Pennycook A (2001). *Critical applied linguistics: a critical introduction*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
Phillipson R (1992). *Linguistic imperialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Rajagopalan K (2004). 'The philosophy of applied linguistics.' In Davies A & Elder C (eds.) *A handbook of applied linguistics*. Oxford: Blackwell. 397–420.
Ricento T (2000). 'Historical and theoretical perspectives in language policy and planning.' In Ricento T (ed.) *Ideology, politics and language policies; focus on English*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 9–24.
Shohamy E (2001). *The power of tests: a critical perspective on the uses of language tests*. London: Longman.
Spolsky B (1995). *Measured words*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Skutnabb-Kangas T (2000). *Linguistic genocide in education – or worldwide diversity and human rights?* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
Tollefson J (2000). 'Policy and ideology in the spread of English.' In Hall J K & Eggington W (eds.) *The sociopolitics of English language teaching*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters. 7–21.
Venuti L (1997). *The scandals of translation: towards an ethics of difference*. London: Routledge.
Walsh C (1991). *Pedagogy and the struggle for voice: issues of language, power, and schooling for Puerto Ricans*. Toronto: OISE Press.
Widdowson H G (2001). 'Coming to terms with reality: applied linguistics in perspective.' In Graddol D (ed.) *Applied linguistics for the 21st century, AILA Review* 14, 2–17.
Williams G (1992). *Sociolinguistics: a sociological critique*. London: Routledge.
Wodak R (1996). *Disorders of discourse*. London: Longman.

Critical Discourse Analysis

T van Leeuwen, Cardiff University, Cardiff, UK

Introduction

Critical discourse analysis is founded on the insight that text and talk play a key role in maintaining and legitimating inequality, injustice, and oppression in society. It employs discourse analysis to show how this is done, and it seeks to spread awareness of this aspect of language use in society, and to argue explicitly for change on the basis of its findings.

Critical discourse analysis is not associated with a specific school of linguistics or discourse analysis. Many have followed Fairclough (1989) in drawing primarily on the systemic-functional linguistics of Halliday (1989). According to Halliday, the resources of language simultaneously fulfill three major functions: the **ideational** function of constructing representations of the world; the **interpersonal** function of constituting social interactions; and the **textual** function of creating cohesively structured texts and communicative events. This suits the purposes of critical discourse analysis, which engages both with the way language is used to construct and disseminate discourses – ideologically specific representations of some aspect of the world – and with the way language is used to enact hegemonic genres – specific ways of using language to achieve purposes of social domination. Fairclough (1993: 134; 2000: 14, see also van Leeuwen, 2005) added styles – uses of language to construct and enact social identities.

But many critical discourse analysts use other methods, including, for instance, argumentation strategies (e.g. Wodak and Matouschek, 1993), narrative analysis (see e.g. Mumby, 1993), forms of conversation analysis that go beyond the constraints stipulated by proponents such as Schlegoff (1997) and link conversational data to their wider social context (e.g. Ehrlich, 1998), and more. While Fairclough and others (e.g. van Leeuwen, 1996) have adapted and elaborated systemic-functional linguistics for purposes of critical discourse analysis, van Dijk (e.g. 1993a) and others have demonstrated that a much wider range of methods can usefully be applied in critical discourse analysis, arguing for a multidisciplinary approach which "chooses and elaborates theories, methods and empirical work as a function of their relevance for the realization of socio-political goals" (1993a: 252). The methodological diversity of critical discourse analysis is well demonstrated in the pages of *Discourse and Society*, which has been the key journal for critical discourse analysis over the past 17 years.

Critical discourse analysts engage not only with a range of discourse analytical paradigms, but also with critical social theory. In more recent work social theory may even dominate over discourse analysis. Fairclough in particular has consistently explored ways of grounding critical discourse analysis in

critical social theory (see Chouliaraki and Fairclough, 1997). Strongly influenced by Marx and Gramsci, Fairclough's work also engages with Foucault, Bourdieu, Habermas, Harvey, and Giddens, to mention just a few names. But, again, there is no theoretical orthodoxy in critical discourse analysis. With regard to the key concept of **ideology**, for instance, van Dijk (1993a: 258; 1998), sees 'ideologies' as the 'worldviews' that constitute 'social cognition': "schematically organized complexes of representations and attitudes with regard to certain aspects of the social world, e.g. the schema (...) whites have about blacks, which may feature a category 'appearance'," while Fairclough has a more Marxist view of ideology in which ideologies are "constructions of practices from particular perspectives (...) which iron out the contradictions, dilemmas and antagonisms of practices in ways which accord with the interests and projects of domination" (Chouliaraki and Fairclough, 1997: 26). But this has not led to divisions within critical discourse analysis. What unites critical discourse analysis is neither methodology nor theoretical orthodoxy, but a common goal: the critique of the hegemonic discourses and genres that effect inequalities, injustices, and oppression in contemporary society.

The issues critical discourse analysts have explored over the past 20 years have also varied widely. A great deal of work, particularly by Wodak (e.g. Wodak *et al.*, 1990; Wodak and Matouschek, 1993) and van Dijk (e.g. 1991, 1993b) and their associates has focused on racism and antisemitism, and more recently also on immigration and asylum (e.g. Van Leeuwen and Wodak, 1999). The discourses of neoliberalism and their role in the neocapitalist policies and practices of governments, the business world, and other institutions have become another important focus (e.g. Fairclough, 1993, Chouliaraki and Fairclough, 1997, Fairclough, 2000). But the pages of *Discourse and Society* and collections such as Toolan (2002) show that critical discourse analysts have addressed many other issues as well, including gender, education, doctor-patient communication, war and terrorism, and welfare and unemployment, to mention just a few. The data used by critical discourse analysts also vary. Although there has been a tendency to focus on speeches by politicians, parliamentary debates, and media reports and editorials, critical discourse analysts have also analyzed school textbooks, advertisements, the books of management gurus, transcripts of doctor-patient and workplace meeting interactions, and much more. And as a glance at the contents of *Discourse and Society* will demonstrate, this work has increasingly come from all corners of the world.

Critical Linguistics

The immediate forerunner of critical discourse analysis was critical linguistics, a movement that started at the University of East Anglia in the mid–1970s (Fowler *et al.*, 1979; Hodge and Kress, 1993). Halliday's systemic-functional linguistics provided the fundamental insight that made it possible to move linguistic analysis beyond formal description and use it as basis for social critique (1989: 101):

> Grammar goes beyond formal rules of correctness. It is a means of representing patterns of experience (...) It enable human beings to build a mental picture of reality, to make sense of their experience of what goes on around them and inside them.

Critical linguists added two further steps. The first was inspired by Marx. The "patterns of experience" Halliday refers to, they argued, are not necessarily neutral. They are patterned the way they are to suit the needs and interests of those who use them both to understand and to enact their reality, and if such interests include domination, they are ideological. The second was inspired by Whorf. If different languages can encode different "patterns of experience" (and different ideologies), they argued, so can different uses of one and the same language. In a study that has rightly become a classic, Tony Trew (1979: 106–107) described how, when the Harare police, in what was in 1975 still Rhodesia, fired into a crowd of unarmed people and shot thirteen of them The *Rhodesia Herald* wrote: "A political clash has led to death and injury," while the *Tanzanian Daily News* wrote, "Rhodesia's white suprematist police (...) opened fire and killed thirteen unarmed Africans." Analyzing texts of this kind, Trew demonstrated that political views are not only encoded through different vocabularies (of the well-known freedom fighter versus terrorist type) but also through different grammatical structures, here for instance through the coding of the same event as either a noun ('death') or a verb ('kill') that, for its grammatical completion, requires an active subject ('police') and an object ('Africans'), so that both the perpetrators and the victims must be referred to explicitly. Another key example of what critical linguists have called "ideological transformations" is passive agent deletion: if the Tanzanian version were to be passivized ("Thirteen unarmed Africans were killed...") it would no longer be necessary to name the police as the agent of the killing.

With work of this kind, critical linguists took the fundamental step of interpreting grammatical categories as potential traces of ideological mystification, and broke with a tradition in which different

ways of saying the same thing were seen as mere stylistic variants, or as conventional and meaningless indicators of group membership categories such as class, professional role, and so on. Without their work, critical discourse analysis would not have been possible.

Critical Discourse Analysis

Critical discourse analysis started in the mid–1980s as a new direction in the work of Fairclough, van Dijk, Wodak, and others. As a movement it began in 1992, at a meeting in Amsterdam with presentations by van Dijk, Fairclough, Wodak, Kress, and van Leeuwen, which were later published as a special issue of *Discourse and Society* (*4, 2*,1993). The group gradually expanded and continued to meet annually from 1992 onward. Another early collection of influential papers was published a few years later (Caldas-Coulthard and Coulthard, 1996). Since then critical discourse analysis, now usually referred to as CDA, has been a fast growing and increasingly interdisciplinary movement. A first large-scale international conference was held in 2004 in Valencia. Two new journals started in the same year, *Critical Discourse Studies* and the *Journal of Language and Politics*.

Critical discourse analysis moved beyond critical linguistics in a number of ways. The first has already been mentioned: the attempt to ground critical discourse analysis in critical social theory and to articulate the relation between discourses and the social practices in which they are embedded. By the early 1990s, discourse had also become a key term in postmodern philosophy and cultural studies, and critical discourse analysis explicitly distanced itself from the dominant tendency in these fields to reduce the social to discourse, and discourse only. Concepts such as marketization (Fairclough, 1993) could incorporate both changing practices (the market practices that are now introduced in many institutions, including universities) and the changing discourses that played a key role in this process by proposing and legitimating changes, training people in new practices, requiring them to learn new ways of talking and writing, and so on. As universities had to learn to compete with each other for students, treat students as customers, and so on, their discourses were also marketized. Job advertisements, for instance, changed from traditional forms such as "Applications are invited for a lectureship in the Department of English Literature ... " to forms such as "The Department of Law is a thriving department committed to excellence in teaching and research ... ," to accommodate the new emphasis on and entrepreneurial ethos and self promotion. Fairclough stressed the interdiscursivity of such genres. The old continues alongside the new, certainly for as long as the new practices still cause tension and have not stabilized.

Critical discourse analysis also moved beyond critical linguistics in adopting a much more fully interdisciplinary approach, studying not only texts and transcripts of talk, but also their contexts, whether by historical or ethnographic methods. Wodak's 'discourse-historical approach' set the example here, increasingly involving collaborations between discourse analysts, on the one hand, and historians, political scientists, anthropologists, and sociologists on the other hand, as well as stimulating reflection on interdisciplinarity itself (e.g. Weiss and Wodak, 2003).

Critical discourse analysis has also moved beyond language, taking on board that discourses are often multimodally realized, not only through text and talk, but also through other modes of communication such as images. Kress and van Leeuwen (1996) developed methods of visual analysis that were strongly inspired by Halliday's systemic-functional linguistics and demonstrated how these methods could be used for purposes of critical discourse analysis. To mention an example, van Leeuwen (2000) shows how 'visual racism' is realized not just by the most obvious racist stereotypes, but also through subtler methods. The members of some social groups, for instance, are never personalized, never depicted as individuals with unique characteristics. They are represented *en groupe*, often in highly similar or identical poses. This can then create a 'they are all the same' or 'you can't tell them apart' effect. Again, the members of some social groups are consistently depicted in 'long shot', which, literally and figuratively, 'distances' them from the viewer.

Overall, then, critical discourse analysis has moved towards more explicit dialogue between social theory and practice, richer contextualization, greater interdisciplinarity and greater attention to the multimodality of discourse.

Critiques

Critical discourse analysis is no longer of interest only to linguists. The work published in journals such as *Critical Discourse Studies* and the *Journal of Language and Politics* shows that social scientists from a range of different fields are actively engaging with critical discourse analysis. By contrast, CDA has received some strong-worded critiques from within linguistics. These have often been included in collections of CDA papers (e.g. Toolan, 2002) and in the prescribed reading lists of university courses in linguistics departments, thus encouraging a certain

suspicion of critical discourse analysis, especially in contexts where linguistics is taught and practiced as a neutral scientific enterprise.

In one of the most widely quoted critiques, Widdowson (1995, 1996) argues that it is the business of discourse analysis to describe formal patterns 'above the sentence' and that critical discourse analysts confuse discourse analysis with textual interpretation. In a similar vein Stubbs (1997) calls the analysed of critical discourse analysts 'textual commentaries.' Like Widdowson, Stubbs mainly targets Fairclough, conveniently ignoring the wide range of critical discourse work published over the years in *Discourse and Society* and elsewhere. The text analysed in Fairclough (1989), which are often pedagogical examples to demonstrate methods of analysis in what is essentially a textbook, are, according to Stubbs, "fragmentary" and "insufficient" because they do not constitute a representative sample and do not involve the kind of large scale quantitative work in which many linguists are now engaged.

Most of all, however, these critiques take offense at the explicit social and political goals of critical discourse analysis. Widdowson, for instance, argues that texts are differently interpreted by different readers and that critical discourse analysts unfairly privilege their own interpretations. From the point of view of critical discourse analysis (see e.g. Fairclough, 1996), traditional sociolinguistic and stylistic approaches to the study of language in social life may have succeeded in describing patterns of language use and patterns of language change, but they have not explained them. They have treated them as more or less meaningless conventions and autonomous evolutionary processes. Critical discourse analysts are seeking to explain why texts are the way they are, and why they change the way they do, and following Halliday, they look for the answers to these questions in the social, economical, and political world.

Critical discourse analysts are aware that their own work, too, is driven by social, economical, and political motives, but they argue that this applies to all academic work. Social divisions of labor have traditionally ensured that scientists and other academics do not have to confront the conditions that make the continuation of their work possible and the place it has in the wider scheme of things. Critical discourse analysts at least make their position explicit and feel they do not need to apologize for the critical stance of their work; on the contrary, by contributing to debates on issues that are of crucial importance to society, they continue the tradition of reasoned debate that has been fundamental to democratic societies since antiquity, feeling that their work as scholars entails greater social responsibilities than providing facts for others to interpret and use.

See also: Critical Applied Linguistics; Discourse, Foucauldian Approach; Discrimination and Language; Discursive Practice Theory; Media and Marginalized Groups; Media, Politics, and Discourse: Interactions; Political Rhetorics of Discrimination; Politics and Language: Overview; Politics, Ideology and Discourse; Power and Pragmatics; Social Construction and Language.

Bibliography

Caldas-Coulthard C R & Coulthard M (1996). *Texts and practices: readings in critical discourse analysis.* London: Routledge.

Chouliaraki L & Fairclough N (1997). *Discourse in late modernity: rethinking critical discourse analysis.* Edinburgh: University of Edinburgh Press.

Ehrlich S (1998). 'The discursive reconstruction of sexual consent.' *Discourse and Society 9(2),* 149–171.

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

Fairclough N (1993). 'Critical discourse analysis and the marketization of public discourse.' *Discourse and Society 4(2),* 133–168.

Fairclough N (1996). 'A reply to Henry Widdowson's "Discourse analysis: a critical view."' *Language and Literature 5(1),* 49–56.

Fairclough N (2000). *New labour, new language.* London: Routledge.

Fowler R, Hodge B, Kress G & Trew T (eds.) (1979). *Language and control.* London: Routledge.

Halliday M A K (1989). *Introduction to functional grammar.* London: Arnold.

Hodge R & Kress G (1993). *Language as ideology.* London: Routledge.

Kress G & van Leeuwen T (1996). *Reading images: the grammar of visual design.* London: Routledge.

Mumby D K (ed.) (1993). *Narrative and social control: critical perspectives.* London: Sage.

Schlegoff E (1997). 'Whose text? Whose context?' *Discourse and Society 8(2),* 165–187.

Stubbs M (1997). 'Whorf's children: critical comments on critical discourse analysis (CDA).' In Ryan A & Wray A (eds.) *Evolving models of language.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters. 100–116.

Toolan M (ed.) (2002). *Critical discourse analysis: critical concepts in linguistics* (4 vols). London: Routledge.

Trew T (1979). Theory and ideology at work. In Fowler *et al.* (eds.). 94–116.

van Dijk T A (1991). *Racism in the press.* London: Routledge.

van Dijk T A (1993a). 'Principles of critical discourse analysis.' *Discourse and Society 4(2),* 249–283.

van Dijk T A (1993b). *Elite discourse and racism.* London: Sage.

van Dijk T A (1998). *Ideology: A multidisciplinary study.* London: Sage.
van Leeuwen T (1993). 'Genre and field in critical discourse analysis: a synopsis.' *Discourse and Society 4(2),* 193–224.
van Leeuwen T (1996). 'The representation of social actors.' In Caldas-Coulthard & Coulthard (eds.). 32–70.
van Leeuwen T (2000). 'Visual Racism.' In Wodak R & Reisigl M (eds.) *The semiotics of racism.* Vienna: Passagen Verlag. 331–350.
van Leeuwen T (2005). *Introducing Social Semiotics.* London: Routledge.
van Leeuwen T & Wodak R (1999). 'Legitimizing immigration control: a discourse-historical analysis.' *Discourse Studies 1(1),* 83–118.
Weiss G & Wodak R (eds.) (2003). *Critical discourse analysis: theory and interdisciplinarity.* London: Palgrave.
Widdowson H G (1995). 'Discourse analysis: a critical view.' *Language and Literature 4(3),* 157–172.
Widdowson H G (1996). 'Reply to Fairclough: Discourse and interpretation: conjectures and refutations.' *Language and Literature 5(1),* 57–69.
Wodak R & Matouschek B (1993). ''We are dealing with people whose origins one can clearly tell by just looking': Critical discourse analysis and the study of neo-racism in contemporary Austria.' *Discourse and Society 4(2),* 225–248.
Wodak R, Novak P & Pelikan J (1990). *'Wir sind alle unschuldige Täter' Diskurshistorische Studien zum Nachkriegsantisemitismus.* Frankfurt: Suhrkamp.

Croatia: Language Situation

Editorial Team

The official language of Croatia is Croatian (Serbo-Croatian). The writing system is based on an adopted version of the Roman alphabet. The same language is referred to by different names, Serbian (srpski), Serbo-Croat (in Croatia: hrvatsko-srpski), Bosnian (bosanski), based on political and ethnical grounds. Minority languages (Serbian, Italian, Albanian, Hungarian) are not numerous and are not in official use.

Croatia became an independent country after the breakup of Yugoslavia in 1992. Language politics have been heavily involved in the numerous ethnical conflicts that took place from 1990 to 1996, and it is still a very sensitive issue in the whole area of the Balkans. The language situation in Croatia has undergone a twofold change in the following period. First, there was a very active engagement of the government and other national institutions trying to stress the differences between the Croatian and other varieties of Serbo-Croat. Second, a large number of Serbs (estimated to several hundreds thousands of people) fled the country in the year 1995, which resulted in an abrupt change in the numbers of speakers who declare to speak Serbian.

One linguistic consequence of the political and ethnical processes during the 1990s is that the language that used to be officially called Serbo-Croat has gotten several new ethnically and politically based names. Thus, the names Serbian, Croatian, and Bosnian are politically determined and refer to the same language with possible slight variations. The language has two major dialects, the Ekavian and Ijekavian, the former being spoken by the majority of Croatians. Still, these dialects do not coincide with the ethnically motivated names, because they both are spoken by more than one ethnic group.

The official language of the Republic of Croatia is Croatian (with over 4 250 000 speakers in the territory of Croatia without Kosovo, or 96% of the population). Minority languages are Serbian (around 45 000 speakers), Italian (20 500 speakers), Albanian (14 500 speakers), and Hungarian (12 500) and several more with under 10 000 speakers.

See also: Language Policies: Policies on Language in Europe; Serbian–Croatian–Bosnian Linguistic Complex; War Rhetoric.

Bibliography

Babić-Finka-Moguš (1996). Hrvatski pravopis (*The Croatian orthography*). Zagreb: Školska knjiga.
Barić i sur (1996). *Hrvatska Gramatika* (The croatian grammar). Zagreb: Školska knjiga.
Brodnjak V (1993). *Razlikovni rječnik srpskog i hrvatskog jezika. Školske novine, Hrvatska sveučilišna naklada* (The differential dictionary of Serbian and Croatian), Zagreb.
Peco Asim (1978). *Pregled srpskohrvatskih dijalekata* (An overview of the Serbo-Croat dialects). Beograd: Naučna knjiga.
Težak S & Babić S (1994). *Gramatika hrvatskog jezika* (The grammar of Croatian). Zagreb: Školska knjiga.