*Language in Society* **35**, 613–628. Printed in the United States of America

# REVIEWS

*Language in Society* **35** (2006). Printed in the United States of America
DOI: 10.1017/S0047404506210285

RUTH WODAK & PAUL CHILTON (eds.), *A new agenda in (critical) discourse analysis: Theory, methodology and interdisciplinarity*. Discourse Approaches to Politics, Society, and Culture, 13. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2005. Pp. xi, 322. Hb $138.00.

Reviewed by SEAN ZDENEK
*English, Texas Tech University*
*Lubbock, TX 79409*
*sean.zdenek@ttu.edu*

The title of this book implicitly raises a number of important questions about the relationships among discourse analysis (DA), critical discourse analysis (CDA), and interdisciplinarity: Is CDA one approach to analyzing text and talk, or is it (by implication of the ambiguous parenthetical reference in the book's title) somehow merging with (an increasingly more critical) DA? To what extent does or should (C)DA embrace interdisciplinary approaches to treating language in use? Finally (and perhaps most compelling of all), what is this new agenda, what is wrong with the old agenda, and why is a new agenda needed at this time? Overall, the book does a fair to good job of addressing these questions.

Readers will most likely identify the first editor, Ruth Wodak, with CDA and thus draw some preliminary conclusions about how the book answers the questions implicitly raised in the title. According to one of the contributors, Teun A. van Dijk, "CDA specifically deals with the study of the discursive reproduction of power abuse, with forms of domination and social inequality. This also means that CDA needs to make explicit the way socially shared beliefs are discursively reproduced and how such beliefs are abused in the maintenance and legitimation of domination" (pp. 87–88). One might thus assume, given the editor's interests and editorial influence, that the book is concerned to a large extent with CDA, especially with promoting an increasingly interdisciplinary approach to CDA. Indeed, Wodak's influence on the collection is unmistakable. For example, we learn in the Acknowledgments that the book grew out of a workshop organized in 2003 by Wodak at the University of Vienna and entitled "New Agenda in CDA." Moreover, the majority of the essays in Part I are written by well-known CDA scholars, while the majority of essays in Part II are written by researchers who worked under the direction of Wodak at the University of Vienna and who have been influenced by her "discourse-historical"

© 2006 Cambridge University Press 0047-4045/06 $12.00 

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404506220281 Published online by Cambridge University Press

approach (see the essays by Krżyzanowski, Oberhuber, and Bärenreuter). Wodak also contributes a chapter to Part II, cowritten with Gilbert Weiss. Finally, one of the three essays in Part III, by Irene Bellier, bears the clear stamp of Wodak's influence, as evidenced through in-text citations.

The book's 13 chapters are organized into three parts. In Part I, "Interdisciplinarity and (C)DA," contributors draw on the trope of interdisciplinarity to build a new agenda for CDA. Some of the biggest names in the field of (C)DA contribute essays to Part I: Theo van Leeuwen, Paul Chilton, Norman Fairclough, Teun A. van Dijk, and Ron Scollon & Suzie Wong Scollon. Not surprisingly, the essays in Part I are also the best in the book. They raise important questions about the very viability of CDA (Chilton), the need for greater interdisciplinarity in CDA research (van Leeuwen, Fairclough), and the relationship among cognition, texts, and action (Chilton, van Dijk, Scollon & Scollon). Chilton's essay is a must-read. Taking seriously the call for greater interdisciplinarity in CDA research, Chilton argues that CDA scholars (with the notable exception of van Dijk) have "neglect[ed] the cognitive aspect of communication" and thus "may be incapable of going beyond description" (44). By drawing on a "blend of blending theory and cognitive evolutionary psychology" (41), Chilton develops a cognitive approach to ideology and concludes, tentatively but provocatively, that "CDA as an academic and pedagogical enterprise might not be necessary at all" (31) because "humans may already have a critical instinct, even perhaps something like a [cognitive] module for CDA" (43). What "prevents people using their innate cheater-detecting logico-rhetorical modules to protect their own interests" (45) is not a cognitive deficit per se but "economic forces or socio-political institutions that restrict freedom of expression and freedom of access to information" (45). If this is true, then what is needed is "historical, social, economic and political analysis not the analysis of language itself" (45–46).

Chilton makes a compelling case for interdisciplinarity in CDA to address neglected fields such as psychology and cognitive science. The cognitive dimension is addressed in two other essays in Part I. Van Dijk offers a model of "the way knowledge in discourse production and comprehension is managed as a function of context" (72). For van Dijk, the interface between context models and common knowledge among speakers and listeners (or readers and writers) has not been adequately theorized. Van Dijk's theory hinges on what he calls a "K-device," which "calculat[es] what the recipients know at each moment of a communication or interaction" (76). He applies his model very briefly to knowledge management in CDA and to a news article about the Israel-Palestine conflict. Three implications for CDA are worth noting here: Symbolic elites (e.g., journalists) may presume that "ideologically based beliefs [are] certified knowledge of the community" (88), treat others as ignorant by being "too explicit" (which van Dijk calls a form of domination; 89), and/or assume that "knowledge is *only* conveyed by elite discourse" (89).



https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404506220281 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The essay by Scollon & Scollon is also concerned with the cognitive dimension, specifically the ways in which discourse is internalized as action, and action is externalized as discourse. For the authors, the "weak link [for CDA] in this chain of discourse and action, of action and discourse is the psychological one" (101). They argue that language theorists have been too quick to embrace the concept of "habitus" as an explanation for how discourse may be internalized over time through a sequence of actions (106). In place of "habitus" they offer the work of Nishida Kitaro on the "historical body," since Kitaro's work arguably provides a better link between psychological and social theory. Bringing these ideas to bear on the question of interdisciplinarity, Scollon & Scollon suggest that the links among discourse, actors, and actions "are the minimal necessary units for our interdisciplinary development of what have largely been independent academic disciplines" (111).

The other two essays in Part I focus on the question of interdisciplinarity and how we might more fully integrate discourse analysis with other disciplines. Van Leeuwen presents three models of interdisciplinarity (centralist, pluralist, and integrationist), and suggests that the integrationist model more fully realizes the goal of leveraging the expertise of a number of disciplines to solve common problems through a common vocabulary. Fairclough's essay might be read as an application of the integrationist model. For Fairclough, interdisciplinary research should aim for a "dialogue" between disciplines in which each discipline develops through an encounter with the logic of the other(s). This is the essence of "transdisciplinarity."

The essays in Part II, "Implementing interdisciplinarity," clearly reflect the influence of Wodak (with the exception of that by Peter Muntigl & Adam Horvath). In the opening essay of Part II, Wodak & Gilbert Weiss discuss their theoretical framework for explaining European identities and European Union (EU) discourses. This framework is the result of an interdisciplinary approach, but one that still lacks a "uniform theoretical framework" for "reconciling different (sociological and linguistic) perspectives without reducing them to one another" (125). Wodak & Weiss offer steps for addressing this "mediation problem," steps that might be read in terms of Fairclough's earlier call for transdisciplinarity. The next three essays in this section take up the topic of European identity. All are written by younger scholars who worked under Wodak's direction at the "Discourse, Politics, Identity" research center at the University of Vienna. The essays by Michał Krżyzanowski and Florian Oberhuber are in fact different sides of the same research project (167): Krżyzanowski reports on the ways in which European identity is mediated through the discourses of the European Convention; Oberhuber focuses on the "*context* of Convention discourse" (165). Since both essays are influenced by Wodak's "discourse-historical approach" (142, 166), they provide examples of Wodak's methodology in action. Both essays also build on the concept of "mainstreaming," in which the discourse of the European Convention is arguably shaped by an "overriding ide-



https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404506220281 Published online by Cambridge University Press

ology" (150), and they suggest how the ideal of "deliberative democracy" is not realized in practice (173). Bärenreuter also takes up the topic of European identity as a function of popular/news discourse in which "discourses on European issues are closely intertwined with discourses on national identities" (191). For those readers specifically interested in EU issues and the ongoing construction of a new European identity, and especially for those who are also interested in Wodak's influence on CDA, these four essays raise important questions, offer insightful readings of interactions, and open avenues for further exploration.

The final four essays in the book (the last in Part II and the three in Part III) might be read as an invitation to assess how well the questions raised in Part I are taken up by scholars who are not so closely tied to or influenced by Wodak's research agenda. The last essay in Part II, by Muntigl & Horvath on "Language, psychotherapy and client change," does an excellent job of implementing interdisciplinarity. The authors adopt an integrationist perspective (borrowing from van Leeuwen) in which linguistic theory and psychotherapy research co-evolve. By bringing together the linguistic and relationship levels under "a more general *semiotic* level" (234), the authors implicitly suggest another way in which Fairclough's transdisciplinary ideal might be realized.

The three essays that comprise Part III, "Inside and outside traditional disciplines," are worthwhile insofar as they provide a forum for scholars from outside the field of discourse studies to reflect on its impact on their own disciplines and research. But I suspect that discourse analysts and others interested in discourse studies will find them lacking for at least two reasons: They do not analyze examples of discourse at anywhere near the level of detail discourse analysts will expect (for contrast, see the essay by Muntigl & Horvath), and they fit unevenly, and sometimes not at all, into the larger discussions that make up the book, especially the issues raised in Part I.

Overall, I would recommend *A new agenda in (critical) discourse analysis*, especially the essays that make up Part I, to scholars in discourse studies. It is not intended for those who are new to the field or new to CDA in particular. Moreover, the preface, which serves as the introduction, is only about 500 words long; a much longer introduction, which identified and tied together the various threads in the book, would have gone a long way toward unifying the chapters, clarifying their interconnections, and demarcating the "new agenda" from an old one. Finally, prospective readers should keep in mind the decidedly European ethos that shapes the book: Four of the 13 chapters focus on the discursive construction of European identity, and virtually all of the contributors hail from Europe.

(Received 15 February 2006)



https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404506220281 Published online by Cambridge University Press

*Language in Society* **35** (2006). Printed in the United States of America
DOI: 10.1017/S0047404506220281

SHI-XU, *A cultural approach to discourse*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005. Pp. x, 233. Hb $69.95.

Reviewed by J. W. UNGER
*Linguistics and English Language, Lancaster University*
*Lancaster, LA1 4YT, UK*
*j.unger@lancs.ac.uk*

This book presents Shi-xu's theoretical and methodological framework for discourse analysis, which he terms the Cultural Approach to Discourse (CAD), and critiques what he sees as the predominantly "Western" canon of social science research so far. Shi-xu argues, often convincingly and engagingly, that culture has a far more important role to play than it has hitherto enjoyed in Western approaches to discourse. He positions himself as a researcher operating from "in-between" cultures. After critiquing Western theories and methodologies of discourse research such as representationalism, universalism, and foundationalism, Shi-xu sets out the theoretical and methodological framework for CAD, and then proceeds to give practical examples of how the approach can be applied to research. Unfortunately, there are a few incongruities between the claims the author makes about his book and more generally about his approach, and what the book actually contains and what CAD is shown to have achieved. I will highlight these in the course of describing the different sections of the book. As a whole, however, *A cultural approach to discourse* contains much that will interest "Western" social scientists; it could serve as a guide to those who have previously ignored "culture" in their research (at least, in the author's estimation of the term), and will perhaps lead to interesting debates with those who have already incorporated some conception (perhaps an opposing one) of "culture" in their theoretical frameworks.

The book comprises an Introduction followed by two main sections, "Theory and methodology," and "Practical studies." The Introduction indicates Shi-xu's primary motivation for writing the book: that "the contemporary, everyday world is becoming at once increasingly interconnected and antagonistic" (p. 2). International disorder threatens our common cultural existence, according to the author, and he asserts that mainstream scholarship is striving to maintain and expand this conflict. Discourse studies practitioners, he claims, come from "Anglo-American/European Western" backgrounds and thus have corresponding culturally rooted outlooks, concepts, procedures, issues, and data. He states that CAD, in contrast, "spans an entire research system" (4) and will focus particularly on the voices of subordinated groups.

Chap. 1, "Discourse and reality," begins with a critical examination of the "representationalist" model, which sees discourse as a mirror of reality. This



https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404506220281 Published online by Cambridge University Press

model, Shi-xu argues, does not account for the importance of context to discourse, nor does it allow "research into the dynamic relationship that linguistic communication may have with the world" (18). This dynamic relationship is an essential part of the next model described, the view that discourse is "reality-constitutive." It is clear that Shi-xu considers the latter to be more convincing, and thus he adopts it into CAD. The second part of the chapter is taken up with an informative discussion of context.

In chap. 2, "Discourse and culture," Shi-xu goes further in critiquing Western discourse analysts who claim to be "objective and neutral, dispassionate and impersonal – acultural, so to speak" (42). However, he argues that attempting to achieve the opposite position, in other words being PARTICULARIST rather than UNIVERSALIST, is also not the best way to proceed. Instead, he proposes that "we theorize discourse FROM IN BETWEEN CULTURES" (43, emphasis in original). In his description of universalism, the author claims that "various Western lineages" (44) of discourse analysis subscribe to universalist portrayals of discourse, treating the object of inquiry (discourse) as objectively given. Unfortunately, he does not give details of precisely which lineages this applies to, or which scholars working within each approach have thus described discourse. Furthermore, rather perplexingly, by the next page it has become a "fact that universalism is widely accepted in language studies" (45). Despite this somewhat exaggerated claim (for counterexamples, see Titscher et al. 2000), the rest of the section on universalism contains some interesting observations on the "culture-specific origins of discourse studies" (48), and in particular raises the question of who controls the "communications system" (49) used to publish and speak about discourse studies. Once again, Shi-xu points out Western dominance in this area, which may suppress marginalized voices from other cultures. This line of argumentation presents some interesting problems for Western scholars who wish to critique Shi-xu's approach, particularly if they do not have the advantage of being able to take a perspective from "in-between cultures." If they disagree with Shi-xu, are they suppressing a non-Western voice and approach to discourse studies? For the record, I feel I should position myself as a reviewer at this point: I consider myself to be culturally Austrian and Australian, ethnically Jewish and Caucasian, and I have lived in Austria, Scotland, Australia, and England. I definitely consider myself to be "in-between" cultures, although according to Shi-xu's taxonomy of cultures (principally Western vs. non-Western) I am presumably part of "Anglo-American/European Western" culture.

To return to the book, the next section explains how CAD researchers can study discourse from in-between cultures: The theorist must forgo "grand narrative" and attend "local, hitherto marginalised" discourses, and "culturally different" theories must interact. The end of a chapter brings a statement of the goals of CAD, which include as their ultimate objective "cultural co-existence and common cultural prosperity" (67). Shi-xu offers two strategies to achieve these goals: DECONSTRUCTIVE, which broadly means undermining culturally repres-



https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404506220281 Published online by Cambridge University Press

sive discourses, and TRANSFORMATIONAL, which involves creating and advocating new or alternative discourses.

Chap. 3 sees the book moving ever closer to a practical application of CAD. In "Political ethnography" Shi-xu critically reviews what he considers to be the main Western methodological approaches to social science – phenomenology and hermeneutics. Following this comes what I see as the most serious omission from this book: The author writes, "I could move on to doing the same exercise on the Chinese methodological approaches . . . but my purpose here is not to offer a cultural comparative analysis" (83). Many readers will be familiar with at least some, if not all, of the Western methodologies he critiques, and indeed with some of their shortcomings. The same cannot be said for the Chinese approaches. I admit I am completely ignorant of them, and having read this book I remain so. A quick look at the bibliography confirms that the vast majority of references are to Western works. Surely the best way to encourage Western researchers to take an in-between cultural approach would be to present them with methodological approaches from different cultures and let them choose the ones they think fit their particular research projects best. To his credit, Shi-xu gives the address of a very informative online article about "Chinese science." However, I feel this was a missed opportunity to, as Shi-xu himself might put it, promote non-Western methodological approaches. In the next section, "Western bias in social research methodology," the author asserts that social scientific methods, for example critical discourse analysis (CDA), denigrate non-Western views and consolidate and perpetuate the Anglo/European/American Western dominant position. Perhaps I am not sufficiently able to see things from an in-between cultural perspective, but I have a very different view of CDA. In my experience CDA practitioners challenge dominant discourses, be they Western or non-Western, and bring to light hitherto hidden, marginalized discourses, irrespective of culture (a relevant example is Teo 2000) – exactly the goals Shi-xu sets out for CAD earlier in the book.

Part II comprises four practical applications of CAD. "Deconstructing the other place," in chap. 4, is an analysis of Western discourse of cultural difference and discrimination toward Singapore, China, and Hong Kong. Shi-xu focuses particularly on the construction of the "other place" and on contradictions. Chap. 5, "Reading non-Western discourses," is an analysis of China's and Hong Kong's discourses on Hong Kong's history and the end of British colonial rule. The next chapter is a study of the change over time of group identity discourses in Northern Ireland. The final chapter is an attempt to set into motion CAD's second strategy for achieving its cultural-political goals, namely advocating future discourses. It is aimed at "experts" such as scholars and educators. There is much that is of merit in all three empirical studies and in the final chapter, but there are also certain ways in which they fail to fully satisfy the requirements of CAD set out earlier in the book.

It is not entirely clear to me how any of these studies could be truly said to be in-between cultures, except in the sense that they explain events in one culture to



https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404506220281 Published online by Cambridge University Press

readers who may be in another culture. Moreover, the discourses discussed in the studies are not those of marginalized people in non-Western cultures. They are those of politicians and journalists (some in non-Western cultures, some not, but in all cases powerful individuals within their respective communities). In the third study, Shi-xu claims that "the identity discourse in Ireland and Northern Ireland has not continued through time" (196), but the evidence he cites is from political statements, agreements between governments, and speeches reported in the media. It seems somewhat risky to make such a general statement on the basis of data from just a few genres. There could be a wealth of examples of identity discourses that have remained unchanged in other genres. The final chapter is perhaps the most convincing application of the CAD framework, although it is difficult to see exactly how the suggestions offered by the author, though all laudable, can be applied in practical terms.

In conclusion, CAD as outlined in this book is a promising framework, and Shi-xu convincingly argues for more cultural diversity in social sciences research. The outline and critiques of Western theories and methodologies are mostly comprehensive and quite informative, but they lack concrete examples and at times give an inaccurate picture of current Western discourse approaches. The practical applications described in the book are good examples of a critical discourse studies approach, but it is not clear how this differs substantively from other critical approaches with similar aims, except that in two of the cases the object of research was non-Western. Shi-xu uses predominantly Western arguments to justify his approach and seems to gloss over existing non-Western approaches, so I have to conclude that the book does not do quite what it sets out to do.

## REFERENCES

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

Titscher, Stefan; Meyer, Michael; Wodak, Ruth; & Vetter, Eva (2000). *Methods of text and discourse analysis*. London: Sage.

(Received 3 October 2005)

*Language in Society* **35** (2006). Printed in the United States of America
DOI: 10.1017/S0047404506230288

NORMAN FAIRCLOUGH, *Analyzing discourse: Textual analysis for social research*. London: Routledge, 2003. Pp. vii + 270. Hb $135.00, Pb $31.95.

Reviewed by SEYYED ABDOLHAMID MIRHOSSEINI
*Iranian Ministry of Education*
*samirhosseini@yahoo.com*

This latest book by Norman Fairclough is an extension of his earlier work on critical discourse analysis (CDA) (e.g., Fairclough 1989, 1995, 2001). Relying on systemic functional linguistics (SFL) as his linguistic theoretical standpoint



https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404506220281 Published online by Cambridge University Press

on one hand, and on social theoretical themes presented by critical theorists like Bourdieu and Habermas on the other, the author attempts to present a detailed framework of linguistic analysis that links the "micro" analysis of texts to the "macro" analysis of social relations (p. 16). In his introductory chapter, Fairclough specifies two types of audience for the book who may find this framework relevant to their own research: students and researchers in social sciences and humanities with little or no knowledge of language analysis, and those specializing in language studies.

After the introduction, in the two chapters of Part I, Fairclough presents an overview of the framework to be elaborated later in the book. He depicts three levels of social phenomena as the broad context of his framework: social structures as very abstract social entities, social practices as a mediating level between social structures and events, and social events as actual happenings. Language as an abstract phenomenon parallels social entities at the level of social structure. At the level of social practice, language appears as "orders of discourse" – that is, "a network of social practices in its language aspect" (24). At the level of social event, orders of discourse figure in text. The actualization of social-practice-level discourse (as an uncountable noun) in social-event-level text has three main aspects. These three aspects – genres, discourses (as a countable noun), and styles – are the major lines along which the author organizes the practical analytical procedure of his framework.

Genres are the actional aspect of what texts mean, discourses reflect the representational meaning, and styles include the identity-making aspect of text meaning. Fairclough's framework for analysis of texts as parts of social events involves looking at texts in terms of these three types of meaning. The threefold analysis of text meaning allows for exploring "internal" and "external" relations of texts and making connections between actual events and more abstract social practices. This conceptual web might appear complicated, especially to readers from disciplines other than language studies who might be overwhelmed by the linguistic jargon, although the author expresses his concern for avoiding linguistic terms and his attempt to move away from the "forbidding terminology of linguistics" (6). To make this further complicated, and, ironically, to explicate other aspects of the proposed analytical framework, in this first part of the book he also discusses issues of dialectical relations among the three types of meaning, genre mixing, intertextuality, and assumptions as well as some social theoretical themes like governance, the public sphere, and hegemony.

The three chapters of Part II discuss genres and the actional aspect of texts in detail. The proposed process of analysis of genres, as discoursal aspects of acting, proceeds in three steps: analysis of genre chains, analysis of mixtures of genres in particular texts, and analysis of individual genres. Although Fairclough asserts that "there is no established terminology for genres" (66), he goes on to distinguish between levels of abstraction of genres: pre-genres, disembedded genres, situated genres, and sub-genres. However, this does not seem to make



https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404506220281 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the framework any richer. Taking genre as the actional aspect of text meaning, one would need to analyze the actional meaning of sentences or longer stretches of texts rather than to specify and name genres at different levels of abstraction. The author proposes a process of analysis of individual genres in terms of three aspects: activity, that is, what is done with language; social relations between social agents; and communication technology, that is, being unidirectional/dialogical and mediated/nonmediated.

Semantic relations between sentences that actualize the generic aspect of texts are discussed and exemplified in detail. These relations include causal, conditional, temporal, additive, elaborative, and contrastive relations. Grammatical relations of parataxis, hypotaxis, and embedding are also discussed and applied to analysis of some examples. Surprisingly, higher-order generic semantic relations such as problem solution and goal achievement are only touched upon in a very brief section, but one would expect an elaborate discussion of these semantic aspects of long stretches of text. Fairclough discusses actional meaning at the sentence level in a separate chapter. He concentrates on three issues of genre analysis at the level of the individual clause: types of exchange that take place through sentences in texts, functions of speech, and grammatical mood. Examples of how text analysis is carried out in terms of these concepts are also presented throughout the chapter.

In Part III the author elaborates on discourses as the second aspect of realization of social-practice-level discourse in texts as parts of social events. Discourses are the representational aspect of texts. In Fairclough's own words, discourses "not only represent the world as it is . . . they are also projective, representing possible worlds which are different from the actual world, and tied in to projects to change the world in particular directions" (124). His scheme of identifying discourses in texts includes two dimensions: identification of aspects of the world represented, and identification of the particular perspective on representing those aspects. The major characterizing features of discourses are lexical semantic relations, assumptions, and grammatical features, with vocabulary asserted to be the most obvious distinguishing feature of discourses. In the second and final chapter of this part, heavily drawing upon Halliday's (1994) systemic functional linguistics, Fairclough discusses elements of social events that can be represented in texts and different levels of abstraction in representation, along with actual examples of the representational aspect of texts.

Discourses seem to be the most significant aspect of texts, not only because representational meaning is a major type of text meaning but also because the other two major types of meaning are forms of representations, as well. Genres and styles are functional and identificational aspects of meaning, but at the same time they represent parts of the world from particular perspectives. Therefore, analysis of representations reflected in discourses could be viewed as the major part of textual analysis covering all aspects of text meaning. Considering this overarching nature of discourses, one might expect a more elaborate and ex-



https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404506220281 Published online by Cambridge University Press

tended discussion of this aspect of texts than what Fairclough presents in these two brief chapters. Moreover, as in his discussion on textual realization of genres, Fairclough seems to be simply neglecting the higher-order textual representations such as assumptions, which can extend beyond clause level.

Part IV of the book, comprising two chapters, focuses on the identificational aspect of meaning reflected in styles. Identification as "a complex process" (160) is dealt with, ironically, in a very short chapter of only four pages. The interplay between social and personal identity, levels of abstraction of identification, and linguistic features in which styles may be realized is briefly touched upon in this chapter. In the second chapter of this final part of the book, based on the assumption that "what people commit themselves to in texts is an important part of how they identify themselves" (164), Fairclough elaborates on modality and evaluation as two major textual factors relevant to the identificational aspect of texts. How these two are realized in clauses is discussed, along with examples of their application for analyzing texts.

In the three parts of the book dealing with the three types of meaning, two issues might appear questionable. First, although the author reiterates the dialectic relationship between the three aspects of text meaning, the exact nature of the link between them is not obvious. Actional and identificational meanings might be viewed as representations, and representational meaning might be considered as an action. Therefore, how the three aspects of meaning interact dialogically needs to be discussed more. Second, the author seems to be reluctant to approach aspects of text meaning beyond the clause level and over longer stretches of text. Reducing text to sentence-level meaning, or at the most to the combination of a few neighboring sentences, could be a serious problem that might lead to ignoring higher-order aspects of text meaning over longer pieces of text, such as paragraphs. Arrangements of sentences and paragraphs and also interconnections among them throughout the text seem to be crucial aspects of texts that need to be accounted for in a framework of text analysis.

The concluding chapter has two objectives: drawing together and summarizing details of the text analysis framework presented in the book, and presenting a "manifesto" for CDA as a general research agenda (191). Fairclough summarizes the framework in the form of questions one might ask before analyzing texts, starting with "What social event, and what chain of social events, is the text a part of?" (191). He also presents his analysis of a sample text on the basis of the framework. In his manifesto, he depicts CDA as a form of critical research. In Fairclough's view, critical social research, concerned with relations of power, control, and possibility, needs to focus on language and discourse because language is playing a crucial role in social transformations. Finally, he puts forward and briefly discusses a five-step schematic view of CDA as a "method" in the critical social analysis of language.

An extensive glossary of key terms appears after the body of the book. It includes brief notes on linguistic and social theoretical concepts discussed



https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404506220281 Published online by Cambridge University Press

throughout the chapters. Numbers after each entry of the glossary, indicating the chapters where the concepts are used, allow cross-referencing and can be helpful in the process of reading the book. To make the glossary more helpful, the note on each entry contains references for further reading. A descriptive list of key theorists is also provided. There follows an appendix of 15 example texts that were used to exemplify theoretical discussions throughout the book.

The proposed framework offers challenging discussions for students and researchers in various areas of linguistics. Although the book might not appear to present a comprehensive and thoroughly delineated framework, it does admirably contribute to CDA by attempting to inform it through an established linguistic theory (SFL) on one hand, and by placing text and textual analysis in a broader framework of social practices and social structures, on the other. Moreover, the book would remind linguists of the generally neglected necessity that CDA is to be established as a social scientific research procedure applicable by nonlinguists as well. Researchers in social sciences and humanities, as part of the intended audience of the book, may also benefit from the book. It would provide them with invaluable insights into the social functioning of language and how linguistic analysis might contribute to a better understanding of social structures, although they might not be very likely independently to apply CDA as a research method solely based on this book. The book is, therefore, a resource definitely worth reading by students and researchers in various areas of social sciences and humanities in general, and in linguistics and applied linguistics in particular.

## REFERENCES

Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and power*. London: Longman.
_____ (1995). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. London: Longman.
_____ (2001). Critical discourse analysis as a method in social scientific research. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (eds.), *Methods of critical discourse analysis*, 121–138. London: Sage.
Halliday, M. A. K. (1994). *An introduction to functional grammar*. 2nd ed. London: Edward Arnold.

(Received 29 July 2005)

*Language in Society* **35** (2006). Printed in the United States of America
DOI: 10.1017/S0047404506240284

ROBIN WOOFFITT, *Conversation analysis and discourse analysis: A comparative and critical introduction*. London: Sage, 2005. Pp. ix, 234. Hb $69.95, Pb $31.95.

Reviewed by CRAIG O. STEWART
*English, Old Dominion University*
*Norfolk, VA 23529 USA*
*craigste@alumni.cmu.edu*

Robin Wooffitt aims to answer a question in his new book: "Analytically, what is the best way to understand everyday communicative activities?" (2). His



https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404506220281 Published online by Cambridge University Press

answer: "Conversation analysis offers the most sophisticated and robust account of language in action" (2). The remainder of the book proceeds, then, not only as an introduction to Conversation Analysis (CA) and Discourse Analysis (DA) as approaches to the study of language and communication in the social sciences (specifically, sociology and European social psychology), but also as a polemic for CA as a methodology superior to DA. The book is marketed as an introductory textbook; thus, each chapter includes periodic bulleted section summaries, and the early introductory chapters conclude with suggestions for further reading. As a textbook, this volume seems best suited for graduate seminars in linguistics or sociology; it deals with theoretical and methodological disputes that go well beyond most undergraduate students' background knowledge or pedagogical needs. As a scholarly volume, it should attract attention from social scientists already engaged in research utilizing CA or DA, as well as those working with other methodologies who are interested in how CA and DA conceptualize and investigate discourse.

The book is organized into three sections. The first, comprising chaps. 1–4, introduces CA and DA as methodologies that emerged within the discipline of sociology. These chapters become progressively more detailed in their descriptions of CA and DA as methodologies. Chap. 1 focuses on the initial development of these approaches within sociology, describing Harvey Sacks's early research on telephone call openings and Nigel Gilbert and Michael Mulkay's early research on sociology of science. Chap. 2 adds detail to this discussion, describing in depth one seminal study in CA and one in DA, showing the analytical moves that characterize each approach and summarizing findings that continue to influence these fields. This chapter concludes with summaries of more general research foci and methods that characterize CA and DA. Chap. 3 discusses more recent research trends in DA and CA, starting with DA's critique of traditional approaches to sociology and psychology and its increasing interest in ideology (both of which are covered in more detail later in the book). Another CA study, on interactions in news interviews, is also discussed in detail, showing how these findings extend those discussed in chap. 2. Finally, chap. 4 presents the similarities and differences between CA and DA, arguing that despite commonalities between these approaches to discourse, they are ultimately quite different from each other.

Although these chapters are intended to be introductory, they set the stage for Wooffitt's more polemical arguments later in the book. In chap. 2, DA is subject to the following unfavorable comparisons to CA: DA's transcription practices are less precise, its research terms less technical, and its procedures less formal. Throughout these chapters, Wooffitt positions the conversation analyst as an objective, technical, and disinterested observer who "*reveals* how participants' own interpretations … inform their conduct" rather than "interpret[ing] the significance or nature of conversational activities" (86–87; emphasis added), and "can see *directly* what is relevant to the participants" (64). A conversation analyst's



https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404506220281 Published online by Cambridge University Press

claims are "data driven, not led by theory" (65). A discourse analyst, in contrast, practices "a craft skill which relies on the development of largely tacit expertise" (43), and may, for instance, "impute an ideological significance to utterances when their design may owe more to the particular turn-taking sequences which provide an immediate interaction context" (56). In sum, Wooffitt's introductory chapters portray CA as a methodologically sophisticated, highly technical method of analysis that provides virtually unmediated access to the processes of social interaction, whereas DA is less technical and more dependent on the researcher's intuition.

The next section of the book presents three intellectual developments in DA: rhetorical psychology, discursive psychology, and critical studies. In these chapters, Wooffitt draws boundaries between all these areas, and between them and the broader field of DA. These chapters utilize these developments as a springboard for discussing how CA can enrich not only DA, but also other areas in the social sciences. Chap. 5, on rhetorical psychology, concerns studies of how speakers position their discourse as factual accounts. Wooffitt argues that DA, as opposed to rhetorical psychology, offers a superior analysis of such discourse because it is more closely aligned with CA. This chapter concludes with showing how CA, particularly Sacks's notion of "being ordinary," can influence research in the fields of parapsychology, cognitive psychology, and psychiatry. Wooffitt is most persuasive in his discussion of psychiatry, showing how CA can bring to light the interactional features of discourse that allow clinicians to discriminate delusional from nondelusional accounts of extraordinary events. Discursive psychology, covered in chap. 6, fares the best among the intellectual trends in DA in Wooffitt's estimation because of its alignment with CA. This chapter also uses parapsychology to demonstrate CA's relevance to discursive psychology, showing how "parapsychological cognition" is demonstrated in a three-turn sequence in which the third turn contains attribution of information to a paranormal source. Although they are interesting examples of applications of CA, the discussions of parapsychology seem somewhat idiosyncratic. They distract from Wooffitt's argument for the value of CA as a research methodology in the social sciences and instead work to justify parapsychology as a legitimate area of research in the social sciences.

Chap. 7 introduces critical approaches in DA, distinguishing between CDA and Foucauldian Discourse Analysis (FDA). According to Wooffitt, CDA is in many respects incompatible with CA. CDA approaches discourse with a priori assumptions that power and ideology are manifest in discourse, whereas CA does not "begin with a conception of what kind of thing discourse is" (144). Indeed, CDA, with its political commitments and emancipatory goals, "obscures and diminishes the importance of the communicative competencies which people are using as they organize their talk collaboratively" (145). The differences between CDA and FDA are identified in their approaches to text, with CDA paying closer attention to linguistic details, and in their approaches to ideology, with CDA



https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404506220281 Published online by Cambridge University Press

showing a stronger commitment to Marxist notions of class and domination. These chapters introduce their respective topics in an engaging and thorough manner. Scholars unfamiliar with these topics would be well served using these chapters as starting points. For a textbook, however, it perhaps would have been preferable to organize these chapters around particular textual objects and research questions, showing how each perspective might approach a text or address a research question. This arrangement would have had the advantage of engaging students in concrete issues, rather than attempting to involve (undergraduate) students at a more theoretical level. It also would have highlighted the interrelationships, rather than the fairly esoteric distinctions, between these areas of discourse studies.

The final two chapters are the most polemical. Here Wooffitt critiques DA as a methodology and attempts to show how CA can address traditional areas of research in the social sciences. After refuting specific criticisms of CA made by the discourse analysts Michael Billig and Margaret Wetherell, Wooffitt charges that DA offers an "impoverished view of human conduct" (179) in which human communicative competencies are reduced to two or maybe three discourses. Second, he argues that CDA fails to ground its claims adequately in empirical evidence. And third, Wooffitt argues that there is no systematic method for identifying discourses. These are serious charges, which discourse analysts need to consider. However, in making these charges, Wooffitt does not seem to consider the aims of DA – the kinds of data it may deal with besides interaction, or the research questions that it wishes to address that differ from those raised in CA. For example, criticizing DA's tendency to identify a small number of discourses in operation, Wooffitt asks, "Is this really all there is to say? . . . is that *it*?" (180). Here, Wooffitt addresses a straw man, as few if any discourse analysts set out to record exhaustively all that could be said about a particular text. Likewise, there are certainly critical discourse studies that make careful reference to their data to warrant their analytical claims, and discourse analysts are not without sophisticated ways of operationalizing their terms and outlining their methods, even if there is no single method for doing DA; it seems unusual to criticize a discipline for failing to have a single method by which all studies are conducted.

The book concludes with a consideration of how CA can address central issues in the field of sociology – specifically, power. Wooffitt describes how CA accounts for interactions in a marketplace, for turn-taking in talk radio, and for sexual harassment interactions. These examples vary in their effectiveness in showing how CA can address the role of power in society. Wooffitt's discussion of Ian Hutchby's studies of argumentative discourse on talk radio are the most effective, showing how CA can reveal unequal distribution of discursive resources that would not otherwise be apparent. The least effective is the discussion of CA in describing how sellers in a marketplace gain compliance by persuading potential buyers to purchase their goods. It is not clear from Wooffitt's discussion that CA adds very much substance to the rich literature on social influence that has been developed in the social sciences.



https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404506220281 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The book ends rather abruptly: There is no concluding chapter to summarize and reflect upon the book's arguments, which would have been an especially nice feature for a textbook. Thus, there is no reflection on whether there can be a détente between CA and DA, whether CA could fruitfully incorporate any insights from DA (rather than vice versa), or whether there are any kinds of discursive data or research questions for which a DA approach might be more appropriate than CA. Overall, the book offers good, comprehensive introductions to the development and methodologies of CA and DA and to intellectual trends in DA – and their relationships to CA. These should prove useful for graduate students and social scientists interested in learning about these approaches. Likewise, Wooffitt offers important critiques of DA that discourse analysts should certainly be aware of and address; however, it would have been preferable to have considered how CA and DA might be integrated and to have provided more guidance in how to choose between research approaches. An integrative approach to introducing CA and DA would have added to this volume's existing value both as a textbook and as a call for social scientists to attend carefully and systematically to language in their research.

(Received 14 December 2005)



https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404506220281 Published online by Cambridge University Press