Annual Review of Applied Linguistics (2002) **22**, 96–110. Printed in the USA.
Copyright © 2002 Cambridge University Press 0267-1905/01 $9.50

5. BEYOND SCIENCE AND IDEOLOGY CRITIQUE: DEVELOPMENTS IN CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS[1]

Allan Luke

Critical discourse analysis (CDA) is an explicitly normative analysis of how texts and discourses work in ideological interests with powerful political consequences. This chapter provides an historical overview of CDA, placing it in the long lineage of attempts to develop a normative political linguistics beginning with Voloshinov. Recent approaches and procedures are discussed. These attempt to bring together text analysis with contemporary social, political, and cultural theory. The case is made that new conditions of economic and cultural globalization have created theoretical and empirical challenges for CDA and, more generally, for a critical applied linguistics. It is argued that these will require that CDA augment its strong focus on ideology critique with the study of texts that model the productive uses of power and discourse in new conditions.

A Genealogy of the Critical

Critical discourse analysis isn't new. But it is at a crucial point in its formation as method, as field, and as intellectual and political project. My purpose here is neither to recount or recant its procedures and methods for novices, nor to take sides on disputes between particular approaches for those who presently are using and refining it. Nor is my task to convince and convert the skeptical. There are numerous textbooks and key works in the field that do the job quite adequately, some cited here. My aim in this review is to historically and theoretically resituate critical discourse analysis, reviewing its key principles, current dilemmas, and possible futures.

Questions about the emergence and stability of a discipline are crucial for applied linguistics, with its impure history and practices, contested institutional position, and aspirations. There are many ways to explain the rise and fall of discourses and disciplines. These include now classical Kuhnian explanations of change of natural sciences that focus on paradigm crisis, unresolved anomalies in

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190502000053 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the field, and the formation of new theory. Such explanations concentrate on the internal dynamics of scientific discovery, and on the generative relationship of method and theory in the identification and solution of problems. By contrast, studies in the sociology of science stress political, cultural, and economic forces that historically shape the force of fields.

Turning to the state of critical discourse analysis (hereafter, CDA, having won its own acronym): What are we to make of a field that ties itself in word and deed, theory and method, to a normative, explicitly political inquiry into social, economic, and cultural power? How do we appraise research that sets out to disrupt and interrupt ideological common sense, everyday language use, and the codification of discourse power by dominant groups and interests? One answer, of course, is to treat it as an aberration in an otherwise unblemished march of linguistics *qua* normal science. This would be to argue that CDA doesn't stand directly in the lineage of a proper scientific, empirical linguistics and that it needlessly biases work on the pressing, practical tasks facing applied linguistics: the formation of language planning and policy and the teaching and learning of language and literacy in social institutions.

To do so would ignore a distinguished if incomplete history of attempts at a normative political linguistics, from the Voloshinov/Bakhtin circle to the more recent work of Michel Pecheux, Jacob Mey, and others. It also would fail to engage with the late-twentieth century acknowledgment among social scientists of the constitutive force of language and discourse in social formation and discipline, economic exploitation and power. CDA thus stands in *this* sustainable counter-tradition in linguistics, as against the technical, scientific projects of Humboldt, Saussure, and Chomsky. It is overtly skeptical of the claims of those postwar interactional and sociolinguistic approaches to the 'social' that are premised on liberal and neoliberal theories of the individual and society. Nor should it be surprising that we find its earliest 'revoicings' in early twentieth century European attempts to generate a neoMarxist analysis of language, linguistics, and signs that would seek to critique and transform material relations and conditions.

To treat CDA as a formalized corpus of analytic and methodological techniques thus might be to miss the point altogether. Critical discourse analysis is more akin to a repertoire of political, epistemic stances: principled reading positions and practices for the critical analysis of the place and force of language, discourse, text, and image in changing contemporary social, economic, and cultural conditions (Luke, 1997; van Dijk, 1993).

A more constructive approach might be to treat it as discourse itself, contingent upon particular historical conditions, agents and possibilities. It is a field of force, power, and relations in formation. New forms of social life in advanced capitalist societies turn on text and discourse. If indeed the emergence of

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190502000053 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the modern European nation-state, with all of its achievements and foibles, was driven by "print capitalism" (Anderson, 1991), it is clear that conditions of globalized capitalism are enabled by discourse-saturated technology and environments. We might term these *semiotic economies*, where language, text, and discourse become the principal modes of social relations, civic and political life, economic behavior and activity, where means of production and modes of information become intertwined in analytically complex ways.

The stances, positions, and techniques of CDA vary. There have been major attempts to formalize and codify approaches (Fairclough, 1992; Wodak, 1996). These synthesize a corpus of text analytic techniques drawn from a number of related areas: systemic linguistics, sociolinguistics and the ethnography of communications, ethnomethodology, pragmatics and speech act analysis, and narrative text grammar analysis. In turn, approaches to text analysis are integrated with concepts from contemporary social and cultural theory drawn, variously, from Frankfurt School critical theory, neoMarxist, poststructuralist and feminist cultural studies, Bourdieuian sociology, and, most recently, postcolonial and multiculturalist theory. How we stitch these together into an intellectual, explicitly political project is the task at hand. This is complicated given the predelictions of some of the aforementioned models, both linguistic and social, toward comprehensive, rational grand theory, and the penchant of others for radical skepticism toward system and structure.

CDA, like all social inquiry, faces fundamental dilemmas: changing objects of study, as blended life-worlds and identities, transnational institutions and social formations, new forms of exploitation and oppression, and persistently troubling material and discourse conditions emerge. I will make the case here that, despite the articulation of canonical principles and regularized procedures and approaches, CDA and 'the critical' more generally cannot sit *in media res*. The next generation of CDA research must contend with blended and hybrid forms of representation and identity, and new spatial and temporal relations generated by the technologically enhanced 'flows' of bodies, capital, and discourse that characterize economic and cultural globalization. These are likely to require new, hybrid blends of analytic techniques and social theories. Part of this challenge, I argue here, is for CDA to move beyond a focus on ideology critique and to document 'other' forms of text and discourse—subaltern, diasporic, emancipatory, local, minority, call them what we may—that may mark the productive use of power in the face of economic and cultural globalization.

Like many other forms of contemporary social theory, the generational basis of CDA can be traced to the political events of 1968. This would include neoMarxist theories of interpellation and hegemony, as in the Birmingham Centre for Cultural Studies interpretations of Gramsci and Althusser (e.g., Hall, 1996). But it also explains the emergence of anti-essentialist, post-Marxist philosophies of

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190502000053 Published online by Cambridge University Press

discourse and society generated by Foucault and Derrida, and, more recently, Lyotard and Baudrillard's versions of postmodernity. Directly and indirectly, whether in response or reaction, much of this work was spurred by the student movements, especially the rise and perceived failure of the Marxist project in 1968. A *de facto* effect was a generational politicization of scholarship and research in Western academic work in social sciences and humanities. While the student revolution as political force may have met with varying degrees of success and failure, it succeeded in changing the character of university scholarship and life. The resultant work has been extremely intellectually generative and, as might have been expected, shifted the then emergent "linguistic turn" in the social sciences to another epistemological and political level: an understanding of the centrality of language, text, and discourse in the constitution of not just human subjectivity and social relations, but also social control and surveillance, the governance of polity and nation-state, and attendant modes of domination and marginalization, lived desire and pleasure.

With historical prototypes in the admixtures of political linguistics, pragmatics and neoMarxist theory by Jacob Mey, Michel Pecheaux, and colleagues over two decades ago; the powerful adaptation of systemic functional linguistics by Gunther Kress, Robert Hodge, Roger Fowler, and colleagues (see Kress & Hodge, 1979); and finally, its mature theoretical engagement with Foucault, Bourdieu, and Gramsci by Norman Fairclough and colleagues in the last decade, it would hardly be appropriate to define CDA as a newcomer, as an outsider to the formalized fields of linguistic-based discourse analysis, or to view it as a kind of radical chic moment that is likely to fade with shifts in partisan politics. But why is CDA still considered a fringe dweller in mainstream analysis? Relatedly, if it is to remain a sustainable field of inquiry and, indeed, a productive mode of sociopolitical intervention, what are its millenial theoretical and empirical challenges?

To survey the field: Through the editorial advocacy of Teun van Dijk in the journal *Discourse and Society*, CDA has achieved some degree of stability, canonicity, and, indeed, conventionality. Contemporary work in CDA has produced different, innovative analyses of a range of texts, some of which went unnoticed in conventional linguistic analysis. These include: violent and conflictual face-to-face exchanges in institutional settings; political speeches and parliamentary proceedings; advertising and mass media texts of all types; textbooks and other official pedagogic texts; different views of the political and economic dimensions of clinical, legal and service encounters; and, more recently, analysis of digitalized communications including online exchanges, mobile phone exchanges, and webpages. Graduate student theses openly declare CDA as a method and supervisors needn't look far for paradigmatically sympathetic examiners. Undergraduate and masters-level courses in CDA in education, cultural and literary studies, and linguistics are more common, with a host of 'how to' textbooks available from major publishers. Specific journals and publishers

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190502000053 Published online by Cambridge University Press

have staked their claims on the field; indeed, major encyclopedias and annual reviews such as this volume routinely assemble chapters on the topic. Its spread is uneven. It proliferates in the United Kingdom, Europe, and Australia in part because of the very different historical attitudes toward applied political analysis within the academy. But United States scholarship in such fields as feminist studies, critical legal studies, communications and media, multiculturalism, and critical race studies has applied CDA to study matters of identity, control, and power.

Taken together, these are all signs that CDA is showing some signs of maturity, if not late adolescence. If indeed this is the case, and particularly for an analytic activity that is premised less on scientism than its own normative status as intervention, we can ask, first, how and to what extent CDA has moved from an emergent, marginal approach in applied linguistics and the host of affiliated fields noted above, and to what extent its key shared assumptions and approaches require critical self-inspection. That is, putting aside for a moment the debate over whether discourse analysis should be political, the question is how, with what analytic tools, and with what effects.

Method or Standpoint?

There have been significant attempts at taxonomies of analytic categories, most notably the continuing work of Fairclough (1989, 1992), Chouliaraki and Fairclough (1999) in the United Kingdom, European work by van Dijk (1997), Wodak (1996), and related work in the United States by Gee (1999). Though they vary considerably in technical specification, there share a common strategy. CDA involves a principled and transparent shunting back and forth between the microanalysis of texts using varied tools of linguistic, semiotic, and literary analysis and the macroanalysis of social formations, institutions, and power relations that these texts index and construct.

If there is a generalizable approach to CDA, then, it is this orchestrated and recursive analytic movement between text and context. But what differentiates it from previous attempts at socially-based linguistics is that it does not work from liberal and neoliberal, structural functionalist, and symbolic interactionist social theory. CDA sets out to capture the dynamic relationships between discourse and society, between the micropolitics of everyday texts and the macropolitical landscape of ideological forces and power relations, capital exchange, and material historical conditions. This sets CDA apart from the ubiquitous forms of social constructionist and interactionist analysis, particularly in educational studies, that draw liberally upon Vygotsky and Foucault *sans* materialist or micropolitical analysis. Consequently, attempts to systematize CDA draw, on the one hand, from theories and models of text analysis and, on the other, from contemporary social, political, and cultural theories.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190502000053 Published online by Cambridge University Press

For the former, text analysis, there are of course rich technical resources for 'doing' the classical work of discourse analysis; that is, for the parsing of text according to systematic and replicable rewrite rules. In instances, we can extract techniques directly from text linguistics more or less intact. For example, Kress and Hodge's (1979) and Fairclough's (1989) early descriptions of CDA are based upon Hallidayan analysis of formal properties of text, beginning with systematic analysis of lexical resources and categories, moving through a targeted analysis of syntactic functions (e.g., transitivity, modality), building toward the analysis of genre and text metafunction (e.g., macropropositional analysis, exchange structure). Consequently, like others who begin from a systemic functional perspective, these prototypes have a comprehensive focus on the *text qua intentional code*, a position that is theoretically compatible with a neoMarxist focus on ideology and hegemony.

In his organization of the field more generally, van Dijk (1997) offers a programmatic approach based on four categories: action, context, power, and ideology.[2] Within each of these he identifies guiding concepts, many of which are derived not from linguistics but variously from the ethnography of communication, Marxist theories of ideology, schema theoretic models of cognitive processing, and speech act theory. While not purporting to be a formal approach to critical discourse analysis, Gee's (1999) recent model involves methodological heuristics for six categories of discourse resources that subjects use to build representations. He calls these "semiotic building," "world building," "activity building," "identity and relationship building," "political building," and "connection building."

In contrast with Fairclough's approach, van Dijk (1997) and Gee (1999) both develop more theoretically eclectic toolkits, less oriented toward lexicosyntactic features of texts and more focused on the variable cultural and social resources and contexts required of text construction and comprehension. In this regard, both are able to move beyond a reliance on theories of ideology to engage with cognitive and connectionist theories of meaning and cognition, and social psychological work on identity. Their approaches balance an emphasis on the code with an emphasis on the agentive practices of text participation, comprehension, and use. This move matches work in cultural studies that shifts from a strong neoMarxist emphasis on ideological code to the ethnographic analysis of the variable, idiosyncratic uptake of text and discourse by audiences (Ang, 1991).

What sets CDA analyses apart is their attempt to inform text analyses with broader social theory. If, as I suggested earlier, the methodological tactic is to move back and forth from analysis of text to analysis of social formation and institution, then the text can only be made sense out of if we have sufficiently theorized power, political relations, material and historical change, and the social institutions under scrutiny. What this means is that the text analysis can only be

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190502000053 Published online by Cambridge University Press

explicitly normative and political if it explicates how "discourse does ideological work" (Wodak, 1996, p. 17), and (unlike, most overtly, ethnomethodology) if it has a strongly theorized reading of the social world.

But CDA equally needs to move beyond text analysis to the critical analysis of the visible practices of text interpretation and use. To build such a bridge, Fairclough's (1989) widely cited model of text and context draws from political economy: context is defined in terms of conditions of production and conditions of interpretation. These, in turn, are historically contested sites for ideological social relations and delimited by the availability of what Fairclough (1992) calls "members' resources" and van Dijk (1993) refers to as "social cognitions." These contexts could equally be construed as "social fields" for the agentive exchange of symbolic and cultural capital (Bourdieu, 1998). In such a model, the text becomes commodity and artifact subject to forces of production, alienation, appropriation, control, and so forth (cf. Mey, 1985). This is a programmatic way of defining context politically, and thereby avoids the kinds of individualist and depoliticized interactionist approaches to context that have characterized applied linguistics (Pennycook, 2000). However, it only partially resolves the problem of which social theory to select.

Fairclough (1992), Gee (1996), and Chouliaraki and Fairclough (1999) are the strongest attempts to engage with a range of major social theories. These works variously review neoMarxist and Frankfurtian theory, poststructuralist theory, Bourdieuian and Durkheimian sociology, postcolonial theory, and other sources with text analysis, focusing, variously, on contested definitions of discourse, ideology, hegemony, power, identity, and capital and adding their own specialized terminologies. Fairclough (1992) distinguishes between "discursive practice" and "social practice," discourse and "orders of discourse." Gee (1996) differentiates between what he terms "big 'D' discourse" from "little 'd' discourses" arguing for the primacy of the latter when acquired in the contexts of primary socialization. In so doing, this work builds a 'meso' analytic vocabulary around these terms that has the potential to open out readings of texts to more sophisticated institutional and political analysis. Alternately, it can, in weaker applications, simply act as a stand-in for a more rigorous sociological and cultural, or political and economic, analysis of the contexts and consequences of discourse.

My point is that a linguistic and text analytic metalanguage, no matter how comprehensive, cannot 'do' CDA in and of itself. It requires the overlay of a social theoretic discourses for explaining and explicating the social contexts, concomitants, contingencies and consequences of any given text or discourse. That is, what texts 'do' in the world cannot be explained solely through text analysis or text analytic language (Pennycook, 2000). To reiterate, the actual power of the text, its material and discourse consequences, can only be described by reference to broader social theoretic models of the world. In what we might

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190502000053 Published online by Cambridge University Press

term *the logocentric fallacy*, we run the risk of fetishizing the power of the text, preempting its local uptake, and presupposing the systematicity and consequences of its discourses. Let us take this as Foucault's cautionary and promissory note and return to it momentarily.

To summarize: CDA involves a principled shunting back and forth between analyses of the text and the social, between cultural sign and institutional formation, between semiotic/discourse analysis and the analysis of local institutional sites, between a normative reading of texts and a normative reading of the social world. In this way, where each analysis falls on these binary continua reenacts a central unresolved theoretical issue facing discourse theory and social theory alike: the contingent relationship between discourse change and changes in corporeal, spatialized, and material conditions; the relative power of social structure and human agency; the dynamics of bids at centralized state and corporate control versus local appropriation and resistance.

After two decades of discourse analysis and cultural studies, the postructuralist axiom that "everything is discourse," or that "discourse talks things into existence" has become almost facile. While these are profound and potentially productively disruptive claims, they only take us so far toward a political and social analysis (Luke, 1997). It is a far more difficult task to trace, politically, which discourses have which material and discursive effects and consequences for communities, cultures, and human subjects. In this way, the methodological decisions facing us when we undertake any specific critical discourse analysis inevitably lead us back to the theoretical anomalies of its host theories.

Techniques in Search of a Theory

Reviewing key journals and collections in the field, it would appear that there are three common CDA genres of research: (1) traditional sociolinguistic, ethnomethodological, pragmatic, and systemic linguistic analyses that focus on social and political issues as their objects of study (e.g., racism, sexism, violence and oppression, political policies); (2) interactional and ethnomethodological analyses that graft Foucauldian concepts of power into data analysis; and (3) applications of approaches outlined by Fairclough, Wodak, and colleagues that aim to integrate detailed text analysis and depth engagement with recent social theory. What therefore differentiates the field are degrees and levels of explicit politicization, ranging from: (1) a content politicization called for by Wodak (1996) and van Dijk (1993), to (2) a relabeling of conventional analysis by the grafting of social theoretic lexicon, to (3) an explicit politicization of both theory and method.

We began this chapter by noting the binary tension within critical discourse analysis between linguistic formalism and ideology critique between science and politics. This may no longer be the central issue. Despite the

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190502000053 Published online by Cambridge University Press

ostensive tensions between text and social analysis, the shunting between them is tenable and coherent as long as it stays within the domains of particular rationalist, structuralist species of social theory. That is, linguistic formalism, historical materialism, and Frankfurtian ideology critique share a common focus on rationality, systematicity, and logical coherence. Linguistic structuralism, in its Hallidayan and other variants, views discourse and text as a meaning-producing microphysics, a network of systematically linked propositions, coherent and organized ideas. In a legacy that leads from Hegel through Althussarian determinism, Frankfurt School social theory and neoMarxist cultural studies hold that ideology is coherent, that there is a "logic" to capital, and a systematicity of intent and consequence to the texts and discourses of mass capitalism, whether state or multinational.

By contrast, the Foucauldian tradition is antistructuralist and post-Marxist, attempting to capture the almost Dionysian character of discourse in local sites. For our present purposes, we can begin from Foucault's (1982) definition of discourse as "systematically recurrent statements." The contribution of philosophical and literary poststructuralism to CDA is not simply the oft-cited recognition of the constitutive force of discourse in the formation of social and psychological identity, social, economic and political position. The insight that discourse systematically constructs human subjects, versions of 'reality,' relations of power and knowledge, as contestable as it may be to empiricists and positivists, is but our starting point. Foucault consistently warns his readers not to privilege or presuppose structure, not to suppose coherence, intention, systematicity. Discourse might be acting arbitrarily, randomly, and idiosyncratically for, he argues, it tends to take on a life of its own, autonomous from its historical authors, conditions of production, and so forth. This work marks the shift from a strong focus on the central and hegemonic production of discourse and its illocutionary and perlocutionary political intents to the unpredictable lateral and recursive traverse of discourse across institutions and social fields, and the idiosyncrasy and unpredictability of the local exchange and uptake of discourse.

The second, and equally profound, lesson from poststructuralism is based on Derrida's (1980) insights into absence and silence. For Derrida, the absent signifier, the 'unsaid' and the 'unwritten,' can be as significant as what is said. Because CDA has been more or less tied to linguistic modes of analysis, it has had great difficulties dealing not only with multimodal texts, issues of embodiment, place, and those things experienced corporeally and physically. It has even greater difficulty dealing with the unsaid and the unspeakable, that which is not present in visible linguistic traces. Even for an ideology critique, the silent and the absent, represented in terms of euphemism and implied intertextual references, can have powerful political effects.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190502000053 Published online by Cambridge University Press

This isn't to deny that discourse can have what classical ideological critiques call oppressive intents and effects, the patterns framed by van Dijk's (1993) important introduction to CDA. Nor should it distract us from the continuing need for ideology critique, particularly in semiotic economies where the boundaries between work and leisure, production and consumption, and private and civic lifeworlds are blurred and transgressed by media discourse and representation. In current conditions, new technologically mediated modes of surveillance and control sit alongside the forms of face-to-face symbolic violence and print-culture hegemony well documented in current work in CDA.

But discourse and its attendant knowledge/power configurations can be both positive and negative. In this regard they are not necessarily 'ideological' in the classical Marxist sense of deliberate distortion in the service of specific class interests. The fundamental challenge to ideology critique raised as early as Voloshinov's work remains: If all discourse is ideological, refractive, and distorting in the interests of dominant classes (and patriarchies), is it possible to have a nonideological text?

Answers may be found both in the work of Habermas (1984) and Freire and Macedo (1987). I refer here not just to the philosophic construct of "ideal speech situation" as a "counterfactual ideal"—the dialogic, democratic exchange recognised by Fairclough and Wodak as normative ideals. As well, I refer to the possibility of what Freire and colleagues term "emancipatory" discourses: those forms of talk, writing, and representation that are counter-ideological and act to articulate and configure collective interests in transformative ways.

Returning to its original aims: if CDA is a normative form of social science and political action, it must be able to demonstrate what 'should be' as well as what is problematic with text and discourse in the world. I am arguing that a key task facing an effectively normative CDA is to:

- identify and document, in neoMarxist terms, preferred modes of emancipatory discourse; and/or to

- analytically deconstruct, in poststructuralist terms, positive and productive configurations of power/knowledge in discourse.

Without such work, CDA risks becoming entrenched in a neo-Althussarian paradigm operating under the assumption that all media are forms of centrally controlled interpellation, and further assuming that the general populace are victims and objects of this ideological interpellation; then holding that the principal role of CDA practitioners is to act as Gramscian transformative intellectuals in the task of unveiling, countering, and consciousness-raising around dominant

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190502000053 Published online by Cambridge University Press

ideologies, with the aim of mobilizing opinion and action against them and their classes of producers.

The tension in CDA therefore is not solely between the micro/text analytic and macro/social analysis. I have here argued that the prevailing project of CDA is that of ideology critique, which shares with most forms of textual analysis the presupposition of order, systematicity, and logic. CDA has the productive potential to capture, describe, and critique a broader range of normative orders of discourse, including those that construct and transform knowledge and power relations in productive, equitable, and enfranchising ways. It would appear that, regardless of which initial philosophic turn in linguistic and political analysis we make—by starting from Hegel or Nietzche—we return to issues of power.

CDA, Applied Linguistics, and New Times

Many current accounts treat CDA as a radical, 'alternative' field in formation, on the fringes of applied linguistics and sociolinguistics more generally. CDA is bound to be troubling to those who view linguistics as an archetypal disinterested science. Yet given the degree to which applied linguistics is indeed *applied* (with direct engagement with normative, politically charged fields for the commodification of knowledge and language; proscription of face-to-face educational intervention; the shaping of second language policy and pedagogy; and governmental language policy), the notion of a neutral, 'uncritical' applied linguistics itself is problematic. This is precisely the point of Pennycook's (2000) proposal for a "critical applied linguistics," an extension of his previous work on the implication of language education, planning, and policy in the practices of colonialism, neocolonialism, and, indeed, economic and cultural globalization.

I have argued that to move beyond a strong focus on ideology critique, CDA would need to begin to develop a strong positive thesis about discourse and the productive uses of power. To paraphrase Marcuse (1971), we would need to begin to capture an affirmative character of culture where discourse is used aesthetically, productively, and for emancipatory purposes. Yet it would appear that applied linguistics has progressed little in terms of the building of an analytic stance on the normative goals of discourse beyond Hymes' (1996) prototypical statements on "linguistic inequality."

Particularly in the case of education, the affirmative character of discourse can take many forms (Luke, 1995). The purview of CDA could include the documentation of:

1. minority discourses, diasporic voices, texts, and statements that are 'written out' and over by dominant institutions;

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190502000053 Published online by Cambridge University Press

2. emergent discourses of hybrid identity generated by learners counter to dominant pedagogic discourses;

3. idiosyncratic local uptakes—Fairclough's conditions of interpretation—where human subjects take centrally broadcast or dominant texts and discourses and reinterpret, recycle, and revoice them in particular ways that serve their local political interests; and

4. those micropolitical strategies of interruption, resistance, and counter-discourse undertaken by speakers in face-to-face institutional and interpersonal settings.

What forms does productive, liberatory political speech take? What are the textual shapes and practices of 'open' and locally enabling social policies? What would a critical or normatively preferable representation of history in a textbook look like? If CDA is avowedly normative and explicitly political, than it must have the courage to say what is to be done with texts and discourse.

Much of this work is underway, but it is scattered across fields, disciplines, and journals. This renewed agenda would have the potential of pushing CDA through some of the epistemological impasses that I have described above. It might move CDA through generative and necessary, but ultimately self-limiting thresholds: a preoccupation with centrally broadcast texts as modes of ideology, balanced by politically undertheorized analyses of face-to-face exchanges. Perhaps rather than seek a theoretical consensus on what might count as CDA, we should seek out and engage with new objects of study and new theories of the social. I conclude with some comments on possible directions.

Theories of discourse momentarily aside, the empirical, phenomenal reality facing applied linguists and critical discourse analysts is that, for better and worse, semiotic systems have become the engines of globalization and of the new economies. In a now classical description of the new 'scapes' of cultural, economic and political globalization, Appadurai (1996) introduces the multilayered descriptive metaphor of "flows." We can describe the impacts of globalization in terms of the variably regulated and unregulated, systematic and chaotic, organized and disorganized, intentional and accidental flows of bodies, capital, and discourse across what historically were constrained and regulated geographic, geopolitical, and cultural borders and boundaries. The result is that many of the constants of postwar social formation—systems of government and regulation, economic exchange, and even place and displacement—have been disrupted, or, in instances, are morphing into different formations.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190502000053 Published online by Cambridge University Press

I have here described the strong reliance both by CDA, and by its more conventional predecessors and kin in linguistics and applied linguistics, on theories and models of the social that were devised to explain both traditional monopoly "print capitalism," and inter- and postwar nation-state governmentality. The result is that both CDA and current approaches to applied linguistics remain caught up very much in the dialectical analysis of economic and cultural disparity, political oppression, and repression. To date, this has led CDA to a successful focus on tracking changes in state, media, and corporate systems of representation, and on the public representation and repression of diversity and difference. Yet new times may require an expanded research agenda, one that focuses not just on the suppression of diasporic identities by dominant classes. Needed is one that engages with new textual configurations, one that de-reifies concepts of culture, and explores new definitions not only of discourse, but as well of language as necessarily blended, multiglossic, and transcultural. This will require that linguists and sociologists alike question the essentialist symmetries between language, culture, and nation that we continue to take for granted. It also indicates that a nonessentialist focus on blended forms of local "social cognition" (van Dijk, 1993), "cultural models" (Gee, 1999), and "members' resources" (Fairclough, 1992) may offer key insights into the "glocalized" (Robertson, 1992) uptake and use of transnational flows of discourses, images, and texts.

Our very approaches as 'liberal' and 'radical' applied linguists to addressing issues of state policies toward multilingualism and multiculturalism, issues of educational access and opportunity, and, indeed, to redressing matters of historical marginalization remain captured by the dialectics and Manichean allegories of oppressor/oppressed, mainstream/minority, privileged/deficit, center/margin, indeed, and North/South and East/West. These include debates over whether the purposes of a redressive language and literacy education are, indeed, to ensure more equal access, to recognize and (repressively) tolerate linguistic diversity and new forms of identity, to enable direct access to mainstream "cultural capital", or to teach various versions of the "critical," including CDA to students as a means of "empowerment" (Muspratt, Luke, & Freebody, 1997).

The challenges of economic and cultural globalization have already generated quite productive explorations of new social theory, including new materialist analyses (Comaroff & Comaroff, 2000) of transnational capital, theories of new geographical and social spaces (Soja, 1999), discussions of new forms of blended cosmopolitan identity (Cheah & Robbins, 1998), and, in educational studies, analyses of transnational youth and corporate culture. Taken together, these suggest that CDA and a project of "critical applied linguistics" forwarded by Pennycook (2000) may need new tools to describe new textual formations, new configurations of discourse, and, indeed, blended forms of governmentality and identity. Whether disinterested linguistic science and ideology critique in and of

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190502000053 Published online by Cambridge University Press

themselves are up to these complex methodological and theoretical challenges is moot.

Notes

1. The author wishes to thank Mary McGroarty for editorial assistance and advice; Carmen Luke and Alaister Pennycook for resources and ideas; Salla Lahdesmaki of the University of Helsinki, Yonjg Bing Liu, Katie Weir, and Margaret Kettle for rich discussion in the ongoing doctoral seminar on CDA at the University of Queensland.

2. Thanks to Katie Weir for drawing this work to my attention as part of her CDA research on curriculum and educational policy.

REFERENCES

Anderson, B. (1991). *Imagined communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism.* London: Verso.

Ang, I. (1991). *Desperately seeking an audience.* New York: Routledge.

Appadurai, A. (1996). *Modernity at large: Cultural dimensions of globalization.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1998). *Practical reason: On the theory of action.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Cheah, P., & Robbins, B. (Eds.) (1998). *Cosmopolitics: Thinking and feeling beyond the nation.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Chouliaraki, L., & Fairclough, N. (1999). *Discourse in late modernity: Rethinking critical discourse analysis.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Comaroff, J., & Comaroff, J.F. (2000). Millennial capitalism: First thoughts on a second coming. *Public Culture, 12*(2), 291–343.

Derrida, J. (1980). *Writing and difference.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Foucault, M. (1982). *The archaeology of knowledge.* New York: Pantheon.

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

Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and social change.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Freire, P., & Macedo, D. (1987). *Literacy: Reading the world and the world.* South Hadley, MA: Bergin & Garvey.

Gee, J. P. (1996). *Social linguistics and literacies* (2nd ed.). London: Taylor & Francis.

Gee, J. P. (1999). *An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method.* London: Routledge.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190502000053 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Habermas, J. (1984). *A theory of communicative action*. Boston: Beacon Press.
Hall, S. (1996). The meaning of new times. In D. Morley & K. Chen (Eds.), *Stuart Hall: Critical dialogues in cultural studies* (pp. 223–238). London: Routledge.
Hymes, D. (1996). *Ethnography, linguistics and narrative inequality*. London: Taylor & Francis.
Kress, G., & Hodge, R. (1979). *Language as ideology*. London: Routledge.
Luke, A. (1995). Text and discourse in education: An introduction to critical discourse analysis. In M. W. Apple (Ed.), *Review of Research in Education, 21* (pp. 3–48). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.
Luke, A. (1997). The material effects of the world: Apologies, 'stolen children' and public discourse. *Discourse, 18*, 343–368.
Marcuse, H. (1971). *Negations: Essays in critical theory*. Boston: Beacon Press.
Mey, J. L. (1985). *Whose language? A study in linguistic pragmatics*. Amstersdam: John Benjamins.
Muspratt, S., Luke, A., & Freebody, P. (Eds.). (1997). *Constructing critical literacies*. Creskill, NJ: Hampton.
Pennycook, A. (2000). *Critical applied linguistics*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
Robertson, R. (1992). *Globalization: Social theory and global culture*. London: Sage.
Soja, E. (1999). *Thirdspace*. London: Verso.
van Dijk, T.A. (1993). Principles of critical discourse analysis. *Discourse and Society, 4*, 249–283.
van Dijk, T. A. (Ed.) (1997). *Discourse studies: A multidisciplinary introduction: Vol. 2. Discourse as social interaction*. London: Sage.
Wodak, R. (1996). *Disorders of discourse*. London: Longman.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190502000053 Published online by Cambridge University Press