19 Critical Discourse Analysis: A Sample Study of Extremism

John P. O'Regan and Anne Betzel

In Zhu Hua (Ed.) (2016) *Research Methods in Intercultural Communication*. Blackwell Guides to Research Methods in Applied Linguistics. London: Blackwell. (Forthcoming).

Summary

Critical discourse analysis (CDA), or the critical analysis of discourse, refers to a collection of socio-theoretical perspectives on discourse in society, encompassing a range of applications and approaches in discourse analysis. This chapter takes a broad view of CDA which highlights how there are different avenues into the critical analysis of discourse, and not always with the same understandings or objectives. With this purpose, this chapter begins by giving an overview of the theoretical rationale and dispositions which have often informed a critical approach to discourse and summarizes the principal issues at stake. Having outlined the main parameters of interest and debate, we select a particular model of CDA – the dialectical-relational approach – and using an adapted version of this methodology apply it to a selection of discourse data derived from the (inter)cultural contexts of islamism, white supremicism, and multiculturalism.

Introduction

Critical discourse analysis (CDA) refers to a diverse collection of socio-theoretical perspectives on discourse in society, encompassing a wide range of applications and approaches in discourse analysis (Fairclough, 1992, 2003, 2010a; Wodak & Meyer, 2009; Pennycook, 1994, 2001, 2007; Blommaert, 2005, 2010; Lazar, 2008; Graham & Luke, 2013; Slembrouck, 2001; Chilton, 2004; Wodak & Chilton, 2005; van Dijk, 1998, 2011) and drawing upon an equally broad range of perspectives in critical social theory, including for example Marx & Engels (1998/1845), Gramsci (1971), Althusser (1971), Habermas (1984), Pêcheux (1982), Foucault (1972, 1980), and more recently Bhaskar (1986, 1998, 2008). It is the link to social theory and the critique of social formations which provides the impetus and rationale for describing this approach to discourse analysis as critical. For the purposes of this overview we are including as part of this group a number of researchers working critically in discourse analysis who due to the poststructuralist orientations of their work, might not, or would not, describe themselves as practitioners of CDA, but whom we nevertheless consider to be critical analysts of discourse (see, Pennycook, 1994, 2001, 2007; Blommaert, 2005, 2009, 2010; Blommaert & Omoniyi, 2010; Block, 2007; Luke, 2005; Rajagopalan, 2004, 2012). We have done this in order to highlight how there are different avenues into the critical analysis of discourse and not always with the same understandings or objectives. With this purpose, this chapter begins by giving an overview of the theoretical rationale and dispositions which often inform a critical approach to discourse and summarizes the principal issues at stake. Having outlined the main parameters of interest and

debate, we select a particular model of CDA, which we have adapted for our purpose, and offer an illustrative sample of analysis following this methodology.

Critical discourse analysis (CDA) has attracted considerable attention over several years, usually as an approach to language which is concerned with the critique of relations of power and ideology in society at large. The objects which CDA has used for this critique have in the main consisted of texts, either spoken or written, where asymmetrical power relations are often in play, e.g. police interviews, courtroom exchanges, political speeches, policy documents, and asylum interrogations and applications (cf. Fairclough, 2001, Ehrlich, 2001; Blommaert, 2009; Phipps, 2013). CDA, as it has been commonly understood, is thus concerned with the production, circulation and interpretation of texts in which relations of domination and control may be said to be at stake (van Dijk, 1993, 2011; Fairclough & Wodak, 1997; Fairclough 2001; Fairclough 2010a).

Crucial to the critique which CDA presents is the perception that it is ideology in concert with power which provide the legitimation for relations of inequality and domination. Ideology can be described as referencing explicit and even vocal opinions which may then be aligned with an implicit, presupposed and often naturalized 'world view', or overarching perspective on the reality in which we are participating. In the words of Fairclough (2010b), 'Ideologies are seen as one modality of power, a modality which constitutes and sustains relations of power through producing consent or at least acquiescence, power through hegemony, rather than power through violence or force' (p. 73). It is a critical concept of ideology, which owes its articulation to the Marxist philosophical thinking of Gramsci (1971) and Althusser (1971), in addition to Marx himself (Marx & Engels, 1998/1845) (see also, Hall et al, 1978; McLennan et al, 1978; Williams, 1977; Thompson, 1984; Larrain, 1979; Eagleton, 1991; Bourdieu, 1984; 1991; van Dijk, 1998; Blommaert, 2005; Holborow, 2012). There are, however, a number of reservations about this concept of ideology, and critical analysts of discourse who take a more poststructuralist stance will often prefer to use the term discourse (as a count and non-count noun) in its place (see for example, Weedon, 1997; Pennycook, 2001; Blommaert, 2005; Block,2007). This is because of the implication, following Foucault (1980), that when the term ideology is used, it often, 'stands in virtual opposition to something else that is supposed to count as truth' (p. 118). In poststructuralism, veridical truth is denied. The result is that in CDA both terms are used, often interchangeably.

The dialectical–relational approach

As noted, there are a variety of approaches to critical discourse analysis. These include sociocognitive (Chilton, 2005; van Dijk, 2008), discourse-historical (Reisigl & Wodak, 2009), and multimodal perspectives (Kress & van Leeuwen, 2000; Kress, 2010). While there are overlaps

between them, there is also a good deal of diversity and dispersion in the way in which they go about (critical) discourse analysis, as well as in the ways in which they define constructs such as ideology, power, discourse, and the term critical itself. As Wodak & Meyer (2009) note, 'CDA has never been and has never attempted to be or to provide one single or specific theory' (p. 8). For reasons of space we are not able to give an account of these individual perspectives and so we direct the reader to the literature to learn more about them (see, Fairclough & Wodak, 1997; Blommaert & Bulcaen, 2000; Pennycook, 2001, Wodak & Chilton, 2005; Wodak & Meyer 2009; Fairclough et al, 2011). Instead we will focus upon a particular model in the light of the foregoing discussion. This is the dialectical-relational approach, and is to be found in the recent work of Norman Fairclough (see, Chouliaraki & Fairclough, 1999; Fairclough, 2001, 2003; 2006; 2010a; 2012). We have chosen this approach in order 1) to highlight the dialectical-relational approach as a significant model of CDA, 2) to show how this approach may be adapted depending upon the epistemological position from which you as a researcher are working, and 3) to illustrate how the dialectical-relational approach can be applied to a sample body of discourse data.

The dialectical-relational approach is greatly influenced by the philosophy of critical realism (Bhaskar, 1986, 1998, 2008), and works according to a (critical) realist ontology in which it is argued that reality is distinct from our knowledge of it, and that our knowledge does not exhaust that reality (Collier, 1994; Sayer, 2000). In a critical realist ontology, and thus also in the dialectical-relational approach, discourse *construes* reality, in the sense that reality must be conceptually mediated if we are to have any knowledge of it. It is discourse or *semiosis* which is the mediating mechanism for our knowledge of reality. Discourse (as a non-count noun) and semiosis are synonymous terms, and in the dialectical-relational approach it is often the latter term which is preferred because of the confusion which can arise with discourse as a count noun for referring to a perspectival way of seeing and knowing. The fact that discourse construes reality, and that there is no possibility of meaning creation in the absence of it, entails that discourse itself is a powerful facet of social life, and in the dialectical-relational approach, and in other iterations of CDA (in addition to poststructuralist ones), discourse (or semiosis) as well as the discourses which are part of it are viewed as having distinctive – albeit contingent upon other social elements – causal powers and 'liabilities' (i.e. effects) of their own (Fairclough et al, 2010). Reality in this sense is made up of discursive and non-discursive dimensions of which discourse is one *moment* in a dialectical relationship with other moments of the social process (Best & Kellner, 1991; Harvey, 1996; Fairclough et al, 2010). These other 'moments' may be economic, political, environmental, legal, educational, religious, dispositional, concrete, and so on. Moments are constituted within *fields* (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992) – such as politics, education, and the legal system – and are bound up

with power, itself another moment within the social relations of fields. In Fairclough's words, 'power is partly discourse, and discourse is partly power – they are different but not discrete, they 'flow into' each other' (2010d, p.4). If power and discourse – and therefore knowledge too – are intertwined, then it follows from a dialectical-relational perspective that, 'economic forces and socio-political institutions are in part semiotic, and [so] analysis has to be in part semiotic analysis' (Fairclough, 2010c, p.252).

The discourse-theoretical complex which the dialectical-relational approach presents is augmented by a structural conception of the social process as consisting in, 'an interplay between three levels of social reality: *social structures*, *practices* and *events*' (ibid, p.232) to which correspond three dimensions of semiosis: *semiotic systems* (language and other semiotic codes), *orders of discourse* (a specific configuration of genres, discourses and styles), and *texts* (written, spoken, and other semiotic modalities). If social structures conform with social reality in the broadest sense, then semiotic systems (of which one code is language) are the means by which social reality is mediated and comprehended. Social reality – and the social structures of which it is comprised – are in turn made up of a range of social practices, i.e. people *doing things* within diverse social spaces by acting conventionally (genres), articulating beliefs (discourses), adopting identities (styles), and generally performing their mode of being, or *habitus* (Bourdieu, 1984, 1991). These spaces are not randomly made but can and do coalesce into discursive regularities, for example, as social institutions (political systems, legal systems, faith systems, security systems etc.), as workplaces (parliaments, universities, hospitals, banks, legal practices, police stations, registration centres etc.), and as ideologies (perspectival discourses and habitus). Fairclough (1992) has taken from Foucault (1972, 1981) the term *order of discourse* to describe these discursive regularities. Orders of discourse are the semiotic dimension of social practices and represent different configurations of discourses, genres and styles. These are each ways of acting and interacting semiotically. Discourses are ways of representing (and therefore also ways of *believing*); genres are ways of acting conventionally (e.g. in writing, and in spoken and non-verbal communication): 'they are ways of regulating (inter)action' (Fairclough et al, 2010, p.213); and styles are ways of taking up identities in their semiotic aspect – i.e. of enacting one's being as part of a subject position or 'role' (e.g. father, mother, policeman, asylum seeker, receptionist, CEO). As a result of changes in the economic, social and political fields, new discourses (i.e. ideological ways of seeing and knowing) can be *enacted*, which lead to the *inculcation* of new ways of (inter)acting, which in turn produce new ways of being (identities). Since 9/11 for example, the discourses around counter-terrorism globally have led, amongst other things, to radical changes in airport security procedures, leading to changed ways of acting and interacting (new genres and styles) on the part of passengers and airport staff in airports

in response to the perceived threat. Such social events always have a semiotic dimension. These are texts (in the broadest sense) in multiple semiotic modalities, of which language as either writing or talk is one. We can illustrate these different levels and their relations as follows:

Social processes		**Semiotic fields**		**Semiotic codes**
Social structures	↕	Semiotic systems	↕	Language, image, sound, space, gaze, shape etc.
Social practices		Orders of discourse		Discourses, genres, styles
Social events	↕	Texts	↕	Writing, talk, and other semiotic modes

As is usual in this model, between the levels of structures, practices and events and their respective fields and codes a dialectic is in play so that no level is discrete, but is in a constant process of flowing into and between the other elements in each of the levels. Fairclough (2010c) refers to the dialectical relation of discourses, genres and styles as one of *interdiscursivity* and as a component in the analysis of texts: 'textual analysis includes both linguistic analysis (and if relevant, analysis of other semiotic forms, such as visual images) and interdiscursive analysis (analysis of which genres, discourses and styles are drawn upon, and how they are articulated together)' (p. 238). An important issue here is that Fairclough sees interdiscursivity as a mediating 'interlevel' between the micro-level linguistic analysis of the text (in conjunction with relevant social analysis) *and* the analysis of social structures. In other words, relations of interdiscursivity via orders of discourse are what connect the analysis of the text with an analysis of social structures.

Methodology

The dialectical-relational approach is a methodology and not just a method. Methodology is understood as theory in combination with method in the construction and analysis of an object of research (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992; Fairclough, 2010c). In this sense it is not simply a matter of taking a method and applying it to an object of research. The object first has to be theorized itself drawing upon relevant social theories in a 'transdisciplinary way', 'either in research teams which bring together specialists in relevant disciplines, or by engaging with literature in such disciplines' (Fairclough, 2010c, p.236). In this process the object of research is constructed. Having done this, the task is to seek a 'semiotic point of entry' into it (ibid). The point of entry in most iterations of CDA is usually written or spoken texts which circulate as social practices within the order of discourse that corresponds to them, and which act as interdiscursive *cues*. As far as texts based on language are concerned, in this approach, a principal purpose is to identify and discuss the linguistic features of texts which appear to act as cues to interdiscursive relations.

The methodology of the dialectical-relational approach is derived from Bhaskar's explanatory critique (Bhaskar, 1986; Chouliariaki & Fairclough, 1999) and consists in four stages. The dialectical-relational approach as formulated by Fairclough (2010c) is consistent with critical realism in having a normative (i.e. emancipatory) agenda. This leads to the stages to be followed being articulated so that a principal concern is the righting of social 'wrongs':

1. Focus upon a social wrong, in its semiotic aspect.
2. Identify obstacles to addressing the social wrong.
3. Consider whether the social order 'needs' the social wrong.
4. Identify possible ways past the obstacles.

This kind of normative focus can have the effect of circumscribing to some extent the kind of critical discourse analysis that it is possible to do, because by taking such a defined epistemological stance, the prospective CDA researcher within this frame is obliged to commit to a form of analysis whose objective is the creation of a better world. Such a transformational agenda, while no bad thing in itself, is in conflict with epistemological positions, such as poststructuralism, which do not accept such grand narrative approaches to reality and social life, and where the concept of truth itself is problematic and provisional. Despite this difference, we agree with Fairclough, that the research of topics which have significant implications for human well-being, such as immigration, terrorism, globalization and security, are necessary activities in any critical analysis of discourse (Fairclough, 2010c). To accommodate these concerns and interests, we have adapted the four stages of the dialectical-relational approach in the following way:

1. Focus upon a social phenomenon in its semiotic aspect (Draw upon relevant theories about the phenomenon and look for a semiotic point of entry)
    a. Step 1 Identify the phenomenon you want to research
    b. Step 2 Theorize the phenomenon in a transdisciplinary way (Use relevant theory). Once you have the theory, you can then look for a semiotic point of entry
2. Identify the causes of the phenomenon and (if relevant) the obstacles to changing it (Why is the phenomenon like this?)
    a. Step 1 Select texts in the light of the object of research and adopt an analytical framework for categorizing and interpreting their features
    b. Step 2 Analyze texts by linking linguistic analysis to interdiscursive and social analysis
3. Does the social order require the phenomenon to be the way that it is? Who benefits most from the phenomenon remaining unchanged?
4. Identify ways past the obstacles. Can the dominant discourse be contested?

Case in point: Discourses of extremism and multiculturalism

1. Focus upon a social phenomenon in its semiotic aspect

The social phenomenon we focus upon is the discursive construction of identities in discourses of extremism and multiculturalism, on the part of islamists and white supremacists on the one hand and UK politicians on the other, and the way in which cultural essentialism and outsiderness may be seen to dominate the lenses of both discourses. We have selected these examples because of their relevance to key issues in Intercultural Communication and because CDA often concerns itself with the analysis of discourses and texts of social import and consequence. In addition, we have selected them because we see similarities between the way in which these discourses are articulated by their distinctive protagonists. More precisely, we wish to show how in discourses of extremism and multiculturalism, a distinct division between Us and Them serves as an organizing principle which isolates certain cultural elements and identity markers within an essentialist view that reduces and 'others' the Other, and which closes off – intentionally in the case of islamists and white supremacists, and at least consequentially in the case of politicians – any possibility of a dialogic understanding of culture and intercultural relations which might alter the (inter)cultural status quo. In this manner, 'the dominant group justifies its power with stories – stock explanations – that construct reality in ways to maintain their privilege' (Ladson-Billngs & Tate, 1995, p. 58).

We locate the discussion of discourses of extremism and multiculturalism within an 'interdiscourse approach' to Intercultural Communication which, 'set(s) aside any a priori notions of group membership and identity and […] ask(s) instead how and under what circumstances concepts such as culture are produced by participants as relevant categories for interpersonal ideological negotiation' (Scollon & Scollon, 2000, p. 544). Whereas a good deal of Intercultural Communication studies have adhered, often implicitly, to a predominant essentialism and have been inclined to take membership categorization as a given, interdiscourse approaches emphasize the social and linguistic practices which bring identity and culture into being (Blommaert, 2005; Holliday, 1999; Piller, 2007), and so complement interdiscursivity in the dialectical-relational approach. In addition, we also draw upon critical race theory (Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995; Delgado, 2001; Cole, 2009) as a wider theoretical frame. Critical race theory operates from the perspective that racism is deeply ingrained in social life both institutionally and structurally (Delgado, ibid) and that in discussions of race, 'social reality is constructed by the formulation and the exchange of stories about individual situations. These stories serve as interpretive structures by which we impose order on experience and it on us' (Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995, p. 57).

Within these theoretical frames, and in keeping with the dialectical-relational approach of CDA, we seek a semiotic point of entry into extremism and multiculturalism as social phenomena through discursively mapping how references to polarized collective identities in the discourse of islamists, white supremacists and political leaders lead to the discursive construction and maintenance of an essentialized difference. To this end, and for the purposes of this illustration, we have chosen to analyze discourses of extremism and multiculturalism as they are constructed in statements made by the following individuals: (1) Mohammad Siddique Khan, a suicide bomber believed to be the leader responsible for the London '7/7' bombings of 7 July 2005. Khan recorded a suicide video message before his murder of six civilians on the Edgware Road Circle underground line; (2) Michael Adebolajo, one of two islamist converts who attacked and killed soldier Lee Rigby on the afternoon of 22 May 2013 near the Royal Artillery Barracks in Woolwich, London. Adebolajo was recorded on the phone of an eyewitness making a statement justifying the killing; (3) Anders Behring Breivik, a white supremacist responsible for the bombing of government buildings in Oslo and a mass shooting at a Workers' Youth League (AUF) camp on the island of Utøya on 22 July 2011 which left a total of 85 people dead. Breivik gave notice of his right-wing militant leanings in an online compendium entitled '2083: A European Declaration of Independence' (Breivik, 2011); (4) British prime minister David Cameron's speech at the Munich Security Conference in February 2011 in which he sets out his view on radicalization and Islamic extremism (*sic)* (Cameron, 2011).

The selected text excerpts are indicative of contemporary discourses of extremism and multiculturalism on the part of islamists, white supremacists and conservative British politicians. Both discourses are contained within a wide range of texts, including speeches, interviews, press releases, radio and television addresses and policy documents. Furthermore, discourses of extremism and multiculturalism are constructed in other semiotic modes in the form of symbolic and emblematic representations such as flags, insignia, iconic images or memorials. These texts are interdiscursively related as they are constituted by a combination of elements in orders of discourse, on the one hand configuring extremism and on the other configuring conceptions of multiculturalism, and set out relevant parameters and categories which consequently influence social practices and structures. For example, discourses about multiculturalism in a speech by David Cameron may find their way into policy initiatives, which through implementation and inculcation are reproduced and amplified as generally accepted genres and styles in response to the perceived terrorist threat.

In our analysis we primarily focus upon the process of Othering, i.e. 'the process whereby the 'foreign' is reduced to a simplistic, easily digestible, exotic or degrading stereotype' (Holliday, 1999, p. 245). The analytical categories are identity and the discursive construal of identities which

we understand to be dialectically related to social practices and structures. We consider the process of Othering and the categorization of collective identities as both deliberate and deriving from 'common sense', i.e. they originate from our ideological conceptualizations of reality and social groups, and a shared set of beliefs in relation to them.

2. Identify the causes of the phenomenon and the obstacles to changing it

The discourses of Khan, Adebolajo, Breivik and Cameron display shared features which consist of (1) an appeal to a legitimating authority, (2) reference to unifying ideological constructs which are either religious, political, or philosophical, or a combination of these, and (3) pervasive Self/Other dichotomies. They can be described as generic as they are based upon, 'a common structure of functional units (obligatory and optional) that is repeated again and again from text to text' (Lemke, 1998, pp.1182-1183).

Appeals to a legitimating authority in islamist discourse include religious references, for example, to *'the one true God, Allah'*, to *'the final messenger and prophet Muhammad'* (Khan, 2005), and to religious verses: *'we are forced by the Quran in Sura at-Tawba, through many, many ayah throughout the Quran that we must fight them as they fight us'* (Adebolajo, 2013). The white supremacist Breivik, for his part, makes references to supposed resistance organizations such as the *'Western European Resistance'* and *'the Knights Templar'* (Breivik, 2011). Cameron's references to a legitimating authority include *'my country, the United Kingdom'*, *'Western values'* and most frequently the inclusive pronoun *'we'* to refer to the British nation (Cameron, 2011). Khan and Adebolajo mention Islam as the unifying construct legitimizing their actions, whereas Breivik (2011) construes these forces in a negative way, by reference to, *'the name of the devil: cultural Marxism, multiculturalism, globalism, feminism, emotionalism, suicidal humanism, egalitarianism - a recipe for disaster'*. Cameron (2011) in his speech appeals to a conception of the UK as a liberal country which believes in certain essential British values, such as, *'freedom of speech, freedom of worship, democracy, the rule of law, equal right regardless of race, sex or sexuality'*. These values are identity markers essential for Cameron's ideological rendering of the British nation and his construction of an idealized sense of British community and identity. They represent an unequivocal appeal to reassert 'British' values in the face of radicalization and extremism. They furthermore constitute a key element in a politico-national discourse according to which Britain is a good society because of the values it holds, and which constitute the imperatives driving British foreign policy. The statements about values can be understood as a product or artefact of ideology, rather than a direct description of *actual* British values.

The most ubiquitous features of the discourses of extremism and multiculturalism are the appeal to identity and pervasive Self/Other dichotomies. Breivik (2011) emphasizes *'our moral inheritance'* and *'our Judea-Christian values'*, which necessarily entails, like Cameron's speech, an act of differentiation and exclusion. He explains, '*It is not only our right but also our duty to contribute to preserve our identity, our culture and our national sovereignty by preventing the ongoing islamisation'.* Self/Other dichotomies also appear in Khan's suicide video statement (2005), although they are appropriated according to his political and historical positioning, i.e. he reclaims himself as a victim: '*And our words have no impact upon you, therefore I'm going to talk to you in a language that you understand. Our words are dead until we give them life with our blood'.* Self/Other dichotomies lock social groups into a particular form of identity and effectively immobilize the relationship between them. In order to establish where the moral responsibility and blame for his actions lie, he engages in a concerted effort to present the identities of *'my Muslim brothers and sisters'* as victims and to emphasize the responsibility of *'your democratically elected governments'*:

> And your support of them makes you directly responsible, just as I am directly responsible for protecting and avenging my Muslim brothers and sisters. Until we feel security, you will be our targets. And until you stop the bombing, gassing, imprisonment and torture of my people we will not stop this fight. We are at war and I am a soldier. Now you too will taste the reality of this situation. (Khan, 2005)

A similar justification is provided by Michael Adebolajo. After the killing of Lee Rigby, Adebolajo makes a statement recorded on a witness's phone in which he justifies violence as a reaction to the violence of others: *'The only reason we have killed this man today is because Muslims are dying daily by British soldiers. And this British soldier is one. It is an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth'* (Adebolajo, 2013).

In Cameron's speech (2011), the construction of polarized identities, or Othering, is evident in the emphasis on Britishness and a call for unity constructed around a choice of being either with 'Us' or with the 'Other': *'At stake are not just lives, it is our way of life. That is why this is a challenge we cannot avoid; it is one we must rise to and overcome'.* The emphasis on *'our way of life'* reduces diversity into a binary logic which simplifies intercultural relations according to an idealized conception of Britishness while also dismissing alternative viewpoints. Cameron considers Britishness to be endangered due to *'a weakening of our collective identity'*:

> Under the doctrine of state multiculturalism, we have encouraged different cultures to live separate lives, apart from each other and apart from the mainstream. We've failed to provide a vision of society to which they feel they

> want to belong. We've even tolerated these segregated communities behaving in ways that run completely counter to our values. (Cameron, 2011)

Cameron's discourse is defensive as it intends to counteract forces from 'without' through presenting 'Britishness' as an uncontested, given category; and it is antagonistic as it seeks to (re)structure membership and 'Britishness' via the common endeavour of providing *'a vision of society'* and overcoming *'a challenge we cannot avoid'*. The discourse furthermore functions to discipline domestic society by marginalizing dissent or protest, and enforces national unity by reifying a particular conception of community. Accordingly, Cameron emphasizes the need for others to integrate with an essentialized and idealized 'British' Self, and a culture which is conceived and constructed as a static and homogenous entity (Faulks, 2006).

3. Does the social order require the phenomenon to be the way that it is?

The Other cast as alien is not only a feature of islamist and white supremacist discourse, but as we have seen is also a feature of political discourse, such as that of Cameron, and others on the European right (Fekete, 2012). All the protagonists in this analysis employ concepts of culture and belonging in fundamentalist and absolutist ways which entail a perception of the Other as a separate and completely *other* counterpart to an essentialized pure Self. The unity of the Self and the unity of the Other are simplistic categorizations which allow the different protagonists to overcome any cognitive dissonance concerning their actions and to construct Self-affirming ways of thinking about difference, while also reinforcing a preconceived (inter)cultural status quo. The focus on difference in discourses of multiculturalism allows for the implementation of a political and (inter)cultural agenda which is centred upon a principally 'white' nation, as well as the inculcation of new ways of acting (genres) and new ways of being (styles) in response to a particular construal of the terrorist threat (e.g. via security protocols, border restrictions, and surveillance practices). The political implications of the discourse of multiculturalism show how new genres and styles have become ideologically accepted across societal structures as networks of social practices within orders of discourse. However, through employing pervasive Self/Other dichotomies, the alienation and continued ostracism of the Other is perpetually renewed. In the case of extremists such as Khan, Adebolajo and Breivik, the Self/Other dichotomy legitimizes their indifference to the suffering of the Other. In the case of Cameron it works in tragic mimicry of those he wishes to condemn. By adopting the same cultural binaries which are to be found in the discourse of extremists, Cameron excludes from 'Britishness' everyone who does not share the values of his 'British' Self. Attention is thus focused onto perceptions of cultural difference in such a way which relegates ethnic minority communities, many of whom are British citizens and consider themselves British, to a secondary

relationship with an idealized ethno-cultural British Self. In the absence of an intercultural consciousness which acknowledges the presence of the Other in the Self, the prospect of a dialogue which might facilitate structural and institutional change is thereby rendered intentionally remote (Jackson, 2005; Shaw, 2012; Phipps, 2014).

4. Identify ways past the obstacles

When identifying ways past the obstacles, your route will depend upon your epistemological and/or political stance. For example, through taking a more emancipatory or critical realist stance you may engage in a normative project and a discussion of how societal 'wrongs' might be 'righted'. For this purpose, you might refer to models of intercultural dialogue which focus on openness, difference-creation, difference management, and difference training as solutions to the practice of Othering (Lederach, 2003). Alternatively, you might understand such a transformative agenda as problematic due to the claims it makes regarding truth and knowledge (Kramsch, 2009; MacDonald & O'Regan, 2012; Nair-Venugopal, 2012). This may lead you to adopt a more poststructuralist or problematizing stance, which means understanding the act of analysis and the destabilization of rigid dominant interpretations as a form of contestation. Your objective may then be to engage in a discourse politics through mapping discourses and problematizing givens which present themselves as truths. In either approach, it is extremely doubtful that critique of itself can overcome or destabilize the dominant discourse, but by subjecting the dominant discourse to criticism, critical approaches to discourse analysis may be said to 'underlabour' (Bhaskar, 1998, p. 179) for activities whose interests lie in that direction.

Concluding remarks on CDA

For researchers new to CDA, there are a number of pointers to bear in mind. First, there is the issue of having some familiarity with social theory, particularly with concepts such as discourse, ideology, and power, and a considered view on what these mean. Second, is the need to have some understanding of language in order to be able to analyze texts – CDA is not just commentary. Third, it is important to provide a reasoned account of the interpretation which is placed upon the discourse that is analyzed, which is to say that the analysis should seek to be faithful to the internal workings of the text rather than, for example, simply in disagreement with it. Finally, and closely related to the previous point, is that simply applying the linguistic analytical categories of CDA to a text is insufficient. Not all features of a text are going to be discoursally significant, so identifying which are and which are not requires careful judgement and argument as well as reference to wider theoretical and empirical frames within which the analysis should be located.

Key Terms

Critical An attitude or stance which questions given assumptions or propositions. The term is also used to refer to research approaches which have been informed by social theory, particularly from the perspectives of Marxism, critical realism, or poststructuralism.

Dialectic/ Dialectical This term refers to a relationship between two or more elements which is not simply one way, but is multiple and dynamic. In a CDA perspective, the relation between discourse and the social context for discourse is dialectical in that discourse and context are both mutually constituted as well as mutually conditioned.

Discourse(s) The non-count noun 'discourse' refers to language on its own, and to *semiosis*, i.e. all forms of meaning construction in their social context, and of which language is one instance. Discourse as a count noun refers to perspectival ways of seeing and knowing as they are constituted through semiosis. Discourses and ideologies can in this respect be viewed as synonymous although ideology is often dispreferred in favour of discourse in poststructuralist perspectives. In CDA both terms are used, often interchangeably.

Poststructuralism An epistemological perspective which questions the grounds for knowledge and veridical truth. Poststructuralism is the subset of postmodernism which is devoted to the study of discourse, and is closely associated with continental, particularly French, philosophy. Poststructuralists tend to prioritize discourse over other material factors such as the economy in explaining social reality and change.

Order of discourse Orders of discourse are the semiotic dimension of social practices and represent different configurations of discourses, genres and styles. Discourses are ways of representing (and therefore also ways of *believing*); genres are ways of acting conventionally (e.g. in writing, and in spoken and non-verbal communication); and styles are ways of taking up identities in their semiotic aspect – i.e. of enacting one's being as part of a subject position or 'role' (e.g. father, mother, policeman, asylum seeker, receptionist, CEO). The relationship between these three dimensions is known as *interdiscursivity*.

References

Adebolajo, M. (2013). *Woolwich attack: Terrorist proclaimed 'an eye for an eye' after attack*. [Online]. Available at: http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/uknews/terrorism-in-the-uk/10073910/Woolwich-attack-terrorist-proclaimed-an-eye-for-an-eye-after-attack.html. [Last accessed 18.02.2014].

Althusser, L. (1971). *Lenin and philosophy*. New York: Monthly Review Press.

Best, S., & Kellner, D. (1991). *Postmodern theory: Critical interrogations*. London: MacMillan.

Bhaskar, R. (1986). *Scientific realism and human emancipation*. London: Verso.

Bhaskar, R. (1998). *The possibility of naturalism: A philosophical critique of the contemporary human sciences* (3rd ed.). London: Routledge.

Bhaskar, R. (2008). *A realist theory of science*. London: Verso.

Block, D. (2007). *Second language identities*. London: Continuum.
Blommaert, J. (2005). *Discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Blommaert, J. (2009). Language, asylum and the national order. *Current Anthropology, 50*(4), 415-441.
Blommaert, J. (2010). *The Sociolinguistics of Globalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Blommaert, J., & Bulcaen, C. (2000). Critical Discourse Analysis. *Annual Review of Anthropology, 29*, 447-466.
Blommaert, J., & Omoniyi, T. (2010). Email Fraud: Language, Technology, and the Indexicals of Globalisation. *Social Semiotics, 16*(4), 573-605.
Bourdieu, P. (1984). *Distinction*. London: Routledge.
Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and symbolic power*. Oxford: Polity.
Bourdieu, P., & Wacquant, L. (1992). *An Invitation to reflexive sociology*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
Breivik, A. B. (2011). *2083 - A European Declaration of Independence*. [Online]. Available at: http://www.deism.com/images/breivik-manifesto-2011.pdf. [Last accessed 24.02.2014].
Cameron, D. (2011). *PM's speech at Munich Security Conference*. [Online]. Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/pms-speech-at-munich-security-conference. [Last accessed 24.02.2014].
Chilton, P. (2004). *Analysing political discourse*. London: Routledge.
Chilton, P. (2005). Missing links in mainstream CDA: modules, blends and the critical instinct. In R. Wodak & P. Chilton (Eds.), *A new agenda in (Critical) Discourse Analysis* (pp. 18-51). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Chouliaraki, L., & Fairclough, N. . (1999). *Discourse in late modernity: Rethinking Critical Discourse Analysis*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
Collier, A. (1994). *An Introduction to Roy Bhaskar's philosophy*. London: Verso.
Cole, M. (2009). *Critial race theory and education: A marxist perspective*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
Delgado, R. (2001). Two ways to think about race: Reflections on the id, the ego, and other reformist theories of equal protection. *Georgetown Law Journal, 89*, 2279-2296.
Eagleton, T. (1991). *Ideology: An introduction*. London: Verso.
Ehrlich, S. (2001). *Representing rape: Language and sexual consent*. New York: Routledge.
Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and social change*. Cambridge: Polity.
Fairclough, N. (2001). *Language and power*. Harlow: Longman.
Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analysing discourse: Textual analysis for social research*. London: Routledge.
Fairclough, N. (2006). *Language and globalization*. London: Routledge.
Fairclough, N. (2010a). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language* (2nd ed.). London: Longman.
Fairclough, N. (2010b). Language and ideology. In N. Fairclough (Ed.), *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language* (pp. 56-83). London: Longman.
Fairclough, N. (2010c). A dialectical-relational approach to critical discourse analysis in social research. In N. Fairclough (Ed.), *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language* (pp. 230-254). London: Longman.
Fairclough, N. (2010d). General introduction. In N. Fairclough (Ed.), *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language* (pp. 1-21). London: Longman.
Fairclough, N. (2012). Critical discourse analysis. In J. P. Gee & M. Handford (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of discourse analysis* (pp. 9-20). London: Routledge.
Fairclough, N., Jessop, B., & Sayer, A. (2010). Critical realism and semiosis. In N. Fairclough (Ed.), *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language* (pp. 202-222). London: Longman.
Fairclough, N., Mulderrig, J., & Wodak, R. (2011). Critical discourse analysis. In T. A. van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse studies: A multidisciplinary introduction* (pp. 357-378). London: Sage.
Fairclough, N., & Wodak, R. (1997). Critical discourse analysis. In T. van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse as social interaction* (pp. 258-284). London: Sage.

Faulks, K. (2006). Education for citizenship in England's secondary schools: A critique of current principle and practice. *Journal of Education Policy,* 21 (1)*,* 59-74.
Fekete, L. (2012). The Muslim conspiracy theory and the Oslo massacre. *Race & Class, 53*(3), 30-47.
Foucault, M. (1972). *The archaeology of knowledge*. London: Tavistock Publications.
Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings*. Brighton: Harvester.
Foucault, M. (1981). The order of discourse. In R. Young (Ed.), *Untying the text* (pp. 48-78). London: Routledge.
Graham, P. W., & Luke, A. (2013). Critical discourse analysis and political economy of communication: Understanding the new corporate order. In R. Wodak (Ed.), *Critical discourse analysis: Concepts, history, theory (Volume 1).* London: Sage.
Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selections from prison notebooks*. London: Lawrence and Wishart.
Habermas, J. (1984). *The theory of communicative action: Reason and the rationalisation of society: Volume 1.* London Heinemann.
Hall, S., Lumley, B., & McLennan, G. (1978). Politics and ideology: Gramsci. In B. Schwarz (Ed.), *On ideology* (pp. 45-76). London: Hutchinson.
Harvey, D. (1996). *Justice, nature and the geography of difference*. Oxford: Blackwell.
Holborow, M. (2012). What is neoliberalism? Discourse, ideology and the real world. In D. Block, J. Gray & M. Holborow (Eds.), *Neoliberalism and applied linguistics* (pp. 33-55). London: Routledge.
Holliday, A. (1999). Small Cultures. *Applied Linguistics,* 20 (2)*,* 237-264.
Jackson, R. (2005). *Writing the war on terrorism: Language, politics and counter-terrorism*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
Khan, M. S. (2005). *London bomber: Text in full*. [Online]. Available at: http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk/4206800.stm. [Last accessed 24.02.2012].
Kramsch, C. (2009). *The Multilingual Subject*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Kress, G. (2010). *Multimodality: A social semiotic approach to contemporary communication*. London: Routledge.
Kress, G., & van Leeuwen, T. (2000). *Multimodal discourse*. London: Arnold.
Ladson-Billings, G., & Tate, W. F. (1995). Toward a critical race theory of education. *Teacher's College Record, 97*(1), 47-68.
Larrain, J. (1979). *The concept of ideology*. London: Hutchinson Education.
Lazar, M. M. (2008). *Feminist critical discourse analysis: Studies in gender, power and ideology*. London: Palgrave MacMillan.
Lederach, J. P. (2003). *Conflict transformation*. Intercourse, PA: Good Books.
Lemke, J. L. (1998). Analysing Verbal Data: Principles, Methods and Problems. In K. Tobin and B. Fraser (Eds), *International handbook of science education* (pp. 1175-1189). New York: Kluwer.
Luke, A. (2005). Normativity and the material effects of discourse. *Critical Discourse Studies, 2*(2), 198-202.
MacDonald, M. N., & O'Regan, J. P. (2012). The ethics of Intercultural Communication. *Educational Philosophy and Theory, 45*(10), 1005-1017.
Marx, K., & Engels, F. (1998/1845). *The german ideology*. New York: Prometheus Books.
McLennan, G., Molina, V., & Peters, R. (1978). Althusser's Theory of Ideology. In B. Schwarz (Ed.), *On ideology* (pp. 77-105). London: Hutchison.
Nair-Venugopal, S. (2012). *The gaze of the West and framings of the East*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
Pêcheux, M. . (1982). *Language, semantics and ideology: Stating the obvious*. London: MacMillan.
Pennycook, A. (1994). Incommensurable discourses? *Applied Linguistics, 15*(2), 115-138.
Pennycook, A. (2001). *Critical applied linguistics: A Critical introduction*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
Pennycook, A. (2007). *Global Englishes and transcultural flows*. London: Routledge.

Phipps, A. (2013). Unmoored: language pain, porosity, and poisonwood. *Critical Multilingualism, 1*(2), 96-118.
Phipps, A. (2014). 'They are bombing now': 'Intercultural Dialogue' in times of conflict. *Language and Intercultural Communication,* 14 (1)*,* 108-124.
Piller, I. (2007). Linguistics and Intercultural Communication. *Language and Linguistics Compass,* 1 (3)*,* 208-226.
Rajagoplan, K. (2004). On being critical. *Critical Discourse Studies, 1*(2), 261-263.
Rajagoplan, K. (2012). 'World English' or 'World Englishes'? Does it make any difference? *International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 22*(3), 374-391.
Reisigl, M., & Wodak, R. (2009). The discourse-historical approach (DHA). In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (pp. 87-121). London: Sage.
Sayer, A. (2000). *Realism and Social Science*. London: Sage.
Scollon, R., & Scollon, S. W. (2000). *Intercultural Communication: A discourse approach*. Oxford: Blackwell.
Shaw, I. S. (2012). Stereotypical representations of Muslims and Islam following the 7/7 London terror attacks: Implications for Intercultural Communication and terrorism prevention. *The International Communication Gazette,* 74 (6)*,* 509-524.
Slembrouck, S. (2001). Explanation, interpretation and critique in the analysis of discourse. *Critique of Anthropology, 21*(33), 34-57.
Thompson, J. (1984). *Studies in the theory of ideology*. Cambridge: Polity.
van Dijk, T. A. (1993). Principles of critical discourse analysis. *Discourse and Society, 4*(2), 249-283.
van Dijk, T. A. (1998). *Ideology: An interdisciplinary approach*. London: Sage.
van Dijk, T. A. (2008). *Discourse and context: A sociocognitive approach.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
van Dijk, T. A. (Ed.). (2011). *Discourse studies: A multidisciplinary approach*. London: Sage.
Weedon, C. (1997). *Feminist practice and poststructuralist theory*. London: Wiley.
Williams, R. (1977). *Marxism and literature*. Oxford: Oxford Univerity Press.
Wodak, R., & Chilton, P. (Eds.). (2005). *A new agenda in (critical) discourse analysis*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (Eds.). (2009). *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (2nd ed.). London: Sage.

Further Reading and Resources

Fairclough, N. (2001). *Language and power*. Harlow: Longman.
Blommaert, J. (2005). *Discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Fairclough, N. (2010). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language* (2nd ed.). London: Longman.
Pennycook, A. (2001). *Critical applied linguistics: A critical introduction*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
Wodak, R., & M., Meyer. (Eds.). (2009). *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (2nd ed.). London: Sage.