



Interdiscursivity in Critical Discourse Analysis: A Generic Mixture

Dr. Yagouta Beji

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received: 12 April 2019;

Received in revised form:
26 April 2019;

Accepted: 6 May 2019;

Keywords

Critical Discourse Analysis,
Ideologies,
Power Struggle,
Human Rights Watch
Discourse,
Discursive Practices,
Generic Mixture,
Interdiscursivity.

ABSTRACT

This study illustrates the importance of Critical Discourse Analysis in revealing the latent ideologies and power struggle. It contains a theoretical description of Critical Discourse Analysis, a framework for the analysis of Human Rights Watch discourse on the Palestinian-Israeli issue that is published in its Annual Report 2013; a discussion of discursive practices; and a consideration of the selected framework in the analysis of the generic mixture. In fact, the application of Halliday & Matthiessen's 2014 Systemic Functional Linguistics approach shows the representation of the case from a material and relational perspectives. Three major types of participants predominate; namely, actors, carriers, and goals. The application of Fairclough's 1992 Interdiscursivity approach uncovers hybridity, materialization and selectivity procedures in the description of human rights in the Palestinian and Israeli case.

© 2019 Elixir All rights reserved.

Introduction

The objective of this paper is, first, to illustrate the importance of Critical Discourse Analysis as an approach in the disclosure of the ideologies and power relations that shape and are shaped by social and cultural practices, and second, to consider the importance of the interdiscursivity analysis of discourse in emphasizing the role of generic mixture in discourse.

The first section of the paper, 'the theoretical framework', is a condensed theoretical description of Critical Discourse Analysis. The second section, 'the interpretative framework', is a presentation of Fairclough's (1992) interdiscursivity approach and the third section, 'a text-based examination', is an application of Halliday & Matthiessen's (2014) Systemic Functional Grammar approach on the paper corpus. The paper ends with a discussion of the significance of Critical Discourse Analysis when it is applied alongside with other linguistic approaches in tracing any type of social or cultural change caused by a control or exploitation of one part over another.

I. The Theoretical Framework: Critical Discourse Analysis

CDA is a discourse analytical study that is concerned with the study of the system through which, inequity, dominance and social power abuse are acted out, reproduced and opposed by discourse in the social, cultural, and political background. Within the same context, Fairclough (1993) defines CDA as:

discourse analysis which aims to systematically explore often opaque relationships of causality and determination between (a) discursive practices, events and texts, and (b) wider social and cultural structures, relations and processes; to investigate how such practices, events and texts arise out of and are ideologically shaped by relations of power and struggles over power; and to

explore how the opacity of these relationships between discourse and society is itself a factor securing power and hegemony. (p. 135)

Critical discourse analysts have a tendency, for that reason, to figure out, interpret and ultimately, defend against social wrong.

In general, power, and particularly institutionally reproduced power, is elemental to Critical Discourse Analysis as it is the inspection of 'opaque as well as transparent structural relationships of dominance, discrimination, power and control as manifested in language' (Wodak 1995: 204). In fact, it

[CDA] studies real, and often extended, instances of social interaction which take (partially) linguistic form. The critical approach is distinctive in its view of (a) the relationship between language and society, and (b) the relationship between analysis and the practices analyzed. (Wodak, 1997: 173).

According to Fairclough (2013) language use is a "social practice", and this means that it is a form of action (Austin, 1962; Levinson, 1983) that is a historically and socially "shaped" and "shaping" power. Hence, Critical Discourse Analysis studies the tension that exists between the two areas of linguistic use: "the socially shaped and socially shaping 'constitutive'" (Fairclough, 2013: 92).

For the study of language in its socially 'shaping' or constitutive dimension, it is important to rely on a theory of language to specify the social relations, the social identities and the classification of information and ideas of a text. Halliday's (1978, 1985) modal of discourse analysis will be appropriate, if used, regarding its role in uncovering the multifunctionality of a text, for it describes the ideational, textual, and interpersonal functions of language.

As for the study of language in its socially 'shaped' dimension, it is worth noticing that societies and institutions maintain a number of discursive practices where the relationship between these discursive events is complex as it underlies norms and conventions of language use (Fairclough, 1992b). These norms and conventions could be conceptualized under their "order of discourse" (Fairclough, 1989, 1992a) or "interdiscourse" (Pêcheux, 1982; Maingueneau, 1987).

II. The Interpretative Framework: Fairclough's Interdiscursivity Approach

The aim of interpreting interdiscursivity is to identify the discourse type, genre, or 'activity type' that is included in the text. This helps to tell whether the text is formed out of one or a grouping of different discourse types and if it is rather inventive relying in essence on Fairclough's (1992) accounts for the means the addresser uses to get to the addressee and gain his/her confidence.

Interdiscursivity appears as the product of the producers' preference making, of linguistic adaptation and of active negotiation. It is defined as the assimilation and hybridity of different discourse genres, or styles coupled with institutional and social meaning in the same text. Candling & Maley (1997: 212) defined interdiscursivity as "[...] the use of elements from one discourse and social practice which carry institutional and social meanings from other discourses and other social practices".

In fact, interdiscursivity was first introduced in Bakhtin's (1981, 1986) works under the name of heteroglossia. Bakhtin argues that (1981: 291) any text is a combination of one's own voice and others' voices. Later, heteroglossia was re-contextualized as interdiscursivity and ideology in Fairclough's 1992. Ideology was given importance by Fairclough much more than that given by Bakhtin. As for intertextuality, Fairclough (1992: 84) presents it as "the property texts have of being full of snatches of other texts, which may be explicitly demarcated or merged in, and which the text may assimilate, contradict, ironically echo, and so forth".

The existence of a text in another one stands for textuality. It is presented under the form of different techniques of discourse manifestation, negation, presupposition and/or irony. Yet, interdiscursivity, a branch in intertextuality, is associated with styles allied with some types of discourse, genres and action types. The occurrence of a composite mixture of statements is what Bakhtin labels 'hybridization' (Bakhtin 1981, 1986). Late in the 1960's, Kristeva presented Bakhtin's intertextuality theory into France (Kristeva 1986, written in 1966). He defined it as "the insertion of history (society) into a text and of text into history" (1986: 39). French discourse analysts, conversely, differentiate between 'manifest' and 'constitutive' intertextuality. The first is introduced as the 'orders of discourse' such as the discourse genres and styles, and the second, defined by Fairclough as 'interdiscursivity', reflects Pêcheux's notion of 'interdiscourse'.

Besides the diachronic presentation where all texts appear to be inter-textual and where in each text there are traces of the histories of others, texts are backed with a synchronic review which as Allen (2000) argues, considers textuality or interdiscursivity a construction that is approached in literary and non-literary texts under the written or oral form.

As important in literary texts for its esthetic as well as social implications, interdiscursivity in CDA is concerned with leading or with understanding social change.

Fairclough framework has been utilized by many researchers.

Musson & Cohen (1996), for instance, concluded that the medical discourse is increasingly governed by the discourse of enterprise. Candling and Maley (1997) have argued about the interdiscursive links between bargaining, counseling, therapeutic and legal genres of discourse. Equally, Bhatia (1995, 2004) studied interdiscursivity in the discourse of legal documents, business advertisement, public administration, news reporting and bureaucratic communicating to conclude that there exists an extreme tendency to mix genres so that 'private intentions' merge with 'socially recognized communicative purposes'. Scollon (2000, 2002) works on news discourse and identity reveal the complexities and poly-vocalities of the social practices in news discourse and therefore the social structure of identity in new discursivity is a clear interdiscursive practice (Scollon, 2002).

According to Chouliarki & Fairclough (1999) the discourse hybridity is an important characteristic of the post modern social life.

Sarangi (2000) applied interdiscursivity on different discourse types in genetic counseling: decision making, information giving and advice seeking.

Wodak (2001) considers interdiscursivity within the 'discourse historical approach'. She highlights the interdiscursivity relations in texts in the critical analysis of social problems such as sexism, bureaucratism, racism, etc.

Lemke (1995), as well, studies the development of technocratic discourse into new domains; Bernstein (1996) shows the growing use of pedagogical discourse behind educational establishments; Fairclough & Mauraren (1997) focus on the 'conversationalization' of political discourse (see Fairclough 1992).

III. Data Analysis Using Halliday Systemic Functional Grammar approach

The structural analysis of the corpus relies on Halliday's approach, namely, the Systemic Functional Grammar as a direct step towards the meaning interpretation. A text for Halliday is an "interweaving 'ideational', 'interpersonal', and 'textual' meanings" (Fairclough, 2013: 94). The ideational is divided into the experiential which constructs an explanation of or provides meaning to our experience and the logical which establishes the relationship between a process and another or a participant and another that have the same position in the text; the interpersonal defines the course of societal relations that is taking place; the textual meanings refer to the relationship and interchange of linguistic components that give unity to a text. Halliday added that the field was generally expressed through the experiential function, the tenor through the interpersonal function and the mode through the textual function (Halliday & Martin, 1993; Martin, 1992, and Martin & Rose, 2003).

1. The Ideational metafunction: Field (clause as representation)

In Halliday's words (2014), transitivity as a main constituent in experiential function of the clause deals with the "transmission of ideas "representing 'processes' or 'experiences': actions, events, processes of consciousness and relations". It manifests how various choices predetermine the author's ideological position that is affected by cultural and social institution.

According to Fowler (1986:27), these linguistic codes cannot echo reality objectively and so, they represent ideologies. It also functions as a rich interpretative instrument utilized in critical discourse analysis. This instrument deals with “who or what does what to whom or what?” where actor, action and goal are highlighted. Transitivity consists of a study of process types, namely, doing, happening, feeling, sensing, saying, behaving, and existing that might be classified into material, relational, mental, verbal, behavioral, and existential processes. (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014: 217-18); participants with different labels such as Actor, Goal; Sayer, Phenomenon; Carrier, Attribute; Sayer, Target; Behavior; Existent; and circumstances including Cause, Location, Manner, Means and Instrument.

***The participants in HRW discourse:** the title of this section -‘Israel/Palestine’ (HRW Annual Report 2013) gives an anticipatory idea about the main participants. In fact, the participants can be classified into two basic categories, relying on the number of processes achieved. We can refer, then, to the major process participants who are ‘actors’ and ‘carriers’ and to the minor process participants who are ‘sayers’.

Major process participants: **Israel:** It is referred to as “Israel”, “Israeli Defense forces”, and “Israeli authorities”. These names stand for the same participant who plays two roles. He is an ‘actor’ and a ‘carrier’ at the same time. Palestine, however, acts only as an ‘actor’ and is representative of two distinct forces: PA (Palestinian Authorities) and Hamas (see *table 1* below).

Minor process participants: All minor process participants in this discourse act as ‘sayers’ (“reported”), except Egypt which acts as an ‘actor’. These participants are: Israeli rights group B’Tselem, the United Nations, The Palestinian Center for Human Rights, Independent Commission for Human Rights (ICHR), and International Criminal Court (ICC).

***The processes:** In this discourse the dominant process type is the material (action). The number of processes is equally performed by the two major actors, Israel and Palestine, whose goals are adversative. The following table includes within the material process some of the actions that dominate the discourse.

Table 1. Major participants and goals and acts representation.

Actor: Israel (58)		Actor: Palestine (51)	
Goal: Palestinians	Goal: Israelis	Goal: Israelis	Goal: Palestinians
Killed, destroyed, injured, imposed, barred, sentenced, fired, wounded, forced, demolished, coarse, deprived, held, confiscated, detained, separated	Did not have, held, prevent, legalized, planned, deports, continue to deny, began to implement, indicate, provides, allows, refused, returned, come,	Tortured, suppressed, launched, killed, beat, increased, shot down, wounded, injured, executed, sentences, ill treated, assaulted, detained, destroyed, harassed	Arrested, tortured, continued to exercise, dispersed, assaulted, detained, abused, prosecuted, injured, did not publish, took measures

The actions performed by Israel have two distinct goals. The range of verbs depicts the confrontational and violent state between Israel and Palestine on the one hand, and the

conscientious attitude between Israel and its citizens on the other. This conscientious attitude is reinforced by the use of a number of relational processes through which the Israeli government is interested in keeping relationships with its citizens.

Similarly for Palestine, the goals are distinct. The difference is that the verbs convey an enmity on the part of Palestine towards Israelis and Palestinians at the same time. So the damage in Palestine is not caused by external forces only (coming from Israel), but by internal ones as well. The internal power is led by Hamas. It is depicted as a power that is responsible for material damages and for human rights abuses in Israel and in Palestine at the same time.

The verbal processes in this report are performed essentially by the aforementioned minor participants. Their role is abstract though the issue needs some concrete measures in order to be resolved. Actually this minority is given the verbal role while the material, relational, mental, behavioral or existential could be better alternatives to this problem.

The only minor force that was present as an actor in the report is Egypt. This power was responsible for acts of blockade committed against Palestinians and consequently, for certain human rights violation in its neighboring state.

***Circumstances:** The spatial circumstances in the discourse refer to actions that took place in Palestine. The temporal circumstances are represented through 30 temporal adjuncts that are placed either in a thematic position or last in the clause. Almost half of these temporal adjuncts refer to the same period of time, namely to November. The remaining adjuncts refer to other dates starting from June (except 1 in February and 1 in May).

2. The Interpersonal metafunction: Mood (Clause as Exchange)

Of direct relevance to this study is the interpersonal metafunction. In Halliday and Hasan (1985: 12) this function is defined as **Tenor** and which “refers to who is taking part, to the nature of the participants, their statuses and roles: what kinds of role relationship obtain, including permanent and temporary relationships of one kind or another, both the types of speech roles they are taking on in the dialogue and the whole cluster of socially significant relationships in which they are involved”

The analysis of meanings related to identities and relationships comes after the analysis of text forms, which include for example, their generic forms (a narrative,...), interrelated relations between sentences and clauses in complex sentences, their dialogic or organization, the grammar of the clause (mood, modality, transitivity...), and vocabulary.

In this metafunction, the clause plays the role of exchange where an interactive event between a ‘speaker’ and a ‘listener’ is organized. Within an ‘interact’ or ‘exchange’ (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014:135) the speaker may have various roles: he can give something to the addressee or demand something of him/her (in Halliday’s term: ‘the commodity’). This ‘something’ can either be the information or goods and services in terms of giving or demanding. Goods and services can occur autonomously from language with offering and commanding as speech functions, but information cannot be real outside the representative exchange structure with statement and questions as speech functions.

In the present report, the declarative mood is related to the nature of this discourse.

Positive declarative clauses are recommended to convey as many as possible messages and to convince the audience with facts, change his attitudes and arouse his passion to share the same proposal of the addresser.

As a report, this discourse includes statements which present a list of information. The interpersonal analysis, therefore, does not rely on the study of the dialogical structure but of the lexical construction of ideas.

In fact, the report includes an exhaustive list of value judgmental adjectives (unclear, severe, excessive, inadequate, unfair, arbitrary, unlawful...) and act related adjuncts (forcibly arbitrarily, virtually, fatally, regularly, repeatedly, forcibly, frequently, indiscriminately, seriously, allegedly, brutally, violently, illegally...). They describe the actions and attitudes of the two opponent rivals. The description allocates almost two third majorities of these evaluative expressions (18 out of 30) to elicit the ferocity of the Palestinian force in its battle.

3. The Textual Metafunction: Theme (clause as message)

Thematic structure is concerned with the Theme, and Rheme, or the old and new information. According to Halliday (2014: 89) the theme includes the message in a text and indicates the type of text relations. Topic comes first and after that comment appears to expand, justify and provide additional information to preceding ones. The clause acts as a message in the thematic statuses of Theme and Rheme in terms of the local and spatial position in a sequence where Theme takes the initial position whether marked or unmarked and Rheme the non-initial position.

This text is a synoptic recount of the Palestinian Israeli issue in the Middle East region. For this reason, the Themes in this discourse are either unmarked nominative (simple and complex) structures, or marked temporal circumstantial structures (see table below for examples). The use of the nominative structures helps to construct a theoretical and objective perception of the events. This style is frequently used in reports; therefore, the deictic references do not include personal pronouns. The circumstances of location in time are selected here because they scaffold the events through time. This method of managing time is typical of texts which deal with longer spans of time which cannot be handled in details of history, as opposed to narration for example.

Table 2. examples of Themes in the discourse.

Unmarked Themes (nominal structure)	Marked Theme (temporal location)
Hamas and Palestinian armed groups	In November
Israel's anti-rocket system	In August
The internal security agency and Hamas police	In June 2012
Hamas security forces	As of November 27

IV. Interpretation and conclusion

1. Hybridity

The interdiscursivity analysis refers to the mixing of diverse genres and styles of discourse associated with the institutional meaning. The linguistic phenomenon permeates through language use. The discourse type in this text is expository because it includes news information; argumentative and analytical because it supports the information with explanatory ideas; and persuasive because of the use of the emotional appeal (pathos) through

descriptions and value judgmental language, and the use of the logical appeal (logos) through temporal and spatial references, comparative statistical and numerical records.

Plurality is again present in the voices that build this text. Actually, HRW's voice is not the omnipotent one. It is accompanied by other voices. They represent the minor participants that we dealt with in the interpretation of the ideational metafunction.

In the mediating event related to human rights issue, three kinds of activities intermingle in a hybrid way to achieve an 'appropriate' persuasive message. The discourse encompasses as a first mediator a depiction of the warfare state in the region. The discourse on war is realized lexically through the range of expressions that describes the state between the different rivals (see *table 1*), including a presentation for the different types of weapons, the different acts of attacks and counter attacks, and causes and consequences of each event. This type uncovers, as well, a relation of winner and loser during a struggle. The second mediator is the description of the economic state and financial crisis in Palestine and its fundamental relation with Egypt blockade strategy. The following is an extract from the report to illustrate this idea. The relevant words are underlined.

Blockade: Israel's punitive closure of the Gaza Strip, particularly the near-total blocking of exports from Gaza, continued to have severe consequences for the civilian population. Egypt also blocked all regular movement of goods at the crossing it controls. The World Bank reported that the "the severity of poverty has increased" among impoverished Gazans. More than 70 percent of Gaza's population receives humanitarian assistance. Israel and Egypt allowed imports to Gaza that amounted to less than half of preclosure levels, the United Nations reported, including construction materials for projects undertaken by international organizations. As of September, Gaza still had an estimated shortage of some 250 schools. In a ceasefire agreement with Hamas, announced on November 21, Israel agreed to negotiate via an Egyptian intermediary, "opening the [Gaza] crossings and facilitating the movement of people and transfer of goods." Egypt, for its part, continued to ease restrictions on the movement of Palestinians at the Rafah crossing between Gaza and Egypt's Sinai. But as of November 2012, it still did not permit regular imports or exports of goods through Rafah, although it tended to turn a blind eye to commerce through an extensive network of tunnels.

The third mediator is the judicial discourse and which similarly identifies other aspects for human rights violation. The following is an example:

In July, Israel amended the law governing the state's civil liability for wrongdoing to bar all compensation lawsuits against Israeli forces by Palestinians from Gaza. Palestinians from Gaza with ongoing cases were barred from traveling to Israeli courts to testify. In August, a military court accepted a soldier's plea bargain and sentenced him to 45 days in prison for shooting his weapon without authorization in January 2009. The charge was reduced from manslaughter for killing a mother and daughter on the basis of discrepancies between soldiers' and Palestinian witnesses' accounts. The military investigation failed to re-interview witnesses to reconcile the accounts.

2. Materialization and Selectivity process

Being selective, the discourse builds for material social powers. Selectivity can be realized in many aspects.

On the one hand, the representation of the world was realized in the material and relational processes, neglecting other relations such as the mental, existential, behavioral, etc.

The impact of this centrifugal movement shows a detachment of HRW, and other Human Rights organizations, from the responsibility regarding human rights abuses. On the other hand, the themes with relation to human rights violation include warfare, economic situation and legal system, and do not refer to other themes as health, education, safety, infrastructure etc. As such, the material and selective presentation of the case is not comprehensive and this method understates the situation between the two rivals while blurring other truths about the case.

To conclude it is worth noticing that the use of the interdiscursivity analysis of discourse will be comprehensible as it allows the analyst to expose the underlying meanings of the surface structure of texts and the social changes it is meant to reflect, to understand the manipulative nature of discursive practices, and to improve communication and well-being by removing the barriers of assumed beliefs legitimized through discourse.

References

Allen, G. (2000). *Intertextuality*, London: Routledge.

Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to do things with words*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

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

Bernstein, B. (1996). *Pedagogy, Symbolic Control and Identity*, London: Taylor & Francis.

Bhatia, V. K. (1995). Genre-mixing in professional communication: the case of "private intentions" v. "socially recognized purposes". In *Explorations in English for Professional Communication*, eds., Bruthiaux, P., Boswood, T., and B. Bertha, 1-19, Hong Kong: City University of Hong Kong Press.

Bhatia, V. K. (2004). *Worlds of Written Discourse*, London/New York: Continuum.

Candlin, C., and Y. Maley. (1997). Intertextuality and interdiscursivity in the discourse of alternative dispute resolution. In *The Construction of Professional Discourse*, eds., Gunnarsson, B., Linell, P., and B. Nordberg, 201-222, New York: Addison Wesley Longman Limited.

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

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

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

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

Fairclough, N. (1992b). Discourse and text: Linguistic and intertextual analysis within discourse analysis. *Discourse and Society* 3: 193--217.

Fairclough, N. (1993). Critical Discourse Analysis and the Marketization of Public Discourse: The Universities. *Discourse & Society* 4(2): 133-168.

Fairclough, N., and A. Mauranen. (1997). The conversationalisation of political discourse: a comparative view. In *Political Linguistics*, eds., Blommaert, J., and C. Bulcaen, 89-120, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Fairclough, N. (2013). *Critical Discourse Analysis: the Critical Study of Language*. UK: Taylor & Francis.

Fairclough, N. (2011). Discursive hybridity and social change in critical discourse analysis. Unpublished lecture, Naples.

Fowler, R. (1986). *Linguistic Criticism*. Oxford: Oxford.

Halliday, M. A. K. (1976) 'Anti-languages', *American Anthropologist* 78

Halliday, M.A.K. and Martin, J.R. (1993). *Writing science: literacy and discursive power*. London: The Falmer Press.

Halliday, M.A.K. 1994 (first edition 1985): *Introduction to functional grammar* (second edition). London: Edward Arnold.

Halliday, M. A. K & Hasan, R. (1985). *Language, Text and Context*. Geelong, Vic, Deakin University Press (republished by OUP 1989)

Halliday, M.A.K & Matthiessen, M.I.M. (2014). Ed. 4. *Halliday's Introduction to Functional Grammar*. UK: Routledge.

HRW Annual Report .2013.
http://www.hrw.org/sites/default/files/related_material/AR2008-web.pdf.

Kristeva, J. (1986). Word, dialogue and novel. In *The Kristeva Reader*, ed., T. Moi, 34-61, Oxford: Blackwell.

Lemke, J. L. (1995). *Textual Politics: Discourse and Social Dynamics*, London: Taylor & Francis.

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

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

Martin, J.R. (1992). *English text: system and structure*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Martin, J. R. and Rose, D. (2003). *Working with Discourse*. London: Continuum.

O'Toole, M. (1994) *The Language of Displayed Art*. London: Leicester University Press

Musson, G., and L. Cohen. (1996). The enterprise discourse: an empirical analysis of its effects, Paper presented at the conference Communication and Culture: China and the World Entering the 21st Century, Beijing University.

Pêcheux, M. (1982). *Language, Semantics and Ideology*. London: Macmillan.

Sarangi, S. (2000). Activity types, discourse types and interactional hybridity: the case of genetic counseling. In *Discourse and Social Life*, eds., Sarangi, S. and M. Coulthard, 1-27, London: Pearson Education Limited.

Scollon, R. (2000). Methodological interdiscursivity: an ethnographic understanding of unfinalisability. In *Discourse and Social Life*, eds., Sarangi, S. and M. Coulthard, 138-154, London: Pearson Education Limited.

Scollon, R. (2002). Interdiscursivity and identity. In *Critical Discourse Analysis: Critical Concepts in Linguistics*, ed., M. Toolan, 4: 79-94, London: Routledge.

Wodak, R. (1995). Critical linguistics and critical discourse analysis. In Verschueren, Whorf, B.L. (edited and with an introduction by J.B. Carroll) 1956: *Language, thought and reality: selected writings of Benjamin Lee Whorf*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. J. et al. (eds.), *Handbook of Pragmatics: Manual*: 204--210. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Wodak, R. (Ed.) (1997). *Gender and Discourse*. London: Sage.

Wodak, R. (2001). 'What CDA is about - a summary of its history, important concepts and its developments', in R. Wodak and M. Meyer (eds), *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Sage, pp. 1-13.