The discursive construction of Portuguese national identity: elite vs. lay participants discursive strategies in a phone-in radio show

Filipa Ribeiro
Lancaster University, UK & Universidade do Algarve, Portugal

Abstract

This paper proposes to analyse the discursive construction of Portuguese national identity in the semi-public (media) discourse, namely how two apparently competing discourses on national identity (that of the elite and that of laypeople) represent and reframe the country's national identity. I am interested in how these different types of participants co-construct and negotiate (national) identities and how the rhetorical contrast is set between what the prior speaker has said and what the current speaker suggests as an oppositional action.

   I will explore, from a discourse-historical approach and a conversation analysis framework, how the discursive practices of participants in an hour-long phone-in radio broadcast programme (whose topic was "is national identity in crisis?") are constructed along different identity dimensions. I will look at personal deictic forms in order to uncover the participants' allegiance and non-allegiance to certain groups referred to in the programme.

Introduction

The idea of a Portuguese national identity has been highlighted by the country's political elite since the later half of the 19th century, either to appeal against what was perceived as external threats or as a mobilizing factor when facing challenges such as the democratic revolution of April, the 25th, 1974 or, later on, joining the European Union in 1986 (Cabral, 2003; Mattoso, 1998). Drawing on Anderson's (2006) phrasing, the Portuguese "imagined community" has been investigated from various angles and approaches such as the historical, sociological, literary and socio-political. However, these debates have assumed, for the most part, an essentialist view of national identity (Almeida, 2002).

This paper presents a view of the discursive construction of national identity in a phone-in radio show. Coming back to Anderson's concept of "imagined communities", the research pinpoints the different "attachments" diverse social groups feel for "the inventions of their imaginations" (2006: 141). The data set for this study consists of an hour-long phone-in national radio programme called *Antena Aberta* (Open Antenna), broadcast live on 27th of June 2006 during the football World Cup, when the Portuguese team seemed a possible finalist. The programme was presented under the heading "Is Portugal's national identity in crisis?" precisely because this sports event brought about nationalistic feelings. Conversely, warning calls against these feelings, and voices of protest asking why these feelings only surfaced during this type of 'national' event, were also common at the time.

The concern of this article is twofold. First, it explores how the discursive practices of the participants are constructed along different dimensions on the explicit topic of national identity, within an overall Critical Discourse Analysis (hereafter CDA) framework. Secondly, I explore the data according to two approaches: Conversation Analysis (hereafter CA) and the Discourse-Historical Approach (hereafter DHA). The data analysis stems from two main research questions framed in order to understand to what extent the various participants on the programme reproduce discourses on Portuguese national identity: (1) What discourses do semi-public lay participants and 'experts' draw on to construe and/or represent Portugal's national identity when discussing major national events of the present and the past? (2) How are the 'Us' and the 'Other' discursively represented when constructing national identity?

Theoretical framework

Critical discourse analysis (CDA) and the discourse-historical approach (DHA)

In talk, discursive differences are negotiated; they are governed by differences in power, which are in part encoded in and determined by discourse and by genre. Therefore, texts and talk are often sites of struggle in that they show traces of differing discourses and ideologies contending and battling for dominance (Weiss and Wodak,

2003). CDA in the methodological tool used here. One major tenet of CDA is the critical stance of analysts, who take explicit positions when understanding, exposing and eventually resisting social inequality while they focus on social problems and political issues in a multidisciplinary fashion (Van Dijk, 2001b). So CDA aims to make visible the "ideological loading of particular ways of using language" which are often invisible to people (Fairclough and Wodak, 1997).

The study of language must be carried out with contextualization in order to give insights into social processes and consequently the application of multiple approaches is relevant when studying discourses (Reisigl and Wodak, 2009; Wodak et al, 1999). This study follows the CDA theoretical and methodological frameworks of Reisigl and Wodak (2001, 2009), Van Dijk (1993, 1995, 1996, 2001a, 2001b, 2004), Wodak (1990, 2001, 2006) and Wodak et al. (1999, 2008). As such, my data show the competing viewpoints from different social and/or political spheres on the issue of national identity. Finally, I will link my data to the concept of *public sphere*, defined as "the social sites or arenas where meanings are articulated, distributed and negotiated", thus enabling "citizens to participate in democratic dialogue" (Koller and Wodak, 2008: 1).

The discursive events on the topic of Portuguese national identity are embedded socially, and more importantly, historically. The DHA focuses primarily on historical and political topics as developed by the Vienna School of CDA[1] and applied in various studies on national identity and on the discourse about nation and national identity in Austria (Reisigl and Wodak, 2001; Wodak et al, 1999; Wodak and de Cillia, 2007). The DHA proposes three interrelated dimensions of analysis to be addressed recursively (de Cillia et al., 1999; Reisigl and Wodak, 2001, 2009): (1) to identify the specific contents or topics of a specific discourse; (2) to investigate the discursive strategies; (3) to examine linguistic means and the specific, context-dependent linguistic realizations. This paper analyses the data in order to bring out some of these types of features.

The discursive construction of national identity

Discourse on Portuguese national identity deserves close inspection in the light of its historical dimension and diachronic change because, amongst other political and historical events, the 1974 democratic revolution constitutes a watershed moment from which I believe all current narratives on national identity construct their major reference.

For Anderson (2006) nations can be understood as mental constructs. De Cillia et al. (1999: 149) drawing extensively from Anderson, state that nations "are represented in the minds and memories of the nationalized subjects […] and can become very influential guiding ideas". They also argue that national identities are discursively "produced, reproduced, transformed and destructed". Billig expands the argument further by introducing the term "banal nationalism" to cover "nationalism

---

[1] The DHA approach was developed to trace the constitution of an anti-Semitic stereotypical image as it emerged in public discourse in the 1986 Austrian presidential campaign (Wodak et al. 1990 quoted by Martin and Wodak, 2003: 7).

[…] as an endemic condition" (1995: 6) pervasive in all aspects of our daily life. The present research draws on the assumption that language used in discourses reshapes and reframes social processes and practices, and that "discourse is socially constitutive as well as socially shaped" (Fairclough and Wodak, 1997: 258). Social practice and social processes reproduce, reshape and reframe unequal relationships through language in use. As a result, the link between language and social reality is a two-way, multi-varied relationship.

Conversation analysis (CA) and data

As this study focuses on a radio phone-in broadcast, and as some distinct features of this type of data, such as the local interactive processes of negotiating and conflict management, cannot be accounted for solely with the DHA, I also draw on a conversation analytical framework as the guiding resource for the initial approach to the data.

Together with CDA, CA is probably the most widely adopted discourse-analytical approach to the study of media talk. The present framework follows Ian Hutchby's extensive work on media talk (1996, 1999, 2001, 2006). I argue that this method allows the analysis of the *organization of interaction*, one of the key features present in the data, and that helps to shed some insights into the immediate language or text-internal co-text. I also rely on some of Van Dijk's (1999) and Hutchby's (2006) arguments to claim that a good deal of CA links the properties of talk with 'higher-level' features of society. This triangulation of methodologies and perspectives (integrating the CA perspective within the broader DHA framework) allows me to explore, in this particular data set, how power relations are enacted and negotiated when constructing and reframing national identity narratives. Hutchby's conversational analysis framework (1996, 2006) accounts for power as an integral feature of talk-in-interaction. Bringing DHA and CA together will thus overcome criticisms of the CA framework, such as Billig (1999) and Fairclough (1995), who claim that the CA approach is flawed by being "resistant to linking properties of talk with higher-level features of society and culture – relations of power, ideologies, cultural values" (Fairclough, 1995: 23).

Data analysis

Describing the data and method of approach

The phone-in radio show begins with two consecutive presenters (first a generic radio presenter followed by the host) introducing the topic of Portuguese national identity. Both presenters (re)produce topics on the discourse of national identity. They contextualize the programme's theme by referring to the recent commemorations of the day of Portugal, the twentieth anniversary of Portugal joining the European Union and the Portuguese team's winning streak during the football World Cup (2006).

However, they state how numerous Portuguese complain that the Portuguese people only "feel proud of being Portuguese" on these commemorative occasions. Therefore, the presenters argue, there is a good case for a debate on the topic of national identity. The host, besides echoing the radio presenter's words, quotes several Portuguese poets and writers who have dealt with this issue and who have elected "language and culture as the main pillars of our [Portuguese] identity". The host ends her long turn with questions that, according to her, are tormenting the country, such as: "Is there a feeling of national identity?" and "How did the European Union affect the country's national identity?" The debate then follows a regular pattern: each caller is very briefly greeted by the host, who immediately hands over to him or her.

Fourteen people come on the programme, with different lengths of turn duration, ranging from 1 to 5-minute calls. However, there is the exception of C3 and C11,[2] who are both presented as university research professors. Significantly, in each of these two participations, the host intervenes six times, asking questions, asking for clarification or for practical examples of what is being stated. This exceptional behaviour will be discussed below.

One feature that makes these data particularly interesting is the fact that talk from ordinary members of the public is included. It therefore crosses between key sociological categories such as private and public, lay and professional in complex ways. Keeping in mind this key point, one can say that this spoken corpus is *semi-public* (Wodak et al, 1999), is *naturally occurring* (Taylor, 2001) and is *unscripted* or *fresh talk* (Goffman, 1981; Hutchby, 2006). I chose to designate the data as 'semi-public discourse' because lay participants publicly share their 'authentic' opinions and beliefs, following the rationale of authors who apply this label for data gathered in a focus group setting such as Wodak et al. (1999). I have also considered it to be 'naturally occurring language' (i.e. without any interference of the researcher), although the situational context has a declared purpose (the discussion of the topic of national identity) and a particular venue. Even though designating the data as *naturally occurring* is indeed controversial, my take here is that talk can occur in a natural way in more structured situations. Taylor (2001: 27) discusses this issue of 'naturalness', claiming that it does not necessarily refer to speakers being unselfconscious "but to the talk being uninfluenced by the presence of the observer". Even though the researcher is not present or even conceived as such, the programme's perceived audience will tend to constrain the participants. Nonetheless, and even though the amount of naturalness we may observe is arguable, I believe we can defend the 'naturalness' of these data, if compared to scripted talk.

I divided the data analysis into two main parts. The first (sections 3.2 and 3.3) is dedicated to describing how the host and phone-in participants negotiate identities. This closely follows Hutchby's (2006) CA framework. In the second part (section 3.4), I focus on the construction of national identity using the DHA. According to Hutchby, the "differential distributions of discursive resources […] enable certain participants to achieve interactional effects that are not available or are differentially available to others in the setting" (2006: 33). I will suggest that these features impact on the

---

[2] Each participant was ascribed a number according to the call sequence.

discourses produced on national identity, and on how participants claim various 'truths' about the nation, the country, and its people. Therefore, this approach to talk-in-interaction sheds light on how and why certain topoi are framed, produced and recontextualized, not only contextually, but also co-textually. Reisigl and Wodak (2001: 75) define *topoi* as the "content-related warrants or 'conclusion rules' that connect the argument or arguments with the conclusion, the claim." They argue that they "justify (a shortcut) transition from the argument or arguments to the conclusion" (ibid.). Topoi are not always expressed explicitly, but can be made explicit as conditional or causal paraphrases such as 'if x, then y' or 'y, because x' (Reisigl and Wodak, 2009: 110).[3] Discourses on national identity are built on systems of cultural representation that are based on topoi or presupposition of sameness, not only by the explicit construction of an in-group but also, I will argue, through the linguistically reconstruction of fallacious topoi.[4] This point might be illustrated by the topos of threat, salient in the data as I illustrate below, based on the following conditionals: national identity is threatened by external and internal dangers (elites, politicians, Spain, European Union,) in various ways that should be stopped.[5] In the first part, I also focus on semantic macro-areas or topics, as these can be conveyed through topoi when the argument is not explained or justified, and therefore there is a transition from the argument to the conclusion without the presentation of full argumentation.

Topic analysis shows that national identity is dealt with in relation to two themes. First, and most prominent, is the link to past historical events. And second, there is a constant reference to the economic and political situation of Portugal as it links to the people in power and to the European Union. There are two important semantic dimensions recurrent in this identity discourse: one is the semantic relation between identity and economic issues, therefore social class, as I illustrate below, and the second is the semantic relation linking identity to government. This means there are several instances where national identity becomes discursively linked to economic issues as well as to issues of political governance, as extract (1) illustrates:[6]

---

[3] Myer (2005) and Valk (2003) offer a different viewpoint of the concept. For them, t*opoi* or *loci communes* are often based on standard arguments that can carry the "socially shared identities of feeling" (Shotter, 1993 quoted by Myers, 2005: 536). Thus, topoi are best approached from the angle of commonplace phrasing, when people will draw on a shared repertoire or topos to convey and legitimate their (public) viewpoints, often reproduced as an uncritical judgement (Myers, 2005). Moreover, a topos can be regarded as a system of public knowledge, a discursive resource in which one finds arguments to sustain a conclusion (Van der Valk, 2003). Thus, topoi are general principles that support an argument without themselves constituting the argument itself, providing the standard arguments, typical of specific issues.

[4] Reisigl and Wodak (2009: 110) following Van Eeemeren and Grootendorst (1992) argue that fallacious topoi do not abide with the following rules: the freedom of arguing, the obligation to give reasons, the correct reference to the previous discourse by the antagonist, the obligation to 'matter-of-factness', the correct reference to implicit premises, the respect of shared starting points, the use of plausible arguments and schemes of argumentation, logical validity, the acceptance of the discussions results, and the clarity of expression and correct interpretation.

[5] There are several instances of this topos in the data, namely "What will the Portuguese children being born in Spain say in the future?" (C4).

[6] ?   A question mark indicates a rising or questioning intonation.

-                  A dash indicates a false start or cut-off.

(.)   A dot enclosed in a bracket indicates short pause.

(1) C8

one thing is (.) the identity of our country and another is the managing of our country now in relation to managing our country unfortunately (.) it has to be asked are our politicians man- managing umm with a true umm sense of national identity? [7]

Following De Cillia, Reisigl and Wodak's (1999) and Wodak et al.'s (1999) framework, I will list a few of the semantic macro-areas related to the construction of Portuguese identity and nation identified in the spoken data. Next, I will focus mainly on the specific content of the participants' utterances, as they illustrate topics and topoi. The analysis demonstrates that in various instances, topics are conveyed through topoi when the argument is not explained or justified. Therefore, and within the evoking of a common past, (common past being one of the discursive topics of national identity), participants might claim that "[they] don't like hearing youngsters say it would have been better if Afonso Henriques hadn't done what he did and that all of this should be Spain" (C5). This utterance presupposes that the audience, because they share a common past with the speaker, will immediately understand the argument implied.[8]

The main relevant topics highlighted by the data are as follows: (1) the topic of a common identity; (2) the topic of (absence of) "pride in being Portuguese"; (3) the concept of national defeat; (4) the narrative of a collective political and historical past; (5) the discursive construction of Portugal's membership of the European Union; (6) the discursive construction of the absence of a common future; (7) the discursive construction of Portugal vs. Spain; (8) the discursive construction of an in-group/out-group economic and class boundary: 'us' (the poor and workers) versus 'them' (the rich, the elite, the politicians).

Each of these semantic macro-structures or topics is conveyed through various claims or topoi. I will only focus on the following: (1) the topic of a common identity; (2) the topic of (absence of) "pride in being Portuguese". Several topoi or argumentation schemes are employed in the discursive legitimization of national identity: the topos of threat, the topos of history and the topos of culture.[9]

((laughs))	A description enclosed in a double bracket indicates a non-verbal activity.
(*italics*)	Single brackets indicate information added by the researcher to clarify the transcription or translation.
sou:::nd	Colons indicate that the speaker has stretched the preceding sound or word.
[ ]	Square brackets indicate where overlapping talk starts and ends.
<u>Underline</u>	Underlined fragments indicate speaker emphasis.
=	The 'equals' sign indicates contiguous utterances.
(xxx)	Parentheses with xxxs indicate untranscribable talk.

[7] All extracts have been translated from the Portuguese transcription of the programme. The translations are meant to convey the gist of the original rather than the exact wording. Many of the participants are grammatically inaccurate, very hesitant and repetitive. The translation attempts to keep these oral traits.

[8] Afonso Henriques, first king of Portugal (1143AD), rebelled against his mother, whom he imprisoned, and declared unilaterally the independence of Portugal from the northern Spanish kingdoms, ruled by his cousin.

[9] See Reisigl and Wodak (2001) for an overview of the main topoi concerning the discursive construction of discrimination and Wodak et al (1999: 34ff.) for topoi on the discursive construction of national identity.

Co-construction of meaning – interaction in spoken discourse

The co-construction of meaning in talk-in-interaction impacts on the discourse produced on national identity as certain topoi, topics or even agency and 'othering' strategies are framed, produced and recontextualized co-textually. I suggest that there are three causes affecting the usage of the 'us and them' deictics, and hence on the discourses produced on national identity in these data. First, there is the co-construction of arguments within the interaction; then, the asymmetric positions set up in the opening turn sequences between host and callers; and finally, the strong and deep seated hierarchical forms of address in the Portuguese language.

The opening sequences on a talk radio show are crucial to observe participants establishing their relevant institutional identities (Hutchby, 1999), and thus to help us understand the relationship between language use and social life. Hutchby (1999), following the initial research of Goffman (1961, 1974), advocates that the opening moments of newly forming encounters allow us to observe people manoeuvring into position and adjusting their frame. Therefore, the data show that talk radio calls routinely open by means of a single two-turn sequence as shown in (2) and (3) below:

(2) C2
Host: Elídio Santos good morning electrician is in Braga (.)(*town in the north of Portugal)* what is your opinion?
Caller: [Good morning I think tha::t Portuga::l

(3) C4
Host: I'm on my way to meet another participant Aureliano Burrica, he's a baker, and is calling from Beja *(town in the south interior of Portugal)*(.) good morning=
=Good morning, Doutora Eduarda Maia.
Caller: We're listening Aureliano.
Host: [look I'm going to talk about

In fact, Montgomery also points out the "fixed formulae of transitions between one phrase, episode or footing and another, such as greetings" (2007: 31). Hutchby's (1996) claim about the asymmetry of host-caller positions in arguments (what he calls the potential action-opposition sequence) seems to fully apply to the data, since the organization of calls on talk radio requires callers to begin by stating their position, as extracts (2) and (3) illustrate.

Although the amount of interaction in terms of turn-taking is very limited for each of the twelve lay participants, I suggest there is, to some extent, co-construction of meaning. In fact, participants explicitly or implicitly refer back to what has been previously said: "I'm calling to talk about that professor who was there just now" (C4) or "our elites are to blame, contrary to what the gentleman said a while back (C5) or "I really enjoyed listening to this last lady" (C15). This of course relates to *situated* language use, within the process of meaning being created in the interaction. Each of the participants uses referential strategies to designate what has been previously said and to refer to the participants (such as 'that professor', 'the gentleman' and 'this last

lady'). Hence, the audience witnesses a simulated dialogue or interaction, where each participant responds with a rejoinder or rebuttal using what Hutchby (2001: 128) calls the "You say X but what about Y" device. Therefore, there is in fact a rhetorical contrast between what the prior speaker has said and what the current speaker suggests as an oppositional action. Hutchby (ibid.) further argues that the "You say X" device signals the type of utterance under production, and listeners will recognize the argumentation pattern. Nevertheless, the data's originality lies in the explicit non-interactional nature between callers (since they are not talking amongst each other, but only to the host) which becomes quite clear when reading the transcript, yet the participants use the "you say X" device, with the modification of the addressee, so in this case the device should probably be modified to "s/he said X but what about Y".

Besides the asymmetry of host-caller positions in arguments, there is also a second type of asymmetric power relation evident in the forms of address in Portuguese, which links to the notion of conversationalizing institutional talk, discussed in the following section.

Authenticating and conversationalizing institutional talk

The way participants say things can be as important as what they say (Myers, 2005, 2007). Interaction may be constrained by conventions about who asks questions, how they are answered, who speaks next, and how topics and relevance to the topic are mutually defined by participants (2005: 81). These constraints appear to be determinant to the positioning of host and callers in the opening turn sequences.

The diverse positioning of participants' roles and social identities might be construed as hegemonic access to the media and therefore as unequal access to constructing a specific discourse on national identity. The host has the first opportunity for opposition within each call and this turns out to be a powerful argumentative resource (Hutchby, 1996). Bearing in mind this argumentative resource, let us consider two further strategies which also contribute to the asymmetric power relations, not only between lay participants and host, but also between lay participants and the academics who participate as experts. To consider these, the concepts of authenticating and conversationalizing institutional talk will be taken on board.

Thornborrow (2001) has considered hosts' discourse strategies to authenticate "the expert" and "the lay member of the public" that come in on radio programmes. A distinction between the two types of participants is drawn through the oppositional characteristics, which differentiate the discourse of professional speakers from that of lay participants. Thornborrow focuses on the talk of lay participants and the production of "authentic talk" within the mediated discourse that will authenticate the public role that is situationally available to them. This authentication of roles is "done" by participants by building relevant identities for themselves in the early moments of their talk.

In the Portuguese language, forms of address in any interaction are crucial in setting a person's social identity. Speakers addressing adult strangers usually select a form based on the social, professional or administrative position of the hearer, all of which require the third-person singular form of the verb (Oliveira, 2005). However, in

the phone-in radio programme, the host is considerably more informal with lay participants than with the two academics: she addresses lay callers by their first names exclusively and does not use any professional title. On the other hand, all lay participants defer to the host by using the more formal ways of address that the Portuguese language allows for. Forms of address in Portuguese take on a rather complex form; as such, the host never uses the more informal 'you' (*tu*) when addressing the participants directly. She chooses to address them by their first name which implies a certain degree of familiarity and equality in the relationship on her part: "Hi, António, good morning" (C6). In one instance, she even states "It's been a long time since I've heard from you" (*você* = in-between formal way of address) (C5). This in-between formal and informal way of address is not reciprocated by any of the lay participants who instead use the very formal and deferent forms such as "Ms. Eduarda Maio" (*Dona* Eduarda Maio or *Doutora* Eduarda Maio), or *"Ma'am"* (*Minha Senhora*).[10] This unequal relation is enacted by each participant when coming on the show. This seems to indicate a perceived bottom-up class hierarchy from those who 'defer' to the host of the programme when phoning in. Traditionally, the Portuguese language has strategies that allow people to defer linguistically to people who are formally better-educated. However, in this particular broadcast programme, several participants are framed as being as educated as the host (i.e. having completed a university degree), therefore the asymmetric relationship is more striking when the participant does not reciprocate to the "Hi, António, good morning" on a first name basis with a possible "Good morning, Eduarda". In sum, the data reaffirm how the asymmetric power relations are profoundly embedded in the Portuguese social network and in the linguistic enactment of asymmetric dominance in the construction of social identities.[11]

Montgomery (2007: 182ff) compared discourses of broadcast news in the 1980s and in the present day to conclude that "there is a tendency to greater naturalism and informality in delivery" (Montgomery, 2007: 196). Similarly, in open-line talk radio shows, there has been a move towards conversationalizing institutional talk by the shows' hosts, i.e. producing linguistic markers such as the use of first names, a preference for informal styles and registers and positive politeness such as talking to participants as if they were friends (see Cameron, 2001; Thornborrow, 2001). Therefore, institutional talk is borrowing features from 'ordinary' conversation.

However, and coming back to the data set, there is a marked difference between the host's register when introducing or interacting with lay callers and when interacting with the 'experts'. The latter are discursively framed within the role of experts by four different indicators: by the moderator's longer introduction, by the more significantly formal form of address, i.e. "professor", by the way the two 'experts' establish an equal-term relationship with the host by being, out of the 14 participants, the only two addressing her on a first-name basis. Finally, another means of contrasting their role is their rather long turns (C3, 08:01 min.; C11, 12:00 min.)

---

[10] 'Dr.' which is short for 'doutora' is a form of addressing people with a university degree, very common in formal settings, and used for establishing hierarchical boundaries between interlocutors.

[11] See Oliveira (2005) for a detailed study on the Portuguese address form system.

compared to the other participants, whose longest extract is a 05:37 minute-long turn. Thus, to come back to what I have argued above, these diverse positionings of participants' roles and social identities convey hegemonic access to the media and asymmetrical access to constructing discourses on national identity. On the other hand, and from the audience's viewpoint these strategies authenticate their 'expertise'.

The construction of national identity – voices of authority and voices of lay people

Linguistic realization – personal deixis

In this section, I examine the different roles the lay and professional callers play in the programme and how their discursive strategies differ when discussing the topic of national identity. Krzyzanowski and Oberhuber (2007), drawing from the extensive research and illustrative examples of Wodak et al (1999), analyse the role of personal deixis in the discourses of European identities. They suggest that looking at various personal-deictic forms such as 'we' (and all possible conjugations of 'us', 'our', etc) or 'they' ('them', 'their') and/or on the switching between individual ('I', 'my') and plural deixis ('we', 'they') allows the analyst, on the one hand, to discover the participant's allegiance and non-allegiance to certain groups. On the other hand, it also facilitates the observation of how a speaker constructs his/her own agency in the actions accounted for in the discourse using 'I', or generalises those actions as an effect of collective endeavours using 'we' or 'us' (see table 1).[12] One of the most striking differences between the two types of participants relates to patterns that index participants' footing[13] as there is a constant shift of referent (see table 1). For instance, C3 and C11, who come on the programme in the role of experts on the topic of national identity, behave in a different way from each other. When C3 uses "we" he is distancing himself from the object of study – Portugal – and "we" means 'we= scholars' or an addressee inclusive 'we'. C11 makes abundant use of 'we' as a whole-inclusive Portuguese people. Table 1 adapts the data to the list of potential meanings of first person plural pronouns used in the discursive construction of national identities proposed by Wodak et al. (1999: 46) and Wodak (2006: 112).

---

[12] See Wodak et al. (1999: 45ff) for an extensive discussion of these deictics.

[13] Footing refers to instances of talk where participants' alignment, set, stance, posture or projected self is somehow activated (Goffman,1981: 128).

PARTICIPANT	INSTANTIATION	SUBJECT POSITION	REFERENT
C2	Portugal is a bit run down due to the politicians **we** have because because only look at themselves, they don't look at the things of the poor	we I + you sg.+ they	the Portuguese people; the poor; the blue-collar workers (addressee inclusive)
		they	politicians
C3	**we** can observe that; **we** verify that	we I + s/he	the scholar; the academics (addressee partially inclusive ?)
C4	**we** go to France and **we** are welcome	we I + s/he	People who travel; I; one (addressee exclusive)
C5	the elites have led **us** to rock bottom so that **we** lose our national identity	us I + you sg.? + they	the Portuguese like myself (addressee inclusive?)
C7	we are not guided **we we** mainly when I say **we** I mean the people	we I + you sg.+ they	the Portuguese people
C11	one aspect of our society which is not healthy its that **we** always talk about the Portuguese as if **they** were other people in whom **we** do not include **ourselves**	we I + you pl + they	the Portuguese people (the whole inclusive we)
C13	our problem is no longer to know who **we** are **our** problem is that **we** do not know who **we** were because at a certain point **we** erased our history	we/our you ?+ they	the Portuguese people (speaker exclusive)

Table 1 The use of personal deictic-forms: the first person plural pronouns

Topics and topoi

1) The topic of a common identity and the discursive construction of national identity

The topic of national identity built on the topos of threat links to other topoi, that is, to other "routine flagging of nationhood" (Billig, 1995: 50), but the data show a distinctive discursive construction of national identity as an anthropomorphised entity which needs to be defended and protected from 'them', the out-group. However, this

'othering' - contrary to what studies on the discursive construction of various national identities seem to indicate - is closer to home and means primarily the national government and/or the elites (who appear to be a rather diffuse entity, but nevertheless indicate a clear class divide), Europe and/or the European Union, Spain, the media and, finally, the labour migrants (who are only mentioned within the dichotomy 'us and them' by one participant, C12, further discussed below.

According to the conceptual model proposed by the discourse-historical approach, one of the fundamental discursive constructive strategies of establishing a particular national identity is based on the national 'we-group' through particular acts of reference, for example using the pronoun 'we' in connection with the de-toponymical labelling 'Portuguese' i.e. "we, the Portuguese", which serves as a basis of appealing directly or indirectly to national solidarity and union. Conversely, strategies of dismantling and destruction will negatively present the in-group, will demolish existing national identities or elements of them, or will emphasise intra-national differences, as it is the case with the participants' emphasis on differences amongst social and economic groups. As such, presupposing intra-national sameness or similarity is juxtaposed to presupposing intra-national differences – the speaker presumes to speak for 'the Portuguese' as such, and takes for granted that there is a homogeneous 'we-group' with a shared mentality – imagined community.

On the other hand, the presupposition of differences between nations is a very common discursive strategy, and often leads to the negative debasing delimitation of an out-group which is considered as a different national collective (De Cillia et al. 1999). However, apart from one or two passages by the experts where inter-national differences are emphasised, these differences apparently do not serve the negative debasing delimitation of an out-group. Instead, highlighted differences emphasise the negative features of the in-group, i.e. the Portuguese. Again, this is a dismantling or destructive strategy. These negative attributes are not discursively constructed from the outside or imposed from the outside, but are the exclusive responsibility of 'we, the Portuguese people', whether regarded as a whole entity or as sections of the national group, such as 'they', 'the elites', 'they, the government', 'they, the state' or 'they, the politicians'. These types of strategies serve to de-mythologize existing national identities or elements of them, as extract (4) illustrates:

> (4) C5
> the so called between inverted commas elites have driven us at the end
> of the day we have lost our national identity (xxx) there are countries
> that have a very deep seated identity which is our case with 900 years
> of history

During the entire show, the topic of a 'common identity', and therefore, the argumentation scheme relying on the topos of 'threat' or 'danger', claiming that national identity may be in danger, is barely questioned, dismantled or discussed. In fact, and perhaps not surprisingly, precisely because "nationalism is an endemic

condition" (Billig, 1995: 6), the common identity might be perceived as being in crisis, but its nature is not questioned. There is a strong identification with Portugal as a concrete, living being, visible in the metonymies and personification. Portuguese national identity is discursively constructed as a tangible thing that is possessed, owned, can be lost, and most importantly can also be stolen, thus the use of possessive determinants 'its' and the verbs 'to have', 'to lose' and 'to steal', as extracts (4) above and (5) and (6) below show:

> (5) C1
> So Portugal if I'm not very mistaken (.) has been pract- practically for nine centuries with its identity (.) umm that the identity of these people is at risk? it is indeed and globalization and Brussels are enough cause of that

> (6) C13
> and I apologise for being rude this herd of pseudo-intellectuals stole from us(.) it is them who have controlled our destinies and in fact they stole from us that national identity

Finally, even though Portugal has changed its demographics from a country of emigrants during the 1950s and 1960s to an immigrant-receiving country by the end of the 20th Century, I found strikingly few strategies of other-presentation in relation to working migrants. Only C12 constructs his argument against immigration, as illustrated in (7):

> (7) C12
> I think that we're losing our national identity because of immigration […] where I live there are hundreds if not thousands of people from Romania and as you may know these people eat and drink but won't work there's thousands of them

2) The topic of "pride in being Portuguese"

The topic of 'pride in being Portuguese', or rather the absence of this pride, is brought in to the show during the introductory opening of the programme by both the generic radio presenter and the phone-in host. Both refer to the topic of 'pride in being Portuguese' because of the "pride felt for our ancestry" (topos of history and topos of culture), quoting canonical writers and poets, who are collectively known for having discursively constructed representations of both the Portuguese people and the Portuguese 'motherland' (*patria*). This linguistic representation of national identity is contrasted by the first radio presenter by using a dichotomy in terms of lexical choices: "we give way to despair and fatalism and lack of interest after teaching the world not to be afraid of the sea."

When opening the debate, the phone-in host quotes several literary authors by naming them. Her last quotation is from the state's highest figure, the Portuguese

President, who is also quoted[14] in having quoted the authors referred to above. Therefore, the initial 2-3 minutes of the programme are equating national identity and national pride with canonical writers, and with the state in a circular and interdiscursive fashion. The choice of verbs to indicate how the Portuguese feel towards their identity also indicates intertextuality with canonical Portuguese literature and poems, as illustrated in (8). This is the discursive representation of the hegemonic discourse on national identity as it has been reproduced in institutionalized and official settings. Thus, the topos of authority (based on the conclusion rule: Portugal is embedded with all these qualities because the canonical writers (authority) are correct) is fed by several rhetorical devices such as stereotypical positive attributions that implicitly construct positive difference and by visible dichotomies that enhance the country's positive identity. Thus, predication devices such as the ones that occur in extract (8) line 1 together with the contrast between "old country" but "main strength", the reference to the open "borders", and finally, the reference to "a people" who were the pioneers of "universalism" illustrate this idea. This is the state's 'official' discourse, subscribed to and reproduced by state figures in official state acts and ceremonies:

> (8) Host
> Portugal is an old country whose main strength lies in its people's soul (.) a people who have never closed themselves within borders and in a: way umm have shown (.) the world (.) taught the world not to be afraid of the sea ((in breath)) a people who anticipated the European spirit pioneer of the universal spirit as Manuel Alegre says they cannot lose confidence in themselves and in the future of their country ((in breath))

The change in footing is noticeable in most lay participants, constituting a revealing discursive feature of the construction of Portuguese national identity in this particular setting. In fact, and according to C11 (the second academic), this shift in footing could be generalisable to most discourses on national identity uttered by the Portuguese in various settings:

> (9) C11
> one aspect of our society which is not healthy is that we always talk about the Portuguese as if they were other people in whom we do not include ourselves

The plural noun 'the Portuguese' refers in most instances to 'them' and seldom to 'us', even though it is 'our country'. Therefore, each of the lay participants assumes his or her implicit feelings for the country, but they question everyone else's. Extract (10) is indicative of this ambivalent construction. The speaker's footing signalled by the deictic *we* (including conjugated verbs in the first person plural, possessive pronouns and deitics) is original, because it is for most of the instances speaker exclusive. Indeed,

---

[14] This programme was broadcast on the 27th June. The President usually delivers a solemn speech about 'the idea of Portugal' on *National Day of Portugal, Camões and the Portuguese Communities* (10th June).

'we' (the Portuguese) as active agents do not include 'I' (the speaker), who actually "knows who we (they) are" (line 2). However, the footing shifts between *we=they* and *we=us* and, from line 5 onwards, *we* becomes an all inclusive *I + you + they*:

(10) C13
our problem is no longer to know who we are *((in breath))* our problem is that we do not know who <u>we were</u> because at a certain point- point we erased our history our traditions our culture and the new slogan became being citizens of the world. citizens of Europe(.) and to <u>become</u> citizens of Europe we need to know above all how to <u>be::</u> Portuguese the result of all this is that we are not respected we do not have any prestige and we are perceived in Europe as some poor <u>dev</u>ils umm in the European Union I am convinced that we are seen as the five-star hotel waitress whom the boss pats on the head

Conclusion

The critical discourse analysis and conversation analysis frameworks seem to function jointly in linking the models of identity proposed by the (political) elites or the media (the system world) and everyday discourses (the life world). Whereas CDA, or more specifically the DHA, focuses on various levels of contexts, CA (together with the DHA) highlights the co-construction of meaning, a crucial feature in talk. The CA framework illustrates how macro-topics such as the marked class divide can also become evident through the analysis of initial turn taking, participants' footing, forms of address and argumentation construction within the interaction. Within the same communicative event, I partially analysed the elites' discursive representations of national identity, the ordinary people's own representation and their reactions to the former. Most of this article was guided by this dichotomy, addressing the question of what discourses semi-public lay participants draw on to construe and/or represent Portugal's national identity when discussing major national events of the present and the past. In addition, I addressed the question of how the 'us' and the 'other' are discursively represented when constructing national identity, as it highlights one of the main discursive macro-strategies for constructing national identity.

Bearing these characteristics in mind, first, the data revealed features such as the hegemonic or dominant discursive construction of national identity to be very much embedded in the Portuguese collective past, collective history, collective memory and canonical writers - as the semantic macro-areas illustrate. Secondly, the data illustrate how ordinary participants fall back upon 'othering' the social groups whom they perceive as being responsible for the dominant national identity narrative: the elites, the politicians, the political and economic centres of power. As such, it is not the question of competing narratives of Portuguese identity, but rather of one dominant narrative which is superimposed. Thirdly, one of the curious results that needs further investigation relates to the destructive strategy aiming at dismantling parts of national identity. The data show that this strategy is regularly used: national

identity is discursively constructed as a tangible thing that 'others' can steal or destroy. The results show that this delimitation is targeted at the in-group, the Portuguese, and not at an out-group. Theoretically, and according to the DHA framework, this destructive strategy usually links to the constructive strategy focused on presupposing and highlighting in-group national sameness, which is constructed by contrast with constructing out-groups, namely ethnic, national or cultural minorities. However, and surprisingly (if we take into consideration the official numbers for legal and illegal labour migrants in Portugal), this is not the case in these spoken data. In fact, the data suggest that constructing national identity is also the site of social struggle between social classes instead, as research in other national contexts indicates, between 'us=the national group' and 'them=the labour migrants', or 'them=the ethnic minorities'. The constant shifting of perspective together with the various referential strategies for 'Portugal' corroborate these findings.

Finally, when studying the media we must keep in mind that "media production always walks the line between content orientation, factual representation, and the necessity to reach and entertain as many people as possible" (Koller and Wodak, 2008: 6). A show where a given topic is presented for open-line discussion raises questions as to the real public opinion of what is being talked about. As Fairclough (2003: 45) points out in relation to TV debates, the journalist "gathers 'views' from the audience but in a way which separates and fragments them leaving no possibility of dialogue between them". This foregrounds the need to reach a balance between consultation in the public sphere and the host's tight regulation of the interaction or, in other words, the contingent constraints, in the name of a "good show". According to Habermas' communication model of deliberative democracy, a "self-regulating media system" should grant "anonymous audiences feedback between an informed elite discourse and a responsive civil society" (2006: 411-412). The public sphere, then, should grant people free access to a space for eventual consensus with the possibility of marking the difference and leading to action. However, this is not present in my particular data genre, and it is questionable if it is ever present outside the realm of the ideal.

References

Almeida, O. T. (2002). National Identity - A Revisitation of the Portuguese Debate, *NUI Maynooth papers in Spanish, Portuguese and Latin American Studies*. NUI Maynooth.

Anderson, B. (Revised edition). (2006). *Imagined communities: reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*. London and New York: Verso.

Billig, M. (1995). *Banal Nationalism*. London: Sage.

Billig, M. (1999). 'Critical Discourse Analysis and Conversation Analysis: an exchange between Michael Billig and Emanuel A. Schegloff'. *Discourse and Society, 10*(4), 543-582.

Cabral, M. V. (2003). 'Portuguese National Identity: Content and Relevance'. *Dados: Revista de Ciências Sociais, 46* (03), 513-533.

Cameron, D. (2001). *Working with Spoken Data*. London: Sage.

De Cillia, R., Reisigl, M. and Wodak, R. (1999). 'The discursive construction of national identity'. *Discourse and Society, 10*(2), 149-173.

Fairclough, N. (1995). *Media Discourse*. London: Hodder Arnold.

Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analysing Discourse: Textual analysis for social research*. London: Routledge.

Fairclough, N. and Wodak, R. (1997). Critical Discourse Analysis. In Dijk, T. van (ed.), *Discourse as Social Interaction* (Vol. 2). London: Sage, 258-284.

Goffman, E. (1961). *Encounters*. New York: Bobbs-Merrill.

Goffman, E. (1981). *Forms of Talk*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Habermas, J. (2006). 'Political communication in Media Society: Does Democracy Still Enjoy an Epistemic Dimension? The Impact of Normative Theory on Empirical Research'. *Communication Theory 16*, 411-426.

Hutchby, I. (1996). 'Power in discourse: The case of arguments on a British talk show'. *Discourse and Society, 7*(4), 481-497.

Hutchby, I. (1999). 'Frame attunement and footing in the organisation of talk radio openings'. *Journal of Sociolinguistics, 3*(3), 41-63.

Hutchby, I. (2001). ''Oh', irony, sequential ambiguity in arguments'. *Discourse and Society, 12*(2), 123-141.

Hutchby, I. (2006). *Media Talk: Conversation Analysis and the Study of Broadcasting*. Berkshire: Open University Press.

Koller, V. and Wodak, R. (2008). Introduction: Shifting boundaries and emergent public spheres. In Wodak, R. and Koller, V. (eds.), *Handbook of Communication in the Public Sphere* (Vol. 4). New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 1-17.

Krzyzanowski, M. and Oberhuber, F. (2007). *(Un) Doing Europe: Discourses and Practices of Negotiating the EU Constitutions*. Oxford: Peter Lang.

Martin, J. R. and Wodak, R. (Eds.). (2003). *Re/reading the Past: Critical and functional perspectives on time and value* (8). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Mattoso, J. (1988). *A Identificação de um País*. Lisboa: Editorial Estampa.

Montgomery, M. (2007). *The Discourse of Broadcast News - A linguistic approach.* London: Routledge.

Myers, G. (2005). 'Applied Linguistics and Institutions of Opinion'. *Applied Linguistics, 26*(4), 527-544.

Myers, G. (2007). Enabling Talk. *Text and Talk, 27*(1), 79-105.

Oliveira, S. M. (2005). 'A retrospective on address in Portugal (1982-2002): Rethinking power and solidarity'. *Journal of Historical Pragmatics, 6*(2), 307-323.

Reisigl, M. and Wodak, R. (2001). *Discourse and Discrimination: Rhetorics of racism and antisemitism*. London: Routledge.

Reisigl, M. and Wodak, R. (2nd revised ed.). (2009). The discourse-historical approach (DHA). In Wodak, R. and Meyer, M. (eds.), *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Sage.

Santos, B. S. (1993). *Portugal: Um Retrato Singular*. Porto: Afrontamento.

Taylor, S. (2001). Locating and Conducting Discourse Analytic Research. In Wetherell M, Taylor, S. & Yates, S. J. (eds.), *Discourse as Data*. London: Open University & Sage, 5-48.

Thornborrow, J. (2001). 'Authenticating talk: building public identities in audience participation'. *Discourse Studies, 3*(4), 459-479.

Van der Valk, I. (2003). 'Right-wing parliamentary discourse on immigration in France'. *Discourse and Society, 14*(3), 309-348.

Van Dijk, T. A. (1993). 'Principles of critical discourse analysis'. *Discourse and Society, 4*, 249-283.

Van Dijk, T. A. (1995). Power and the News Media. In Paletz, D. (ed.) *Political Communication and Action*. Cresskill, N.J: Hampshire Press, 9-36.

Van Dijk, T. A. (1996). *Opinion and Ideologies in Editorials*, Paper for the 4th International Symposium of Critical Discourse Analysis, Language, Social Life and Critical Thought,

Athens, 14-6 December 1995, 30pp. <http://www.discourse-in-society.org/editoria.htm > accessed 15 September 2004.

Van Dijk, T. A. (Ed.). (1997). *Discourse as Social Interaction*, (2). London: Sage.

Van Dijk, T. A. (1999). 'Critical Discourse Analysis and Conversation Analysis'. *Discourse and Society, 10*(4), 459-460.

Van Dijk, T. A. (2001a). Multidisciplinary CDA: a plea for diversity. In Wodak, R. and Meyer, M. (eds.), *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis* (1st ed.). London: Sage, 95-120.

Van Dijk, T. A. (2001b). Critical Discourse Analysis. In Tannen, D., Schiffrin, D. and Hamilton, H. (eds.), *Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. Oxford: Blackwell, 352-372.

Van Dijk, T. A. (2004). From Text Grammar to Critical Discourse Analysis: a brief academic autobiography. <http://www.discourse-in-society.org/beliar-e.htm>. Retrieved 1.10.2004

Weiss, G. and Wodak, R. (2003). Introduction. In Weiss, G., Wodak R. (eds.), *Critical Discourse Analysis: Theory and Interdisciplinarity*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 1-32.

Wodak, R. (2001). The discourse-historical approach. In Wodak, R., Meyer, M. (eds.), *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Sage, 61-94.

Wodak, R. (2004). Critical discourse analysis. In Seale C., Gobo G., Gubrium J. F., Silverman, D. (eds.), *Qualitative Research Practice*. London: Sage, 197-213.

Wodak, R. (2006). Discourse-analytic and Socio-linguistic Approaches to Study of Nation(alism). In Delanty, G., Kumar K. (eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Nations and Nationalism*. London: Sage, 104-117.

Wodak, R. and Krzyzanowski, M. (eds.). (2008). *Qualitative Discourse Analysis in the Social Sciences*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Wodak, R. de Cillia, R., Reisigl, M., and Liebhart, K. (1999). *The Discursive Construction of National identity* (A. Hirsch & R. Mitten, Trans.). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Wodak, R. and de Cillia, R. (2007). 'Commemorating the past: the discursive construction of official narratives about the 'Rebirth of the Second Austrian Republic''. *Discourse and Communication, 1*(2), 337-363.