



Editorial: Critical Perspectives on Ideology, Identity, and Interaction

Copyright © 2012
Critical Approaches to Discourse Analysis across Disciplines
<http://cadaad.net/journal>
Vol. 5 (2): i-xiv
ISSN: 1752-3079

MONIKA KOPYTOWSKA

University of Łódź

monika.kopytowska@gmail.com

1. Ideology, identity and interaction within discourse and society dialectics

Interest in ‘language as social practice’ and in the ‘context of its use’ (Fairclough and Wodak 1997), which has been the defining feature of various frameworks and studies within the Critical Discourse Analysis programme, has generated continuous attempts to identify, analyse and describe various aspects and dimensions of the dialectics between discursive events and social structures, situations and institutions. One can get the idea of the scale of these attempts looking at the number of publications, conferences, and projects devoted to the discourse and society interface, aiming to address the complexity of the socially constituted nature of discourse and its socially constitutive function and to demonstrate how it both reflects and shapes (sustains, reproduces or transforms) social actions and relations, (self)identification of social actors and representations of the world. Critical research published regularly in *Discourse, Dialogue and Discourse, Discourse and Society, Discourse and Communication, Journal of Language and Politics, Visual Semiotics, Critical Discourse Studies, CADAAD Journal*, to name but a few discourse-cantered journals, brings forth new insights, perspectives and approaches to both old and emerging problems within theory, methodology and data analysed.

The triad of ‘ideology, identity and interaction’, chosen as a theme of this special issue, encompasses concepts that have figured prominently not only in CDA-centred research but also across the field of humanities and social sciences. Dialectically interrelated within itself the triad encapsulates various dimensions of social practices articulating action and interaction, social relations, persons (with beliefs, attitudes, histories, etc.), the material world, and discourse, including the ways in which discourse figures in these practices, namely genres (ways of acting), discourses (ways of representing) and styles (ways of being) (Fairclough 2003: 25). Each component of this web of social and discursive interdependencies necessarily brings in the remaining elements and, to a greater or lesser extent, questions of ideology, identity and

interaction. Hence, the focus on social actors and social relations, for example, generates questions concerning individual and collective identity on the one hand, and the notions of hierarchy and power relations along with their ideological underpinnings and consequences on the other: How is 'identity work' done by individuals, groups and institutions? How are identities related to gender, ethnicity, religion and profession formed, represented and negotiated? How is the outgroup or the Other delineated and characterized discursively? How are power relations enacted and represented in discourse?

In today's interconnected and globalized world, society is subject to constant change and so is communication, in particular in its visualized and mediatized forms. As a consequence of recent geopolitical events, global migrations and cross-cultural contact on the one hand, and the socio-economic and cultural changes on the other, identities are contested and in flux. Hybridization of genres, non-linearity of textual forms, and a new dimension of interactivity and intertextuality, have brought about, to use Kress's (2005) words, the 'crisis' of the traditional *status quo* within the domain of representation and communication, creating the need for redefining traditional forms and for generating new methods of critical study to be applied to texts structurally and functionally different from the genres traditionally studied in the past. The concepts of 'mediated society', or even 'mediatized society' have frequently been applied to account for 'the ways in which the media have infiltrated into the rhythms and practices of everyday life' (Cottle 2006: 9), transforming, in consequence, not only the media-politics-society interface, but also the prototypical roles of discourse producers, audiences, and even text itself. 'Networked public sphere' has stretched the 'public sphere' in its traditional Habermasian (1989) sense, beyond the 'geospatial' (territorially bounded) configuration via the 'sociospatial' (virtual space online) one (Youngs 2009). Mediated or mediatized politics has 'lost its autonomy, has become dependent in its central functions on mass media, and is continuously shaped by interactions with mass media' (Mazzoleni and Schulz 1999: 250). All these processes have had a bearing on identity formation, types and dynamics of interactions among people and 'ideological work' in various contexts and genres. CDA over the recent years has been trying to address a multitude of issues resulting from the changing face of the social reality. Acknowledging the need for cognitive pluralism in discourse studies, it has fostered multidisciplinary and methodological eclecticism within its research programme. Addressing the new dynamics of contemporary public space it has explored new genres and themes.

This special issue is the result and manifestation of such thematic explorations and pursuit of theoretical interdisciplinarity and methodological eclecticism. While delving into realisations of ideology and identity work in discursive actions and interactions, the authors apply, critique and expand existing theoretical and methodological models, testifying to the claim that 'Only an inclusive, contradictory CDA can have the impact it deserves' (Hodge, this issue).

2. From 'science of ideas' to 'modality of power'

When Antoine Destutt de Tracy coined the term 'ideology' in his *Mémoire sur la faculté de penser* (vol. 1, 1796-1798) and *Éléments d'idéologie* (1801), he conceived of it as a 'science of ideas'. Since then the concept has acquired multifarious definitions, interpretations and connotations, oscillating between the simply descriptive and the pejorative. Marxists situated ideology, which they defined as 'production of ideas, of conceptions, of consciousness' (Marks and Engels 1970) within class struggle and domination, and saw its main function in legitimizing the hegemonic order. The proponents of the concepts of 'false consciousness' (Engels 1893), 'ideological state apparatus' (Althusser 1971), and 'the manufacture of consent' (Gramsci 1971) envisaged ideology as a determining factor within the society-power nexus, inevitably in the service of the ruling class. For Habermas (1979, 1987), who extended the notion of 'false consciousness' to 'fragmentation of consciousness' (1987: 355), it was a form of systematically distorted communication operating in line with the strategic interests of powerful communicators and constituting part of 'internal colonisation' (Habermas 1987: 332-373). Ideology, in his view, was linked to 'mediatization', the situation in which money and power determine the core processes of symbolic reproduction, viz. socialization, social integration and cultural transmission (ibid. 196). And a key role in that process was attributed by him to language:

Language is also a medium of domination and social power. It serves to legitimate relations of organized force. In so far as the legitimations do not articulate the relations of force that they make possible, in so far as these relations are merely expressed in the legitimations, language is also ideological. Here it is not a question of deceptions within language, but of deception with language as such (Habermas 1979:130).

It was in the context of strategic communication along with its normative argumentation that Habermas situated 'discourse' imbued with an ethical dimension.

Foucault rejected the Marxist concept of 'ideology', but his understanding of 'discourse', especially in terms of the focus on the interface between discourse, power and knowledge, carried some remnants, or rather encompassed some aspects of it:

Each society has its regime of truth, its 'general politics' of truth: that is, the types of discourse which it accepts and makes function as true; the mechanisms and instances which enable one to distinguish true and false statements, the means by which each is sanctioned; the techniques and procedures accorded value in the acquisition of truth; the status of those who are charged with saying what counts as true. (Foucault 1980: 131)

Hence, although, as argued by Mumby (2004: 240), we can observe within the theory of ideology a shift from early work of 'ideology critique', with its focus on Gramsci, ideology and hegemony, to later work on the 'dialectics of power and resistance', 'the abolition of the category of "ideology"' in Foucault (Hall 1996: 31) is only superficial. Contemporary theoretical approaches (whether Marxist or non-Marxist) continue to explore the cognitive and social embedding of ideology, its dialectic relationship with power in the context of

dominant groups, political economy, gender and culture (Eagleton 1991, Larrain 1979, Thompson 1984, 1995). There is also a growing focus on the ideological effects of texts, or, in other words, ideology and its discursive representation. While Thompson (1984) refers to ideology as ‘meaning in the service of power’, for Hall the concept encompasses:

...the mental frameworks – the languages, the concepts, categories, imagery of thought, and the systems of representation – which different classes and social groups deploy in order to make sense of, define, figure out and render intelligible the way society works. (Hall 1996: 26)

What emerges from the above definition of ideology is its situatedness between social ‘cognition’ and ‘representation’ on the one hand, and its impingement on ‘social agency’ on the other. This system of interrelations, which could be otherwise conceptualized as a triangular nexus between ideology, discourse, and society has been one of the main foci of Critical Linguistics and Critical Discourse Analysis, aiming, in the words of Fairclough (2003: 9), to examine the effects of texts in ‘inculcating and sustaining or changing ideologies’, or, as Wodak (2011: 52) puts it, ‘to demystify discourses by deciphering ideologies’. The early publications within this approach, *Language and Control* (1979) and *Language as Ideology* (1979), exploring the links between linguistic structures, social structures and the notion of power, created ground for further ideology-centred questions informing critical linguistic research:

How does the naturalization of ideology come about? Which discursive strategies legitimate control or ‘naturalize’ the social order? How power is linguistically expressed? How are consensus, acceptance and legitimacy of dominance manufactured? Who has access to which instruments of power and control? Who is discriminated against in what way? Who understands a certain discourse in what way and with what results? (Wodak 2011: 53-54)

In its research on discourse-ideology nexus, CDA goes beyond both classical perspectives and other contemporary ‘descriptive’ views (Fairclough 2003: 9, van Dijk 1995: 21). Situating ideology, which van Dijk (1995: 21) defines as ‘social cognition, with specific internal structures, and specific cognitive and social functions’, and Fairclough (2003) sees as ‘modality of power’, within the discourse-society-cognition triangle has at least three implications for critical studies. Firstly, it requires theoretical multidisciplinary and methodological eclecticism. Secondly, it entails taking under analysis multiple genres and public spaces. Thirdly, it means examining intertextual and interdiscursive relationships with focus on ‘recontextualization’ as ‘one of the most important processes in connecting genres as well as topics and argumentation patterns’ (Wodak 2011: 54).

Hence, in its textual and cognitive analysis of ideology CDA goes beyond linguistic and philosophical approaches and draws on the insights from social psychological theories and political science in order to establish interpretative links between social cognition, action and linguistic structures, and determine ‘how exactly ideology shapes text and talk, and conversely, how it is formed, acquired or changed by discourse and communication’ (van Dijk 1998a: vii). Van Dijk (1998a: 6) locates his theory of ideology ‘in a joint psychological-sociological account of the social mind in its social (political, cultural) context’

and argues that it is through the interface of personal and social cognition that social structures influence discourse structures and that they are enacted, instituted, legitimized, sustained or challenged in text and talk. For Fairclough (2003: 9) ideologies are both socially 'enacted' and 'inculcated' in the identities of social agents. Transcending the individual texts, they 'can be associated with discourses (as representations), with genres (as enactments) and with styles (as inculcations) (ibid.), which Fairclough calls 'orders of discourse'.

With its emphasis on discourse practices and their ideological effects consisting, among others, in producing and reproducing unequal power relations between social classes, men and women, ethnic and cultural groups, through the ways of representing social reality and positioning social actors, CDA has elucidated, identified and analysed ideological meanings and effects in multifarious contexts, genres and public spaces, applying various methodological frameworks. Social semiotics and Multimodality theory put forward by Kress and Van Leeuwen (1996) have examined the ideological underpinnings of social practices in various semiotic modes – the visual, the verbal, and the gestural – within media, education, and technology. Ruth Wodak, within Discourse Historical Approach, has focused on discursive manifestations of antisemitism, racism, sexism, as well as political ideologies within the European parliamentary discourse (Krzyzanowski and Wodak 2008, Reisigl and Wodak 2001, Wodak 2009). Van Dijk (1987, 1991, 1993) has applied his socio-cognitive model in the analysis of racism and ethnic prejudice, and on the theoretical level, studied ideology in the context of knowledge and 'context models', while Fairclough in his socio-semiotic approach has examined the 'the Language of the New Labour' (2000) as part of Language of the New Capitalism and the Knowledge-based Economy (KBE) and scrutinized the functioning of ideologies in everyday life and in institutional contexts, including the media and organisations (Chouliaraki and Fairclough 1999, Fairclough 1992, 1993, 2003). Looking at the media discourse purporting to be neutral and transparent, he has demonstrated its mediating and constructing role as the Fourth Estate. Critical Metaphor Analysis, constituting part of an emerging cognitive approach within CDA (Charteris-Black 2004, 2005; Hart 2010; Koller 2004), has brought in a new dimension in critical studies on the concept, namely the focus on the ideological embedding and implications of metaphor choices. Last but not least, Chilton (2004, 2011) has incorporated cognitive linguistic perspective in his Discourse Space Theory applied in the analysis of the ideological underpinnings of political discourse

3. Identity in action and interaction

Identity formation, negotiation, and maintenance, subsumed within the term of 'identity construction' under the influence of 'social constructivism' in social sciences, has become one of the major concerns of (critical) discourse analysts. As argued by Bamberg et al. 2011: 189) in their discourse-oriented contribution to *Handbook of Identity Theory and Research*,

Using the lens of discourse and the lens of construction and bringing them to focus onto identity, what comes to the fore are discursive practices as the sites

for identity formation processes – where the social and the personal/individual are fused and become empirical, as situated, in vivo, interactive processes.

Such a perspective moves away from the understanding of identity as something that is static, given and unchanging towards a dynamic view of the concept as emerging in social action and interaction, and entails

a shift away from viewing a person as self-contained and *having* identity and generating his/her individuality and character as a personal identity project towards focusing instead on the processes in which identity is *done* or *made* – as constructed in discursive activities. (Bamberg et al. 2011: 178)

Identity thus can be seen as both reflected and constituted in discourse – actively, ongoingly, and dynamically – or, to use Fairclough's terms (2003: 8–9) 'construed' with potential for 'construction'¹ (see also Benwell and Stokoe 2006).

Bamberg et al. (2011: 178) differentiate between, what they see as, two opposing views within discourse-focused approaches to identity, one viewing a person as constructed in and through existing discourses, which, following Gee (1999), they call 'capital-D discourses', and the other one in which a person constructs who they are by use of discourse, which they label as perspective. The theorists whom they associate with the former – Habermas, Foucault and Lyotard – view discourse in the form of 'discourse ethics' (Habermas 1979), 'regimes of truth' (Foucault 1972), or 'discourse genres' (Lyotard 1984), as central for the interface of society and individual actions. Foucault, for whom people have no 'real' identity within themselves, refers to 'technologies of the self' as ways in which individuals, through their engagement in communal practices, produce particular modes of identity. In his deterministic account of the production of 'subjectivity' in discourse, social practices are imposed on individuals by culture, society and communal norms and thus identities derive from already existing repertoires (Foucault 1988: 11). Hence, as argued by Bamberg et al. (2011: 178), the 'Foucauldian lines' within discourse analysis focus predominantly on communal and institutional conditions under which discourses can form 'regimes of truth', while discourse theorists belonging to 'small-d discourse' group (e.g. Harris 1952, Schiffrin 1994) are more interested in the actual choices made by the speakers as manifestations of how they make sense of the social context, that is in what they call 'presentation of the self in everyday interactions'. Looking at the recent developments within the CDA programme, one might, however, make a legitimate claim that most critical approaches bridge the gap between the micro-macro levels of analysis (Fairclough 1993, 1995, 2003, van Dijk 1985, 1988) in their attempts to identify and describe how the local instantiations of discourse are constituted by and constitutive of social processes. Fairclough (1994, 2003) rejects the deterministic Foucauldian account of the 'powerless subject' for failing to engage with language as a situated practice, that is to acknowledge that fact that, firstly, 'people are not only pre-positioned in how they participate in social events and texts, they are also social agents who do things, create things, change things' and, secondly, 'self-consciousness is a precondition for social processes of identification, the construction of social identities, including social identification in discourse and text' (Fairclough 2003: 160).

Within CDA identity is frequently analyzed as constituted in text within semantic, grammatical, lexical and phonological relations at two levels: representation, that is relationship between text and reader or conversational participants, and the 'expressive' dimension that reveals subjects' ideologies and attitudes (Fairclough 1989, 2003). The latter is characterized as 'style' or way of being incorporating both social and personal identity (Fairclough 2003: 159-163). There exists, however, a dialectical relationship between discourse as representation and style/identification by which discourses are inculcated in identities in a more agentive ongoing process of identification.

While scrutinizing how discursive forms provide access to 'identity categories' – general membership categories such as age, gender, race, occupation, gangs, socio-economic status, ethnicity, class, nation-states, regional territories, Bamberg et al. (2011: 178) suggest three dimensions for exploration:

1. **agency and control**, resulting in the question whether it is the person, the *I-as-subject*, who constructs the way the world is or whether the me-as-undergoer is constructed by the way the world is – and how this dilemma is navigated on a case-to-case basis;
2. **difference and sameness between me and others**, posing the question of how we can draw up a sense of self as differentiated and/or as integrated with self-other relations – and how in concrete contexts we navigate in between those two;
3. **constancy and change**, posing the question how we can claim to be the same in the face of constant change and how we can claim to have changed in the face of still being the same – and what degree of continuity and development are necessary to develop and maintain a sense of self as unitary;

Choices at the level of lexis, grammar and metaphorical conceptualizations may result in low or high agency with implications for the degree of empowerment in the discursive space. Low agency is central to the construal of a victim status or deemphasizing responsibility for one's actions. Conversely, high agency entails a sense of control and can be used in the discursive construction of a hero. The representation of agency is of crucial importance to what Boltanski (1999) discusses as the mediation of 'distant suffering', or what Chouliaraki (2006) calls 'the spectatorship of suffering':

This is the analytical category that focuses on action on suffering in terms of the agency of the sufferers themselves and the system of other agents that operate in the scene of suffering. The type of action that these figures of pity play out on screen has an effect on the spectators' own orientations towards the sufferers [...] In the analytics of mediation, humanization is the process of identity construction that endows sufferers with the power to say or do something about their condition, even if this power is simply the power to evoke and receive the beneficiary action of others. The humane sufferer is the sufferer who acts. (Chouliaraki 2006: 88)

The dividing potential of the concept of agency in identity construction and ascription has thus frequently been brought up in the context of 'the West and the rest' divide, media coverage of humanitarian emergencies and natural

disasters (see Trckova this issue), and the Western ethnocentric perspective on the East and Africa (see Kopytowska 2009, Kopytowska this issue).

Discursive choices linked to self-differentiation and self-integration position the subject in relation to others who are being referred to or talked to. The ingroup vs. outgroup representation becomes especially important in the situation of conflict in its various dimensions (political, ethnic, cultural, religious, etc.) or in the representation of immigration (Hart 2010). Its dynamics are captured by Van Dijk's 'ideological square' (1998b: 33), set to present 'us' in a favourable light and 'them' unfavourably, and consisting in emphasizing 'our' good properties/actions, while highlighting 'their' bad properties/actions. One of the most effective strategies used by the media in the pro-war propaganda has always been the presentation of the conflict in terms of binary oppositions of black and white, good and evil, godly and ungodly, 'us' and 'them'. Indeed, the terms 'us' and 'them', for the insiders and the outsiders respectively, are in the words of Burke (1969: 298–301) 'good terms' and 'devil terms', and are very powerful linguistically. Such a dichotomy prompts the personalization of the conflict which in turn 'functions to promote straightforward feelings of identification, empathy or disapproval and to effect a metonymic simplification of complex historical and institutional processes' (Fowler 1991: 15). Its arguably most important role is the construction of identity, through the evocation of a set of shared values and through establishing an inclusive subject 'we', and the creation of an enemy. As Caldas-Coulthard (2003: 272) observes, for example, "we", 'the civilized world', 'the free democracies', 'the West', 'the free world' have been contrasted with 'the other' – Eastern countries which the terrorists may come from. In this metonymic process, "one element (the USA), stands for another entity – supposed collectivity labeled 'free democracies', whose real world reference, however, is not determinate, but excludes or classifies negatively the 'others'". Such a dichotomy implies defence on "our" side versus aggression on "their" side, "our" rationality versus "their" irrationality, and last but not least juxtaposes freedom and force (cf. Ivie 1980: 279-294).

Discursive change in relation to social and cultural change has also been one of the foci of critical studies. At least two lines of research can be distinguished here in relation to identity. Firstly, constancy and change have been investigated in personal narratives in the context of gender, sexuality, age, etc, based on the premise that 'our narrative identities are the stories we live by' (McAdams et al. 2006: 4 cit. in Bamberg et al. 2011: 185, see also Bamberg 1997, 2003, Bamberg et al. 2007, Bamberg and Georgakopoulou 2008). Secondly, they have been scrutinized in institutional/organizational discourse with the assumption that 'changes in organization and culture are to a significant extent changes in discourse practices (Fairclough 1993: 7). Hence, various authors within CDA have recently focused on identifying discourses associated with particular institutions operating interdiscursively (Chouliaraki and Fairclough 1999, De Fina et al. 2006).

4. Overview of Special Issue

The present Special Issue is a critical explorative endeavour into the triad of ideology, identity and interaction across a wide variety of discourse contexts, spoken and written text and talk, and images. It brings together various perspectives on the role of discourse in social interactions and social interactions as manifested in discourse, revisiting both the tenets of CDA along with main concepts, and the analytical frameworks within the programme.

The opening paper by Bob Hodge is a critical reflection on the condition of CDA, the challenges it faces and the directions for further development. Hodge starts by revisiting the main tenets of the approach, offering both a diachronic perspective and a snapshot of contemporary developments. Examining the triad of ideology, identity, and interaction, he advocates the validity and usefulness of 'ideological-complex theory' in dealing with 'contradiction', which he sees as crucial to not only 'ideological effects in a highly complex world', but also the development of the theory, analysis and action. One of the weaknesses of Critical Linguistics that he points to is the lack of a comprehensive, multiscalar model that would make it possible to attend the complexity of meaning generation in the social context. The multiscalar CDA research could be facilitated, as Hodge suggests, by the application of fractal models in corpus analysis. After illustrating his theoretical and methodological proposals with data analysis, he argues that what critical studies need is a diverse and inclusive analytic project, encompassing social, cognitive and linguistic perspectives, studying all media and modalities, and operating across all scales of space and time.

Veronika Koller in her contribution presents an approach to examining group identity in discourse. Defining collective identities as 'conceptual structures comprising beliefs and knowledge, norms and values, attitudes and expectations as well as emotions, and as being reinforced and negotiated in discourse', she proposes an array of linguistic and semiotic tools (including social actor representation, process types, evaluation, modality, metaphoric expressions and intertextuality) which can be used to identify, examine and describe types of collective identities in texts and the process of constricting them. These are then discussed in the context of genre, participants and processes of discourse practice, social context and the ideologies by which it is dominated. The analytical procedure is illustrated with data from a retailer's catalogue, which Koller examines for the discursive construction and socio-cognitive representation of gender and sexual identity.

Ian Lamond discusses the validity of critical discourse analytic approach in the context of recent theoretical developments within social and cultural studies. Interestingly, instead of discussing the indebtedness of critical paradigm to other lines of linguistic and social research (which has often been done due to its interdisciplinary and eclectic character both in theory and methodology), Lamond puts forward a claim that CDA could methodologically and empirically enrich cultural policy studies. Arguing that the discipline focused on the dialectics between policy and culture and its institutional dimension lacks firm empirical grounding, he demonstrates, with his lexis-centered analysis of Labour manifesto for the 1997 election and Conservative's

1992 manifesto, how CDA analytical tools can be effectively applied in the analysis of political discourse in order to discover how political texts represent, construct and transform social reality.

Jiska Engelbert's article is a critique of a 'Faircloughian' CDA with its assumption that discourse's rhetorical orientation is geared towards the concealment of problematic 'extra-discursive' interests. Exploring the intersection of language and ideology, and commenting on Fairclough's approach to discourse as a site of hegemonic struggle in *New Labour, New language?* Engelbert proposes a different approach to ideological agents' discourse, the vision of rhetoric which does not assign a priori dubious or concealed commitments and investments to discourse producers. Drawing on the work of Billig, Potter and Edwards, Engelbert analyses Tony Blair's 2006 Labour party conference speech and demonstrates how considering extra-discursive interests as discursive 'concerns' still makes it possible to understand New Labour as a discursive project attempting to normalise a particular view of social life and governance.

Discursive manifestations of ideology are also the focus of the next article by Katarzyna Molek-Kozakowska. Challenging the notion of the 'dominant ideology' in service of the elites, the author makes an attempt to demonstrate that public discourse in contemporary societies abounds in articulations of multiple, often conflicting ideologies. To this end Molek-Kozakowska identifies and describes multiple ideological positions on female political representation in Poland in the 2009 Internet-mediated debate over the implementation of gender parity legislation by analyzing generic frames, terms of address, and rhetorical figures as salient textual features of the argumentation in the debate.

Maarten Van Leeuwen, in his scrutiny of the linguistic manifestations of the ideological underpinnings in the political discourse, proposes to go beyond traditionally analysed grammatical phenomena providing insights into the construal of agency in discourse, viz. nominalization, transitivity and passivization. He thus highlights the notion of 'complementation' and illustrates its rhetorical potential to convey ideological messages in a detailed stylistic analysis of a speech held by the Dutch controversial politician Geert Wilders.

Irina Diana Mădroane explores the identity, ideology and discourse interface in mediatized political messages. Arguing that the enlargement of the EU along with the recent financial and economic crisis, and the resulting socio-economic transformations of both old and new member-states triggered the resurgence of discrimination and new racism, affecting in particular migrants, Mădroane discusses the role of the press in policy deliberations and the dynamic and strategic construal of collective identities. In her critical assessment she examines argumentation schemes, and intertextuality in a press campaign targeted at policy change for the purpose of preventing the ethnonym-based confusion between 'Roma' and 'Romanian' and concludes that the discursive representation of collective identities gives prominence to a nationalist discourse of Romanian (national) identity, while disempowering the 'Gipsy' ethno-cultural identity.

Silva Bratoz adopts a critical cross-linguistic perspective on metaphorical conceptualisations as an intrinsic part of human cognition and communication on the one hand and an ideological and cultural construct on the other. Combining the conceptual theory of metaphor with CDA in her comparative study of election discourse, Bratoz addresses the issue of universality and variation in metaphorical construal of the socio-political reality along with the motivations/explanations behind the choices of particular conceptualizations and the implications they have for the cognitive-affective attitudes of the audience. The analysis of source and target domains in a corpus of newspaper coverage of elections held in 2008 in Slovenia and in the USA, sheds light on the interface of the universal nature metaphor and its cultural conditioning, both making it an important tool for the negotiation of specific meanings and references.

Metaphorical conceptualizations of a natural phenomenon in the media coverage of natural catastrophes and their ideological grounding and effects are also the focus of Dita Trckova's data-driven study. Examining the representation of the 2004 Indian Ocean tsunami and 2005 Hurricane Katrina in three newspapers published in Western English-speaking countries: *The New York Times*, *The Guardian* and *The Globe and Mail*, Trckova identifies three dominant metaphorical patterns: the natural phenomenon as an ANIMATE BEING, a MONSTER and a WARRIOR, and argues that by demonizing nature, such representation reinforces Western nature-culture dualism, puts the blame for the catastrophe on the natural phenomenon and hides social and historical factors contributing to the disaster.

Laura Filardo Llamas focuses on the discursive construction of identity and its interplay with collective memory as manifested in commemorative practices in contemporary post-Agreement Northern Ireland. The process and products of commemoration, she argues, have a dual function: on the one hand, through representing selected historical events, they construct a collective memory of the past; on the other hand, as they reconstruct these events, they endow them with various degrees of legitimacy. Through the interplay of the verbal and the visual in murals, graffiti and commemoration plaques social actors may be portrayed in different ways, with various aspects of their actions and situations highlighted or de-emphasized. This mediating function of discourse in its various modalities entails the legitimization of a certain version of history, which Filardo Llamas analyses in two sets of commemoration plaques in Belfast.

Argyro Kantara examines interaction patterns in the political news interview. Rather than concentrating on the conversationalization or 'solidarity work' within the interview discourse, which has been the focus of previous research, she analyzes the dialectics of adversarial challenges between the interviewer and interviewee. Her typology of various challenge-response patterns on the basis of Greek political news interview provides insights as to how co-participants (re)shape the ever-changing confrontational institutional norm of the political news interview, co-constructing a new form of neutralism.

Notes

- ¹ Fairclough (2003: 9) rejects the extreme version of social constructivism and accepts only a moderate version of the claim that the social word is textually constructed.

References

- Althusser, L. (1971). *Lenin and Philosophy*. London: New Left Books.
- Bamberg, M. (1997). Positioning between structure and performance. *Journal of Narrative and Life History* 7: 335-342.
- Bamberg, M. and Georgakopoulou, A. (2008) Small stories as a new perspective in narrative and identity analysis. *Text and Talk* 28(3): 377-396.
- Bamberg, M., De Fina, A. and Schiffrin, D. (2011). Discourse and Identity Construction. In: S. J. Schwartz, K. Luyckx and V. L. Vignoles, V. L. (eds.), *Handbook of Identity Theory and Research*. Berlin: Springer Verlag. pp. 177-199.
- Bamberg, M., DeFina, A. and Schiffrin, D. (eds.) (2007). *Selves and Identities in Narrative and Discourse*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Benwell, B. and Stokoe, E. (2006). *Discourse and Identity*. Edinburgh, UK: Edinburgh University Press.
- Blommaert, J. (ed.) (1999). *Language Ideological Debates*. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Burke, K. (1969). *A Rhetoric of Motives*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Caldas-Coulthard, C. R. (2003). Cross-Cultural Representation of 'Otherness' in Media Discourse. In: G. Weiss and R. Wodak (eds), *Critical Discourse Analysis: Theory and Interdisciplinarity in Critical Discourse Analysis*, London: Palgrave. pp. 272-296.
- Charteris-Black, J. (2004). *Corpus Approaches to Critical Metaphor Analysis*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Charteris-Black, J. (2005). *Politicians and Rhetoric. The Persuasive Power of Metaphor*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Chilton, P. (2004). *Analysing Political Discourse: Theory and Practice*, London: Routledge.
- Chilton, P. (2011). *Language Structure and Geometry*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Chouliaraki, L. and Fairclough, N. (1999). *Discourse in Late Modernity. Rethinking Critical Discourse Analysis*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Cottle, S. (2006). *Mediatized Conflict: Understanding Media and Conflicts in the Contemporary World*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.
- De Fina, A., Schiffrin, D. and Bamberg, M. (eds). (2006). *Discourse and Identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Eagleton, T. (1991). *Ideology*. London: Verso.
- Engels, F. (1893). Engels to F. Mehring, July 14, 1893. Translated from German and reprinted in K. Marx and F. Engels (1968). *Selected Works In One Volume*. London: Lawrence and Wishart.
- Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and Power*. London: Longman.
- Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and Social Change*. London: Polity Press.

- Fairclough, N. (1993). Critical discourse analysis and the marketization of public discourse. *Discourse and Society* 4(2): 133-168.
- Fairclough, N. (2000). *New Labour, New Language?* London: Routledge.
- Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analyzing Discourse and Text: Textual Analysis for Social Research*. London: Routledge.
- Fairclough, N. and Wodak, R. (1997). Critical discourse analysis. In: van Dijk (T.). *Discourse as Social Interaction*. London: Sage. pp. 14-31.
- Foucault, M. (1972). *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. New York: Pantheon.
- Foucault, M. (1980). Truth and Power. In: *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977*. Trans. Colin Gordon et al. Ed. Colin Gordon. Brighton, Sussex: The Harvester Press. pp. 107-133.
- Foucault, M. (1988). *Technologies of the Self: A Seminar with Michel Foucault*. (L.H.Martin, H. Gutman, P.H. Hutton, Eds.). Amherst, Mass.: University of Massachusetts Press.
- Fowler, R. (1991). *Language in the News: Discourse and Ideology in the Press*. London: Routledge.
- Fowler, R., B. Hodge, G. Kress and Trew, T. (1979). *Language and Control*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Gee, J. P. (1999). *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis Theory and Method* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selections from the Prison Notebooks of Antonio Gramsci*. New York: International Publishers.
- Gramsci, A. (1977). *Selections from the Political Writing, 1910-1920*. New York: International Publishers.
- Gramsci, A. (1978). *Selections from the Political Writing, 1921-1926*. New York: International Publishers.
- Habermas, J. (1979). *Communication and the Evolution of Society*. Boston: Beacon.
- Habermas, J. (1987). *The Philosophical Discourse of Modernity: Twelve Lectures*. Cambridge, MA: MIT.
- Habermas, J. (1989). *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Hall, S. (1996). The problem of ideology: Marxism without guarantees. In: D. Morley and K-H Chen (eds.). *Stuart Hall: Critical Dialogues in Cultural Studies*. London: Routledge. pp.25-46.
- Harris, Z.S. (1952). Discourse Analysis. *Language* 28: 1-30.
- Hart, C. (2010). *Critical Discourse and Cognitive Science: New Perspectives on Immigration Discourse*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- Ivie, R. (1980). Images of savagery in American justifications of war. *Communications Monographs* 47: 279-291.
- Koller, V. (2004). *Metaphor and Gender in Business Media Discourse: A Critical Cognitive Study*. Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke.
- Kopytowska, M. (2009). Corpus linguistics and an eclectic approach to the study of news - the mechanism of framing. In: B. Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk and K. Dziwirek (eds.), *Studies in Cognitive Corpus Linguistics*. Frankfurt am. Main: Peter Lang. pp. 83-109.
- Kress, G. (2005). Gains and losses: New forms of texts, knowledge and learning. *Computers and Composition*. 22(1): 5-22.

- Kress, G. and Hodge, R. (1979). *Language as Ideology*. London: Routledge.
- Kress, G. and Van Leeuwen, T. (1996). *Multimodal Analysis*. London: Arnold.
- Krzyzanowski, M. and Wodak, R. (2008). *The Politics of Exclusion. The Austrian Case*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.
- Larrain, J. (1979). *The Concept of Ideology*. London: Hutchinson.
- Marx, K. and Engels, F. (1970). *The German Ideology. Part I*. New York: International Publishers.
- Mazzoleni, G. and Schulz, W. (1999). Mediatization of Politics: a challenge for democracy? *Political Communication* 16(3): 247-61.
- McAdams, D. P., Josselson, R. and Lieblich, A. (eds.). (2006). *Identity and story: Creating self in narrative*. Washington, DC: APA Book, pp. 1-11.
- Mumby, D. K. (2004). Discourse, Power and Ideology: Unpacking the Critical Approach. In D. Grant et al. *The Sage Handbook of Organizational Discourse*. London: Sage. pp. 237-258.
- Reisigl, M. and Wodak, R. (2001). *Discourse and Discrimination*. London: Routledge.
- Schiffrin, D. (1994). *Approaches to Discourse*. Oxford: Blackwell
- Thompson, J. (1984). *Studies in the Theory of Ideology*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Thompson, J. (1995). *The Media and Modernity*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- van Dijk, T. (1987). *Communicating Racism*. London: Sage.
- van Dijk, T. (1991). *Racism and the Press*. London: Routledge.
- van Dijk, T. (1993). *Elite Discourse and Racism*. London: Sage.
- van Dijk, T. (1995). Discourse analysis as ideology analysis. In C. Schäffner and A. Wenden (eds.), *Language and Peace*. Aldershot: Dartmouth Publishing. pp. 17-33.
- van Dijk, T. (1998a). *Ideology*. London: Sage.
- van Dijk, T. (1998b). Opinions and ideologies in the press. In A. Bell and P. Garrett (eds.), *Approaches to Media Discourse*. Oxford: Blackwell. pp. 21-63.
- Wodak, R. (2009). *The Discourse of Politics in Action. Politics as Usual*. London: Palgrave.
- Wodak, R. (2011). Critical Linguistics and Discourse Analysis. In: J. Zienkowski, J. O. Ostman and J. Verschueren (eds.), *Discursive Pragmatics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. pp. 50-70.
- Youngs, G. (2009). Blogging and globalization: the blurring of the public/private spheres. *Aslib Proceedings: New Information. Perspectives* 61(2): 127-138.