The concept of discourse in the analysis
of complex communication events

*The hermeneutic intent is nowhere more needed
than in theoretical discussions of the mass media*
(James Carey, 1993:69).

1. Introduction

The Dutch discourse researcher Teun A. van Dijk introduced 1985 his book *Discourse and Communication: New Approaches to the Analysis of Mass Media and Communication* with the following words: "There are two vast fields of research that, despite their common interest for text, talk and communication, seem to virtually ignore each other: the study of mass communication on the one hand and discourse analysis on the other hand" (van Dijk, 1985: V). Some 12 years later a change towards a growing interest between these two fields of research can be stated - new theories about media discourse analysis have been developed and some major empirical studies using discourse analysis as a method to investigate complex communication events[1] have been done. This paper presents and discusses different approaches to media discourse analysis:

- Discourse analysis with Michel Foucault.
- The socio-cognitive approach of Teun van Dijk.
- Critical Discourse Analysis with Norman Fairclough
- Critical Discourse Analysis with the Duisburg School.
- The discourse-historical method of the Vienna School.

The discussion of these approaches aims to show similarities and differences between some of the most established approaches to discourse analysis by focusing on the various definitions of discourse, the methodical design and the aims of discourse analysis. This selection obviously neglects discourse approaches, which define themselves primarily as part of language studies (e.g. conversation analysis, sociolinguistics, critical linguistics) on the one hand; and approaches, which do not include analysis of intertextuality and linguistic analysis (e.g. social semiotics), on the other hand. Basically this selection mirrors the recent development of how Michel

---

[1] Complex communication events are defined as chains of discursive events about certain topics. Moreover the term complex communication events is addresses the complex and multidimensional character of an discursive event, including text production, text distribution, the text itself and text reception - all in relation to the concrete setting of the given discursive event and its sociocultural context. The analysis of complex communication events is supposed to take account of all these aspects.

Foucault's thinking has been integrated into discourse approaches in the tradition of critical theory[2]. Therefore Foucault's discourse approach is seen as a basic model or frame for discourse analysis from a critical perspective in which the concept of discourse is offering new answers in order to overcome the traditional dualisms of action-structure and micro-macro.

There is a broad range of definitions of discourse and discourse analysis which has led to a certain semantic haziness and terminological flexibility of these terms. This is not surprising for successful concepts in general (e.g. culture, communication, constructivism). Precisely the fact that the concept of discourse seems to suit both social theorists and researchers in linguistics and other branches of the humanities opens this concept to the unification of and co-operation between different angles in the concrete investigation of complex communication events.

The following presentation and discussion of different concepts and approaches in this paper is a kind of synchronic and diachronic description of the discourse about discourse on its own. The aim of this discussion is to raise a methodical frame for my Ph.D.-dissertation "Constructions of Germans and Germany in Danish Media Discourses". The choice of the concepts to be discussed below is influenced by central questions in my Ph.D.-dissertation. These questions are:

- Which **information basis** offers the Danish mass media about Germany and Germans? Who are the authors and where does this information come from? What are the objects of and who are the subjects in discourses about Germany and Germans?
- What **role models** are offered by the Danish media for intercultural contact between Danes and Germans, and which concepts, attitudes and opinions are expressed in media discourses about Germany and Germans? What can be said about the argumentation background for these attitudes and opinions?
- Which **strategies** (linguistic, argumentative, narrative) are used in the construction of discourses about Germans and Germany between the different actors in the discourse? How do these strategies interplay with historical, social, cultural and political aspects in public opinion? How do these strategies relate objects, subjects and concepts of the discourses to each other?

---

[2] The tradition of critical theory is defined as a research perspective, which has basically a critical attitude towards society. This perspective dates back to the first decade after the first world war and is closely connected to its key figures Max Horkheimer, Theodore Adorno, Erich Fromm and Herbert Marcuse. On the background of the historical processes in first decades of this century (Stalinism, Fascism, the decline of the international trade labour movement etc.) these researchers insisted on Marxist criticism of capitalism, but tried at the same time to reformulate the philosophical foundations of Marxism according to the historical and political developments.
.

An attempt to answer these questions presupposes the establishment of an empirical basis or corpus which enables the analyst to do both quantitative and qualitative analysis in a historical perspective. Therefore my primary corpus consists of all texts dealing with Germany and Germans in the five highest circulated Danish newspapers and the two Danish public service tv-channels, collected in the period April, 1 to September, 30[h], 1996. In qualitative case studies, this primary corpus is to be supplemented by further texts about the same discursive topic, preceding and succeeding the data collection period in 1996.

My intention is to define a methodical frame for this project to enable the analyst to gain general and representative results on the basis of the analysis of a large amount of texts (quantitative analysis on macro level) on the one hand, and to gain profound insights about the nature of media texts form and content (qualitative analysis on micro level) on the other hand. Such a frame could be based on a synthesis of these approaches, which takes account of the advantages and disadvantages of the different approaches to be presented and discussed below in relation to my own project. Thus I hope to be able to offer a frame based on critical discourse analysis, that can also be useful for similar projects which also have to deal with large amount of texts and nevertheless seek to combine a quantitative with a qualitative perspective in the analysis of those texts[3].

---

[3]   All quotations from non-English sources are my own translations.

2. General background

Surveying the last 15-20 years of media research, it can be stated that messages[4] in media texts have not actually been the focus of research interest. Much work has been done on developing sociological and socio-psychological theories, methods and empirical investigation of media institutions, conditions of production and reception. However, comparatively little attention has been paid to the systematic analysis of what mass communication seems primarily to be about: texts and messages. Also much of the media and communication research in the 90's is focusing on how individuals or groups are interpreting texts. Connell & Mills (1985:30f.) describe the attitude towards texts among most scholars in reception studies as follows:

> *In their view, and it is a view common to this sociology, any analysis properly concerned with the social would look elsewhere than texts to discover social relations and structures. Texts may be socially constructed and may express socially shared meanings, but they are not themselves social! For this sociology the text is simply an 'artefact', a given stability which is fixed once and for all.*

Although individuals in an audience interpret media texts in relation to their own life-world and experiences, the text itself still has decisive influence on these interpretations, due to the fact that communication always is based on an agreement or contract between the producers of texts and the readers of texts (cf. Grice, 1979:243-265). This agreement has to do with the readers genre expectations to the texts, with textual and communicative coherence and therefore with the readings of the audience. Texts are intentionally constructed and contain expectations about possible interpretations. All texts are structured *a priori* by their producers and therefore (and because of the interrelation between form and content) all texts bind their audience to this structure. Media texts guide the reader's interpretations as well as the circumstances of a communicative event and the reader's (cultural, sociological etc.) background. Finally, one more argument for the relevance of textual analysis comes even from sociology and social psychology itself: mankind is by definition socially determined, the individuals life-world and experiences are part of a shared and common social reality. Therefore the reception, understanding and interpretation of texts is fundamentally unique for each member of an audience or independent of the text producers intentions, but a result of social rules and conventions.

Few media researchers categorically neglect that texts create frames and limits for possible (and impossible) interpretations of the readers. Nevertheless, much of the

---

[4] The term message refers to basic models in communication theory which use the term to describe intentional utterances of the text producer. It refers both to the form and the content of these utterances.

analytical work in media research contains surprisingly little about these frames and media text analysis still remains rather rudimentary in the research field. Profound and systematic analysis of the correlation of registration and interpretation of media contents - not to mention the analysis of linguistic features and ways of expressions - is normally insufficient.

One may ask why this is so. In my opinion there are at least two main reasons for the present state. Firstly, the main part of communication and media studies has emerged from the social sciences and is orientated against sociological topics (Kjørup, 1984:5-22). However, why should sociologists not also be interested in texts which are essential parts of each communicative event (like audience and media institutions)? At least media sociologists could have worked together with media text analysts, both of them analysing communication within their respective spheres of interest.

The Norwegian communication analyst Svennik Høyer (1991:48) offers a theoretical explanation for the boom of reception analysis on micro level and the neglect of texts:

> *The receiver understands the text by understanding the sender and the situation within which texts are communicated. However, there is still a truism in media research that mass communication is seriously lacking feedback, that the world of senders and the world of receivers are very different, and that mass communication may be a contradiction in terms.*

Another explanation could be a lack of convincing methods and tools for the analysis of media texts (van Dijk, 1985:1). The way media research based in the humanities has been dealing with validity and reliability and the lack of value of textual analysis in terms of generalisation have been criticised by media sociologists. This critique is also related to the practice of analysing texts without taking into account the actual circumstances of the communicative event and the sociological parameters in communication processes. Chomsky's "revolution of linguistics" had certainly also an impact on the lack of integration and common efforts between linguistic and social theory, because he and his followers declared that the content of texts is behind the interest of linguistic analysis.

3. Established approaches to the analysis of media texts

3.1 Quantitative Content Analysis

Probably the most well established approach to the analysis of media texts is *quantitative content analysis*. The birth of this method can be dated back to the 18th century in Sweden (Asp,1986:19), but its break through came with Berelsons article *Quantitative content analysis in communication research* (1952/71). Quantitative content analysis reflects the idea that it is possible to measure the content of texts by examining the statistic occurrence of defined units (such as arguments or phrases). Therefore the first step in quantitative content analysis is to break down a text into countable units and works on statistical computations in relation to categories, defined by the analyst. And thus the definition of suitable and meaningful categories is the pitfall of this method: "Content analysis stands or falls by its categories" (Berelson (1952/71:147). The results of this measurement will afterwards be evaluated and interpreted by the analyst. According to Berelson and his followers (e.g. Bassewitz, 1990:67) this method enables the analyst to describe content systematically and objectively.

Quantitative content analysis has been massively criticised for its rooting in the positivist and behaviourist paradigm of science - in particular by researchers in the tradition of the hermeneutics and critical theory[5]. I will very shortly list some of the main critiques: According to the critics, the quantitative content analysis tried to escape from subjectivity, which is immanent in textual interpretation. But by breaking down a text into measurable units the analyst is destroying what he is supposed to study. Internal relations between the units and the textual whole are precluded from analysis and therefore quantitative content analysis runs the risk to neglect what might be important aspects of the textual meaning (cf. Larsen, 1997:70; Asp, 1986:21; Fühlau, 1982:92ff.). Qualitative aspects, such as the ways of expressions in a text, the co- and context of the text, power relations in a text or agents perspectives in a text are not subject for discussion. There are problems in the process of defining the categories of analysis, which at least is a process that certainly is not objective (cf. Bucher, 1989:145). Furthermore the definition of categories is normally based on formal linguistics and not on communication theory and creates inference problems between the goals of analysis and these categories. Despite the massive critiques, quantitative content analysis seems still to be one of the most common methods to analyse media messages in an international perspective because it aims to present representative results from textual analysis (cf. Bassewitz, 1990:67).

---

[5] For a comprehensive critique of quantitative content analysis see e.g. Bucher & Fritz (1989:145-149).

3.2 Qualitative Content Analysis

Stemming from the critique of quantitative content analysis and hand in hand with a general rise against positivism, many Scandinavian media researchers subscribed to qualitative content analysis from an ideological perspective. This so-called "humanistic trend" in Scandinavian mass communication research started in the early 1970's. Much of the work focused on power relations expressed and established in and by media texts and moved towards qualitative analytical designs, often derived from the advances made in general and textual semiotics. Peter Larsen, one of the leading figures in qualitative content analysis in Denmark, described this trend as follows:

Content analysis was, on the other hand, not considered to be an end in itself. Another characteristic feature of these studies, and another indication of the researcher's background in the humanities, was the "holistic" ambition, the attempt at interpreting media messages against broader historical, social and cultural contexts. To this should be added that the studies were usually grounded in a critical knowledge interest in emancipation (Larsen, 1991:67).

According to Mayring (1983:27) qualitative content analysis is based on careful examination of the sources of the material to be analysed and on explicit observation and presentation of the analysts own pre-understanding. Furthermore, qualitative content analysis has to take the perspectives of others into consideration and it has to be open towards re-interpretations. Semiotic terms, pragmatic theory of meaning and rules for interpretation from structuralist textual analysis are instruments in the analytical process, which includes the basic principles of summarising, explaining and structuring of the material (Mayring, 1983:53).

This holistic ambition could not really be realised, because the methodical tools at that time made it difficult to establish a systematic empirical relation between studies of text and co- and context. Most of the empirical work focused on the analysis of individual or very few media texts. A systematic analysis of the co- and context of media texts did not happen and so these analyses had a tendency to become self-fulfilling prophecies. This critique and the general rise of reception research led to the decline of the role of textual analysis in media research. In the 80s poststructuralism dominated the research field according to the general "Zeitgeist" in the social sciences. Nevertheless qualitative content analysis was an important methodical step towards the analysis of complex communication events.

3.3 Cultivation Theory, Cultural Studies and Semiotics

It should be emphasised that message analysis was not altogether absent in media research in the last 20 years. An important contribution came from George Gerbner's (1969) *Cultivation Theory* on cultural indicators in media texts, which - although strongly opposed by the sociological school in media research - today seems to be confirmed by the cultural mainstreaming in the last decades developments in the media. Cultivation is defined as follows:

> *The term is used to describe that our primary concern is not with bits of information, education, persuasion, etc., or with any kind of direct communication "effects". It is with the common context into which we are born and in response to which individual and group selections and interpretations of messages takes places* (Gerbner, 1985:14).

According to Gerbner, mass media play an important role in the process of cultivation. They inform and form common images, they entertain and create publics, they reflect and shape attitudes, tastes and preferences. Therefore Gerbner speaks about "the mass production of messages forming message systems" (ibid:16), which can be analysed as collective extracts:

> *Its purpose is to describe the symbolic "world", sense its climate, trace its currents, and identify its functions…Message system analysis seeks to examine what large and heterogeneous communities absorb but not necessarily what any individual selects. The analysis extracts from the discourse its basic presentation of elements of existence, importance, value, and relationship, and then re-aggregates these elements into larger patterns aloing lines of investigate purpose…Message system analysis thus investigates industrial behaviour in message mass-production for large and heterogeneous populations. The analysis suggests collective and common features and functions of public image formation* (ibid:17).

Other important contributions came from the Glasgow University Media Group (1976, 1980, 1982) and the Centre of Contemporary Cultural Studies in Birmingham (e.g. Stuart Hall et al, 1980), who defined the media as a major cultural and ideological force, taking a dominant position with respect to the way in which social an political problems were defined and the production and transformation of popular ideologies in the audiences were addressed. Altogether these contributions can be seen as a break with quantitative approaches in media text analysis. Cultural Studies have been strongly influenced by current European structuralist thinkers (Lévi-Strauss, Lacan, Saussure, Gramsci, Althusser, Barthes and Foucault), who also laid the ground to the notion of ideology, to semiotic analysis and discourse analysis in media research. Semiotic research about "the life of signs in society" directed attention from the single text to the

surrounding society in which the text was created and in which it had a particular function. Textual analysis was no longer seen isolated from the co- and contexts of media texts, narratives of texts as well as intertextuality and genres came into focus of textual analysis (e.g. Fiske & Hartley, 1978; Bentele, 1981; Jensen, 1995). Thus textual analysis became a part of discourse studies which integrated contributions from both cultural studies and semiotics (cf. Connell & Mills, 1985:32-42).

4. Looking for clues - Social Semiotics and Discourse Analysis

Beside these tendencies in what I will call the humanities based media research, there has also been a remarkable development in the part of media research which emerged from social sciences such as political science and sociology. While earlier focusing on macro-phenomena such as institutions, the audience or the public from a macro-sociological perspective and on a rather high level of abstraction, the growing interest in micro-sociological phenomena, such as segmentation of target groups and lifestyle analysis (as we find in e.g. Pierre Bourdieu's influence on media research) indicates a shift towards qualitative analyses on a micro level.

Both tendencies - the growing interest for co- and context in textual analysis and the growing focus on qualitative micro-sociological analysis - open new dimensions for the analysis of complex communication events. A central position in this process is taken by the concept of discourse. Barret (1991:124) distinguishes between two separate tendencies in modern social and cultural theory: textuality (the linguistic turn, which is related to key figures like Roland Barthes and Jaques Derrida) and discursivity. While the linguistic turn defines a movement towards a revaluation of the text as text rather than as pale reflection of some prior reality and towards a study of texts in its own terms, discursivity focuses on the social context in analysing texts.

While I earlier described the shift form qualitative content analysis to poststructuralism (and its consequences for context-orientated textual analysis) in the beginning 80s, some 15 years later publications in the field of mass communication research indicate a major shift in terms of a renewed interest in texts (e.g. Selby & Cowdery, 1995; Fiske, 1996; Abercombie, 1996; Ekecrantz, 1997; Lund, 1997; Petersen, 1997). The concept of discourse plays a central role in this change. This concept integrates existing knowledge from semiotics and qualitative content analysis by focusing on genre, intertextuality and especially the context of texts. The activity of reading a media text is seen "as a complex negotiation between the discourses articulated by the media text and the discourses of the reader (which relate, of course, to their own social experience)" (Selby & Cowdery, 1995:210). The media concept of discourse seeks to combine the analysis

of media texts with text production and text reception "by extending and integrating these two areas of concern" (ibid.) and to combine the analysis of ways of expressions with content analysis and - methodically - quantitative and qualitative approaches in a systematic and topical analysis of texts. By doing so, discourse analysis aims to tackle the interrelationship of text, producer and audience from an analytical perspective. Therefore media text analysis gains the ability to scope and to investigate social and cultural changes in society. Media texts are not just simply seen as a mirror for these changes but also as an active part in the process of constructing new social and cultural identities. As Fiske (1996:6) underlines, discourse studies do not describe language as a system but analyse language as social act and social use of language:

> *Discourse is the continuous process of making sense and of circulating it socially. Unlike a simulacrum, discourse is both a noun and a verb, it is ever on move. At times it becomes visible or audible, in texts, or a speech, or a conversation. These public moments are all that the discourse analyst has to work on, but their availability does not necessarily equate with their importance: discourse continues its work silently inside our heads as we make our own sense of everyday lives. Though discourse is used privately and individually, it remains inescapably social, so those who share discourse are likely to form social and political alliances, for they will share broadly an understanding of the world and the way that their interests can best be secured within it.*
> *We use discourse, then, both to form our sense of the social world and to form the relations by which we engage in it. In the realm of social relations, discourse works through a constant series of invitations and rejections by which it attempts to include certain social formations in its process and exclude others. Discourse offers continuous but unequal opportunities for intervention, and discursive guerrillas are key troops in any political and cultural campaign.*

While linguists - sometimes even almost exclusively - focus on how statements are made on the micro level of discourses, social researchers are mostly interested in what statements are made in discourses and how these statements can be seen as expressions of the social conditions, they both affect and are determined by. The following quotation expresses these different positions (ibid.:3):

> *Discourse is an elusive term, for it both refers to a general theoretical notion and to specific practices within it. At the theoretical level, 'discourse' challenges the structuralist concept of 'language' as an abstract system (Saussure's langue) and relocates the whole process of making and using meanings from an abstracted structural system into particular historical, social, and political conditions. Discourse, then, is language in social use, ... Discourse analysis differs from*

linguistic analysis in focusing on what statements are made rather than how they are… At this level, then, discourse is the means by which those conditions (of social use) are made to make sense within the social relations that structure them. It is structured and structuring, for it is both determined by its social conditions and affects them…Discourse also operates on a lower level on which a number of discourses put discourse-in-general into practice, and this is the level where it can be most particularly analysed.

Both discourse analysis and social semiotics see themselves as new interdisciplinary approaches to the analysis of complex communication events. But as Høyer (1991:34) remarks, the universal claim of semiotic approaches i neglecting serious shortcomings: "Semiotics, however, does not explain why and how rules of encoding are created, how codes are regulated, how they are understood by the audience, why rules changes or why we communicate in the first place." The critique of social semiotics is due to its structural determination of social sense-making of the world and the lack of interest for a processes and developments, which often led to static analysis of systems and structures without paying sufficient attention to the role of the active subjects. This critique of semiotic discourse approaches does on the other hand not exclude the integration of structuralist and semiotic concepts in the critical and hermeneutic based media discourse analysis. Moreover, there has lately been an tendency towards a convergence of approaches rooting in Semiotics and critical theory (cf. Jensen, 1997; Fiske, 1996; Kress & van Leeuwen, 1990; Kress, Leite-Garcia & van Leeuwen, 1997).

Van Dijk (1997a:1-5) distinguishes basically between common sense-definitions and theoretically elaborated definitions of discourse. While "discourse" is synonymous to social or institutional language use in everyday speech, theoretical definitions cover over three dimensions of communicative events: (1) language use, (2) communication of opinions and cognition and (3) interaction. These three dimensions can also be seen as the basic differentiation of discourse approaches in a mapping of the research field according to the primary cognitive interests (ibid.:7-28):

(1) The study of discourse can either deal with local and global discursive structures (there form and content) in highlighting different aspects as they appear in discourse semiotics, discourse rhetoric, discourse semantics or discourse grammar. This group of discourse approaches and studies has the strongest affection to traditional linguistics.

(2) Likewise discourse studies can primarily investigate the construction of mental models, processes and representations and try to define rules and conventions of social knowledge production. This group of discourse approaches and studies is closely connected with cognitive and social psychology.

(3) Finally the study of discourse can focus on aspects of interaction as they appear in speech act and conversational analysis. Central concepts of this group of approaches are transferred from the social sciences as e.g. the setting of discourse, ideology, power etc. This group has the aim to illuminate the relations between discourses and society.

In each of these three groups of discourse approaches and studies the context of linguistic utterances plays an important role in the analysis of texts. Van Dijk (ibid.:19ff.) distinguishes between local context structures and global context structures. Local context structures include the aims, intentions, communicative and social roles of the participants in discourses as well as the setting of discourse in time, space and modality. Global context structures are important, if discourses are identified as constitutive for institutional actions and procedures. The investigation of global contexts involves broader cultural and social aspects in e.g. discourse studies of ethnicity, intercultural communication and in critical discourse analysis.

Thus the different approaches to discourse analysis which I will present and discuss at the following pages, have in common that they all focus on narratives, intertextuality and genre features in the hermeneutic and interpretative analysis of media texts. The review cannot be done in all comprehensive details, considering the voluminous work done by the researchers discussed and all the discussions of these approaches in scientific literature. Therefore the survey aims to present, to discuss and to elaborate on those central ideas and concepts in approaches which seem to be most relevant in terms of how they can contribute to complex communication analysis in general, and to media text analysis in particular. The review highlights the following aspects: line of tradition, definition of discourse, aims of discourse analysis, central terms and concepts in the methodical design, and advantages (successful contributions) in relation to the field of discourse studies. Beside the programmatic texts and key works of the different researchers, the following pages have drawn on surveys by Wodak/Fairclough (1997:258-284) and Frandsen (1996:9-32).

5. Discourse Analysis with Michel Foucault

> *... if I had encountered the Frankfurt School while young, I would have been seduced to the point of doing nothing else in life but the job of commenting on them* (Foucault, 1971*)*.

The central task for Michel Foucault was to write a history of expounding problems as a critique and deconstruction of Western thinking which had always focused on what it means to be a human being instead of how it is to be a human being. There is no real human agency which leads to the Foucault-related notion of "the dead of the unified subject and the rise of many subjects". Although human beings are acting in their lives, they are not the subject of these actions, but products of discursive practises. Objects are not social facts, but how subjects bring things to presence through language (objectification). Therefore a relation between power and language can be stated and subjects must be seen as social constructions, produced through social discourses which position them in a field of power relations (cf. Layder, 1994:95). While critical thinking focuses on our ability to gain access to language (e.g. via knowledge); Foucault focuses on how technologies of calculation produce calculable and empowered subjects because of their inscription into force by technologies (subjectivication). Therefore his attack of the central importance of the subject can be seen as his major interest.

Foucault defines discourses as knowledge systems that inform social and governmental technologies. These technologies constitute power in society. Power does not come from outside, but is in us, the (dead) subjects, who are ruled by our own creations and constructions: the technologies and techniques of power in social institutions. Thus Michel Foucault opposes the concept of ideology because it is implicated in unacceptable universal truth claims and rests on a humanist understanding of the individual subject (cf. Foucault, 1977/1978:34). In his concern with and examination of Saussures structuralist theory of language and Nietzsches genealogical works, Foucault therefore developed his concept of discourse as an alternative concept to the concept of ideology.

His work is normally divided into three phases: the archaeological, the genealogical and the ethic phase (cf. Dreyfus & Rabinow, 1983:352; Kammler, 1986:17). From the methodical point of view in this paper, especially the first phase deserves special attention. Here he developed his concept of discourse in two main methodical writings: *L' archéologie du savoir* (1969) and *L' ordre du discours* (1971). In his genealogical studies, Foucault later shifted his focus to relationships between knowledge and power. Foucault saw power in contrast to Marxist theorists, to whom power was an instrument

of class dominance originated from economic interests, as something incorporated in numerous practices and technologies and not attached to certain agents or interests. Also in Foucault's concept of power the word "how" (and not "what" or "who") is the basic key word of analysis. Genealogical work involves a rediscovery of struggles and is directed against the great truths and systems of the modern order (Philip, 1985:76). The complementary relationship between the first (archaeological) phase of his works, where he defined the methodical foundation of his discourse approach, and the second (genealogical) phase, where he focused on how power is working in discourses, is described in Dean (1994:34) as follows:

Archaeology is concerned with the 'problematisations', by which, human beings question what they are, do, and the world around them; genealogy with the changing conditions of formation of such problematisations in particular 'practices of the self'.

Foucault's discourse analysis aims to illuminate the unconscious structures, which limit our way of thinking. His *Archaeology of Knowledge* is an attempt to create a non-hermeneutic, non-dialectic and non-epistemological method for the description and classification of historical discursive formations:

Archaeology tries to define not the thoughts, representations, images, themes, pre-occupations that are concealed or revealed in discourses; but those discourses themselves, those discourses as practices obeying certain rules…It is not an interpretative discipline: it does not seek another, better-hidden discourse (Foucault, 1969/72:138f.).

With regard to our central topic of interest, discourse, discursive order, objects, subjects, concepts and strategies appear to be central terms in Foucault's approach. Discourses are broadly defined as "statements" and discourse analysis as the analysis of verbal performances (1969/72:107ff.). This is a constitutive view of discourse: Discourses are seen as actively constituting and constructing society while at the same time being dependent of a society or institution. Certain types of discourses are considered as rules, constituting areas of knowledge:

Whenever one can describe, between a number of statements, such a system of dispersion, whenever, between objects, types of statements, concepts, or thematic choices, one can define regularity (an order, correlation, position, functioning, transformation), we will say, for the sake of convenience, that we are dealing with a **discursive formation** (Foucault, 1969/72:37f.).

Discourses are expressions of power relations and refer to all that can be thought, written or said about a particular topic or thing. They draw on historically prior texts and are generated by combinations of and with other discourses and texts (interdiscursivity and intertextuality). Discourse analysis is concerned with the rules (practises, technologies) which make a certain statement possible to occur and others not at particular times, places and institutional locations (Foucault, 1969/72:20). Certain rules of formations of objects, subjects, concepts and strategies are constituted in a given discursive formation and can be seen as the basic rules of discursive order. Objects and subjects of discourses are organised in relation to particular concepts, which involve social and political experiences about the modalities relating subjects and objects to each other. These modalities of relating objects, subjects and concepts, Foucault labels strategies. With strategies he does not mean particular intentions or goals of the subjects, but topical choices, which interrelate subjects, objects and concepts in discourses to each other and across different discourses (cf. Foucault, 1969/72:20; Lund & Christensen, 1995:245). The analysis of rules of formations of objects, subjects, concepts and topical choices can be seen as a fundamental approach to discourse analysis. It illuminates which objects, subjects, concepts or topics are banned from a particular discourse and how the relations between those elements are established in this discourse. Foucault defines taboos, rituals and the subjects exclusive and privileged right to speak as social procedures for the exclusion from discourses (Foucault, 1969/72:20).

Foucault's substantial empirical studies have been of a historical nature, e.g. about the history of madness, punishment and sexuality, and they cut across traditional boundaries of philosophy, psychology, psychiatry, sociology and history (cf. Layder, 1994:94). His work has been criticised for the lack of a comprehensive research programme for discourse analysis. He was almost exclusively interested in showing that the subject is nothing - except as a product of discursive practices. Foucault's archaeological and genealogical studies had primarily the aim to show exactly this thought and therefore he was not interested in traditional linguistic analysis of how something is said, but in how **what** is said in a particular discourse (Foucault, 1969/72:27-28):

The question posed by language analysis of some discursive fact or others is always: according to what rules has a particular statement been made, and consequently according to what rules could other statements be made? The description of events of discourse poses a quite different question: how is it that one particular statement appeared rather than another?…The question proper to such an analysis might be formulated this way: what is this specific existence that emerges from what is said and nowhere else?

Nevertheless Foucault provided in his lecture *L'ordre du discours* (1971/1980:50-9) the text analyst with some methodically remarkable and important observations by distinguishing between primary and secondary texts and by underlining the role of comments in discourses. Foucault distinguishes every day-texts from fundamental *textes majeurs* which eliminate the coincidences in discourses. A conclusion regarding the methodical design of discourse studies must be the focus of such studies on identifying, analysing and interpreting these *textes majeurs*.

Foucault's work makes important contributions to a social theory of discourse and power in areas as the discursive construction of subjects and knowledge and the functioning of discourse in social change. These are exactly those areas, where linguistic and critical approaches to discourse traditionally are weak and undeveloped. Therefore some of Foucault's ideas have been very influential on the different approaches to critical discourse analysis to be discussed below.

6. The socio-cognitive approach of Teun A. van Dijk

> *There are few disciplines that offer such a broad, multidisciplinary, multicultural and socially relevant approach to human language, cognition, communication and interaction* (as CDA, RL). Teun A. van Dijk, 1997a:32

One of the outstanding researchers of last 30 years in the field of social texts is Teun A. van Dijk. In the 1970's, before turning his interest to discourse analysis, he was one of the most important voices in demanding that textual theories and media discourse analysis take account of the co- and context of texts and also have a quantitative dimension which allows the analyst to draw representative conclusions about his/her analysis. Thus van Dijk presented models to textual analysis, which were based on a generative approach to textual grammar and narrative structures (e.g. van Dijk, 1972). Later he integrated the concept of action into his approach about textual grammar (van Dijk, 1974/75) and became through his attention to macro-structures interested in complex discourses. Consequently he widened his research field in the 80s to discursive formations. Here van Dijk asked for a systematic approach to analyse media discourses, which takes account of the various levels and dimensions for analysis (e.g. layout, graphical expressions, intonation, non-verbal aspects, syntactic structures, lexical style, rhetorical mechanisms, connotations etc.). At the end of the 80s van Dijk presented a new interdisciplinary theory about news in the press (1988a, 1988b) and adopted this

theory on to describe and investigate the reproduction of ethnic prejudices in the media, the abuse of power and the reproduction of inequality through ideologies (1991, 1993). His empirical studies are mainly based on an extensive empirical data collection and text corpus and aim to show how societal structures are in turn enacted, instituted, legitimated, confirmed or challenged by text and talk.

Van Dijk is primarily interested in the global organisation of texts, which ensures a coherent encoding of each part of a text (sentences, utterances). The superior frame for his concept of discourse is a theory of socio-cognitive processes. This theory is based on the assumption that both production and reception of texts rest on cognitive models and schemata which he labels *superstructures*. These experiences are in van Dijk's terms collective and individual ideologies. Media texts are a meeting place and manifestation of these cognitive schemata. To van Dijk these cognitive schemata are the missing link between text and society and between discourse structures and social structures. These structures are always mediated through the interface of personal and social cognition. Therefore discourse semantics is close to theories of the social mind and mental schemata and it seems "plausible that the structural forms and the overall meaning of a news text are not arbitrary, but a result of social and professional routines of journalists in institutional settings, on the one hand, and an important condition for the effective cognitive processing of news texts by both journalists and readers, on the other hand" (van Dijk, 1985:70).

Mastering these schemata is one of the professional skills in public discourse. It corresponds closely to our intuitive understanding (strategies) of how text planning and comprehension works. Van Dijk and Kintsch (1983:64-65) define the term *strategy* as follows:

> *Intuitively, a strategy is the idea of an agent about the best way to act in order to reach a goal. For our purpose we will, indeed, take a strategy to be a cognitive representation of some kind, just as a plan was defined as a cognitive representation of some macroaction. Now, whereas a plan is a global concept of the macroaction and its final result or goal, a strategy is a global representation of the means of reaching that goal.*

Van Dijk distinguishes between two forms of global organisation of texts: topical macro-structures on semantic level which organise local microstructures of discourses and schematic superstructures on syntactic level. In his empirical works (e.g. 1989:199-226) the analytical focus lies on topics, coherence, thematic structures, actor roles, the role and background of the text producer and stylistic features of texts as well as on narrative and argumentative structures.

Topical macro-structures are based on our ability to reduce even very complex information to macro-propositions, which express the theme or topic of the whole text. Van Dijk defines three rules for these reduction processes: the deletion of all irrelevant information; the generalisation, which creates a general macro-proposition via abstractions from the different micro-propositions; and finally the construction, where micro-propositions get combined to a sequence and replaced of a new macro-proposition. The following diagram illustrates the hierarchical structure of topical macro-structures:

<div align="right">source: van Dijk, 1988a:33</div>

Schematic superstructures on the syntactic level are, according to van Dijk, formal criteria which organise the global meaning of texts by functional relations between the micro- and macro-propositions of a text. These relations have a tendency to be conventionalised in different genres and include functional categories and rules. Based on empirical studies van Dijk claims that news articles are build up according to a certain news scheme, which determines both production and reception of the news and where each category becomes part of a general hierarchy:

<div align="right">source: van Dijk, 1988b:17</div>

Beside the investigation of basic discourse structures, van Dijk puts the analysis of rhetorical structures into the centre of his interests. Here he puts discourse analysis in a line of tradition which points back to the Aristotelian rhetoric:

Historically, discourse analysis can be traced to classical rhetoric…Only in the 1960s was it realised that classical rhetoric had more to offer. Rhetoric was defined as new rhetoric and began to play a role in the development of structural analysis of discourse, for example, in literary studies…Note that rhetoric is often understood in a broader sense as the discipline that deals with all aspects of persuasive speaking or writing. In that sense, it becomes nearly identical with at least a large part of discourse analysis (van Dijk, 1988a:18ff.).

Van Dijk's theory has been one of the most influential theories in recent research on media texts. Certainly he deserves credits for (re-)setting the demand for systematic (and quantitative extensive) analysis of media texts and contexts on the agenda of media research and for developing a theory which combines the analysis of texts with the growing interest in reception studies by offering a more precise description of how textual rules set frames for both production and reception of news.

Despite the success of the socio-cognitive theory about news as discourse, there have been critical comments on this approach. These critical comments concern mostly the empirical application of the approach and the focus on social representation and ideology. Therfore it is questionable, whether social theorists can accept the way van Dijk is dealing with his textual data in terms of representational value and generalisation when he claims to establish a new theoretical frame to understand the relation between ideology and text (Frandsen, 1996). Moreover his approach in focusing on existing topical structures inside discourse (how things can be said) does not take account of texture, that is what at all can be a topic in the discourse (and what cannot be said).

Fairclough (1995:30) criticises van Dijk's almost exclusive focus on social relations and how these relations are accomplished through routine practices. Thus he underestimates the role of the interpersonal function of language and the intertextual relations, and overestimates the stability of structures, which reproduce power relations and ideology. Another point of critique is expressed by Bucher & Fritz (1989:151-156), who criticise van Dijks approach for not distinguishing between the different levels of description (linguistic features, contextual aspects, topics etc.) in an integrative analysis of complex communication events. By doing so, van Dijk's approach from a methodical point of view is just a refinement of traditional content analysis. Bucher (1991:25) sums up his critiques as follows:

They work like the control service of the water management agency, who makes spot checks each 20 kilometres of the river to ascertain the concentration process of harmful chemical by correlating the single results to each other. As a method in producing hydrological reports this method makes sense. But in the case of media studies the relevant connections can not be investigated by the correlation-methods, but must in its own become an object of the analysis.

Finally, and despite of these critiques which mostly concern the basic rooting of van Dijk's socio-cognitive theory in a functionalist perspective and thus opposes both the ideas of Foucault and the mainstream in critical hermeneutics, the main advantage of this approach has to be underlined: Van Dijk's socio-cognitive discourse approach is - in contrast to Foucault's own studies and most of the other approaches to critical discourse analysis - opening discourse analysis towards a systematic and quantitative analysis of large amounts of texts.

7. Critical Discourse Analysis with Norman Fairclough

What intertextual analysis offers media reception studies is a textual basis for answering questions about what social resources and experiences are drawn upon in the reception and interpretation of media, and what other domains of life media messages are linked or assimilated to in interpretation.
(Fairclough, 1995b:200)

The English linguist Norman Fairclough has worked on a model of critical discourse analysis, which also includes the analysis of media discourses. Fairclough is strongly influenced by the work of functional and critical linguistics, which see sentences and texts as multifunctional entities. Fairclough draws on traditions in critical theory, when he defines a normally unconscious link between the use of language and power. Critical discourse analysis aims "systematically to explore often opague relationships of causality and determination between (a) discursive practices, events and texts, and (b) wider social and cultural structures, relations and processes" (Fairclough, 1995b:132). Furthermore discourse analysis aims to show how changes in the use of language can be seen as a sign of general social and cultural changes in a society, which again have to do with changes in power relations. By doing so, critical discourse analysis also has a special function in promoting interdisciplinary scientific work (Fairclough, 1992:72):

It is an attempt to bring together three analytical traditions, each of which is indispensable for discourse analysis. These are the tradition of close textual and linguistic analysis within linguistics, the macro-sociological tradition of analysing social practice in relation to social structures, and the interpretative or micro-sociological tradition of seeing social practice as something which people actively produce and make sense of on the basis of shared common sense procedures.

Fairclough offers two definitions of discourse: In the broad sense discourse is "use of language as a particular form of social practise" (1995a:54). In a narrow sense discourse is seen as "the language used in representing a given social practice from a particular point of view" (ibid.:56). Discourses constitute, reproduce and transform social identities and social relations and represent the knowledge systems of the language user. Each discourse is part of a discursive order in a certain institution or certain area of society, in which cultural hegemony is inherent. The order of discourse of a particular social domain is the totality of discursive practices and the relationships between them. Media discourse analysis can illuminate representations, identities and relations:

1. *How is the world (events, relationships, etc.) represented?*
2. *What identities are set up for those involved in the program or story (reporters, audiences, 'third parties' referred to or interviewed)?*
3. *What relationships are set up between those involved (e.g. reporter-audience, expert-audience or politician-audience relationships)?* (Fairclough, ibid.:5)

Each discourse analysis includes an analysis of the discursive event and an analysis of the discursive order (Foucault's discursive formations). Both should not be done isolated from each other. In the centre of the analysis of a discursive event stands the relations between the three dimensions: text, discourse practice and sociocultural practice which are illustrated in the following simple model showing the dimensions of discourse and the dimensions of discourse analysis:

On textual level the following four aspects have to be analysed:

- vocabulary
- grammar
- cohesion
- textual structures

The analysis of words, sentences and texts has to make the important distinction between the meaning potential and its interpretation: "The meaning potential of a form is generally heterogeneous, a complex of diverse, overlapping and sometimes contradictory meanings (…), so that texts are usually highly ambivalent and open to multiple interpretations" (Fairclough, 1992:75).

In the analysis of discourse practise, which includes the analysis of text production, text distribution and text consumption, we find one of the central concepts in Fairclough's model to critical discourse analysis. This is the concept of intertextuality which Fairclough has borrowed from Bakhtin and Kristeva. Intertextual analysis aims to show how media texts get constituted through often hybrid config urations of different genres and discourses. In this sense the analysis of discourse practise relates textual analysis to the analysis of sociocultural practise which is an analysis of the situational, institutional, social and cultural context of the text.

The analysis of discourse order deals with the configuration of genres and discourses that constitute this order and focus in particular on the relation between stability and

change. In his empirical analysis of media discourses, Fairclough highlights the relation between public discourse order in the media and private discourse order in the audience. Here Fairclough claims the tendency that private discourses become more and more influenced by the public and that borders between information and entertainment disappear. These tendencies he calls *conversationalization* and *infotainment*.

The introduction of the term *discourse practice* and the concept of *intertextuality* to media text analysis can be seen as one of the most important and progressive steps in Fairclough's concept of critical discourse analysis. Beside terminological nebulosity (e.g. discourse, discourse type, genre) most of the critiques of Fairclough's approach concern its mezzo-status between linguistics and social theory, which is based on eclectic use of theories and methods from both field of research. But taking into account that Fairclough's intention is to present a methodical frame, which bridges the gap between linguistics and social theory, this general critique appears rather weak and contradictory. On the other hand, Faircloughs own empirical studies and examples clearly show how difficult it is to reach the high level of ambition, presented in this methodical frame and to apply this theory in concrete empirical work. Therefore other and perhaps more substantial critiques (e.g. Pennycook, 1994; Widdowson 1995; Lundgren 1997) are directed against the relation between description and explanation (interpretation) and the lack of understanding for human agency in Faiclough's approach; that is the Neo-Marxist and Neo-Gramscian epistemological foundation of the approach.

Fairclough's approach to critical discourse analysis is - by putting the emphasis on the level of discourse practise - designed for the analysis of rather small amounts of texts. In an empirical design on the basis of a large amount of texts, a very detailed linguistic analysis on textual level seems not to be possible in practise. Normally Fairclough himself just exemplifies the categories defined in his approach to critical discourse analysis by using well-chosen single texts. Thus Fairclough's approach appears to be heavily and explicitly theoretical and the empirical value of the concept to the analysis of news texts seems to be limited to discourse studies with a strong linguistic profile. But exactly this makes it difficult to relate the results from linguistic analysis to social theory on a macro-level.

8. Critical Discourse Analysis with the Duisburg School

Insgesamt:: Nicht dem Fetisch Objektivität im Sinne naturwissenschaftlicher Scheinobjektivität aufsitzen!
(Jäger, 1994:40)

The Duisburg School, which is first of all linked to its *primus motor* and leading figure Siegfried Jäger, is massively influenced by central principles and concepts of Michel Foucault's archaeological approach. Such central ideas are the narrative progression of discourse, where discourse is defined as the linguistic manifestation of a discursive practice. Also Foucault's notion of historical discursive formations which mediate knowledge through time, of power and hegemony and of certain discursive rules and conventions play an important part in the approach to critical discourse analysis developed by the Duisburg School. Jäger's approach combines these ideas with the (speech) act theory of Leontjew (see below) to develop a new theory which integrates social science and linguistics.

The starting point for Jäger's approach is a critique of both traditional linguistic and social research which can be summarised as follows: Linguists primarily do research on formal aspects of language without taking notice of the content of texts, of discursive practise and the social and cultural surrounding of texts. Thus linguistic research - and this includes (although in lesser degree) for Jäger also modern theories as e.g. sociolinguistic, textlinguistic and pragmatic approaches - "has become independent from social practise" (Jäger, 1994:13). Generally speaking Jäger criticises sociolinguists for aiming towards qualitative research goals while working with quantitative research designs. Furthermore, social and linguistic data get related to each other and discussed without any reflection about the inner consistency of these data (Jäger, 1993:21-53).

On the other hand, qualitative social research normally interprets texts without any linguistic methodology and theory at all: "Sociology handles texts generally in form of paraphrases or explanatory notes and more or less free-hand interpretations of texts" (ibid.:15). Therefore qualitative social research according to Jäger lacks a methodical background for the interpretation of texts.

A.N. Leontjew's theory of activity, drawing on the cultural-historical school founded by the Russian social psychologist Vygotsky, appears for Jäger to be an approach that can compensate for the lack of traditional linguistics and social theory by redefining the relation between acting, thinking and communicating and the relation between the individual and society. This redefinition is based on Leontjew's claim that the individual's social and historical background is the key to individual aspects of acting,

thinking and communication. Thus texts are seen as manifestations of individual and social work, expressing socio-historical knowledge in relation to a certain object. Text are understood as fragments of discourses and as building blocks that constitute discourse chains (ibid.:17). Or in other words:" Texts are … never only something individual, but also always social. They are fragments of an over-individual discourse" (Jäger, 1994:21). Consequently, discourse is quite similar to Foucault's definition seen as "historically rooted flow of text and speech, respectively knowledge, through time" (Jäger, 1993:153). The following illustration from Jäger's introduction to critical discourse analysis gives a visual impression of his definition of discourse:

source: Jäger, 1993:156

Discourse fragments are defined as texts or parts of texts, which deal with a particular topic or theme (ibid.:181. A number of discourse fragments constitute a discourse chain, which can be situated on one or several discourse levels (e.g. politics, education, media). Thus, discourse chains are flows of discourse fragments about the same topic. A turbulence and whirl of several discourse chains constitutes the interdiscourse, which can be defined as the total amount of all non-scientific discourses. Finally, this interdiscourse constitutes together with specialised scientific discourses the total amount of social discourse.

Textual analysis is first discourse analysis, if texts are understood as "parts of an entire socially and historically rooted discourse" (Jäger, 1994:24). The aim of discourse analysis is to disentangle the discursive turbulence (*diskursives Gewimmel*) between particular texts and discourses because various texts and discourses are interwoven with each other and constitute a discursive turbulence. For this purpose Jäger has developed an explicit method in several steps to investigate discourse fragments systematically. As for Fairclough, the concept of intertextuality plays a central role in Jäger's concept of critical discourse analysis. Most obvious are intertextuality and interdiscursivity in texts which he labels *discursive knots*. *Discursive knots* can be understood as Foucault's *textes majeur*, as central texts in a discursive chain, because they refer to earlier texts in this discursive chain or to other discourses. And like Fairclough, Jäger stresses that his method to discourse analysis should not be understood as a formal and universal recipe. Any discourse analysis has to be designed to the specific research interests and the specific form and content of the discourse to be analysed. Jäger's approach to the analysis of discourse fragments involves the following main steps and basic questions which doesn't have to be answered in this order or in each detail (Jäger, 1993:187-201; 1994:33-42): Analysis of macro-structure of the whole discourse (e.g. genre-, topic- & structural analysis, that is identification, description and analysis of the discourse fragments in relation to discourse chains, interdiscursivity, discursive knots and the discursive turbulence).

1. Analysis of the verbal context (e.g. analysis of other texts in the media, of discourse fragments in other media, institutional analysis, intertextuality).
2. Analysis of the non-verbal context (e.g. analysis of the text producers ideological, biographical, professional etc. background, social and historical background of the discourse in society).
3. Linguistic analysis on textual micro level (e.g. analysis of collective symbols, metaphors, narrative and argumentative structures in discourse fragments, lexical analysis, argumentation analysis, propositions).
4. Final interpretation (e.g. analysis of message, target group, ideological and social frame of the discourse, linguistic features of realisation, intended effects).

But how can analysis of discourse fragments be generalised to discourse analysis? Jäger does not believe that the combination of qualitative and quantitative methods to gain representative results is necessary to solve this problem. Like Foucault, (and in opposition to e.g. the discourse approach of the Vienna School, se below) Jäger means that the divsion into quantity and quality is abolished in discourses. Also the construction of ideal types (as defined of Max Weber) is unnecessary in his understanding of discourse because it would presuppose the existence of normality and valid averages. To solve the problem of representativity, Jäger refers to an

understanding of discourse, in which discursive routines and rules can be identified in each discourse fragment. Therefore the problem of representativity can be solved by going on with the analysis of different fragments until nothing new can be found by this analysis. Jäger underlines that his own experiences from empirical studies indicate that after few discourse fragments no new information and observations can be gathered (Jäger, 1993:202-212).

The Duisburg School has done a series of major studies on gender, the new right movement and racism in Germany, which showed common characteristics (symbols, types of statements, topics) and differences in linguistic realisation due to the specific audience addressed. By doing so, these empirical studies pinpoint similarities and affinities to van Dijk's empirical works mentioned above and the empirical research of the Vienna School described below. Moreover the empirical studies of the Duisburg School exemplify the notion of critique in its approach to discourse analysis. The critical perspectives are already established when the analyst chooses a socially explosive topic for his analysis. Furthermore discourse analysis has to be seen as the preliminary scientific pre-condition for a succeeding interpretative evaluation of the results of this analysis. According to Jäger this critical evaluation is based on ethic and moral criteria, which are to be found in the specific society around the discourse to be analysed. To avoid moral relativism these specific moral norms have to be related to universal common sense about what are reasonable acts. According to Jäger there exists a dialectic relationship between specific socially and culturally determined norms of a specific society at a historically specific time and universal norms of mankind (e.g. its not acceptable to hurt or kill other human beings).

The notion of a universal norm is of course controversial. Moreover Jäger's definition of central terms (e.g. structural analysis) are not always convincing and explicit. Jäger does not explain explicitly which fragments should be analysed to find the rules of a discourse, although he underlines that special attention should be paid to the start and final points of the discourse and eventual discursive knots. This special attention an answer to the question, which is more reasonable than doing analysis on fragments as long as nothing new comes up (as Jäger suggests). If discourses - as he states - are constituted by fragments in discourse cords, and if discourses are interwoven in each other, especially these discursive knots and the beginning, the end and the climax of a discourse must be the most interesting fragments to analysis. Furthermore, there must be differences between the texts in terms of genre, length and position (e.g. in which media a fragment occurs) that influence the decision about which fragments are relevant to analyse.

In contrast to e.g. Norman Fairclough's approach to critical discourse analysis, Jäger's focus is much on the production side and the text itself - the reception of the audience is

not very illuminated. Thus, Jäger's definition of context is incomplete and has to be widened if discourse analysis should be an analytical bridge between text producer, text and audience.

Despite these critiques, the Duisburg School offers some important contributions to further methodical development of discourse analysis. These are the establishment of a theoretical link between linguistics and social theory via Leontjews speech act-theory and the incorporation of Michel Foucault's ideas about discourse in an analytical concept which can easily be accepted and applied by both linguists and social researchers. In particular the definition of discourse as flow of text, speak and knowledge through time, which both implies an analytical dimension of discourse as social use of language and the notion of discourse as an empirical category (a flow of texts, in which discourse is manifest), is an advantage to most of the other discourse concepts presented here. Thus Jäger's approach is quite similar to the approach of the sociologist Dorothy Smith (1993), who studies marked relations by analysing chains of texts and other social practices.

Excursus - Reading analysis (Utz Maas)
An appropriate turn to the presentation and discussion of the last approach to discourse analysis from the Vienna School would be a short excursus about the German linguist Utz Maas, whose works both inspired the Duisburg School and the Vienna School significantly. In his approach, Maas has combined the central ideas of Michel Foucault with a hermeneutic methodology which he labels *Lesartenanalyse* (reading analysis). In his major discourse study about language of National Socialism, Maas defines discourses as "linguistic forms correlating with social practice, which have to be investigated sociologically and historically" (1984:18). Discourses are in other words not objectively defined by time and space but rather intentionally defined by their content. Furthermore, the subtitle of this study is *Attempt to a Historic Argumentation Analysis*. Thus Maas stresses the rhetoric dimension in the analysis of discourse - a dimension, which e.g. most of the British approaches to Discourse Analysis are not very aware of. As Fairclough & Wodak (1997:267) pinpoint, "the importance of the historical dimension and of hermeneutics is particularly apparent in this approach, in particular in the analysis of allusions which relate to background knowledge and cannot really be understood without taking this knowledge into account".

According to Maas, discourse analysis aims to register all rules which constitute a certain discourse. Discourse is defined as the amount all socially relevant texts in a particular social domain (ibid.:45). The final goal with discourse analysis is the reconstruction of historical ways of thought. His reading analysis comprises the following steps (ibid.:18):

1. Declaration of the content and topic of the text.
2. Description of the staging of the content, that is linguistic (stylistic) analysis.
3. Analysis of the meaning of the staging, that is analysis of the message of the text in relation to the social and historical context.
4. Summary and correlation of the results of the single steps.
5. Elaboration of the competing readings.

As mentioned above, Utz Maas's approach to discourse analysis has had significant influence on the field of discourse studies in German speaking countries. While the Duisburg School draws on the reception of Foucault (but at the same time rejects Maas' hermeneutic foundation and redefines discourse by time), the Vienna School integrates the historical dimension of discourse - that is in Foucaultian terms the notion of archaeology - and Maas' rhetorical angle into the approach to discourse analysis.

9. Discourse-Historical Method of the Vienna School

> *Understanding the news? Information for the already informed!* (Wodak, 1996:100)

These days the Vienna based professor of applied linguistics Ruth Wodak is probably the internationally most well known discourse analyst from the German speaking countries. Ruth Wodak and her colleagues developed a new approach to discourse analysis which is primarily based on sociolinguistic research in the tradition of Basil Bernstein and the tradition of the Frankfurt School as it is expressed in Jürgen Habermas's critique of formal linguistics (Wodak, 1995a:209). Other inspiration sources are - as mentioned before - central ideas in both Utz Maas's and Michel Foucault's approaches to discourse analysis, Stuart Hall's cultural studies and recently even the theory of symbolic capital of the French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu. The key element of the Vienna School is what the school has labelled the *discourse-historical method* which attempts to integrate systematically all available background information in the analysis and interpretation of discourse.

Also for the Vienna School, the starting point is a critique of traditional linguistics. According to Januschek (1986:139) traditional linguistics " not by any good reason but compelled by force again and again miss the real subject of our science, that is the historic-concrete linguistic activity in a historic-concrete society, because we don't understand ourselves as taking part in this society".

For the Vienna School, sociolinguistic research on discourse investigates "the linguistic forms of social discourses on micro-level". Moreover, discourse analysis is able to reconstruct the history of origins of discourse on macro-level (Matouschek, Wodak & Januschek, 1995:13). Moreover, discourse analysis is able to reconstruct the history of origins of discourse on macro-level (ibid.). Behind this definition of the abilities and goals of discourse analysis Ruth Wodak agrees with Norman Fairclough on a definition of discourse as "the use of language in speech and writing - as a form of 'social practice'" (Wodak, 1996:15). The relation between discourse and its situational, institutional and social context is dialectic: "Discourse is both socially constitutive and socially defined" (Wodak et al., 1997:23).

The Vienna School understands discourse analysis as an archaeological process (cf. Matouschek, Wodak & Januschek, 1995:13) in which the genesis of discourses has to be investigated in a multi-level analysis by using a multi-method approach. For this purpose the Vienna School normally combines historical and quantitative analysis on the level of discourse and social practice with qualitative analysis on the textual micro-level. The Vienna School defines the following methical guidelines:

- Grasping of co- and context (situational and personal)
- Confrontation of the reports with facts (e.g. statistical data)
- Differentiation between the dimensions of analysis: patterns caused by setting and definition of discourse
- Methodology and categorisation:
  1. Definition of form and content of discourses
  2. Analysis of argumentative strategies and techniques
  3. Correlation of the results to the linguistic features on micro-level

Wodak distinguishes in principal three levels of analysis: content, argumentative strategies and linguistic features. According to the empirical works of the Vienna School discriminations do not only appear in form of explicit stereotypes on syntactic level, but also implicitly on the textual level. Because of this, the analysis of argumentative strategies is at least as relevant, as the analysis of linguistic features on micro-level (Matouschek, Wodak & Januschek, 1995:49). Furthermore, certain distinctive features on the level of argumentative strategies and techniques cause the sociocultural categorisation of a discourse in which an ingroup and an outgroup will be constituted. In other words, the relationship between discourse and social power is in the centre of the Vienna School's interest. Ruth Wodak (et al., 1997:23-24) defines the aims of critical discourse analysis - in contrast to Foucault - as follows:

Critical Discourse Analysis aims to make ideologically distorted, more or less opaque forms for use of power, of political control and manipulation as well as the use of discriminating - e.g. sexist or racist - strategies of suppression and exclusion in the use of language apparent…The critical discourse analysis is obliged to emancipatory engagement and takes the side of those, who have to suffer under political or social injustice.

This political rather than scientific declaration has found its realisation in concurrent studies of the Vienna School dealing with racist media discourse (Matouschek, Wodak & Januschek, 1995, Wodak 1995b) and post-war anti-semitism in Austria (Wodak & Menz (eds.) 1990). Among the results of these studies is the insight that racist and prejudiced discourses have quite many formal features in common, but the contents of these discourses vary according to the stigmatised groups as well to the settings in which certain linguistic realisations appear. Therefore the discourse-historical method also becomes an instrument to show implicitly prejudiced statements and the allusions in prejudiced discourses. As stated above, the empirical studies of the Vienna School are related to similar studies by van Dijk and Jäger. Consequently, the elsewhere elaborated critique on this group of studies is also relevant here. On the other hand, this critique is mostly directed against the empirical questions to the data in these studies and to the overall programme and goals of these discourse studies. In other words: this critique is not a critique of the method as such but of the epistemological propositions for the use of this approach in empirical studies which determine the phenomenon to be found by the study in advance.

The most recent empirical work by the Vienna School (Wodak et al, 1997) deserves special attention, both in relation to this argument and in relation to my own Ph.D.-project about portrays of Germans and Germany in Danish media. In this empirical study, members of the Vienna School analysed the discursive construction of Austrian identity by using their discourse-historic approach on a data material. Thus, the Vienna School used its instrumental tools on a multidimensional and heterogeneous empirical basis to investigate national identity in the same way, as discourse analysis is used to investigate racism. Wodak et al. conclude that the discourse-historic approach can be used in similar studies, because national identities are produced and reproduced in discourses of similarities and differences and because identities, portrays and self-portrays are discursive constructions, which depend on contextual, social and political aspects.

10. Summary and conclusions

A basic distinction between Foucault's archaeological approach to discourse analysis and the four concepts to critical discourse analysis introduced above has to be done. Foucault's approach is widely accepted and discussed in the social sciences and therefore the integration of central ideas of Foucault into the different approaches to critical discourse analysis can be seen as a kind of basic hurdle to be taken, if critical discourse analysis will be able to reach the goal to be an interdisciplinary approach to analysis in both social sciences and humanities. Despite of the differences between different approaches to critical discourse analysis, substantial points emerging from Foucault's work had a decisive impact on critical discourse analysis. These terms and concepts are the constitutive nature of discourse, the primacy of interdiscursivity and intertextuality, the discursive nature of power, the political nature of discourse and the discursive nature of social changes (cf. Fairclough, 1992:55-56). Also Foucault's concept of *L' ordre du discours* (1971/80) has been integrated into the approaches to critical discourse analysis, although in a modified way as e.g. in Jäger's concept of discursive turbulence. These Foucaultian terms and concepts play an important role in all approaches and can be seen as basic methodical and instrumental tools to discourse analysis from a critical perspective. Therefore the terms and concepts of discursive order/discursive turbulence, discourse chains, levels and dimensions of discourse, primary and secondary texts, discursive strategies and discursive knots should be considered as the foundation and basic methodical tools to the analysis of the questions about the construction of Germany and Germans in Danish media discourses as they have been raised in the very beginning of this paper.

Critical discourse analysis is not a single theory, but a family of approaches. As in each family, there are fundamental common features - but at least as much important differences between the single members. Surveying the last four approaches to critical discourse analysis, there seems to be an indication for differences in defining discourse. With Fairclough (1995a:18) we would suggest two main perspectives on "discourse":

> *One is predominant in language studies: discourse as social action and interaction, people interacting together in real social situations. The other is predominant in post-structuralist social theory (e.g. in the work of Foucault): a discourse as a social construction of reality, a form of knowledge. The first sense is most closely associated with the interpersonal function of language, and with the concept of genre (...). The second sense is most closely associated with the ideational function of language, and with discourses - notice that in addition to be used as an abstract noun for this general view of language in social use, discourse is used as a count noun (a discourse, several discourses) as a category (alongside 'genre') within the intertextual analysis of texts.*

This distinction should not be seen as a polarisation. The four different approaches to critical discourse analysis place themselves in relation to this definition on a continuum scale: while Fairclough's and - to a lesser extent - also van Dijk's approach seem to highlight the first sense of the term, the approach of the Vienna School and in particular Jäger's approach underline the second sense and are, by doing so, closer to Foucault's understanding of discourse(s).

The differences in defining discourse(s) find their expression in the methodical design to discourse analysis. Fairclough, Wodak and Jäger refer to Foucault's discourse approach by integrating the notion of intertextuality as a key concept into their approaches, while this is only due to a lesser extent in van Dijk's socio-cognitive approach. Nor do all approaches include a historical perspective. Only the Vienna School systematically incorporates historical data into the empirical ground of their discourse studies. The approaches also differ in how they view the mediation between the text and the society. Thus both socio-cognitive processes, genres and argumentation strategies and techniques are assumed to mediate between social and discursive practises.

Despite these differences, the four approaches to critical discourse analysis agree on a number of basic assumptions (cf. Van Dijk, 1988b:2-10; Fairclough & Wodak, 1997:268ff.; Jensen, 1997:41):

- Media discourses are specific kinds of language use and of social practice 'framed' by institutions, with rules, conventions and positions of agents. Thus media discourse analysis addresses social problems and power relations and is even a form of social action itself. They are more or less coherent and repeatable linguistic and material practices, creating specific power configurations.
- The relationship between discourse and society is dialectic: Discourses are not just seen as representations of the world, but also as (re-)producing, (re-)constructing and (re-)transforming social practice and social relations.
- Media discourse analysis is by definition interdisciplinary, drawing on disciplines as linguistics, semiotics, cultural studies, ethnography, sociology, rhetoric, social and cognitive psychology.
- Media discourse analysis works with different levels of description (text, discursive practice and social practice), is focused on the level of discursive practice and is basically interpretative.
- Media discourse analysis sees itself as a qualitative alternative and supplement to traditional quantitative content analysis. In contrast to qualitative content analysis it is aware of formal aspects of language use in media texts.

The critical perspective becomes obvious in the choice of topics for the empirical studies: all approaches to critical discourse analysis put social problems on the agenda of their empirical research. In particular the study of racist discourse has been one of the central subjects of these studies. As Wodak et. al. (1997) underline in and with their latest work, the same concepts and terms can be used to the study of the discursive construction of nationality. Although a comprehensive and detailed comparison between racism and nationalism would go beyond the limits of this paper, it can be argued for the same constructive character of both racism and nationalism. Both are mental concepts based on the constitution of in groups and out groups by using images and stereotyped ways of recognition (cf. Guibernau , 1996:91, who calls racism for misused nationalism), both are problems on the social and public agenda these days, also in the media, and both have basically a constructive nature in and by discourse.

However, van Dijk's approach has to be regarded as an exception: sharing this critical perspective with the other approaches to critical discourse analysis and putting the concept of ideology into the focus of discourse analysis (in contrast to Foucault), the methodical stand and concepts used by van Dijk are less orientated towards critical hermeneutics or a Foucaultian understanding of discourse. They are rather a traditional way of handling empirical data in the functional perspective by insisting on a systematic quantitative analysis to handle the problem between micro- and macro analysis, that is to gain both representative results and in depth insights about the discursive rules and conventions; the rhetoric, linguistic and/or cognitive patterns of discourse. Therefore van Dijk's concepts of superstructures seems to be able to handle large amounts of empirical data (texts), while the other three approaches seem better equipped to deal with qualitative in-depth analysis of discourse fragments by pinpointing the concept of intertextuality. Instead of opposing these different approaches and perspectives against each other, the variety of perspectives and angles can also been seen as a variety of different constituents to a critical analysis of complex communication events, which integrates and correlates aspects of form and content of media texts, discursive and other social practises.

Advocating such a view on the different approaches to critical discourse analysis corresponds to the following concluding remark by (van Dijk, 1997a:24), underlining the practical dimension of discourse research, in which the development and application of the method is closely related to and sensitive for the work on the empirical material:

> *But then again, many others may at least in principle reject such a division of the field into directions, approaches or schools. They may precisely advocate that constant renewal in the field comes form new combinations of approaches, across subdisciplines, methods, theories or types of phenomena studied. They may refuse*

*the artificial distinction between theory, description and application, and may study the same phenomena both in text and talk, and do so in abstract terms as well as in the more empirical terms of actual language use and interaction. Given their broad orientation, critical scholars for instance may want to consider **all** levels and dimensions, and all methods and approaches, as long as they contribute to our insight into the role of discourse in society and the reproduction of inequality. It is this variety that is one of the appealing characteristics of contemporary discourse analysis.*

Literatur:

ABERCOMBIE. John Nicholas (1996): *Television and Society.* Oxford & Cambridge. Polity Press.

ASP. Kent (1986): *Mäktiga massmedier. Studier i politisk opinionsbildning.* Stockholm Förlaget Akademilitteratur.

BARRET. Michéle (1991): *The Politics Of Truth.* Oxford & Cambridge. Polity Press.

BASSEWITZ. Susanne von (1990): *Stereotypen und Massenmedien. Zum Deutschlandbild in französischen Tageszeitungen.* Wiesbaden. Deutscher Universitätsverlag.

BENTELE. Günter (1981): *Semiotik und Massenmedien.* München. Ölschläger.

BERELSON. Bernard (1952/71): *Content analysis in communication research.* (Reprint) New York. Glencoe.

BUCHER. Hans-Jürgen (1991): Pressekritik und Informationspolitik. Zur Theorie einer linguistischen Medienkritik. In: Bucher. Hans-Jürgen & Straßner. Erich: *Mediensprache, Medienkommunikation. Medienkritik.* Tübingen. Gunter Narr Verlag.

BUCHER. Hans-Jürgen & FRITZ. Gerd (1989): Sprachtheorie, Kommunikationsanalyse, Inhaltsanalyse. In: Baacke. Dieter & Kübler. (Hrsg.): *Qualitiative Medienforschung. Konzepte und Erfahrungen.* Tübingen. Max Niemeyer Verlag. S. 135-160.

CAREY. James W. (1992): *Communication as Culture. Essays on Media and Society.* London. Routledge.

CONNELL. Ian & MILLS. Adam (1985): Text, Discourse and Mass Communication. In: van Dijk . Teun A. (1985): *Discourse and Communiciation. New approaches to the Analysis of Mass Media Communication.* Walter de Gruyter.

DEAN. Mitchell (1994): Critical and Effective Histories. Foucault's Methods and Historical Sociology. Routledge. London & New York.

DELEUZE. Gilles (1994): Foldings, or the Inside of Thought. In: Kelly. Michael (ed.): *Critique and Power. Recasting the Foucault/Habermas Debate.* Cambridge/Massachusetss/London. The MIT Press.

DREYFUS. Hubert & RABINOW Paul (1983): *Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics.* 2nd edn. Brighton. Harvester.

EKECRANTZ. Jan (1997): Journalism's 'discursive events' and sociopolitical change in Sweden 1925-87. In: *Media, Culture & Society.* Vol.19. No.3. July 1997. Sage.

FAIRCLOUGH. Norman & WODAK. Ruth (1997): Critical Discourse Analysis. In: van Dijk. Teun A. (ed.) (1997): *Discourse as Social Interaction. Vol.2. Discourse Studies: A Multidisciplinary Introduction.* London. Sage.

FAIRCLOUGH. Norman (1995a): *Media Discourse.* London. Edward Arnold.

FAIRCLOUGH. Norman (1995b): *Critical Discourse Analysis: the critical study of languages.* London. Longman.

FAIRCLOUGH. Norman (1992): *Discourse and Social Change.* Cambridge. Polity Press.

FISKE. John (1996): *Media Matters. Race and Gender in U.S. Politics.* University of Minnesota Press.

FISKE. John & HARTLEY. John (1978): *Reading Television.* London. Methuen & Co.

FOUCAULT. Michel (1969/72): *L'archéologie du Savoir.* Paris. Gallimard. (English translation: The Archaeology of Knowledge. Tavistock Publ. Ltd. 1972)

FOUCAULT. Michel (1971/80): *L'ordre discours.* Paris. Gallimard. (Danish translation: Talens forfatning. Rhodos. 1980)

FOUCAULT. Michel (1971): Remarks on Marx. Conversations with Duccio Trombadori, trans. R. J. Goldstein and J. Cascaito. New York. Semiottext(e).

FOUCAULT. Michel (1978): *Intervista a Michel Foucault* di A. Fontana e P. Pasquino. In: Microfisica del Potere, Torino 1977. (German translation: Wahrheit und Macht. In: Dispositive der Macht. Berlin. Merve Verlag. 1978)

FRANDSEN. Finn (1996): Forskning i mediesprog - teorier, modeller og analyser. In: *Medier og sproget.* Aalborg. Aalborg Universitetsforlag. pp. 9-32.

FÜHLAU. Inglunde (1982): *Die Sprachlosigkeit der Inhaltsanalyse. Linguistische Bemerkungen zu einer sozialwissenschaftlichen Methode.* Tübingen. Gunter Narr Verlag.

GERBNER. George (1985): Mass Media Discourse: Message System Analysis as a Component of Cultural Indicators. In: Van Dijk. Teun A. (1985): *Discourse and Communciation. New approaches to the Analysis of Mass Media Communication.* Walter de Gruyter.

GERBNER. George et al. (1969): *The Analysis of Communication Content.* New York. Wiley.

GLASGOW MEDIA GROUP (1982): *Really Bad News.* London. Writers & Readers.

GLASGOW MEDIA GROUP (1980): *More Bad News.* London. Routledge & Kegan Paul.

GLASGOW MEDIA GROUP (1976): *Bad News.* London. Routledge & Kegan Paul.

GRICE. Herbert P. (1979): Logik und Konservation. In: Meggle. Günther (Hg.): *Handlung, Kommunikation, Bedeutung.* Frankfurt.

HALL. Stuart et al. (1980): *Culture, Media, Language.* London. Hutchinson.

HØYER. Svennik (1991): According to Media Research - Does Mass Communication Work? In: Rønning. Helge & Lundby. Knut (ed's): *Media and Communication. Readings in Methodology, History and Culture.* Oslo. Norwegian University Press.

JENSEN. Klaus Bruhn (1997): Medier, kommunikation og social semiotik. In: Keld Gall Jørgensen: *Anvendt Semiotik.* København. Gyldendal.

JENSEN. Klaus Bruhn (1995): *The Social Semiotics of Mass Communication.* London. Sage.

JÄGER. Siegfried (1994): *Text- und Diskursanalyse. Eine Anleitung zur Analyse politischer Texte.* Duisburg. DISS-Texte Nr. 16.

JÄGER. Siegfried (1993): *Kritische Diskursanalyse. Eine Einführung.* Duisburg. DISS-Studien.

JANUSCHEK. Franz (1986): *Arbeit an Sprache. Konzept für die Empirie einer politischen Sprachwissenschaft.* Opladen.

KAMMLER. Clemens (1986): *Michel Foucault. Eine kritische Analyse seines Werks.* Bonn. Bouvier Verlag Herbert Grundmann.

KJØRUP. Søren (1984): Medieforskning som humanistisk displin. I: *Bildetekster 5. Skrifter fra prosjektet "Billedmediene og skolen".* Rapport fra en konveranse avholdt på Dragsvoll d. 15.10.84 s.5-22.

KRACAUER. Siegfried (1953): The challenge of Qualitative Content Analysis. In: *Public Opinion Quarterly* Vol.16, No.2, pp.631-642.

KRESS. Gunther/ LEITE-GARCIA. Regina/ VAN LEEUWEN. Theo (1997): Discourse semiotics. In: VAN DIJK. Teun A. (ed.): *Discourse as Structure and Process. Discourse Studies. A Multidisciplinary Introduction. Vol.1.* London. Sage.

KRESS. Gunther & VAN LEEUWEN. Theo (1990): Reading Images. Geelong, Vic.. Deakin University Press.

LARSEN. Peter (1991): Qualitative Content Analysis. Between "Critical Theory" and Semiotics. In: Rønning. Helge & Lundby. Knut: *Media and Communication. Readings in Methodology, History and Culture.* Oslo. Norwegian University Press.

LAYDER. Derek (1994): *Understanding Social Theory.* London. Sage.

LUND. Anker Brink (1997): *Smitsomme sygdomme i dansk journalistik.* København. Munksgaard.

LUND. Anker Brink & CHRISTENSEN (1995). Gudrun: Tolkning baseret på skriftligt materiale. In: Lund. Inga Marie & Ramhøj. Pia (eds.): *Humanistisk forskning inden for sundhedsvidenskab. Kvalitative metoder*. København. Akademisk Forlag.

LUNDGREN. Kristina (1997) Diskursanalys vs. Massemedieretorik. In: *Rheotorica Scandinavia. Tidsskrift for Skandinavisk Retorikforskning.* Nr.2/1997. S.64-76.

MAAS. Utz (1984): *"Als der Geist der Gemeinschaft eine Sprache fand." Sprache im Nationalsozialismus. Versuch einer historischen Argumentationsanalyse.* Opladen.

MATOUSCHEK. B., WODAK. R., JANUSCHEK, F. (1995): *Notwendige Maßnahmen gegen Fremde? Genese und Formen von rassistischen Diskursen der Differenz.* Wien. Passagen Verlag.

MAYRING. Philipp (1983): *Qualitative Inhaltsanalyse. Grundlagen und Techniken.* Weinheim & Basel. Beltz Verlag.

PENNYCOOK. Alastair (1994): Incommensurable Discourses? In: *Applied Linguistics*, Vol.15, No.2, pp.115-138. Oxford University Press.

PETERSEN. Lars Kjerulf (1997): *Miljøbevidsthed på MTV. Om naturen i massekulturen.* Københavns Universitet.

PHILIP. Mark (1985): Michel Foucault. In: Skinner. Quentin (ed.): *The Return of Grand Theory in the Human Sciences.* Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.

SELBY. Keith & COWDERY. Ron (1996): *How to study television.* London. Macmillan Press Ltd.

SMITH. Dorothy (1993): Texts, facts and femininity: exploring the relations of ruling. London. Routledge.

VAN DIJK. Teun A. (ed.) (1997a): *Discourse as Structure and Process. Discourse Studies. A Multidisciplinary Introduction. Vol.1.* London. Sage.

VAN DIJK. Teun A. (ed.) (1997b): *Discourse as Social Interaction. Discourse Studies: A Multidisciplinary Introduction. Vol.2.* London. Sage.

VAN DIJK. Teun A. (1995): Discourse semantics and ideology. in: *Discourse & Society.* Vol.6, no.2.

VAN DIJK. Teun A. (1993): *Discourse and Elite Racism.* London. Sage.

VAN DIJK. Teun A. (1991): *Racism and the press.* London. Routledge.

VAN DIJK. Teun A. (1989): Mediating racism. The role of the media in the reproduction of racism. In: Wodak. Ruth (ed.): *Language, power and ideology. Studies in political discourse.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia. John Benjamins Publishing Company.

VAN DIJK. Teun A. (1988a): *News as discourse.* Hillsdale (N.J.). Erlbaum.

VAN DIJK. Teun A. (1988b): *News Analysis.* Hillsdale (N.J.). Erlbaum.

VAN DIJK. Teun A. (1985): *Discourse and Communciation. New approaches to the Analysis of Mass Media Communication*. Walter de Gruyter.

VAN DIJK. Teun A. & Kintsch. Walter (1983): *Strategies of discourse comprehension.* New York. Academic Press.

VAN DIJK. Teun A. (1974/75): Action, action-description and narrative. In: *New Literary History* 6, pp. 273-294.

VAN DIJK. Teun A. (1972): *Some aspects of text grammars. A study in theoretical linguistics.* The Hague, Paris.

WIDDOWSON. H.G. (1995): Discourse analysis: a critical view. In: *Language and Literature* 4, pp.157-172.

WODAK. Ruth et al. (1997): *Zur diskursiven Konstruktion von nationaler Identität.* Frankfurt a.M. Suhrkamp.

WODAK. Ruth (1996): *Disorders of Discourse.* London. Longman.

WODAK. Ruth (1995a): Critical Linguistics and Critical Discourse Analysis. In: Verschueren. Jef, Östman. Jan-Ola & Blommaert. Jan: *Handbook of Pragmatics.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia. John Benjamins Publishing Company.

WODAK. Ruth (1995b): The genesis of racist discourse in Austria since 1989. In: Caldas-Coulthard. Carmen Rosa & Coulthard. Malcolm: *Texts and practices. Readings in Critical Discourse Analysis.* London/New York. Sage.

WODAK. Ruth & MENZ. F. (1990): *Sprache in der Politik - Politik in der Sprache: Analysen zum öffentlichen Sprachgebrauch.* Klagenfurt. Drava.