readers who may be in another culture. Moreover, the discourses discussed in the studies are not those of marginalized people in non-Western cultures. They are those of politicians and journalists (some in non-Western cultures, some not, but in all cases powerful individuals within their respective communities). In the third study, Shi-xu claims that "the identity discourse in Ireland and Northern Ireland has not continued through time" (196), but the evidence he cites is from political statements, agreements between governments, and speeches reported in the media. It seems somewhat risky to make such a general statement on the basis of data from just a few genres. There could be a wealth of examples of identity discourses that have remained unchanged in other genres. The final chapter is perhaps the most convincing application of the CAD framework, although it is difficult to see exactly how the suggestions offered by the author, though all laudable, can be applied in practical terms.

In conclusion, CAD as outlined in this book is a promising framework, and Shi-xu convincingly argues for more cultural diversity in social sciences research. The outline and critiques of Western theories and methodologies are mostly comprehensive and quite informative, but they lack concrete examples and at times give an inaccurate picture of current Western discourse approaches. The practical applications described in the book are good examples of a critical discourse studies approach, but it is not clear how this differs substantively from other critical approaches with similar aims, except that in two of the cases the object of research was non-Western. Shi-xu uses predominantly Western arguments to justify his approach and seems to gloss over existing non-Western approaches, so I have to conclude that the book does not do quite what it sets out to do.
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This latest book by Norman Fairclough is an extension of his earlier work on critical discourse analysis (CDA) (e.g., Fairclough 1989, 1995, 2001). Relying on systemic functional linguistics (SFL) as his linguistic theoretical standpoint on one hand, and on social theoretical themes presented by critical theorists like Bourdieu and Habermas on the other, the author attempts to present a detailed framework of linguistic analysis that links the "micro" analysis of texts to the "macro" analysis of social relations (p. 16). In his introductory chapter, Fairclough specifies two types of audience for the book who may find this framework relevant to their own research: students and researchers in social sciences and humanities with little or no knowledge of language analysis, and those specializing in language studies.

After the introduction, in the two chapters of Part I, Fairclough presents an overview of the framework to be elaborated later in the book. He depicts three levels of social phenomena as the broad context of his framework: social structures as very abstract social entities, social practices as a mediating level between social structures and events, and social events as actual happenings. Language as an abstract phenomenon parallels social entities at the level of social structure. At the level of social practice, language appears as "orders of discourse" - that is, "a network of social practices in its language aspect" (24). At the level of social event, orders of discourse figure in text. The actualization of social-practice-level discourse (as an uncountable noun) in social-event-level text has three main aspects. These three aspects - genres, discourses (as a countable noun), and styles - are the major lines along which the author organizes the practical analytical procedure of his framework.

Genres are the actional aspect of what texts mean, discourses reflect the representational meaning, and styles include the identity-making aspect of text meaning. Fairclough's framework for analysis of texts as parts of social events involves looking at texts in terms of these three types of meaning. The threefold analysis of text meaning allows for exploring "internal" and "external" relations of texts and making connections between actual events and more abstract social practices. This conceptual web might appear complicated, especially to readers from disciplines other than language studies who might be overwhelmed by the linguistic jargon, although the author expresses his concern for avoiding linguistic terms and his attempt to move away from the "forbidding terminology of linguistics" (6). To make this further complicated, and, ironically, to explicate other aspects of the proposed analytical framework, in this first part of the book he also discusses issues of dialectical relations among the three types of meaning, genre mixing, intertextuality, and assumptions as well as some social theoretical themes like governance, the public sphere, and hegemony.

The three chapters of Part II discuss genres and the actional aspect of texts in detail. The proposed process of analysis of genres, as discoursal aspects of acting, proceeds in three steps: analysis of genre chains, analysis of mixtures of genres in particular texts, and analysis of individual genres. Although Fairclough asserts that "there is no established terminology for genres" (66), he goes on to distinguish between levels of abstraction of genres: pre-genres, dismembered genres, situated genres, and sub-genres. However, this does not seem to make

the framework any richer. Taking genre as the actional aspect of text meaning, one would need to analyze the actional meaning of sentences or longer stretches of texts rather than to specify and name genres at different levels of abstraction. The author proposes a process of analysis of individual genres in terms of three aspects: activity, that is, what is done with language; social relations between social agents; and communication technology, that is, being unidirectional/diagonal and mediated/nonmediated.

Semantic relations between sentences that actualize the generic aspect of texts are discussed and exemplified in detail. These relations include causal, conditional, temporal, additive, elaborative, and contrastive relations. Grammatical relations of parataxis, hypotaxis, and embedding are also discussed and applied to analysis of some examples. Surprisingly, higher-order generic semantic relations such as problem solution and goal achievement are only touched upon in a very brief section, but one would expect an elaborate discussion of these semantic aspects of long stretches of text. Fairclough discusses actional meaning at the sentence level in a separate chapter. He concentrates on three issues of genre analysis at the level of the individual clause: types of exchange that take place through sentences in texts, functions of speech, and grammatical mood. Examples of how text analysis is carried out in terms of these concepts are also presented throughout the chapter.

In Part III the author elaborates on discourses as the second aspect of realization of social-practice-level discourse in texts as parts of social events. Discourses are the representational aspect of texts. In Fairclough's own words, discourses "not only represent the world as it is ... they are also projective, representing possible worlds which are different from the actual world, and tied in to projects to change the world in particular directions" (124). His scheme of identifying discourses in texts includes two dimensions: identification of aspects of the world represented, and identification of the particular perspective on representing those aspects. The major characterizing features of discourses are lexical semantic relations, assumptions, and grammatical features, with vocabulary asserted to be the most obvious distinguishing feature of discourses. In the second and final chapter of this part, heavily drawing upon Halliday's (1994) systemic functional linguistics, Fairclough discusses elements of social events that can be represented in texts and different levels of abstraction in representation, along with actual examples of the representational aspect of texts.

Discourses seem to be the most significant aspect of texts, not only because representational meaning is a major type of text meaning but also because the other two major types of meaning are forms of representations, as well. Genres and styles are functional and identificational aspects of meaning, but at the same time they represent parts of the world from particular perspectives. Therefore, analysis of representations reflected in discourses could be viewed as the major part of textual analysis covering all aspects of text meaning. Considering this overarching nature of discourses, one might expect a more elaborate and extensive discussion of this aspect of texts than what Fairclough presents in these two brief chapters. Moreover, as in his discussion on textual realization of genres, Fairclough seems to be simply neglecting the higher-order textual representations such as assumptions, which can extend beyond clause level.

Part IV of the book, comprising two chapters, focuses on the identificational aspect of meaning reflected in styles. Identification as "a complex process" (160) is dealt with, ironically, in a very short chapter of only four pages. The interplay between social and personal identity, levels of abstraction of identification, and linguistic features in which styles may be realized is briefly touched upon in this chapter. In the second chapter of this final part of the book, based on the assumption that "what people commit themselves to in texts is an important part of how they identify themselves" (164), Fairclough elaborates on modality and evaluation as two major textual factors relevant to the identificational aspect of texts. How these two are realized in clauses is discussed, along with examples of their application for analyzing texts.

In the three parts of the book dealing with the three types of meaning, two issues might appear questionable. First, although the author reiterates the dialectic relationship between the three aspects of text meaning, the exact nature of the link between them is not obvious. Actional and identificational meanings might be viewed as representations, and representational meaning might be considered as an action. Therefore, how the three aspects of meaning interact dialogically needs to be discussed more. Second, the author seems to be reluctant to approach aspects of text meaning beyond the clause level and over longer stretches of text. Reducing text to sentence-level meaning, or at the most to the combination of a few neighboring sentences, could be a serious problem that might lead to ignoring higher-order aspects of text meaning over longer pieces of text, such as paragraphs. Arrangements of sentences and paragraphs and also interconnections among them throughout the text seem to be crucial aspects of texts that need to be accounted for in a framework of text analysis.

The concluding chapter has two objectives: drawing together and summarizing the details of the text analysis framework presented in the book, and presenting a "manifesto" for CDA as a general research agenda (191). Fairclough summarizes the framework in the form of questions one might ask before analyzing texts, starting with "What social event, and what chain of social events, is the text a part of?" (191). He also presents his analysis of a sample text on the basis of the framework. In his manifesto, he depicts CDA as a form of critical research. In Fairclough's view, critical social research, concerned with relations of power, control, and possibility, needs to focus on language and discourse because language is playing a crucial role in social transformations. Finally, he puts forward and briefly discusses a five-step schematic view of CDA as a "method" in the critical social analysis of language.

An extensive glossary of key terms appears after the body of the book. It includes brief notes on linguistic and social theoretical concepts discussed
throughout the chapters. Numbers after each entry of the glossary, indicating the
chapters where the concepts are used, allow cross-referencing and can be helpful
in the process of reading the book. To make the glossary more helpful, the note
on each entry contains references for further reading. A descriptive list of key
theorists is also provided. There follows an appendix of 15 example texts that
were used to exemplify theoretical discussions throughout the book.

The proposed framework offers challenging discussions for students and
researchers in various areas of linguistics. Although the book might not appear to
present a comprehensive and thoroughly delineated framework, it does admirably
contribute to CDA by attempting to inform it through an established linguistic
theory (SFL) on one hand, and by placing text and textual analysis in a broader
framework of social practices and social structures, on the other. Moreover, the
book would remind linguists of the generally neglected necessity that CDA is to
be established as a social scientific research procedure applicable by nonlinguists
as well. Researchers in social sciences and humanities, as part of the intended
audience of the book, may also benefit from the book. It would provide them with
invaluable insights into the social functioning of language and how linguistic analy-
sis might contribute to a better understanding of social structures, although they
might not be very likely independently to apply CDA as a research method solely
based on this book. The book is, therefore, a resource definitely worth reading by
students and researchers in various areas of social sciences and humanities in gen-
eral, and in linguistics and applied linguistics in particular.
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Robin Wooffitt aims to answer a question in his new book: “Analytically, what is the best way to understand everyday communicative activities?” (2). His

answer: “Conversation analysis offers the most sophisticated and robust account of language in action” (2). The remainder of the book proceeds, then, not only as an
introduction to Conversation Analysis (CA) and Discourse Analysis (DA) as
approaches to the study of language and communication in the social sciences
(specifically, sociology and European social psychology), but also as a polemic
for CA as a methodology superior to DA. The book is marketed as an intro-
ductive textbook; thus, each chapter includes periodic bulleted section summaries,
and the early introductory chapters conclude with suggestions for further read-
ing. As a textbook, this volume seems best suited for graduate seminars in lin-
guistics or sociology; it deals with theoretical and methodological disputes that
go well beyond most undergraduate students’ background knowledge or peda-
gogical needs. As a scholarly volume, it should attract attention from social sci-
entists already engaged in research utilizing CA or DA, as well as those working
with other methodologies who are interested in how CA and DA conceptualize
and investigate discourse.

The book is organized into three sections. The first, comprising chaps. 1–4,
troduces CA and DA as methodologies that emerged within the discipline of
sociology. These chapters become progressively more detailed in their descrip-
tions of CA and DA as methodologies. Chap. 1 focuses on the initial develop-
ment of these approaches within sociology, describing Harvey Sacks’s early
research on telephone call openings and Nigel Gilbert and Michael Mulkay’s
early research on sociology of science. Chap. 2 adds detail to this discussion,
describing in depth one seminal study in CA and one in DA, showing the analy-
tical moves that characterize each approach and summarizing findings that con-
tinue to influence these fields. This chapter concludes with summaries of more
general research foci and methods that characterize CA and DA. Chap. 3 dis-
cusses more recent research trends in DA and CA, starting with DA’s critique of
traditional approaches to sociology and psychology and its increasing interest in
ideology (both of which are covered in more detail later in the book). Another
CA study, on interactions in news interviews, is also discussed in detail, showing
how these findings extend those discussed in chap. 2. Finally, chap. 4 presents
the similarities and differences between CA and DA, arguing that despite com-
monalities between these approaches to discourse, they are ultimately quite dif-
ferent from each other.

Although these chapters are intended to be introductory, they set the stage for
Wooffitt’s more polemical arguments later in the book. In chap. 2, DA is subject
to the following unfavorable comparisons to CA: DA’s transcription practices
are less precise, its research terms less technical, and its procedures less formal.
Throughout these chapters, Wooffitt positions the conversation analyst as an ob-
jective, technical, and disinterested observer who “reveals how participants’ own
interpretations … inform their conduct” rather than “interpret[ing] the signifi-
cance or nature of conversational activities” (86–87; emphasis added), and “can see
directly what is relevant to the participants” (64). A conversation analyst’s

claims are "data driven, not led by theory" (65). A discourse analyst, in contrast, practices "a craft skill which relies on the development of largely tacit expertise" (43), and may, for instance, "impute an ideological significance to utterances when their design may owe more to the particular turn-taking sequences which provide an immediate interaction context" (56). In sum, Woolfitt's introductory chapters portray CA as a methodologically sophisticated, highly technical method of analysis that provides virtually unmediated access to the processes of social interaction, whereas DA is less technical and more dependent on the researcher's intuition.

The next section of the book presents three intellectual developments in DA: rhetorical psychology, discursive psychology, and critical studies. In these chapters, Woolfitt draws boundaries between all these areas, and between them and the broader field of DA. These chapters utilize these developments as a springboard for discussing how CA can enrich not only DA, but also other areas in the social sciences. Chap. 5, on rhetorical psychology, concerns studies of how speakers position their discourse as factual accounts. Woolfitt argues that DA, as opposed to rhetorical psychology, offers a superior analysis of such discourse because it is more closely aligned with CA. This chapter concludes with showing how CA, particularly Sacks's notion of "being ordinary," can influence research in the fields of parapsychology, cognitive psychology, and psychiatry. Woolfitt is most persuasive in his discussion of psychiatry, showing how CA can bring to light the interactional features of discourse that allow clinicians to discriminate delusional from nondelusional accounts of extraordinary events. Discursive psychology, covered in chap. 6, fares the best among the intellectual trends in DA in Woolfitt's estimation because of its alignment with CA. This chapter also uses parapsychology to demonstrate CA's relevance to discursive psychology, showing how "parapsychological cognition" is demonstrated in a three-turn sequence in which the third turn contains attribution of information to a paranormal source. Although they are interesting examples of applications of CA, the discussions of parapsychology seem somewhat idiosyncratic. They distract from Woolfitt's argument for the value of CA as a research methodology in the social sciences and instead work to justify parapsychology as a legitimate area of research in the social sciences.

Chap. 7 introduces critical approaches in DA, distinguishing between CDA and Foucauldian Discourse Analysis (FDA). According to Woolfitt, CDA is in many respects incompatible with CA. CDA approaches discourse with a priori assumptions that power and ideology are manifest in discourse, whereas CA does not "begin with a conception of what kind of thing discourse is" (144). Indeed, CDA, with its political commitments and emancipatory goals, "obscures and diminishes the importance of the communicative competencies which people are using as they organize their talk collaboratively" (145). The differences between CDA and FDA are identified in their approaches to text, with CDA paying closer attention to linguistic details, and in their approaches to ideology, with CDA showing a stronger commitment to Marxist notions of class and domination. These chapters introduce their respective topics in an engaging and thorough manner. Scholars unfamiliar with these topics would be well served using these chapters as starting points. For a textbook, however, it perhaps would have been preferable to organize these chapters around particular textual objects and research questions, showing how each perspective might approach a text or address a research question. This arrangement would have had the advantage of engaging students in concrete issues, rather than attempting to involve (undergraduate) students at a more theoretical level. It also would have highlighted the interrelationships, rather than the fairly esoteric distinctions, between these areas of discourse studies.

The final two chapters are the most polemical. Here Woolfitt critiques DA as a methodology and attempts to show how CA can address traditional areas of research in the social sciences. After refuting specific criticisms of CA made by the discourse analysts Michael Billig and Margaret Wetherell, Woolfitt charges that DA offers an "improvised view of human conduct" (179) in which human communicative competencies are reduced to two or maybe three discourses. Second, he argues that CDA fails to ground its claims adequately in empirical evidence. And third, Woolfitt argues that there is no systematic method for identifying discourses. These are serious charges, which discourse analysts need to consider. However, in making these charges, Woolfitt does not seem to consider the aims of DA - the kinds of data it may deal with besides interaction, or the research questions that it wishes to address that differ from those raised in CA. For example, criticizing DA's tendency to identify a small number of discourses in operation, Woolfitt asks, "Is this really all there is to say? . . . is that it?" (180). Here, Woolfitt addresses a straw man, as few if any discourse analysts set out to record exhaustively all that could be said about a particular text. Likewise, there are certainly critical discourse studies that make careful reference to their data to warrant their analytical claims, and discourse analysts are not without sophisticated ways of operationalizing their terms and outlining their methods, even if there is no single method for doing DA; it seems unusual to criticize a discipline for failing to have a single method by which all studies are conducted.

The book concludes with a consideration of how CA can address central issues in the field of sociology - specifically, power. Woolfitt describes how CA accounts for interactions in a marketplace, for turn-taking in talk radio, and for sexual harassment interactions. These examples vary in their effectiveness in showing how CA can address the role of power in society. Woolfitt's discussion of Ian Hutchby's studies of argumentative discourse on talk radio are the most effective, showing how CA can reveal unequal distribution of discursive resources that would not otherwise be apparent. The least effective is the discussion of CA in describing how sellers in a marketplace gain compliance by persuading potential buyers to purchase their goods. It is not clear from Woolfitt's discussion that CA adds very much substance to the rich literature on social influence that has been developed in the social sciences.
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The book starts rather surprisingly: "There is no contradiction here to summarise"
C. Oger. “L’analyse du discours institutionnel entre formations discursives et problématiques socio-anthropologiques.”


