Ruth Wodak

Aspects of Critical Discourse Analysis[1]

Aspekte kritischer Diskursanalyse

Im vorliegenden Aufsatz wird versucht, verschiedene Richtungen der Kritischer Diskursanalyse zusammenzufassen. Entgegen manchen Meinungen, ist Kritische Diskursanalyse keineswegs ein geschlossenes Theoriegebäude; vielmehr handelt es sich um ein Forschungsprogramm, mit einigen Prinzipien, die von allen ForscherInnen anerkannt werden. Innerhalb dieser recht allgemeinen Prinzipien gibt es jedoch eine große Theorien- und Methodenvielfalt. Diese Vielfalt hängt u.a. mit der Herkunft der einzelnen Ansätze zusammen: manche leiten sich eher von der Kritischen Theorie her, andere von Michel Foucault; manche greifen stark auf M.A.K. Halliday zurück, andere weisen auf Konzepte der traditionellen Soziolinguistik hin. Zunächst werden die wichtigsten Konzepte der Kritischen Diskursanalyse eingehend beleuchtet: Ideologie, Macht, Diskurs, Text, Kontext und Kritik. Der Entstehungszusammenhang der verschiedenen Richtungen wird – so weit in diesem Rahmen möglich – präsentiert, vor allem die Wurzeln innerhalb der Kritischen Linguistik, die sich in England in den 70er Jahren des 20. Jahrhunderts entwickelt hat. Die wichtigsten Forschungsbereiche und ForscherInnenpersönlichkeiten werden anschließend beschrieben. Am Ende werden offene Fragen der Theorienbildung aufgezählt.

Introduction[2]

In this paper, I will attempt to provide an overview of some important approaches to Critical Discourse Analysis. Firstly, I will focus on central and relevant concepts and terms; then I will present the historical development of Critical Discourse Analysis. In conclusion, I would like to summarize some of the most important theoretical and methodological theories within this research paradigm. Owing to problems of space, it will be impossible to

---

[1] This short summary is based on long and extensive discussions with my friends, colleagues and co-researchers as well as students. I would just like to mention and thank Rudi De Cillia, Martin Reisigl, Gertraud Benke, Gilbert Weiss, Bernd Matouschek and Richard Mitten with all of whom I have worked together over the years. Moreover, many ideas have come up with my students. I would like to thank Usama Suleiman, Alexander Pollak and Christine Anthonissen for their insights and elaborations. Finally, I would like to thank my peer-group, whom I have written about, and the many colleagues I have not been able to mention here.

[2] This paper is an elaborated version of a chapter in a book which I edited together with Michael Meyer (*Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*, Sage 2001).

illustrate the different approaches with concrete examples; I will have to refer readers to other research and references where examples are elaborated and discussed.[3]

The terms *Critical Linguistics* (CL) and *Critical Discourse Analysis* (CDA) are often used interchangeably. In fact, recently the term CDA seems to have been preferred and is being used to denote the theory formerly identified as CL. Thus, I will continue to use CDA exclusively in this paper (see *Anthonissen* 2001 for an extensive discussion of these terms). The roots of CDA lie in classical Rhetoric, Textlinguistics and Sociolinguistics, as well as in Applied Linguistics and Pragmatics. The notions of ideology, power, hierarchy and gender together with sociological variables were all seen as relevant for an interpretation or explanation of text. The subjects under investigation differ for the various departments and scholars who apply CDA. Gender issues, issues of racism, media discourses, political discourses, organizational discourses or dimensions of identity research have become very prominent[4]. The methodologies differ greatly in all these studies, on account of the aims of the research and also with regard to the particular methodologies applied: small qualitative case studies can be found as well as large data corpora, drawn from fieldwork and ethnographic research. CDA takes a particular interest in the relationship between language and power. The term CDA is used nowadays to refer more specifically to the critical linguistic approach of scholars who find the larger discursive unit of text to be the basic unit of communication. This research specifically considers more or less overt relations of struggle and conflict in all the domains mentioned above.

Deconstructing the label of this research programme – I view CDA basically as a research programme, the reasons for which I will explain below – involves our having to define what CDA means when employing the terms "critical" and "discourse". Most recently, Michael Billig (2002) has clearly pointed to the fact that CDA has become an established academic discipline with the same rituals and institutional practices as all other academic

---

[3] See *Wodak/ Meyer* (2001); *Wodak* (ed.) (2002) (in press); *Titscher et al.* (1998, 2000); *Reisigl/ Wodak* (eds.) (2001); *Van Dijk* (2001); *Fairclough/ Wodak* (1997); *Weiss/ Wodak* (eds.) (2002); *Blommaert/ Bulcaen* (2000); *Anthonissen* (2001); *Pollak* (2002) etc.

[4] See *Wodak et al.* (1999), *Blommaert/ Verschueren* (1998); *Martin-Rojo/ Van Dijk* (1997); *Pedro* (1997); *Martin-Rojo/ Whittaker* (1998); many editorials *in Discourse and Society* over the years, specifically the debate between Emanuel Schegloff and Michael Billig in issues 2-4, 1999/ 2-4, 2000, *Iedema/ Wodak* (1999); *Wodak/ Iedema* (in press); *Wodak/ De Cillia* (in press), *Wodak/ Van Dijk* (2000).

disciplines. Ironically, he asks the question whether this might mean that CDA has become "uncritical" – or if the use of acronyms such as CDA might serve the same purposes as in other traditional, non-critical disciplines; namely to exclude outsiders and to mystify the functions and intentions of the research. I cannot answer Billig's questions extensively in this paper. But I do believe that he opens up some interesting and potentially very fruitful and necessary debates for CDA.

At this point, I would like to stress that CDA has never been and has never attempted to be or to provide one single or specific theory. Neither is one specific methodology characteristic of research in CDA. Quite the contrary, studies in CDA are multifarious, derived from quite different theoretical backgrounds, oriented towards very different data and methodologies. Researchers in CDA also rely on a variety of grammatical approaches. The definitions of the terms "discourse", "critical", "ideology", "power" and so on are also manifold (see below; *Wodak* 1996). Thus, any criticism of CDA should always specify which research or researcher they relate to because CDA as such cannot be viewed as a holistic or closed paradigm. I would rather suggest using the notion of a "school" for CDA, or of a programme which many researchers find useful and to which they can relate. This programme or set of principles has changed over the years (see *Fairclough/ Wodak* 1997).

Such a heterogeneous school might be confusing for some; on the other hand, it allows for open discussions and debates, for changes in the aims and goals, and for innovation. In contrast to "total and closed" theories, like for example Chomsky's Generative Transformational Grammar or Michael Halliday's Systemic Functional Linguistics, CDA has never had the image of being a "sect" nor does it want to have such an image.

This heterogeneity of methodological and theoretical approaches that can be found in this field of Linguistics would tend to confirm Van Dijk's point that CDA and CL "are at most a shared perspective on doing linguistic, semiotic or discourse analysis" (*Van Dijk* 1993, 131). Below, I would like to summarize some of these principles, which are adhered to by most researchers.

2. The notions of "discourse, critical, power and ideology"

CDA sees "language as social practice" (*Fairclough/ Wodak* 1997), and considers the context of language use to be crucial (*Wodak* 2000, *Benke* 2000):
"CDA sees discourse – language use in speech and writing – as a form of 'social practice'. Describing discourse as social practice implies a dialectical relationship between a particular discursive event and the situation(s),

institution(s) and social structure(s) which frame it: the discursive event is shaped by them, but it also shapes them. That is, discourse is socially constitutive as well as socially conditioned – it constitutes situations, objects of knowledge, and the social identities of and relationships between people and groups of people. It is constitutive both in the sense that it helps to sustain and reproduce the social status quo, and in the sense that it contributes to transforming it. Since discourse is so socially consequential, it gives rise to important issues of power. Discursive practices may have major ideological effects – that is, they can help produce and reproduce unequal power relations between (for instance) social classes, women and men, and ethnic/ cultural majorities and minorities through the ways in which they represent things and position people." (*Fairclough/ Wodak* 1997, 258)

Of course, the term "discourse" is used very differently by different researchers and also in different academic cultures. In the German and Central European context, a distinction is made between "text" and "discourse", relating to the tradition in text linguistics as well as to rhetoric (see *Brünner/ Gräfen* 1995, *Vass* 1994; *Wodak* 1996 for summaries). In the English speaking world, "discourse" is often used both for written and oral texts (see *Schiffrin* 1992). Other researchers distinguish between different levels of abstractness: *Lemke* (1995) defines "text" as the concrete realization of abstract forms of knowledge ("discourse"), thus adhering to a more Foucauldian approach (see also *Jäger et al.* 2001).

In the discourse-historical approach, we elaborate and link to the socio-cognitive theory of *Teun van Dijk* (1984, 1993, 1998) and view "discourse" as a form of knowledge and memory, whereas text illustrates concrete oral utterances or written documents (*Reisigl/ Wodak* 2001).

The shared perspective and programme of CDA relate to the term "critical", which in the work of some "critical linguists" could be traced to the influence of the Frankfurt School or Jürgen Habermas (*Thompson* 1988, 71ff; *Fay* 1987, 203, *Anthonissen* 2001). Nowadays this concept is conventionally used in a broader sense, denoting, as Krings argues, the practical linking of "social and political engagement" with "a sociologically informed construction of society," (*Krings et al.*, 1973, 808), while recognizing, in Fairclough's words "that, in human matters, interconnections and chains of cause-and-effect may be distorted out of vision. Hence 'critique' is essentially making visible the interconnectedness of things" (*Fairclough* 1995, 747; see also *Connerton* 1976, 11-39).

Recently, some scholars in CDA have been adhering to the Frankfurt School, others to a notion of literary criticism, and a few to Marx's notions (see above

and *Reisigl/ Wodak* 2001 for an overview). Basically, "critical" could be understood as having distance to the data, embedding the data in the social context, taking a political stance explicitly, and having a focus on self-reflection as scholars doing research. For all those concerned in CDA, application of the results is important, be it in practical seminars for teachers, doctors and bureaucrats or in the writing of expert opinions or devising schoolbooks.

The reference to the contribution of Critical Theory to the understanding of CDA and the notions of "critical" and "ideology" are of particular importance (see *Anthonissen* 2001 for an extensive discussion of this issue)[5]. *Thompson* (1990) discusses the concepts of ideology and culture, the relations between these concepts and certain aspects of Mass Communication. He points out that the concept of ideology first appeared in late 18th-century France and has thus been in use for about two centuries. The term has been given a range of functions and meanings at different times. For Thompson, ideology refers to social forms and processes within which, and by means of which, symbolic forms circulate in the social world. Ideology, for CDA, is seen as an important means of establishing and maintaining unequal power relations. CDA takes a particular interest in the ways in which language mediates ideology in a variety of social institutions.

Thompson (1990) sees the study of ideology as a study of "the ways in which meaning is constructed and conveyed by symbolic forms of various kinds." This kind of study will also investigate the social contexts within which symbolic forms are both employed and deployed. The investigator has an interest in determining whether such forms establish or sustain relations of domination.

For *Eagleton* (1994), moreover, the study of ideology has to bear in mind the variety of theories and theorists that have examined the relation between thought and social reality. All the theories assume "that there are specific historical reasons why people come to feel, reason, desire and imagine as they do." (1994, 15)[6]

---

[5] In the 1960's, many scholars adopted a more critical perspective in language studies. Among the first was the French scholar *Pecheux* (1992 [1975]), whose approach traced its roots to the work of Russian theorists *Bakhtin* (1981) and *Volosinov* (1973), both of whom had postulated an integration of language and social processes in the 1930's. The term itself was apparently coined by *Jacob Mey* (1974).

[6] The differences between *scientific theories* and *critical theories* lie along three dimensions, following the Frankfurt School (see *Anthonissen* 2001 for a discussion):
First, they differ in their aim or goal, and therefore also in the way they can be used. Scientific theories aim at successful manipulation of the external world: they have

Critical theories, thus also CDA, are afforded special standing as guides for human action. They are aimed at producing both enlightenment and emancipation. These types of theories do not only seek to describe and explain, but also to root out a particular kind of delusion. Even with differing concepts of ideology, critical theory seeks to create awareness in agents of their own needs and interests. This was, of course, also taken up by Pierre Bourdieu's concepts of "violence symbolique" and "méconnaissance." (*Bourdieu* 1989). One of the aims of CDA is to "demystify" discourses by deciphering ideologies.

For CDA, language is not powerful on its own – it gains power by the use powerful people make of it. This explains why CDA often chooses the perspective of those who suffer, and critically analyzes the language use of those in power, who are responsible for the existence of inequalities and who also have the means and the opportunity to improve conditions. In agreement with its Critical Theory predecessors, CDA emphasizes the need for interdisciplinary work in order to gain a proper understanding of how language functions in constituting and transmitting knowledge, in organizing social institutions or in exercising power.

An important perspective in CDA related to the notion of "power" is that it is very rare that a text is the work of any one person. In texts, discursive differences are negotiated; they are governed by differences in power which is in part encoded in and determined by discourse and by genre. Therefore texts are often sites of struggle in that they show traces of differing discourses and ideologies all contending and struggling for dominance.

Thus, the defining features of CDA are to be seen in its concern with power as a central condition in social life, and in its efforts to develop a theory of language which incorporates this as a major premise. Not only the notion of struggles for power and control, but also the intertextuality and recontextualization of competing discourses in various public spaces and

---

'instrumental use'. Critical theories aim at making "agents" aware of hidden coercion, thereby freeing them from that coercion and putting them in a position where they can determine their true interests.

Second, critical and scientific theories differ in their 'cognitive' structure. Scientific theories are 'objectifying' in that one can distinguish between the theory and the objects to which the theory refers. The theory is not part of the object-domain which it describes. A critical theory, on the other hand, is 'reflective' in that it is always itself a part of the object-domain it describes. Such theories are in part about themselves.

Third, critical and scientific theories differ in the kind of evidence which would determine whether or not they are acceptable. Thus, these theories require different kinds of confirmation.

genres are closely attended to. Power is about relations of difference, and particularly about the effects of differences in social structures. The constant unity of language and other social matters ensures that language is entwined in social power in a number of ways: language indexes power, expresses power, is involved where there is contention over power and where power is challenged. Power does not derive from language, but language can be used to challenge power, to subvert it, to alter distributions of power both in the short and the long term. Language provides a finely articulated vehicle for differences in power within hierarchical social structures. Very few linguistic forms have not at some stage been pressed into the service of the expression of power by a process of syntactic or textual metaphor. CDA takes an interest in the ways in which linguistic forms are used in various expressions and manipulations of power. Power is signalled not only by grammatical forms within a text, but also by a person's control of a social occasion by means of the genre of a text. It is often exactly within the genres associated with given social occasions that power is either exercised or challenged.

Thus, CDA might be defined as fundamentally interested in not only analyzing opaque but also transparent structural relationships of dominance, discrimination, power and control as manifested in language. In other words, CDA aims at investigating critically social inequality as it is expressed, constituted, legitimized, and so on, by language use (or in discourse). Most critical discourse analysts would thus endorse Habermas's claim that "language is also a medium of domination and social force. It serves to legitimize relations of organized power. Insofar as the legitimizations of power relations, ..., are not articulated, ... , language is also ideological" (*Habermas* 1967, 259).

3. Discourse, Structure and History – Context

In CDA, nowadays, a huge continuity, of course, exists with CL (see for example *Fairclough, Wodak* 1997; *Blommaert, Bulcaen* 2000) which developed in the 1970s and 1980s, primarily in the University of East Anglia, around Roger Fowler, Tony Trew and Gunter Kress. This continuity is visible mostly in the claim that discourses are ideological and that there is no arbitrariness of signs (see also *Kress* 1993). Functional Systemic Linguistics proved to be most important for the text analysis undertaken by this school (see *Halliday* 1978).

In contrast to other paradigms in discourse analysis and text linguistics, CDA focuses not only on texts, spoken or written, as objects of inquiry. A fully

"critical" account of discourse would thus require a theorization and description of both the social processes and structures, which give rise to the production of a text, and of the social structures and processes within which individuals or groups as social-historical subjects, create meanings in their interaction with texts (*Fairclough/ Kress*, 1993, 2ff). Consequently, three concepts figure indispensably in all CDA: the concept of power; the concept of history; and the concept of ideology (see above).

Unlike some of the research in Pragmatics and traditional Sociolinguistics in which, according to critical linguists, context variables are somewhat naively correlated with an autonomous system of language (*Kress/ Hodge* 1979), CDA tries to avoid positing a simple deterministic relation between texts and the social. Taking into account the insights that discourse is structured by dominance[7], that every discourse is historically produced and interpreted – i.e. is situated in time and space – and that dominance structures are legitimized by ideologies of powerful groups, the complex approach advocated by proponents of CDA makes it possible to analyze pressures from above and possibilities of resistance to unequal power relationships that appear as societal conventions. According to this view, dominant structures both stabilize and naturalize conventions, that is, the effects of power and ideology in the production of meaning are obscured and acquire stable and natural forms, they are taken as "given". Resistance then is seen as the breaking of conventions, of stable discursive practices, in acts of "creativity" (*Fairclough/ Kress*, 1993, 4ff).

These claims imply that the concrete analysis should take into account historical developments of discursive practices (change), intertextuality, and interdiscursivity. This might explain why it is so difficult to provide "short, telling" examples in a paper: an example needs the deconstruction of the whole social-political and historical context in which the discursive practices are embedded. This approach also explains why interdisciplinarity is a necessity when undertaking CDA.

What is thus considered as "context" is subject to theorizing. In *Wodak* (2000), I have proposed that it should be exactly the dimension of "context", which needs explicit theoretical underpinning and which should not only be seen – as was the case in traditional Sociolinguistics – as static sociological variables, or as everything "which is not linguistic". Rather, theories from

---

[7] We could postulate, in the Habermasian sense, that every speech situation is "distorted" by power structures, especially in contrast to his utopia of the "ideal speech situation" where rational discourse becomes possible (*Habermas* 1967, 1972; *Wodak* 1996a, b).

neighbouring disciplines are needed for the discourse analysis itself and to permit the interpretation of context and text.

The History of Critical Discourse Analysis

The 1970s saw the emergence of a form of discourse and text analysis that recognized the role of language in structuring power relations in society (see *Anthonissen* 2001 for an extensive summary of this development). At that time, much linguistic research elsewhere was focussed on formal aspects of language which constituted the linguistic competence of speakers and which could theoretically be isolated from specific instances of language use (*Chomsky* 1957). Where the relation between language and context was considered, as in pragmatics (*Levinson* 1983), with a focus on speakers' pragmatic/ sociolinguistic competence, sentences and components of sentences were still regarded as the basic units. Much sociolinguistic research at the time was aimed at describing and explaining language variation, language change and the structures of communicative interaction, with limited attention to issues of social hierarchy and power (*Labov* 1972, *Hymes* 1972). In such a context, attention to texts, their production and interpretation and their relation to societal impulses and structures, signalled a very different kind of interest (*Beaugrande/ Dressler* 1981; see *Titscher et al.* 2000 for an overview). The work of *Kress/ Hodge* (1979), *Fowler/ Kress/ Hodge/ Trew* (1979), *Van Dijk* (1985) *Fairclough* (1989) and *Wodak* (ed.) (1989) serve to explain and illustrate the main assumptions, principles and procedures of what had then become known as CL.
Kress (1990, 84-97) gives an account of the theoretical foundations and sources of Critical Linguistics. He indicates that the term CL was "quite self-consciously adapted" (1990, 88) from its social-philosophical counterpart, as a label by the group of scholars working at the University of East Anglia in the 1970s (see also *Wodak* 1996a, *Blommaert/ Bulcaen* 2000). By the 1990s the label CDA came to be used more consistently to describe this particular approach to linguistic analysis. *Kress* (1990, 94) shows how CDA was by that time "emerging as a distinct theory of language, a radically different kind of linguistics." He lists the criteria that characterize work in the Critical Discourse Analysis paradigm, illustrating how these distinguish such work from other politically engaged types of discourse analysis. *Fairclough/ Wodak* (1997) took these criteria further and established 10 basic principles of a CDA program (see also *Wodak* 1996b). In this contribution, I would like to take up

these programmatic claims and proposals, and elaborate them further (see *Wodak* 2001a,b):

(1) The approach is interdisciplinary. Problems in our societies are too complex to be studied from a single perspective. This entails different dimensions of interdisciplinarity: the theories draw on neighbouring disciplines and try to integrate these theories. Teamwork consists of different researchers from different traditionally defined disciplines working together. Lastly, the methodologies are also adapted to the data under investigation.

(2) The approach is problem-oriented, rather than focused on specific linguistic items. Social problems are the items of research, such as "racism, identity, social change", which, of course, are and could be studied from manifold perspectives. The CDA dimension, discourse and text analysis, is one of many possible approaches.

(3) The theories as well as the methodologies are eclectic; i.e., theories and methods are integrated which are adequate for an understanding and explanation of the object under investigation.

(4) The study always incorporates fieldwork and ethnography to explore the object under investigation (study from the inside) as a precondition for any further analysis and theorizing. This approach makes it possible to avoid "fitting the data to illustrate a theory". Rather, we deal with bottom-up and top-down approaches at the same time.

(5) The approach is abductive: a constant movement back and forth between theory and empirical data is necessary. This is a prerequisite for principle 4.

(6) Multiple genres and multiple public spaces are studied, and intertextual and interdiscursive relationships are investigated. Recontextualization is the most important process in connecting these genres as well as topics and arguments (topoi). In our postmodern societies, we are dealing with hybrid and innovative genres, as well as with new notions of "time", "identity" and "space". All these notions have undergone significant change; for example, "fragmented" identities have replaced the notion of "holistic identities".

(7) The historical context is always analyzed and integrated into the interpretation of discourses and texts. The notion of "change" (see principle 6) has become inherent in the study of text and discourse.

(8) The categories and tools for the analysis are defined in accordance with all these steps and procedures and also with the specific problem under investigation. This entails some eclecticism, as well as pragmatism. Dif-

ferent approaches in CDA use different grammatical theories, although many apply Systemic Functional Linguistics in some way or other.

(9) Grand Theories might serve as a foundation; in the specific analysis, Middle-Range Theories serve the aims better. The problem-oriented approach entails the use and testing of middle-range theories. Grand Theories result in large gaps between structure/ context and linguistic realizations (although some gaps must remain unbridgeable).

(10) Practice and application are aimed at. The results should be made available to experts in different fields and, as a second step, be applied, with the goal of changing certain discursive and social practices.

Main Research Agenda

Many of the basic assumptions of CDA that were salient in the early stages, and were elaborated in later development of the theory, are articulated in Kress's work. These include assumptions such as:

- language is a social phenomenon;
- not only individuals, but also institutions and social groupings, have specific meanings and values that are expressed in language in systematic ways;
- texts are the relevant units of language in communication;
- readers/hearers are not passive recipients in their relationship to texts;
- there are similarities between the language of science and the language of institutions, and so on. (*Kress* 1989)

Kress concentrates on the 'political economy' of representational media: that is, an attempt to understand how various societies value different modes of representation, and how they use these different modes of representation. A central aspect of this work is the attempt to understand the formation of the individual human being as a social individual in response to available 'representational resources'. His present position as part of an institute on educational research has meant that much of *Kress's* effort has gone into thinking about the content of educational curricula in terms of representational resources and their use by individuals in their constant transformation of their subjectivities, or in other words, the process usually called "learning". One by-product of this research interest has been his increasing involvement in overtly political issues, including the politics of culture. Moreover, he has been concerned with multi-modality and semiotics. Together with Theo van Leeuwen, Kress has developed a taxonomy, which allows the precise

description and interpretation of visual data (*Kress/ Van Leeuwen* 1996). This work has influenced research on the new media (see *Lemke* 2001, *Scollon* 2001).

The work of *Fowler et al.* (1979) has been cited to demonstrate the early foundations of CL. Later work of *Fowler* (1991, 1996) shows how tools provided by standard linguistic theories (a 1965 version of Chomskyan grammar, and Halliday's theory of Systemic Functional Grammar) can be used to uncover linguistic structures of power in texts. Not only in news discourses, but also in literary criticism Fowler illustrates that systematic grammatical devices function in establishing, manipulating and naturalising social hierarchies. Fowler concentrated on analyzing news discourses and in providing grammatical tools (transitivity and modality) for such an analysis.

Whether analysts with a critical approach prefer to focus on micro-linguistic features, macro-linguistic features, textual, discursive or contextual features, and whether their perspective is primarily philosophical, sociological or historical, in most studies there is some reference to Hallidayan Systemic Functional Grammar. This indicates that an understanding of the basic claims of Halliday's grammar and his approach to linguistic analysis is essential for a proper understanding of CDA. For an exposition of Halliday's contribution to the development of CL, one should consider the work of Halliday himself (1978, 1985), as well as the work of scholars who have worked very closely with Hallidayan Grammar, and have not only applied the theory, but also elaborated it. I refer readers specifically to *Kress* (1976), *Martin* (1992) and *Iedema* (1997, 1999). As early as 1970 M.A.K. Halliday had stressed the relationship between the grammatical system and the social and personal needs that language is required to serve (*Halliday* 1978, 142). Halliday distinguished three metafunctions of language which are continuously interconnected: firstly, the ideational function, through which language lends structure to experience. The ideational structure has a dialectical relationship with social structure, both reflecting and influencing it. Secondly, the interpersonal function, which constitutes relationships between the participants. And thirdly, the textual function, which constitutes coherence and cohesion in texts. Moreover, argumentation theory and rhetoric have been successfully combined with Functional Systemic Linguistics (see *Reisigl/ Wodak* 2001, *Muntigl/ Weiss/ Wodak* 2000, *Van Leeuwen/ Wodak* 1999).

Fairclough (1989) sets out the social theories underpinning CDA, and as in other early critical linguistic work, a variety of textual examples are analyzed to illustrate the field, its aims and methods of analysis. Later, *Fairclough* (1992, 1995) and *Chouliariki/ Fairclough* (1999) explain and elaborate some

advances in CDA, showing not only how the analytical framework for researching language in relation to power and ideology developed, but also how CDA is useful in disclosing the discursive nature of much contemporary social and cultural change. The language of the mass media in particular is scrutinized as a site of power, of struggle and also as a site where language is often apparently transparent. Media institutions often purport to be neutral, in that they provide space for public discourse, reflect states of affairs disinterestedly, and give the perceptions and arguments of the newsmakers. Fairclough shows the fallacy of such assumptions, and illustrates the mediating and constructing role of the media with a variety of examples. Most recently, *Fairclough* has been concerned with the "Language of New Labour" (2000) and the Language of the New Capitalism. His grammatical tools also relate to Halliday's Systemic Functional Linguistics, as well as to Conversational Analysis. Rarely does Fairclough undertake fieldwork himself. His examples most frequently illustrate theoretical claims; he has little interest in representative sampling or reliability/ validity of data corpora.

Van Dijk's earlier work in text linguistics and discourse analysis (1977, 1981) already shows the interest he takes in texts and discourses as basic units and social practices. Like other Critical Linguistic theorists, he traces the origins of linguistic interest in units of language larger than sentences and in text- and context-dependency of meanings. *Van Dijk/ Kintsch* (1983) considered the relevance of discourse to the study of language processing. Their development of a cognitive model of discourse understanding in individuals gradually developed into cognitive models for explaining the construction of meaning at a societal level. In the *Handbook of Discourse Analysis*, *van Di*jk (1985) collected the work of a variety of scholars for whom language and its function in discourse is variously the primary object of research, or a tool in the investigation of other social phenomena. It is in some sense a documentation of the 'state of the art' of critical linguistics in the mid-1980s, which then led to his new handbook (*van Dijk* 1997). *Tannen/ Schiffrin/ Hamilton* (2001) present the latest status quo in CDA, as well as *Titscher et al.* (2000), *Blommaert/ Bulcaen* (2000) and *Wodak* (2001 a,b). New questions, which I discuss below, have now become salient.

Van Dijk turns specifically to media discourse giving not only his own reflection on communication in the mass media (*van Dijk* 1986), but also bringing together the theories and applications of a variety of scholars interested in the production, uses and functions of media discourses (*van Dijk* 1985). In critically analyzing various kinds of discourses that encode prejudice, van Dijk's interest is in developing a theoretical model that will explain cognitive dis-

course processing mechanisms. (*Wodak/ van Dijk* 2000). Most recently, van Dijk has focussed on issues of racism and ideology (*van Dijk* 1998) and on an elaboration of a theory of context (*van Dijk* 2001). The socio-cognitive model by van Dijk is based on the assumptions that cognition mediates between "society" and "discourse". Both long-term and short-term memories as well as certain mental models shape our perception and comprehension of discursive practices and also imply stereotypes and prejudices, if such mental models become rigid and over-generalized. The methodology used is eclectic, based primarily on argumentation theory and semantic theories.

In the Vienna School of CDA, the investigation of language use in institutional settings is central (*Wodak* 1996, *Muntigl/ Weiss/ Wodak* 2000). A new focus on the necessity for an historical perspective is also introduced (the Discourse Historical Approach). A second important research focus of the "Vienna School of CDA" is the study of racism and anti-Semitism (see *Wodak et al.* 1990, 1994, 1999, *Wodak/ van Dijk* 2000). Thirdly, and of course connected to the latter two issues, there is the study of identity constructions and changes of identities at national and transnational levels.

The study for which the discourse-historical approach was actually developed, first attempted to trace in detail the constitution of an anti-Semitic stereotyped image, or "Feindbild", as it emerged in public discourse in the 1986 Austrian presidential campaign of Kurt Waldheim (*Wodak et al.* 1990, *Mitten* 1992, *Gruber* 1991). In order to be able to study the discourse about the "Waldheim Affair", "context" was unravelled into various dimensions. The research team, consisting of six researchers from three different fields (linguistics, psychology and history), decided in favour of a triangulatory approach, which made it possible to focus on the many different genres that were situated in the different political fields of action (recontextualization). Obviously these different fields had an impact on the analytical methods used and the interpretation of the data. Ultimately the team developed its own categories that led to the "discourse-historical" approach (see *Wodak/ Nowak/ Pelikan/ Gruber/ de Cillia/ Mitten* 1990).

The discourse-historical approach has been further elaborated in a number of more recent studies, for example, in a study on racist discrimination against immigrants from Romania and in a study on the discourse about nation and national identity in Austria.

The latter study was concerned with the analysis of the relationships between the discursive construction of national sameness and the discursive construction of difference leading to political and social exclusion of specific out-

groups. The findings suggested that discourses about nations and national identities rely on at least four types of discursive macro-strategies (see the distinction between the four general social macro-aims), namely, constructive strategies (aiming at the construction of national identities), preservative or justificatory strategies (aiming at the conservation and reproduction of national identities or narratives of identity), transformative strategies (aiming at the change of national identities) and destructive strategies (aiming at the dismantling of national identities). Depending on the context – that is to say, on the social field or domain in which the "discursive events" related to the topic under investigation take place – one aspect or other connected with these strategies is brought into prominence. [8] The research on Discourse, Politics, Identity is now located in a research centre at the Austrian Academy of Sciences (see www.oeaw.ac.at/wittgenstein).

Recognition of the contribution of all the aspects of the communicative context to text meaning, as well as a growing awareness in media studies generally of the importance of non-verbal aspects of texts, has turned attention to semiotic devices in discourse other than the linguistic ones. Pioneering work on the interaction between the verbal and visual in texts and discourse, as well as on the meaning of images, has been done by Theo van Leeuwen. (*Kress/ van Leeuwen* 1996). Particularly the theory put forward by *Kress/ van Leeuwen* (1996) should be mentioned here, as this provides a useful framework for considering the communicative potential of visual devices in the media. (see *Anthonissen* 2001, *Scollon* 2001). Van Leeuwen has studied film and television production as well as Hallidayan linguistics. His principal publications are concerned with topics such as the intonation of disc jockeys and newsreaders, the language of television interviews and newspaper reporting, and more recently, the semiotics of visual communication and music. His approach has increasingly led him into the field of education. Van Leeuwen distinguishes two kinds of relations between discourses and social practices: "discourse itself [as] social practice, discourse as a form of action, as something people do to or for or with each other. And there is discourse in the Foucauldian sense, discourse as a way of representing social practice(s), as a form of knowledge, as the things people say about social practice(s)." (1993, 193) "Critical discourse analysis", according to van Leeuwen, is, or should be, concerned with both these aspects: "with discourse as the instrument of power

---

[8] For more details see *Wodak/ de Cillia/ Reisigl/ Liebhart/ Hofstätter/ Kargl* 1998, *Reisigl* 1998, *De Cillia/ Reisigl/ Wodak* 1999, *Wodak/ de Cillia/ Reisigl/ Liebhart* 1999; *Reisigl/ Wodak* 2001.

and control as well as with discourse as the instrument of the social construc-
tion of reality" (ibid). Van Leeuwen developed a most influential methodo-
logical tool: the Actors Analysis (1993). This taxonomy allows for the analy-
sis of (both written and oral) data, related to agency in a very differentiated
and validated way. The taxonomy has since then been widely applied in data
analysis.

National Socialist language became the object of critical philological observa-
tions by Viktor Klemperer (*Klemperer* 1970_). Utz Maas, however, was the
first to subject the every-day linguistic practice of National Socialism to an in-
depth analysis: he used NS texts to exemplify his approach of
"Lesweisenanalyse" (*Maas* 1984, 1989a, 1989b). His historical "argumenta-
tion analysis", based on the theories of Michel Foucault, demonstrates how
discourse is determined by society, i.e. in what may be termed "a social prac-
tice". In his analysis of language practices during the National Socialist re-
gime between 1932 and 1938 he showed how the discursive practices of so-
ciety in Germany were impacted by the NS discourse characterized by social-
revolutionary undertones. Nazi discourse had superseded almost all forms of
language (practices), a fact that made it difficult for an individual who did not
want to cherish the tradition of an unworldly Romanticism to use language in
a critical-reflective way. Discourse is basically understood as the result of
collusion: the conditions of political, social and linguistic practice impose
themselves practically behind the backs of the subjects, while the actors do not
see through the game (cf. also Bourdieu's '*violence symbolique*'). Discourse
analysis identifies the rules which make a text, for example, a fascist text. In
the same way as grammar characterizes the structure of sentences, discourse
rules characterize utterances/ texts that are acceptable within a certain practice.
The focus is not on National Socialist language per se, but the aim is to record
and analyze the spectrum of linguistic relations based on a number of texts
dealing with various spheres of life. These texts represent a complicated net-
work of similarities, which overlap and intersect. This is why it is also
important to do justice to the "polyphony" of texts resulting from the fact that
societal contradictions are inscribed into texts. Texts from diverse social and
political contexts (cooking recipes, local municipal provisions on agriculture,
texts by NS politicians, but also by critics of this ideology, who are ultimately
involved in the dominant discourse) are analyzed in a sample representative of
the quantity of possible texts of NS discourse (discourse in the sense of
linguistic "staging" of a particular social practice).

The method of "reading analysis" proposed by Maas may be described as a
concentric hermeneutic approach to the corpus in five steps (statement of the

self-declared content of the text, description of the "staging" (*Inszenierung*) of the content, analysis of the sense of "staging", provisional conclusion of the analysis, and development of competing forms of reading, *Maas* 1984, 18). In this context it should be stressed that competing readings of texts may result from disclosing the difference between self-declared and latent content. Applications of this method, which is not very widely disseminated in the scientific community (*Titscher et al.* 1998, 232), may be found in Januschek's analysis of Jörg Haider's allusions to the NS discourse (*Januschek* 1992) and in Sauer's analysis of texts of the Nazi occupation of the Netherlands (*Sauer* 1989, 1994) (for more details see *Wodak/ De Cillia*, in press). [9]

The Duisburg School of CDA (*Jäger* 1993, 1999) draws on Foucault's notion of discourse (according to *Jäger* 1999, 116) discourse is "materiality sui generis" and discourse theory is a "materialistic cultural theory") on the one hand, and Alexej N. Leontjev's "speech activity theory" (*Sprechtätigkeitstheorie*, *Leontjew* 1984) and Jürgen Link's "collective symbolism" (*Link* 1988) on the other hand. As institutionalized and conventionalized speech modes, discourses express societal power relations, which in turn are impacted by discourses. This "overall discourse" of society, which could be visualised as a *"diskursives Gewimmel"* (literally: "discursive swarming"), becomes

---

[9] Ehlich 1998 offers contributions of different methodological approaches to "language during fascism" , including content analyses, language statistics, historical philology, semantics and stylistics, based on linguistic-sociological approaches but also the "argumentation analysis" with its ideological criticism, as well as pragmatic text and discourse analyses. In his introductory statement Ehlich stresses the central role of linguistic activity during fascism, in which verbal action was de facto limited to acclamation, while the contra-factual impression of self-motivated activity was created in a setting of mass communication. From a perspective of "linguistic pragmatics oriented towards societal analysis" (*Ehlich* 1989, 31), he identified the characteristics of fascist linguistic action: the strategy of making communication phatic; the propositional reduction of communication, which in turn is closely linked to the promise of a "simple world"; the order as another central pattern of linguistic action characterised inter alia by the systematic elimination of the listener's decision and the listener's consciousness and implying a "mandatory speechlessness of the addressee". Linguistic actions serving the purpose of denunciation become extremely common, a fact that has decisive effects on elementary linguistic actions such as jokes entailing life-threatening risks. Given this mental terror, many people demonstrated "conformity" in their linguistic actions as a form of self-protection, and sometimes linguistic action turned into linguistic suffering mainly expressed by silence. Against this background, only a minority managed to transform suffering into linguistic resistance, which had to be anonymous and subversive.

comprehensible in different discourse strands (composed of discourse frag-
ments from the same subject) at different discourse levels (science, politics,
media, and so on). Every discourse is historically embedded, and has reper-
cussions on current and future discourse. In addition to the above levels, the
structure of discourse may be dissected into: special discourse vs. interdis-
course, discursive events and discursive context, discourse position, overall
societal discourse and interwoven discourses, themes, bundles of discourse
strands, and history, present and future of discourse strands. DA makes a
contribution to (media) impact research, as it analyzes the impact of discourse
on individual and collective consciousness. Individual discourse fragments
that are as characteristic as possible are selected from the archived material for
concrete analysis. Selection is based on a structural analysis of the identified
discourse strand. These fragments are analyzed in five steps (institutional
framework, text "surface", linguistic-rhetorical means, programmatic-ideo-
logical messages, and interpretation), for which a wealth of concrete questions
regarding the text is formulated (*Jäger* 1999, 175-187). The uniformity of the
hegemonic discourse makes it possible for analysis to require only a "rela-
tively small number of discourse fragments". *Jäger* (1999) offers concrete
model analyses dealing with every-day racism, the analysis of the "discourse
strand of biopower" in a daily newspaper, and Margret Jäger's analysis of in-
terwoven discourses relating to the "criticism of patriarchy in immigration
discourse". The discourse of the so-called "new right" in Germany was ana-
lyzed by *Jäger/ Jäger* (1993) who based their research on different right-wing
print media. They identified important common characteristics (e.g. specific
symbols, 'ethno-pluralism' [apartheid], aggressiveness, anti-democratic atti-
tudes, and so on) as well as significant linguistic and stylistic differences due
to the different target groups of the newspapers.

The combination of political science and political philosophy (predominantly
under a strong Marxist influence) on the one hand and French linguistics on
the other hand is a typical feature of French discourse analysis. Basically, two
different approaches may be distinguished.

The first is 'political lexicometry', a computer-aided statistical approach to
political lexicon, developed at the École Normale Supérieure at Saint-Cloud.
A text corpus (e.g. texts of the French Communist Party) has been prepared.
Texts are then compared on the basis of relative frequency (cf: *Bonnafous/
Tournier* 1995) One study shows, for example, how the relative frequency of
the words 'travailleur' and 'salarié' varies significantly between French trade
unions, reflecting different political ideologies, and how the frequency

changes over time. (*Groupe de Saint-Cloud*, 1982, *Bonnafous/ Tournier* 1995).

Althusser's ideological theory and Foucault's theory were major points of reference for the second tendency in French discourse analysis, notably the work of *Michel Pêcheux* (1982). Discourse is the place where language and ideology meet, and discourse analysis is the analysis of ideological dimensions of language use, and of the materialization in language of ideology. Both the words used and the meanings of words vary according to the class struggle position from which they are used – according to the 'discursive formation' they are located within. For instance, the word 'struggle' itself is particularly associated with a working class political voice, and its meaning in that discursive formation is different from its meanings when used from other positions. Pêcheux's main focus was political discourse in France, especially the relationship between social-democratic and communist discourse within left political discourse. Pêcheux stresses the ideological effects of discursive formations in positioning people as social subjects. Echoing Althusser, he suggests that people are placed in the 'imaginary' position of sources of their own discourse, whereas actually their discourse and indeed they themselves are the effects of their ideological positioning. The sources and processes of their own positioning are hidden from people. They are typically not aware of speaking/ writing from within a particular discursive formation. Moreover, the discursive formations within which people are positioned are themselves shaped by the 'complex whole in dominance' of discursive formations, which Pêcheux calls 'interdiscourse' – but people are not aware of that shaping. Radical change in the way people are positioned in discourse can only come from political revolution.

Pêcheux and his colleagues changed their views on this and other issues in the late 1970s and early 1980s (*Pêcheux* 1988, *Maingueneau* 1987). The influence of Foucault increased, as did that of Bakhtin. Studies began to emphasize the complex mixing of discursive formations in texts, and the heterogeneity and ambivalence of texts (see, for example, *Courtine* 1981). Some other French researchers investigated detailed rhetorical patterns, for example in the presidential campaigns of 1988 and 1995 (*Groupe de Saint Cloud* 1995). Also the influence of Anglo-Saxon pragmatics is prominent, and that of the French linguist *Benveniste* (1974), whose work on 'énonciation' focused on deictic phenomena. In this framework, Achard produced detailed accounts of the political functioning of a very wide range of text types (*Achard* 1995). (see *Fairclough/ Wodak* 1997 for more details).

6. Open questions and Perspectives

Over the years, several issues have arisen as important research areas which have not yet been adequately discussed (see *Wodak/ Meyer* 2001), which certainly present problems not only for CDA but for text and discourse analysis in a much broader sense:

- The problem of operationalizing theories and relating the linguistic dimension with the social dimensions (problem of mediation);
- The linguistic theory to be applied: often enough, a whole mixed bag of linguistic indicators and variables were used to analyze texts with no theoretical notions or grammar theory in the background:
- The notion of "context", which is often defined either very broadly or very narrowly: how much extra-textual information do we need to analyze texts, how many and which theories have what kind of impact on the concrete analysis and interpretation of texts?
- The accusation of being biased – how are certain readings of text justified? To justify certain interpretations, the decisions for a particular analysis should be made more explicit.
- Inter- or trans-disciplinarity have not yet been truly integrated into text analysis.

Bibliography

Anthonissen, C. (2001): "On the Effectivity of Media Censorship: An Analysis of Linguistic, Paralinguistic and other Communicative Devices used to defy Media Restrictions". Unpublished PhD thesis. University of Vienna.

Achard, P. (1995): "Formation discursive, dialogisme et sociologie". In: Langages, 117, 82-95.

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

Beaugrande, R. de/ Dressler, W. U. (1981): Einführung in die Textlinguistik. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Benveniste, E. (1966/1974): Problèmes de linguistique générale, 2 vols. Paris: Gallimard.

Benke, G. (2000): "Diskursanalyse als sozialwissenschaftliche Untersuchungsmethode". SWS Rundschau(2), 140-162.

Billig, M. (2002): Critical, Discourse and Analysis. In: *Weiss, G./ Wodak, R.* (eds.): CDA and Interdisciplinarity. London: MacMillan (in press).

Billig, M./ Schegloff, E. A. (1999): "Debate: Critical discourse analysis and Conversation analysis" In: Discourse & Society 10 (4), 543-582.

Blommaert, J./ Bulcaen, C. (2000): "Critical Discourse Analysis". Annual Rev. of Anthropology 2000, 29, 447-466.

Blommaert, J./ Verschueren, J. (1998): The Diversity Debate. London: Routledge.

Bonnafous, S./ Tournier, M. (1995): "Analyse du discours, lexicométrie, communication et politique". In: Mots, 117, 67-81.

Bourdieu, P. (1987): Die Kritik der feinen Unterschiede. Frankfurt a. M.: Suhrkamp.

Brünner G./ Gräfen , G. (eds.) (1993), Texte und Diskurse. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.

Chomsky, N. (1957): Syntactic Structures. Den Haag: Mouton.

Chouliaraki, L./ Fairclough, N. (1999): Discourse in Late Modernity: Rethinking Critical Discourse Analysis. Edinburgh: EUP.

Connerton, P. (1976): How Societies Remember. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (1996 reprint).

Courtine, J.-J. (1981): Analyse du discours politique. In: Langages, 62.

de Cillia, R./ Reisigl, M. / Wodak, R. (1999): "The Discursive Construction of National Identities". In: Discourse and Society 10/1/1999. 149-173.

Eagleton, T. (1994) (ed.): Ideology. London: Longman.

Ehlich, K. (ed.) (1989): Sprache im Faschismus – linguistisches Objekt, methodologische Probleme. In: *Wodak, R./ Menz, F.* (eds.): Sprache in der Politik, Politik in der Sprache, Klagenfurt: Drava, 20-41.

Ehlich, K. (ed.) (1998): Sprache im Faschismus. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.

Fairclough, N. (1989): Language and Power. London: Longman.

Fairclough, N. (1992): Discourse and Social Change. London: Polity.

Fairclough, N. (1995): Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language [Language in Social Life Series]. London.

Fairclough, N. (2000): "The discourse of social exclusion". In: *Reisigl, M./ Wodak, R.* (eds.) The Semiotics of Racism. Approaches in Critical Discourse Analysis. Vienna: Passagen Verlag, 65-84.

Fairclough, N./Kress, G. (1993): Critical Discourse Analysis.

Fairclough, N./ Wodak, R. (1997): 'Critical Discourse Analysis'. In: Introduction to Discourse Analysis., *van Dijk, T.A.* (ed.), London, 258-284.

Fay, B. (1987): Critical Social Science. London: Polity Press.

Fowler, R. (1991): "Critical Linguistics". In: *Halmkjaer, K.* (ed.), The Linguistic Encyclopedia. London/ New York: Routledge. 89-93.

Fowler, R. (1996): Linguistic Criticism, Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

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

Groupe de Saint-Cloud (1982): La Parole syndicale: étude du vocabulaire confédéral des centrales ouvrières françaises (1971-1976). Paris: PUF.

Gruber, H. (1991): Antisemitismus im Mediendiskurs. Die Affäre "Waldheim" in der Tagespresse, Wiesbaden/ Opladen: Deutscher Universitätsverlag.

Habermas, J. (1967): Erkenntnis und Interesse (Knowledge and Interest). Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.

Habermas, Jürgen (1972) Knowledge and Human Interests. London: Heinemann.

Halliday, M.A.K. (1978): Language as Social Semiotic. London: Edward Arnold.

Halliday, M.A.K. (1985): Introduction to Functional Grammar. London: Edward Arnold.

Hymes, D. (1971): "The ethnography of speaking". In: Anthropology and Human Behavior.

Iedema, R. (1997): Interactional dynamics and social change: Planning as morphogenesis. Unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Sydney, Australia.

Iedema, R. (1999): "Introduction: Organizational discourse and practices". In: Discourse & Society, 10, 15-20.

Iedema, R./ Wodak, R. (1999): "Introduction: organizational discourses and practices". In: Discourse & Society, Vol 10(1), 5-19.

Jäger, S. (1993): Kritische Diskursanalyse. Eine Einführung. Duisburg: DISS.

Jäger, S. (1999): Kritische Diskursanalyse. Eine Einführung. Duisburg: DISS.

Jäger, M./ Jäger, S. (1993): "Verstrickungen – Der rassistische Diskurs und seine Bedeutung für den politischen Gesamtdiskurs in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland". In: *Jäger, S./ Link, V.* (eds.): Die vierte Gewalt. Rassismus und die Medien, Duisburg: DISS, 49-79.

Jäger, S. et al. (2001) Kritische Diskursanalyse. Duisburg: Diss.

Januschek, F. (1992): Rechts-populismus und NS-Anspielungen am Beispiel des österreichischen Politikers Jörg Haider. DISS-Texte Nr. 15, Köln: GNN.

Klemperer, V. (1975_ /1947): LTI Lingua Tertii Imperii. Die Sprache des Dritten Reiches. Leipzig: Reclam.

Kress, G. (1976): System and Function in Language. London: Oxford University Press.

Kress , G. (1989): "History and Language: towards a social account of language change". In: Journal of Pragmatics 13: 445-466.

Kress, G. (1990): "Critical Discourse Analysis". In: Annual Review of Anthropology, Vol.11, 84-97.

Kress, G. (1993): "Against arbitrariness: the social production of the sign as a foundational issue". In: Critical Discourse Analysis. Discourse & Society, 4(2), 169-193.

Kress, G./ van Leeuwen, T. (1996): Reading Images, London: Routledge .

Kress, G./ Hodge, B. (1979): Language as Ideology. London: Routledge.

Krings, H. et al. (1973): Handbuch philosophischer Grundbegriffe. Kösel.

Labov, W. (1972): Language in the Inner City. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Lemke, J. (1995) Textual Politics: Discourse and Social Dynamics, London.

Lemke, J. (2002), Cognitive Linguistics and Traversals. In: Wodak, R. (ed.) (2002): CDA and Cognition. Special Issue Folia Linguistica (in press).

Leontjew, A.N. (1984): "Der allgemeine Tätigkeitsbegriff". In: D. Viehweger (ed.): Grundfragen einer Theorie der sprachlichen Tätigkeit. Berlin, 13-30.

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

Link, J. (1988): "Über Kollektivsymbolik im politischen Diskurs und ihren Anteil an totalitären Tendenzen". In: kultuRRevolution, 17/18, 47-53.

Maas, U. (1984): Als der Geist der Gemeinschaft eine Sprache fand. Sprache im Nationalsozialismus. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.

Maas, U. (1989a): Sprachpolitik und politische Sprachwissenschaft. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.

Maas, U. (1989b): "Sprache im Nationalsozialismus. Analyse einer Rede eines Studentenfunktionärs". In: *Ehlich, K.* (ed.) Sprache im Faschismus, 162-197.

Maingueneau, D. (1987): Nouvelles tendances en analyse du discours. Paris: Hachette.

Martin, J.R. (1992): English text: System and Structure. Philadelphia: Benjamins.

Martín Rojo, L. / Whittaker, R. (eds.) (1998): Poder – Decir o el poder de los discursos. Madrid: Arrecife.

Martin Rojo, L./ Van Dijk, T.A. (1997). "There was a problem and it was solved!" Legitimation the expulsion of 'illegal immigrants in Spanish parliamentary discourse'. In: Discourse and Society, Vol. 8/4, 523-567.

Mey, J. (1974): Pragmatics. Oxford: Blackwell (reprint 1994).

Mitten, R. (1992) The Politics of Antisemitic Prejudice. The Waldheim Phenomenon in Austria, Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Muntigl, P./ Weiss, G./ Wodak, R. (2000): European Union Discourses on Unemployment. An interdisciplinary approach to employment policy-making and organizational change. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Pêcheux, M. (1982): Language, semantics and ideology. London: Macmillan.

Pêcheux, M. (1988): Discourse – structure or event. In: *C. Nelson/ L. Grossberg* (eds.) Marxism and the interpretation of culture. London: Macmillan.

Pedro, E.R. (1997): Discourse Analysis. Lisbon.

Pollak, A. (2002): Zwischen und Erinnerung und Tabu. Die diskursive Konstruktion des Mythos von der "sauberen Wehrmacht" in den österreichischen Medien. In: *Wodak, R.* (ed.) (2002): CDA and Cognition. Special Issue Folia Linguistica (in press).

Reisigl, M. (1998): "50 Jahre Zweite Republik" – Zur diskursiven Konstruktion der österreichischen Identität in politischen Gedenkreden. In: *Panagl, O.* (ed.): Fahnenwörter in der Politik – Kontinuitäten und Brüche. Wien: Böhlau. 217-251.

Reisigl, M./ Wodak, R. (2001): Discourse and Discrimination. London: Routledge.

Sauer, C. (1989): "Nazi-Deutsch für Niederländer. Das Konzept der NS-Sprachpolitik in der Deutschen Zeitung in den Niederlanden 1940-1945". In: *Ehlich, K.* (ed.): Sprache im Faschismus, Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 237-288.

Sauer, C. (1995): "Sprachwissenschaft und NS-Faschismus. Lehren aus der sprachwissenschaftlichen Erforschung des Sprachgebrauchs deutscher Nationalsozialisten und Propagandisten für den mittel- und osteuropäischen Umbruch?" In: *Steinke, K.* (ed.) Die Sprache der Diktaturen und Diktatoren, Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 9-96.

Scollon, R. (2001): Mediated Discourse. The Nexus of Practice. London: Routledge (in press).

Schiffrin, D. (1993): Approaches to Discourse Analysis. Oxford: Blackwells.

Tannen, D./ Schiffrin, D./ Hamilton, H. (eds.) (2001): Handbook of Discourse Analysis. Oxford: Blackwell.

Thompson, J.B. (1988): Critical Hermeneutics, 4th edn. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Thompson, J.B. (1990): Ideology and modern culture. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Titscher, S./ Wodak, R./ Meyer, M./ Vetter, E. (1998): Methoden der Textanalyse. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.

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

Van Dijk, T.A. (1977): Text and Context: Exploration in the Semantics and Pragmatics of Discourse. London: Longman.

Van Dijk, T.A. (1981): Studies in the pragmatics of discourse. The Hague/ Berlin: Mouton.

Van Dijk , T.A. (1985): Prejudice in Discourse. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Van Dijk, T.A. (ed.) (1986): Discourse and Communication: New Approaches to the Analysis of Mass Media Discourse and Communication. Berlin/ New York: de Gruyter.

Van Dijk, T.A. (1993): ”Principles of critical discourse analysis“. In: Discourse & Society, 4 (2), 249-283.

Van Dijk, T.A. (1997): Discourse as Social Interaction. London: Sage.

Van Dijk, T.A.(1998): Ideology. A multidisciplinary study. London: Sage.

van Dijk, Teun A. (2001): ”Critical Discourse Analysis“. In: *Tannen, D./ Schiffrin, D./ Hamilton, H.* (eds.): Handbook of Discourse Analysis. Oxford: Blackwell.

Van Dijk, T.A./Kintsch, W. (1983): Strategies of discourse comprehension. New York: Academic Press.

Van Leeuwen, T. (1993). Language and Representation – The Recontextualisation of Participants, Activities and Reactions. Sydney: University of Sydney (Department of Linguistics: Thesis).

Van Leeuwen, T./Wodak, R. (1999): Legitimizing immigration control. A discourse-historical analysis. In: Discourse Studies Vol. 1 (1), 83-118.

Vass, E. (1994), Diskursanalyse als interdisziplinäres Forschungsgebiet. Diplomarbeit, Univ. Wien.

Volosinov, V.I. (1973): Marxism and the Philosophy of Language (1928). New York: Seminar Press.

Weiss, G./ Wodak, R. (2002): Visions of European Identities. Frankfurt am Main: Velbrück (in press).

Wodak, R. (1996a): Disorders in Discourse. London: Longman.

Wodak, R. (1996b): The genesis of racist discourse in Austria since 1989. In: *Caldas-Coulthard, C.R./ Coulthard, M.* (eds.): Texts and practices – Readings in critical discourse analysis. London: Routledge, 107-128.

Wodak, R. (2000): ”Recontextualisation and the transformation of meaning: a critical discourse analysis of decision making in EU-meetings about employment policies“. In: *Sarangi, S./ Coulthard, M.* (eds.): Discourse and Social Life. Harlow: Pearson Education, 185-206.

Wodak, R. (2001a): ”What CDA is about – a summary of its history, important concepts and its developments“. In: *Wodak, R./ Meyer, M.* (eds.): Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis. London: Sage.

Wodak, R. (2001b): "The discourse-histocical approach". In: *R.Wodak M.Meyer* (eds.): Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis. London: Sage.

Wodak, R. (2001c) Politikwissenschaft und Diskursanalyse: Diskurs in/ der Politik. In: *Markovits, A. S./ Rosenberger, S. K.* (eds.): Demokratieforschung. Festschrift für Anton Pelinka (in press).

Wodak, R. (2001d): "I'm a very special bird": Ideological gender conflicts and identity dilemmas with EU parliamentarians. Keynote at the 4th Scandinavian Conference on Language and Gender, October 2000, (in press).

Wodak, R. (2002) Critical Discourse Analysis. In: Schiffrin, D. (ed) Handbook in Discourse Analysis, Oxford, Blackwells (in press).

Wodak, R./ Pelikan, J./ Nowak, P./ Gruber, H./ de Cillia, R./ Mitten, R. (1990): "Wir sind alle unschuldige Täter!" Diskurshistorische Studien zum Nachkriegsantisemitismus, Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.

Wodak, R./ Menz, F./ Mitten, R./ Stern, F. (1994): Die Sprachen der Vergangenheiten: öffentliches Gedenken in österreichischen und deutschen Medien, Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.

Wodak, R./ de Cillia, R./ Reisigl, M./ Liebhart, K./ Hofstätter, K./ Kargl, M. (1998): Zur diskursiven Konstruktion nationaler Identität, Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.

Wodak, R./ de Cillia, R./ Reisigl, M./ Liebhart, K. (1999): The Discursive Construction of National Identity. Edinburgh: University Press.

Wodak, R./ Reisigl, M. (1999): "Discourse and Racism: European Perspectives". In: Annu. Rev. Anthropol., 28, 175-199.

Wodak, R./ van Dijk, T. (eds.) (2000): Racism at the Top. Klagenfurt: Drava.

Wodak, R./ Meyer, M. (eds.) (2001): Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis. London: Sage.

Wodak, R./ Iedema, R. (2001): "Communication in Institutions". In: Handbook of the Science of Language and Society Sociolinguistics – Soziolinguistik, Berlin/ New York: de Gruyter, (in press).

Wodak, R./ de Cillia, R. (2001): "Discourse and Politics". In: Handbuch Soziolinguistik, Berlin/ New York: de Gruyter (in press).

Adresse der Verfasserin

Wittgenstein Forschungsschwerpunkt
”Diskurs, Politik, Identität“
Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften
Research Center ”Discourse, Politics, Identity“
Austrian Academy of Sciences
Strohgasse 45
1030 Vienna , Austria
Tel: xx43-1-7102510-6206
Ruth.Wodak@oeaw.ac.at