything to see in Lancaster?', you can infer on the basis of the second of these maxims (the maxim of Quality) that I don't know much about Lancaster.

The most interesting type apart from presuppositions is the fourth, non-standard conversational implicatures. The basic contrast between presuppositions and such implicatures is that the former take as given what is assumed to be known or believed, whereas the latter are fundamentally about the strategic avoidance of explicitness. However, this contrast is made less simple by the possibility of strategically purporting to assume that something is known or believed when one has reason to believe it isn't – for instance, passing off something contentious as if it were uncontentious (e.g. saying 'I didn't realize that Fred was paid by the CIA' as a way of getting one's interlocutor to accept that he is paid by the CIA). While implicatures are inherently strategic, assumptions may be strategic.

This type of implicature arises from what Grice called the 'flouting' of a maxim – apparently breaking a maxim, but adhering to it on an implicit level of meaning. To take a classic example, if I write in a reference for an academic post only that the candidate is 'well-dressed and punctual', this appears to break the maxims of Quantity (it doesn't provide enough information) and Relevance (what information it does provide is not relevant). But if a person reading the reference assumes that

I am being co-operative rather than perverse, s/he may infer that the candidate does not have the qualifications or qualities needed for the post, which is both informative enough (if curt) and relevant.

Summary

We began by distinguishing five orientations to difference in social interaction, and in texts as parts of social interaction, and we used this as a basis for assessing the relative degree of 'dialogicality' of a text, and discussed what sort of orientation to difference would characterize an effective 'public sphere'. Following Laclau, we can see hegemony as the attempted universalization of particulars (e.g. particular representations of economic change), which entails a reduction of dialogicality. We considered a scale of dialogicality, in which the most dialogical option is the inclusion of other voices and the attribution to them of quotations (a form of intertextuality), and the least dialogical option is assumption, taking things as given. The two categories of intertextuality and assumption take up the rest of the chapter. Discussion of intertextuality begins with the question of which relevant 'external' texts and voices are included in a text, and which are (significantly) excluded; and, where texts are included, whether or not they are attributed, and how specifically. We distinguished several types of report, and especially direct reporting which claims some faithfulness to what was originally said or written, and indirect reporting, which does not. I suggested that there are two main issues with reports: their relationship to the reported original, and how reported texts and voices are recontextualized within the reporting text – positioned and framed in relation to each other and in relation to the authorial voice. We distinguished three types of assumptions (existential, propositional, value), suggesting that assumptions may or may not be textually 'triggered', that assumptions are relative to discourses, and that assumptions are of particular significance in terms of the ideological work of texts. Finally, we distinguished assumptions from other types of implicit meaning.

Note

1   See Appendix, page 229, for note about transcription conventions.

References

Allan, K. (2001) *Natural Language Semantics*, Oxford: Blackwell.

Allan, S. (1999) *News Culture*, Buckingham: Open University Press.

Althusser, L. and Balibar, E. (1970) *Reading Capital,* London: New Left Books.

Archer, M. (1995) *Realist Social Theory: the Morphogenetic Approach*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Archer, M. (2000) *Being Human: the Problem of Agency*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Arendt, H. (1958) *The Human Condition*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Austin, J.L. (1962) *How to Do Things with Words*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bakhtin, M. (1981) *The Dialogical Imagination*, Austin: University of Texas Press.

Bakhtin, M. (1986a) 'The problem of speech genres', in *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*, Austin: University of Texas Press, 60–102.

Bakhtin, M. (1986b) 'The problem of the text in Linguistics, Philology and the Human Sciences: an experiment in philosophical analysis', in *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*, Austin: University of Texas Press, 103–131.

Bal, M. (1997) *Narratology: Introduction to the Theory of Narrative*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Bauman, Z. (1998) *Globalization*, Cambridge: Polity Press.

Bazerman, C (1988) *Shaping Written Knowledge: the Genre and Activity of the Experimental Article in Science*, Madison, Wis.: University of Wisconsin Press.

Benhabib, S. (1996) *Democracy and Difference*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Berger, P. and Luckmann, T. (1966) *The Social Construction of Reality*, Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Bernstein, B. (1990) *The Structuring of Pedagogic Discourse*, London: Routledge.

Bhaskar, R. (1979) *A Realist Theory of Science*, 2nd edition, Brighton: Harvester.

Bhaskar, R. (1986) *Scientific Realism and Human Emancipation*, London: Verso.

Bhaskar, R. (1989) *Reclaiming Reality*, London: Verso.

Bjerke, F. (2000) *Discursive Governance Structures*, Working Paper, Institute of Social Sciences and Business Economics, Roskilde University, Denmark.

Blakemore, D. (1992) *Understanding Utterances: an Introduction to Pragmatics*, Oxford: Blackwell.

Boltanski, L. and Chiapello, E. (1999) *Le Nouvel Esprit du Capitalisme*, Paris: Gallimard.

Bourdieu, P. (1977) *Outline of a Theory of Practice*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1984) *Distinction: a Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*, London: Routledge.

Bourdieu, P. (1991) *Language and Symbolic Power*, Cambridge: Polity Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1998) *On Television*, New York: New Press.

Bourdieu, P. and Wacquant, L. (1992) *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology*, Cambridge: Polity Press.

Bourdieu, B. and Wacquant, L. (2001) 'New-Liberal Speak: notes on the new planetary vulgate', *Radical Philosophy* **105**: 2–5.

Boyer, R. and Hollingsworth, J.R. (eds) (1997) *Contemporary Capitalism: the Embeddedness of Capitalist Institutions*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Brenner, R. (1998) 'The economics of global turbulence', *New Left Review* **229** (special edition).

Brown, R. and Gilman, A. (1960) 'The pronouns of power and solidarity', in P. Giglioli (ed.) *Language and Social Context*, Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Butler, J. (1998) 'Merely cultural', *New Left Review* **227**, 33–44.

Butler, J., Laclau, E. and Žižek, S. (2000) *Contingency, Hegemony, Universality*, London: Verso.

Calhoun, C. (1992) *Habermas and the Public Sphere*, Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Callinicos, A. (1995) *Theories and Narratives: Reflections on the Philosophy of History*, Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press.

Cameron, D. (2000) *Good to Talk? Living and Working in a Communication Culture*, London: Sage.

Cameron, D. (2001) *Working with Spoken Text*, London: Sage.

Carter, R., Goddard, A., Reah, D., Sanger, K. and Bowring, M. *Working with Texts*, London: Routledge.

Castells, M. (1996–8) *The Information Age*, 3 volumes, Cambridge: Blackwell.

Chiapello, E. and Fairclough, N. (2002) 'Understanding the new management ideology: a transdisciplinary contribution from Critical Discourse Analysis and the New Sociology of Capitalism', *Discourse and Society* **13**(2): 185–208.

Chouliaraki, L. (1995) 'Regulation in "progressivist" pedagogic discourse: individualized teacher–pupil talk', *Discourse and Society* **9**(1): 5–32.

Chouliaraki, L. (1999) 'Media discourse and national identity: death and myth in a news broadcast', in R. Wodak and C. Ludwig (eds) *Challenges in a Changing World: Issues in Critical Discourse Analysis*, Vienna: Passagen Verlag.

Chouliaraki, L. and Fairclough, N. (1999) *Discourse in Late Modernity*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Connerton, P. (1989) *How Societies Remember*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Crouch, C. and Streek, W. (1997) *Political Economy of Modern Capitalism*, London: Sage.

Dant, T. (1991) *Knowledge, Ideology and Discourse: a Sociological Perspective*, London: Routledge.

De Beaugrande, R. (1997) *New Foundations for a Science of Text and Discourse*, Norwood, N.J.: Ablex.

De Beaugrande, R. and Dressler, W. (1981) *Introduction to Text Linguistics*, London: Longman.

Donadio, P. (2002) 'Modal variations and ideological change', LAUD Symposium, Landau.

Dubiel, H. (1985) *Theory and Politics: Studies in the Development of Critical Theory*, Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Durkheim, E. and Mauss, M. (1963/1903) *Primitive Classification*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Eagleton, T. (1991) *Ideology*, London: Verso.

Eggins, S. (1994) *An Introduction to Systemic Functional Linguistics*, London: Pinter.

Eggins, S. and Martin, J. (1997) 'Genres and registers of discourse', in T. van Dijk (ed.) *Discourse as Structure and Process*, London: Sage.

Fairclough, N. (1988) 'Discourse representation in media discourse', *Sociolinguistics* **17**: 125–39.

Fairclough, N. (1992) *Discourse and Social Change*, Cambridge: Polity Press.

Fairclough, N. (1993) 'Critical discourse analysis and the marketisation of public discourse: the universities', *Discourse and Society* **4**: 133–68.

Fairclough, N. (1995a) *Critical Discourse Analysis*, London: Longman.

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

Fairclough, N. (1999) 'Democracy and the public sphere in critical research on discourse', in R. Wodak and C. Ludwig (eds) *Challenges in a Changing World: Issues in Critical Discourse Analysis*, Vienna: Passagen Verlag.

Fairclough, N. (2000a) 'Discourse, social theory and social research: the case of welfare reform', *Journal of Sociolinguistics* **4**: 163–95.

Fairclough, N. (2000b) *New Labour, New Language?*, London: Routledge.

Fairclough, N. (2000c) 'Represenciones del cambio en discurso neoliberal', *Cuadernos de Relaciones Laborales* **16**: 13–36.

Fairclough, N. (2001a) 'The dialectics of discourse', *Textus* **14**: 231–42.

Fairclough, N. (2001b) *Language and Power*, 2nd edition, London: Longman.

Fairclough, N. (2001c) 'The discourse of New Labour: critical discourse analysis', in M. Wetherell *et al.* (eds) *Discourse as Data*, London: Sage and the Open University.

Fairclough, N. (2001d) 'Critical discourse analysis as a method in social scientific research', in R. Wodak and M. Meyer (eds) *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*, London: Sage.

Fairclough, N. and Wodak, R. (1997) 'Critical discourse analysis', in T. van Dijk (ed.) *Discourse as Social Interaction*, London: Sage.

Fairclough, N. Jessop, R. and Sayer, A. (2002) 'Critical realism and Semiosis', *Journal of Critical Realism* **5**(1): 2–10.

Fairclough, N., Pardoe, S. and Szerszynski, B. (forthcoming) 'Critical discourse analysis and citizenship', in A. Bora and H. Hausendorf (eds) *Constructing Citizenship*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Featherstone, M. (1991) *Consumer Culture and Postmodernism*, London: Sage.

Firth, J.R. (1957) *Papers in Linguistics*, London: Oxford University Press.

Fiske, J. (1987) *Television Culture*, London: Routledge.

Forgacs, D. (1988) *A Gramsci Reader*, London: Lawrence & Wishart.

Foucault, M. (1972) *The Archaeology of Knowledge*, New York: Pantheon.

Foucault, M. (1984) 'The order of discourse', in M. Shapiro (ed) *The Language of Politics*, Oxford: Blackwell.

Foucault, M. (1994) 'What is enlightenment?', in P. Rabinow (ed.) *Michel Foucault: Essential Works vol 1 (Ethics)*, Harmondsworth: Penguin, pages 303–19.

Fowler R., Hodge, B., Kress, G. and Trew, T. (1979) *Language and Control*, London: Routledge.

Fraser, N. (1998) 'Heterosexism, misrecognition and capitalism: a reply to Judith Butler', *New Left Review* **228**: 140–9.

Gardiner, M. (1992) *The Dialogics of Critique: M.M. Bakhtin and the Theory of Ideology*, London: Routledge.

Gee, J. (1999) *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis*, London: Routledge.

Giddens, A. (1984) *The Constitution of Society*, Cambridge: Polity Press.

Giddens, A. (1991) *Modernity and Self Identity*, Cambridge: Polity Press.

Giddens, A. (1993) *New Rules of Sociological Method*, 2nd edition, Cambridge: Polity Press.

Gieve, S. (2000) *Discourse Learning and 'Being Critical'* PhD thesis, Lancaster University.

Goatly, A. (1997) *The Language of Metaphors*, London: Routledge.

Goffman, E. (1981) *Forms of Talk*, Oxford: Blackwell.

Graham, P. (2001a) 'Space: irrealis objects in technology policy and their role in a new political economy', *Discourse and Society* **12**(6): 761–88.

Graham, P. (2001b) 'Contradictions and institutional convergences: genre as method', *Journal of Future Studies* **5**(4): 1–30.

Graham, P. (2002) 'Predication and propogation: a method for analyzing evaluative meanings in technology policy', *Text* **33**: 227–68.

Gramsci, A. (1971) *Selections from the Prison Notrebooks*, London: Lawrence & Wishart.

Grice, H.P. (1975) 'Logic and conversation', in P. Cole and J. Morgan (eds) *Syntax and Semantics 3: Speech Acts*, New York: Academic Press.

Grice, H. (1981) 'Presupposition and conversational implicature', in P. Cole (ed.) *Radical Pragmatics*, New York: Academic Press.

Habermas, J. (1976) *Legitimation Crisis*, London: Heinemann.

Habermas, J. (1984) *Theory of Communicative Action*, Vol. 1, London: Heinemann.

Habermas, J. (1989) *The Structural Transformational of the Public Sphere*, Cambridge: Polity Press.

Habermas, J. (1996) *Between Facts and Norms*, Cambridge: Polity Press.

Halliday, M. (1978) 'The sociosemantic nature of discourse', in *Language as Social Semiotic*, London: Edward Arnold.

Halliday, M. (1994) *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*, 2nd edition, London: Edward Arnold.

Halliday, M. and Hasan, T. (1976) *Cohesion in English*, London: Longman.

Halliday, M. and Hasan, R. (1989) *Language, Context and Text: Aspects of Language in a Social-Semiotic Perspective*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Halliday, M. and Martin, J. (1993) *Writing Science: Literacy and Discursive Power*, London: Falmer.

Harré, R. (1983) *Personal Being*, Oxford: Blackwell.

Harvey, D. (1990) *The Condition of Postmodernity*, Oxford: Blackwell.

Harvey, D. (1996a) *Justice, Nature and the Geography of Difference*, Oxford: Blackwell.

Harvey, D. (1996b) 'Globalization in question', *Rethinking Marxism* **8**(4): 1–17.

Hasan, R. (1996) *Ways of Saying: Ways of Meaning*, London: Cassell.

Hawisher, G. and Selfe, C. (eds) (2000) *Global Literacies and the World-Wide Web*, London: Routledge.

Held, D., McGrew, A., Goldblatt, D. and Perraton, J. (1999) *Global Transformations: Politics, Economics and Culture*, Cambridge: Polity Press.

Hodge, B. and Kress, G. (1988) *Social Semiotics*, Cambridge: Polity Press.

Hodge, B. and Kress, G. (1993) *Language as Ideology*, 2nd edition, London: Routledge.

Hoey, M. (1983) *On the Surface of Discourse*, London: George, Allen & Unwin.

Hoey, M. (2001) *Textual Interaction*, London: Routledge.

Holquist, M. (1981) *Dialogism: Bakhtin and his Works*, London: Routledge.

Hunston, S. and Thompson, G. (2000) *Evaluation in Text*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Iedema, R. (1999) 'Formalising organisational meaning', *Discourse and Society* **10**(1): 49–65.

Ivanič, R. (1998) *Writing and Identity*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Jameson, F. (1991) *Postmodernism, Or, The Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism*, London: Verso.

Jessop, B. (1998) 'The rise of governance and the risks of failure: the case of economic development', *International Social Science Journal* **155**: 29–45.

Jessop B. (2000) 'The crisis of the national spatio-temporal fix and the ecological dominance of globalising capitalism', *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* **24**(2): 323–60.

Jessop B. (forthcoming a) 'The social embeddedness of the economy and its implications for global governance', in F. Adaman and P. Devine (eds) *The Socially Embedded Economy*, Montreal: Black Rose Books.

Jessop, B. (forthcoming b) 'On the spatio-temporal logics in capital's globalization and their manifold implications for state power'.

Kress, G. (1985) *Linguistic Processes in Sociocultural Practice*, Geelong, Victoria: Deakin University Press.

Kress, G. and Van Leeuwen, T. (2001) *Multimodal Discourse*, London: Arnold.

Kristeva, J. (1986a) 'Word, dialogue and novel', in T. Moi (ed.) *The Kristeva Reader*, Oxford: Blackwell, pages 34–61.

Kristeva, J. (1986b) 'The system and the speaking subject', in T. Moi (ed.) *The Kristeva Reader*, Oxford: Blackwell, pages 24–33.

Laclau, E. (1996) *Emancipation(s)*, London: Verso.

Laclau, E. and Mouffe, C. (1985) *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy*, London: Verso.

Lakoff, G. and Johnson, M. (1980) *Metaphors We Live By*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Larrain, J. (1979) *The Concept of Ideology*, London: Hutchinson.

Leech, G.N. and Short , M. (1981) *Style in Fiction*, London: Longman.

Lehtonen, M. (2000) *The Cultural Analysis of Texts*, London: Sage.

Lemke, J. (1988) 'Text structure and text semantics', in R. Veltman and E. Steiner (eds) *Pragmatics, Discourse and Text: Systemic Approaches*, London: Pinter.

Lemke, J. (1995) *Textual Politics*, London: Taylor & Francis.

Lemke, J. (1998) 'Resources for attitudinal meaning: evaluative orientations in text semantics', *Functions of Language* **5**(1): 33–56.

Levins, R. and Lewontin, R. (1985) *The Dialectical Biologist*, Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Levinson, S. (1983) *Pragmatics*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Linstead, S. and Höpfl, H. (2000) *The Aesthetics of Organization*, London: Sage.

Livingstone, S. and Lunt, P. (1994) *Talk on Television: Audience Participation and Public Debate*, London: Routledge.

Luhmann, N. (2000) *The Reality of the Mass Media*, Cambridge: Polity Press.

Lury, C. (1996) *Consumer Culture*, Cambridge: Polity Press.

Lyons, J. (1977) *Semantics*, 2 vols, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Macdonell, D. (1986) *Theories of Discourse: an Introduction*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

McEnery, T. and Wilson, A. (2001) *Corpus Linguistics*, Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press.

McIntyre, A. (1984) *After Virtue*, Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press.

McLuhan, M. (1964) *Understanding Media*, New York: McGraw Hill.

Martin, J. (1992) *English Text*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Martin, J. (2000) 'Beyond exchange: APPRAISAL system in English', in S. Hunston and G. Thompson (eds) *Evaluation in Text*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pages 142–75.

Merleau-Ponty, M. (1964) *Signs*, Evanston, Ill.: Northwestern University Press.

Mey, J. (1993) *Pragmatics: an Introduction*, Oxford: Blackwell.

Mills, S. (1997) *Discourse*, London: Routledge.

Misztal, B. (2000) *Informality: Social Theory and Contemporary Practice*, London: Routledge.

Mitchell, T.F. (1957) 'The language of buying and selling in Cyrenaica: a situational statement', *Hesperis* **26**: 31–71.

Morris, P. (1986) *The Baby Book*, London: Newbourne.

Morrow, R with D. Brown (1994) *Critical Theory and Methodology*, London: Sage.

Muntigl, P., Weiss, G. and Wodak, R. (2000) *European Union Discourses on Un/employment*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Myers, G. (1999) *Ad Worlds: Brands, Media, Audiences*, London: Arnold.

Ochs, E. (1997) 'Narrative', in T. van Dijk (ed.) *Discourse as Social Structure and Process*, London: Sage.

Ollman, B. (1993) *Dialectical Investigations*, New York: Routledge.

Outhwaite, W. (ed.) (1996) *The Habermas Reader*, Cambridge: Polity Press.

Palmer, F. (1986) *Mood and Modality*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pujolar, J. (1997) *De Que Vas Tio? I Llengua en la Cultura Juvenil*, Barcelona: Editorial Empuries.

Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G.N. and Svartvik, J. (1972) *A Grammar of Contemporary English*, London: Longman.

Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G.N. and Svartvik, J. (1995) *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*, London: Longman.

Rogers, R. (ed.) (forthcoming) *New Directions in Critical Discourse Analysis: the Role of Language Learning in Social Transformation*, New York: Erlbaum.

Sayer, A. (2000) *Realism and Social Science*, London: Sage.

Sbis, M. (1995) 'Speech act theory', in J. Verschueren, J-O. Östman, J. Blommaert and C. Bulcaen (eds) *Handbook of Pragmatics*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pages 28–36.

Scannell, P. (1991) 'Introduction: the relevance of talk', in P. Scannell (ed.) *Broadcast Talk*, London: Sage.

Schegloff, E. (1997) 'Whose text? Whose context?', *Discourse & Society* **8**(2): 165–87.

Searle, J. (1969) *Speech Acts: an Essay in the Philosophy of Language*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Seligman, A. (1997) *The Problem of Trust*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Sennett, R. (1974) *The Fall of Public Man*, New York: W.W. Norton & Co.

Sennett. R. (1998) *The Corrosion of Character: Personal Consequences of Work in the New Capitalism*, New York: W.W. Norton & Co.

Silverstone, R. (1999) *Why Study the Media?* London: Sage.

Sinclair, J. McH. (1991) *Corpus, Concordance, Collocation*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Stillar, G. (1998) *Analyzing Everyday Texts*, London: Sage.

Stubbs, M. (1996) *Text and Corpus Analysis*, Oxford: Blackwell.

Swales, J. (1990) *Genre Analysis*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Talbot, M. (1996) *Gender and Language*, Cambridge: Polity Press.

Taylor, C. (1985) *Human Agency and Language*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Thibault, P. (1991) *Social Semiotics as Praxis*, Minneapolis: University of Minessota Press.

Thompson, J. (1984) *Studies in the Theory of Ideology*, Cambridge: Polity Press.

Thompson, J. (1995) *The Media and Modernity*, Cambridge: Polity Press.

Titscher, S., Meyer, M., Wodak, R. and Vetter, E. (2000) *Methods of Text and Discourse Analysis*, London: Sage.

Toolan, M. (1998) *Narrative*, London: Routledge.

Toulmin, S. (1958) *The Uses of Argument*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Touraine, A. (1997) *What is Democracy?*, Boulder, Col.: Westview Press.

Van Dijk, T. (ed.) (1997) *Discourse Studies: a Multidisciplinary Introduction* (Vol. 1: *Discourse as Structure and Process*; Vol. 2: *Discourse as Social Interaction*), London: Sage.

Van Dijk, T. (1998) *Ideology: a Multidisciplinary Approach*, London: Sage.

Van Eemeren, F., Grootendorst, R., Jackson, S. and Jacons, S. (1997) 'Argumentation', in T. van Dijk (ed.) *Discourse as Structure and Process*, London: Sage.

Van Leeuwen, T. (undated) 'The grammar of legitimation', Working Paper, London College of Printing.

Van Leeuwen, T. (1993) 'Genre and field in critical discourse analysis', *Discourse & Society* **4**(2): 193–223.

Van Leeuwen, T. (1995) 'Representing social action', *Discourse and Society* **6**(1): 81–106.

Van Leeuwen, T. (1996) 'The representation of social actors', in C. R. Caldas-Coulthard and M. Coulthard (eds) *Texts and Practices*, London: Routledge.

Van Leeuwen, T. and Wodak, R. (1999) 'Legitimizing immigration control: a discourse-historical analysis', *Discourse Studies* **1**(1): 83–118.

Verschueren, J. (1999) *Understanding Pragmatics*, London: Arnold.

Volosinov, V.I. (1973) *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language*, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Weber, M. (1964) *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization*, New York: The Free Press.

Wernick, A. (1991) *Promotional Culture*, London: Sage.

Wertsch, J. (1991) *Voices of the Mind*, Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Wetherell, M. (1998) 'Positioning and interpretative repertoires: CA and post-structuralism in dialogue', *Discourse and Society* **9**(3): 387–412.

Wetherell, M., Taylor, S. and Yates, S.J. (2001a) *Discourse as Data*, London: Sage and the Open University.

Wetherell, M., Taylor, S. and Yates, S.J. (2001b) *Discourse Theory and Practice*, London: Sage and the Open University.

White, P. (2001) An introductory tour through appraisal theory, Appraisal Website (www.grammatics.com/appraisal)

White, P. (forthcoming) 'Attitude and arguability: appraisal and the linguistics of solidarity', *Text*.

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

Winter, E. (1982) *Towards a Contextual Grammar of English*, London: George Allen & Unwin.

Wodak, R. (2000) 'From conflict to consensus? The co-construction of a policy paper', in P. Muntigl, G. Weiss and R. Wodak (eds) *European Union Discourses on Un/Employment*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Wynne, B. (2001) 'Creating public alienation: expert cultures of risk and ethics on GMOs', *Science as Culture* **10**(4): 445–81.

Index