

Research Project:

***The spatialization and racialization of social exclusion.  
The social and cultural formation of "Gypsy ghettos"  
in Romania in a European context.***

IDEI - PN-II-ID-PCE-2011-3-0354

Project Coordinator: Prof. Enikő Magyari-Vincze (UBBC)

Principal Investigator of the Polish Team: Prof. Michał Buchowski (UAM)

# **Working Paper 1: Public Discourse Analysis**

*by*

***Monika Witkowska***

***Michał Krzyżanowski***

***Michał Buchowski***

Poznań, May 2012

## **Copyright Notice:**

**This working paper is subject to copyright and for project-internal use only. As it is a draft and contains elements of unpublished work it is not to be made public either in print or electronically and can only be distributed strictly among the participants of the project mentioned above.**

## **About the Authors:**

**Monika Witkowska** is a postgraduate student at the School of English, Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań. She is currently completing her MA Thesis on the topic of “*The image of the Roma in the media: The contrastive analysis of the British and Polish news reports*”. Email contact: [mwitkowska888@gmail.com](mailto:mwitkowska888@gmail.com)

**Michał Krzyżanowski** (MA, PhD, Dr. Habil) is currently Assistant Professor at the School of English, Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań with his recent appointments also including those of a Visiting Professor in Media and Communication Studies, Örebro University or a Senior Research Fellow in Linguistics and English Language, Lancaster University. He has previously also worked at Department of Linguistics University of Vienna. Michał has researched widely on socio-political change in Europe from perspectives of discourses of the media, of political and organisational communication and of linguistic constructions of discrimination and social exclusion. He also works extensively on qualitative research methodologies incl. focus groups as well as combinations of ethnography or conceptual analysis and critical discourse studies. Michał has published extensively on those topics and is the author, co-author and editor of several monographs, journal articles and major anthologies (for details, see: [http://ifa.amu.edu.pl/fa/krzyzanowski\\_michal](http://ifa.amu.edu.pl/fa/krzyzanowski_michal)). He is also Associate Editor for *Journal of Language and Politics* and serves on editorial boards of, inter alia, *Critical Discourse Studies* and *Qualitative Sociology Review*. E-mail contact: [mkrzyzanowski@ifa.amu.edu.pl](mailto:mkrzyzanowski@ifa.amu.edu.pl)

**Michał Buchowski** (MA, PhD, Dr. Habil, Prof.) is a Full Professor and Director of Department of Social Anthropology at Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań where he also heads the AMU Centre for Migration Research. He also holds the Chair of Comparative Central and East European Studies at the Viadrina European University, Frankfurt/Oder and has held numerous visiting appointments in Europe and the USA. He was the President of European Association of Social Anthropologists (2009-10) and is currently serving as a President of World Council of Anthropological Associations (WCAA), President of Polish Ethnological Society (since 2005) as well as a Member of the Max Planck Institute for Social Anthropology (since 2010). He is the author of numerous works in the field of social and political anthropology and published especially in such areas as social and political transformation and change and constructions of identity and difference. For full list of publications, see: <http://www.kuwi.europa-uni.de/de/lehrstuhl/vs/mitteleuropa>. E-mail contact: [mbuch@amu.edu.pl](mailto:mbuch@amu.edu.pl)

## **1. Introduction**

The aim of this paper is to make readers acquainted with the perspective of Critical Discourse Analysis (henceforth CDA), especially from the point of view of its application to research on public discourses about Roma. A brief summary of the origins of CDA, its characterization and a short description of schools and trends of research and key research foci will be provided. The paper will then focus on the Discourse Historical Approach (DHA) in CDA which proposes an array of methods of analyzing discriminatory public discourses at different levels of their organization and in different spaces and genres (Krzyżanowski 2010, Reisigl and Wodak 2001, van Leeuwen 1996). The efficiency of DHA methods is eventually demonstrated on the example of a short case study investigating discriminatory discourse against the Roma in British and Polish press (Witkowska 2012).

## **2. Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA)**

### **2.1. Origins of CDA**

Critical discourse analysis is an interdisciplinary research tradition at the intersection of humanities and social sciences (cf. Krzyżanowski 2010, Krzyżanowski and Wodak, 2009, Wodak and Krzyżanowski 2008). Van Dijk (2007: XIX) describes Discourse Studies as “a new ‘cross-discipline’ or even a ‘trans-discipline’” inasmuch as it manifests itself various disciplines within the field of social sciences and humanities. This field of study originated from several disciplines and the story of its emergence was extensively summarized by van Dijk (2007: XIX-XXII, 1983: 21-23). It needs to be stated that the summary provides only subjectively chosen examples of studies within particular fields and there are numerous other equally important, which were less fortunate and did not appear in this synopsis.

Van Dijk notices that the early beginnings of Discourse Studies may be traced back to the mid 1960s, when new interrelated disciplines started to emerge. One of the first scholars recognizing the importance of the study of discourse were anthropologists, who investigated communicative events (Hymes 1972) delved into

*ethnography of speaking* (Bauman et al. 1974) or, later, worked under the broad label of linguistic anthropology (Duranti 2001). During the very same decade, also linguists began to realize that language is not an abstract and isolated structure of sounds, morphemes or sentences but it reaches far 'beyond the sentence'. These linguists (Dressler 1972, van Dijk 1972) departed from structural and generative grammar in Chomskyan sense and turned their attention to actual language use, which was labeled *text* and *discourse grammar*. However, text grammarians were not the only ones interested in discourse within the field of linguistics. The Hallidayan Functional Systemic Grammar (Halliday et al. 1976), later adopted by many other researchers (e.g. Martin 1992), as well regarded aspects of discourse as important.

Roughly about that time when anthropologists and linguists 'discovered' discourse, a new discipline emerged, namely pragmatics. Among the most influential works within this field for van Dijk were (and probably still are) the ones of Austin (1962), Searle (1969) and Grice (1975). Pragmatics focused on various facets of contextually based use of language and, therefore, many researchers interested in language use beyond grammar worked under this label. Similarly, 1960s brought to light another new discipline, i.e. semiotics which has its roots in the study of arts and literature. This study of signs and symbols, originated by Peirce, advanced after publishing influential works by Barthes (1964) and Eco (1976). Semiotics analysed not only language and discourse but also images, films or architecture.

Furthermore, the interest in people's everyday life led sociology to develop *ethnomethodology* which, among others, focused on the discourse. As van Dijk reports, initially Goffman (1959) and Garfinkel (1967) influenced Sacks, Schlegloff and Jefferson (1974) who, in turn, popularized the study of conversation. Conversation Analysis, generally, closely investigated interactional properties of spontaneous talk, such as turn-taking or strategic moves, which involved detailed transcriptions. Within the field of social sciences, at the end of 1960s the emergence of sociolinguistics was also recorded. Sociolinguists scrutinized the actual language use and its relation to social categories, for example gender, status or age. Some of the studies conducted within this field and later within *interactional sociolinguistics* analysed details of interaction in specific social contexts (Gumperz 1982).

In his overview, van Dijk recognizes that cognitive psychology, probably as the youngest mother-discipline in discourse studies, expanded its reach to discourse and its production, comprehension and memory (van Dijk et al. 1983). The psychology of text processing developed at the beginning of the next decade, namely 1970s. The practical application of these studies in, for instance, mass media and education resulted in considerable popularity. As well research on Artificial Intelligence had much to contribute to the studies of relations between discourse processing and knowledge (Schank et al. 1977).

As has been shown by van Dijk (2007: XIX-XXII), despite the fact that anthropology, linguistics, pragmatics, semiotics, Conversation Analysis, sociolinguistics, the psychology of text processing and Artificial Intelligence have different backgrounds, various objects of study and methods, they do share some characteristics. Van Dijk (2007: XXII) successfully presents all these characteristics. In the first place, the above-mentioned disciplines focus not on abstract or invented structures but on 'naturally occurring' language use. Consequently, one may observe the shift from isolated words and sentences to the larger units of analysis, such as discourses or communicative events which, in turn, leads to the analysis of action and interaction. Additionally, these disciplines did not restrict themselves to verbal communication and also investigated non-verbal aspects, such as gestures or images. The last common ground is the investigation of the role of contexts (cognitive, cultural and social) of language use.

The relation between this brief outline of Discourse Studies antecedents and Critical Linguistics (later CDA) is well captured by Wodak (2006):

Since 1979, this general approach has been refined, broadened, changed and re-applied by other linguists coming from very different traditions, many of whom believe that the relationship between language and the social, because of its complex and multifaceted character, requires interdisciplinary research. Scholars from background including sociolinguistics, formal linguistics, social psychology and literary studies have contributed to the growth of the tradition, and have directed CL research into subject domains such as racism, ethnicity, gender studies, political oratory, etc. (Wodak 2006: 5)

The contributions of the above-described fields of study are still visible in the premises and studies conducted within Critical Discourse Analysis framework which emerged at the end of 1970s.

## **2.2. CDA As an Interdisciplinary Research Tradition**

To avoid misunderstanding and confusion, it needs to be underlined that CDA is not (and never intended to be) one homogenous theory or single methodology. Instead, it attempts to “offer a different ‘mode’ or ‘perspective’ of theorizing, analysis, and application throughout the whole field” (van Dijk 2001: 352). Studies under the label of CDA are manifold, originated in various theoretical frameworks and aiming at various methodology, research foci and data. This diversity creates a valuable basis for open discussions or innovations (Wodak 2006: 2). What connects critical discourse analysts, it is the premise that language is a *social practice* (Fairclough and Wodak 1997) and the focus on real language of real people (Krzyżanowski 2010: 67). Wodak (2002) provides an extensive characterization of CDA, thus her paper constitutes the basis for the following description.

As Wodak (2006: 1) notes, Critical Linguistics is a theory which is being recently replaced by the term Critical Discourse Analysis, however, this assumption is not shared by all the researchers within CDA. For van Dijk (1993b: 131), CDA and CL are “at most a shared perspective on doing linguistic, semiotic or discourse analysis”. This “shared perspective” concerns the very term *critical*, which Wodak (2002: 2) defines after Krings as “the practical linking of ‘social and political engagement’ with ‘a sociologically informed construction of society’” (Krings et al. 1973: 808, as cited in Wodak 2002: 2). Simultaneously, she recognizes after Fairclough that “in human matters, interconnections and chains of cause and effect may be distorted out of vision. Hence ‘critique’ is essentially making visible the interconnectedness of things” (Fairclough 1985: 747, as cited in Wodak 2002: 2). CDA, as a critical theory, should aim at enlightenment by means of critical analysis of not only transparent but also opaque structural relationships of power and control. This investigation focuses on social inequality and how it is expressed, legitimized or resisted via language use (van Dijk 1995: 18, 2001: 352, Wodak 2006: 3, 2002: 2). Wodak further notices that CDA generally supports the claim of Habermas that “language is also a medium of domination and social force. (...) language is also ideological” (Habermas 1977: 259, as cited in Wodak 2002: 2). It was later expanded by Fairclough and Wodak (1997) in their discussion on discourse which is both, socially conditioned and also socially constitutive:

It is constitutive both in the sense that it helps to sustain and reproduce the social status quo, and in the sense that it contributes to transforming it. Since discourse is so socially

consequential, it gives rise to important issues of power. Discursive practices may have major ideological effects – that is, they can help produce and reproduce unequal power relations between (for instance) social classes, women and men, and ethnic/cultural majorities and minorities through the ways in which they represent things and position people” (Fairclough and Wodak 1997: 258)

Thus, CDA tries to decipher ideologies and, consequently, “demystify” discourses (Wodak 2006: 4). The assumptions on ideology within CDA are in line with Bernstein’s focus on power and control, which is derived from Marxian theories concerning social structure and class (Krzyżanowski 2010: 67). Since one of the crucial relations investigated is that between language and power, and language is not powerful as such but only gains power from powerful people who use it, the focus of CDA is on institutional, media and political discourses (Wodak 2002: 1-3, 6).

Van Dijk (1995: 17-19) and Wodak (2006: 6-7) list several general tenets of CDA briefly summarized below. In the first place, CDA is problem- or issue-oriented, so social problems are objects of research. Secondly, they stress the fact that CDA is inter- or even multi-disciplinary. The nature of society and its problems is too complex and manifold, hence it needs to be studied from various perspective, not a single one. CDA draws its inferences from many diverse areas, such as ethnography, stylistics, sociolinguistics, media analysis, pragmatics, conversation analysis or narrative analysis. Furthermore, it may be said that the theories and methodologies are eclectic since they are integrated to be adequate for a particular study. Thus, as long as a theoretical and methodological approach is effective, it may be utilized. CDA uses an abductive approach (it is necessary to move back and forth between empirical data and theories), because CDA studies may incorporate fieldwork and ethnography. Additionally, studies may focus on all levels of discourse (for instance phonology, syntax and speech acts) but they also may not limit themselves to *verbal discourse*. CDA investigates also other semiotic dimensions, like gestures, fonts or pictures. However, not only various levels are analysed but also different genres and intertextual dimensions, as well as the historical and social contexts (Wodak and Bush 2004: 107). Notwithstanding, the key aspect and aim of CDA is application and practice and the results of various analyses should lead to the changes of social and discursive practices. As van Dijk (1995: 19) stresses, works in CDA must be effective.

Additionally, since CDA generally deals with an oppositional study of elite discourse (and also discourse against domination) and its consequences, it: “goes beyond the usual methodological criteria of observational, descriptive and explanatory adequacy. Adding the criterion of critical adequacy presupposes social norms and values and introduces a social or political ethics (what we find wrong or right) within the scholarly enterprise as such” (van Dijk 1995: 19). Therefore, critics often accuse CDA of being political, subjective and unscientific by contrast with the ‘objective’ uncritical work. However, academic research is not only inherent in social and political life but also influenced by social structure, hence, it is always political. “Unlike other, implicitly political studies of discourse, CDA explicitly formulates its (oppositional) stance” (van Dijk 1995: 19). This stance may lead to, for example, conducting research in cooperation with dominated groups (van Dijk 2001: 353).

### **2.3. CDA: Schools and research foci**

Since CDA mostly deals with power, social inequality and domination, gender inequality is among the widest areas of critical research. The feminist studies question traditional masculine-feminine splits and unveil discrimination of women (Wodak and Busch 2004: 115-116). The very same focus on social inequality leads many analysts to undertake the topic of racism, hate speech and ethnocentrism. Another popular field of study is media discourse inasmuch as various researchers draw their inspiration from the power of the media (van Dijk 2001: 359-360). Seeing that political discourse is probably the most apparent vehicle for reproduction and legitimization of power, numerous researches were focused on political texts or speeches (van Dijk 2001: 360-361).

As has been stated above, studies under the label of CDA are manifold, thus one may find various schools or trends. They work on different methodologies, from large data corpora to small case studies in order to investigate various subjects. Among the most influential and well-known trends there is Social Semiotics, Foucauldian poststructuralism, The Socio-cognitive Model and Discourse-Historical Approach which are very well summarized by Wodak (2006: 7-19).

Wodak begins her description with Social Semiotics. The basis for it was Halliday’s theory on the connections between social and personal needs and grammatical

system of language. He created a model of three interconnected metafunctions of language, namely ideational, interpersonal and textual functions. A researcher who was heavily influenced by Halliday was surely Gunter Kress. He used to work within Critical Linguistics but then he shifted to a social-semiotic perspective. For Kress, the goal of research is “to connect the specificities of semiotic forms, in any medium, with the specificities of social organizations and social histories” (Kress 1993: 176f, as cited in Wodak 2006: 7). Kress was particularly interested in the analysis of visual media, as may be observed in the work of Kress and van Leeuwen (1990). Van Leeuwen is another researcher who, for Wodak, is worth mentioning with respect to social semiotics. He studied the production of film and television but also the semiotics of music. Recently, he focused on visual communication, such as handwriting or even colour. Van Leeuwen, together with Kress, developed a taxonomy which enables scholars the precise interpretation and description of visual data. He also developed one of the most influential method of written and oral data analysis, namely the Actor Analysis (Wodak and Busch 2004: 110-111).

Next trend within CDA is the Foucauldian poststructuralism, with Fairclough as one of the greatest representatives. He, just like Kress and van Leeuwen, bases his research on Hallidayan theories. Fairclough “sees the value of CDA as a method to be used alongside others in research on social and cultural change, and as a resource in struggles against exploitation and domination” (Fairclough 1993: 133-134, as cited in Wodak 2006: 11). His main research area is power and institutional discourse in which he stresses the intertextuality of different social practices. Wodak notes that Fairclough perceives language as being always constitutive of social relations, knowledge and beliefs, and social identities. He also invalidated the claim that media institutions are neutral, objective and they serve as a space for public discourse and presents the constructing and mediating role of the media (Wodak 2006: 12).

Another trend mentioned by Wodak is known under the label of the socio-cognitive model. Thanks to the work on reproduction of racism in discourse, van Dijk is considered the most famous representative of this approach. He scrutinized the role of, for example, the news media (van Dijk 1991) or elites discourse (van Dijk 1993a) in the (re)production of ethnic prejudices. Van Dijk, however, did not limit himself to

identifying structures of texts but he also wanted to investigate relations between racism and cognition (Wodak 2006: 13-14). Van Dijk bases his socio-cognitive model on the assumption that “cognition mediates between ‘society’ and ‘discourse’” (van Dijk 2006: 359). Another focus of van Dijk’s analysis was on mass media communication (van Dijk 1986).

However, the focal point for this paper is Discourse-Historical Approach (DHA), represented mainly by Ruth Wodak and her Vienna group (currently also prominently represented in, inter alia, Lancaster – UK, Bern – Switzerland or Poznań - Poland). This approach was derived directly from linguistics, having its roots in, for example, linguistic pragmatics, sociolinguistics or linguistic discourse analysis (Reisigl 2007: 6, as cited in: Krzyżanowski 2010: 72). They “base their model on sociolinguistics in the Bernsteinian tradition, and on ideas of the Frankfurt school, especially those of Jurgen Habermas” (Wodak 2006: 14), on Michael Foucault’s discourse theory and on Wittgenstein’s language games (Krzyżanowski 2010: 72). DHA tries to integrate all background information (historical background but also the original historical sources) in the interpretation of all layers of a text since research shows the impact of the context on the function, structure and content of discourse (e.g. Reisigl and Wodak 2001). The focus of DHA is on discursive and linguistic elements, social practices and their in-depth examination, not on language as such (Wodak 2006: 14-16, Wodak et al. 1999, as cited in: Krzyżanowski 2010: 71-72).

“The study in which and for which this approach was developed attempted to trace in detail the constitution of an anti-Semitic stereotyped image as it emerged in public discourse in the 1986 Austrian presidential campaign of Kurt Waldheim” (Wodak 2006: 15) but scholars working within DHA investigate various subjects. Wodak herself investigated sexism, racism, dealing with ‘problematic’ history, institutional communication, national and supranational discourses about Europe and, moreover, speech barriers (in schools or hospitals courts). The main aim of her research is its practical application, such as guidelines for more effective doctor-patient communication and non-discriminatory language. Another application is to provide experts opinions during trials on racist language used by the media (Wodak 2006: 14-16, Krzyżanowski 2010: 74-75). “The discourse-historical approach is designed to enable the analysis of indirect prejudiced utterances, as well as to identify and

expose the codes and allusions contained in prejudiced discourse” (Wodak 2006: 15). Various studies on racism and prejudice contributed to the development of general and theoretical reflection on racist discourse (its content and form) about ethnic minorities or immigrants (Wodak 2006: 15).

#### **2.4. Key terms in CDA studies**

Not surprisingly, one of the most important notions for CDA is discourse. It was stated previously that CDA regards “discourse (...) as a form of ‘social practice’” (Fairclough and Wodak 1997: 258). However from this place, this notion is narrowed to the DHA understanding of discourse which follows Lemke (1995) who sees discourse as:

the social activity of making meanings with language and other symbolic systems on some particular kind of situation or setting. (...) On each occasion when the particular meaning characteristic of these discourses is being made, a specific text is produced. (...) When we want to focus on the specifics of an event or occasion, we speak of the text; when we want to look at patterns, commonality, relationships that embrace different texts and occasions, we can speak of discourses (Lemke 1995: 7, as cited in: Krzyżanowski 2010: 75-76).

Consequently, one cannot understand discourses without texts and the other way round (Krzyżanowski 2010: 76).

Since discourse has already been defined as a concept, other important notions in relation to discourse also should be explained. One of the crucial aspects is *genre*. Traditionally (in literary criticism), it means particular categories of forms, such as poetry, fiction or drama (Shaenen 2010: 29). Generally within discourse studies genres are kinds of texts which “do different things”. Social purpose is the reason for textual differences of texts (Cope and Kalantzis 1993: 7). Later, Chapman developed the definition of genre to “a typified form of discourse or way of organizing or structuring discourse, shaped by and in response to recurring situational contexts” (Chapman 1994: 352).

The next term to be described is *recontextualisation*, which is derived from Bernstein’s work in which he characterized recontextualising principle of discourse as “a principle for appropriating other discourses and bringing them into a special relation with each other for the purposes of their selection, transmission and acquisition” (Bernstein, 1990: 183– 184). Recontextualisation was further defined by Krzyżanowski (2010: 78) who defines recontextualisation as a two-step process in

which elements of particular discourses are taken out of their original context (decontextualisation) and strategically placed into a different context. Recontextualisation manifests itself in the interdiscursivity of texts, hence, this processes should be investigated by focusing on this particular dimension of texts (Wodak and Fairclough 2010: 24).

Since the notion of interdiscursivity has been already touched upon, it needs further explanations proposed by, e.g., Krzyżanowski (2010). As the author argues, “[D]iscourse provides meaning-related links between different texts embedded within respective fields” (Krzyżanowski 2010: 76-77). This linkage constitutes a principle of interdiscursivity which is an extension of intertextuality, viz. theme-related connections between texts (e.g. Duszak 1998, Wodak 1996). Interdiscursivity explains the fact that discursive practices are connected in synchronic and diachronic terms (Krzyżanowski 2010: 77). Intertextuality may be seen on two levels: “the combination in discourse of different genres of different discourses” and “the presence in my discourse of the specific words of the other mixed with my words as for instance reported speech” (Chouliaraki and Fairclough 1999 : 49). To illustrate, Krzyżanowski claims that interdiscursivity occurs when one argument typical for one type of discourse is recontextualised in another discursive form. It generally takes place to achieve pre-defined goals. Interdiscursivity occurs via linkages between both, discourses in general, and their various elements, for instance genres or topics (Krzyżanowski 2010: 77).

As has been stated in the description of DHA, this approach stresses the importance of context in the analysis of discourse. Van Dijk sees context: “as a broader abstract concept which grasps the dynamic relation between physical ‘setting’ and discursively-funded (social) actions undertaken therein by different individual and collective actors” (van Dijk 1977 as cited in: Krzyżanowski 2010: 78). Analysing context demands recognizing its constructive nature since contexts are not just ‘given’. They are, to large extent, dependant on subjective factors and dynamic processes of discursive negotiations. It is important to understand the role of context as actual elements of communication, not only the physical and stable settings of communication. Hence, one recognizes the role of actors in co-constructing contexts (Krzyżanowski 2010: 78). Van Dijk illustrates it as follows:

Contexts are thus not some kind of objective condition or direct cause, but rather (inter)subjective constructs designed and ongoingly updated in interaction by participants as members of groups and communities. If contexts were objective social conditions and constraints, all people in the same social situation would speak in the same way (2008: x as cited in Krzyżanowski 2010: 78).

DHA recognizes various levels of context: the immediate one (language and text-internal co-texts), the interdiscursive relationship, the extra-linguistic social variables and the broad historical and socio-political context. All of the above must be related in the analysis of discourse. Moreover, DHA aims at investigating not only the context of discourse production, but also the reception of it (Wodak 2001: 67 as cited in Krzyżanowski 2010: 79).

Departing for a moment from the 'technical' aspects of discourse, the notion of ideology should be briefly described. Thompson notices that the concept of ideology emerged in France in eighteenth century and but is still is in use. In his understanding, "ideology refers to social forms and processes within which, and by means of which, symbolic forms circulate in the social world" (Thompson 1990, as cited in Wodak 2002: 10). Furthermore, Reisigl and Wodak see ideology as an (often) one-sided world view which is shared by a social group and is (re-)constructed in discourse. Therefore, ideology is linked to social and discursive actions (Reisigl and Wodak 2009: 88, as cited in: Krzyżanowski 2010: 73). CDA recognizes ideology as a crucial aspect of "establishing and maintaining unequal power relations" (Wodak 2002: 10).

If ideology is considered to be a tool for creating and sustaining power relations, the question is what power actually is. "Power is about relations of difference, and particularly about the effects of differences in social structures" (Wodak 2002: 11). Additionally, van Dijk (2001) defines (social) power by *control* which means that a powerful person or group is able to control (to some extent) the minds and acts of other person (or group). This power is attained through, so-called *power base*, namely the access to knowledge, money, fame, status, public discourse and "culture" among others. However, it needs to be stressed that power is very rarely absolute. Groups may only to some extent control other groups or the control is possible in specific situations. Additionally, dominated groups apart from accepting and legitimating power may also resist it. (van Dijk 2001: 355). The relationship between

language and power is very close because language may express power and it can also challenge it or alter its distribution. Language constitutes a fine tool for exhibiting power and therefore, CDA aims at examining how linguistic structures are used to exert power, for example through grammatical forms or the choice of genres (Wodak 2002: 11, Krzyżanowski 2010: 73). “This attempt to uncover the discursive means of mental control and social influence implies a critical and oppositional stance *against the powerful and the elites*, and especially those who abuse their power” (van Dijk 1995: 18). Studies within CDA also attempt to formulate a perspective of solidarity with the domineered group, for instance by creating strategies for the development of counter-power and counter-ideologies (van Dijk 1995: 18).

### **3. Levels and Categories of analysis**

The analysis in line with DHA operates on two levels, of the so-called *thematic* and *in-depth analysis*. The latter follows, inter alia, analytical categories described by Reisigl and Wodak (2001) – Strategies of Self- and Other-Presentation and Van Leeuwen (1996) – The Social Actors Representation. The application of methods will be illustrated by a summary of a case study investigating discriminatory language against the Roma (Witkowska 2012).

#### **3.1. Thematic analysis**

The first step in the analysis of discourse is a thematic analysis, sometimes referred to as an entry-level analysis. The reason for this preliminary analysis is to determine the contents of the analyzed material and to attribute it to particular genres of discourses. The analytical category in this step of analysis is a *discourse topic*, which was reintroduced to CDA by Teun van Dijk (1977):

“In theoretical terms such topics can be described as semantic macro-propositions, that is, as propositions that are derived from sequences of propositions in the text: for instance, by macro-rules such as selection, abstraction, and other operations which reduce complex information. The hierarchical set of topics or macro-propositions forms the thematic or topical structure of the text. Language users employ such *macro-structures* in order to understand globally and to summarize a text” (van Dijk 1991: 113 as cited in Krzyżanowski 2010: 81).

Generally, discourse topics may be perceived as the summary and gist of a text, they also establish the most important information (Krzyżanowski 2010: 81).

In the analysis, discourse topics are defined in an inductive way. After several scrupulous readings, the macro-topic is found (an overall topic) and then, the topics (or also sub-topics) of parts of a text are decoded in a top-down way. Afterwards, these discourse topics are ordered and the list of key themes and sub-themes is prepared (Krzyżanowski 2010: 81).

### **3.2. In-depth Analysis**

In-depth analysis, in contrast to thematic analysis, examines ‘deeper’ located discourse structures. As Krzyżanowski (2010) states, it “is primarily argumentation-oriented and aims to reveal how different elements of discourse are endowed with pragmatic meaning and thus placed within different arguments according to the more-or-less strategic aims set up by the speakers/authors of texts” (Krzyżanowski 2010: 83). During the in-depth step of analysis, an analyst establishes the discursive strategies, linguistic means and the specific linguistic realizations (Reisigl and Wodak 2001: 44).

#### **3.2.1. Strategies of Self and Other Presentation**

The Strategies of Self- and Other-presentation, described by Reisigl and Wodak (2001) when applied to the analysis of discriminatory, racist and stereotypical discourse generally try to answer five questions:

How are persons named and referred to linguistically? What traits, characteristics, qualities and features are attributed to them? By means of what arguments and argumentation schemes do specific persons or social groups try to justify and legitimize the exclusion, discrimination, suppression and exploitation of others? From what perspective or point of view are these naming, attributions and arguments expressed? Are the respective discriminating utterances articulated overtly, are they even intensified or are they mitigated? (Reisigl and Wodak 2001: 44)

These above-mentioned questions delineate the schema of analyzing five discursive strategies, which contribute to the positive self- and negative other-presentation. The term *strategy* is used here to denominate a plan of practices (which is more or less accurate and intentional) which is used in order to achieve, for instance, a social, political or linguistic goal. When it comes to discursive practices, they appear at various levels of linguistic organization (Reisigl and Wodak 2001: 44). Reisigl and Wodak (2001: 44-85) distinguish five different strategies, namely referential/nomination strategy; predicational strategy; argumentation strategy;

perspectivation, framing or discourse representation strategy and intensifying/mitigation strategy. The aforementioned strategies are traced by means of responding to the following, generalized research questions:

- a. *Referential and Nomination Strategies* (Reisigl and Wodak, 2001: 45) - („how are persons named and referred to linguistically?”, *ibid.*: 44);
- b. *Predicational Strategies* (*ibid.*: 45) - („What traits, characteristics,, qualities and features are attributed to them?”, *ibid.*: 44);
- c. *Argumentation Strategies* (*ibid.*: 45) - („By means of what arguments and argumentation schemes do specific persons or social groups try to justify and legitimise the exclusion, discrimination, suppression and exploitation of others?”, *ibid.*: 44);
- d. *Strategies of Perspectivation, Framing or Discourse Representation* (*ibid.*: 45) - („From what perspective or point of view are these naming, attributions and arguments expressed”, *ibid.*: 44); and
- e. *Intensifying and Mitigation Strategies* (*ibid.*: 45) - („Are the respective discriminating utterances articulated overtly, are they even intensified or are they mitigated”, *ibid.*: 44).

The first strategy described above, i.e. referential/nomination strategy, aims at constructing and representing social actors. Not surprisingly, the simplest and elementary discriminatory form is a demeaning or derogatory name, such as the use of single anthroponymic terms, e.g. ‘Nigger’. The devices used for this strategy mostly fall into membership categorization, e.g. using biological, naturalizing and depersonalizing metaphors or using synecdoches (totum pro pars or pars pro toto). Reisigl and Wodak in their method of analysis adapt some of van Leeuwen’s (1993, see below for more detailed description) concepts, however, they also reconstruct some of them. The list of potential referential strategies potential featured in this section is adapted (and gently shortened) from Reisigl and Wodak (2001: 48-52).

Selected Strategies	Linguistic Means	Examples of realisations
<b>Collectivisation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Deictics</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We, us, them, family, group, tribe, population,</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• collectives</li> </ul>	community, race
<b>Spatialisation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• toponyms used as metonymies or/and personifications</li> <li>• anthroponyms referring to a person in terms of living on a place</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Great Britain, Poland</li> <li>• Inhabitant, resident</li> </ul>
<b>De-spatialisation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• De-toponymic anthroponyms</li> <li>• De-adverbial anthroponyms</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Englishman/Englishwoman, Europeans, Africans</li> <li>• Outsider, insider</li> </ul>
<b>Explicit Dissimilation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• xenonyms</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the others, stranger</li> </ul>
<b>Originalisation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• origonyms</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• natives, autochtones, ancestors</li> </ul>
<b>Actionalisation/Professionalisation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• actionyms/praxonyms and professionyms</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• migrant, criminal, worker, employee, clerk</li> </ul>
<b>Somatisation</b>		
1. racialisation (and colouring)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 'racionyms' (often based on colour metaphors and selected body meronyms)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Blacks, red-skins, coloured, whites</li> </ul>
2. 'enageing'	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gerontonyms</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The aged, youngsters, child, parents, generation</li> </ul>
3. Reference in terms of bodily activities, including insufficient bodily control	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Anthroponyms denoting bodily activities [actionyms]</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wanker, passer-by, traveler, climber</li> </ul>
4. Reference in terms of mental deficiency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Anthroponyms denoting mental deficiency</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Idiot, fool</li> </ul>
5. Reference in terms of 'bad', negatively sanctioned, abusive actions or habits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Negative habitonyms [actionyms]</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Drug user, drug addict</li> </ul>

6. Reference in terms of sexual orientation or habits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Anthroponyms referring to persons in terms of their sexual orientation or habits</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Heterosexual, homosexual, lesbian, gay, bisexual, sado-masochist</li> </ul>
7. ethnification	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ethnonyms</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gypsies, Romanians, Poles, nationals</li> </ul>
8. linguification	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• linguonyms</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• German-speaking persons, stammerer</li> </ul>
9. Religionalisation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• religionyms</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Christ, Muslims, Jews</li> </ul>
10. primitivisation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• synecdochism or metonymic anthroponyms denoting 'primitivity' or lack of civilisation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• barefooted, barbarian</li> </ul>
<b>Economisation</b>		
1. profesionalisation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• professionyms</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• worker, labourer, employees, clerks</li> </ul>
2. '(de-)possessivisation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Anthroponyms referring to persons in terms of possessing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rich, poor, owner</li> </ul>
3. problematisation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• (negative) metaphorical anthroponyms</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Guest worker</li> </ul>
<b>'Politicisation'</b>		
1. nationalisation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• nationyms</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• nationals, Romanians, Poles</li> </ul>
2. 'classification'	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• classonyms</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the rich, the poor, high society, upper class</li> </ul>
3. party political alignment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• party names [often metaphors and synecdoches]</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the Greens, the Reds</li> </ul>
4. rough political alignment (polarization)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• anthroponyms referring to persons in terms of rough political orientation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• leftists, right-wing extremists</li> </ul>
5. 'organisationalisation'	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Names of political organizations (political organisationyms)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Committee, parliament, party</li> </ul>
6. 'professionalisation'	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• anthroponyms referring to persons in terms of political</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• politician, minister, major</li> </ul>

	profession (political professionyms	
7. political actionalisation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>anthroponyms referring to persons in terms of political activities [actionyms]</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>voters</li> </ul>
8. granting or deprivation of political rights	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>anthroponyms referring to persons in terms of assigning somebody political rights or of depriving somebody of rights</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>citizens, non-citizens, refugees, voters</li> </ul>
9. ascription of membership to supranational political organisations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>anthroponyms referring to persons in terms of membership to supranational political organisations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>EU citizens</li> </ul>
10. Ascription of being or not being in need of political support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>anthroponyms referring to persons in terms of being or not being in need of political support</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>asylum-seekers, refugees</li> </ul>
<b>Social Problematisation</b>		
1. negation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>specific negative qualionyms, negationyms</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>illegals, unemployed, unskilled</li> </ul>
2. criminalisation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>criminonyms</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>criminals, illegals, dealers, gang, murderer, perpetrator</li> </ul>
3. negative ideologisation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>negative ideologysms</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>racist, nationalist, sexist, Nazi, fascist, right-wing extremist</li> </ul>
4. pathologisation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>pathologonyms</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>psychopath, nymphomaniac</li> </ul>
5. victimisation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>victionyms</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>victim</li> </ul>
<b>Relationalisation/ Sociativisation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>relationyms/ sociatives</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>enemies/opponents, victim, victimizer, friends, children, relatives, compatriots</li> </ul>

Table 1. The list of referential potential (adapted from Reisigl and Wodak 2001: 48-52).

The referential strategy is closely interrelated with the second of the aforementioned strategies, namely predicational strategy. Predication is understood as the process of

ascribing qualities through which people (but also objects, animals, social phenomena etc.) are characterized by means of e.g. quality or time and space. Predication may be realized by forms of reference, attributes, collocations, comparisons, allusions and many others. Predications may be derogatory or appreciative, specific or evasive, explicit or implicit. This strategy may be realized by attaching stereotypical and negative traits to minority members in order to achieve negative other-presentation and contrasting them with a positive self-image.

The third strategy in the Reisigl and Wodak's (2001) method is strongly connected with manipulation, persuasion and discursive legitimation of discrimination. For the purpose of pseudo-argumentatively backing and strengthening the discriminatory discourses, fallacies and topoi (see below) are employed. Among the fallacies (violations of rules of constructive arguing, see van Eemeren and Grotendorst 1992; Krzyżanowski 2010, Reisigl and Wodak 2001) frequently employed in the racist discourse, one may find *argumentum ad hominem* (personal attacks), *argumentum ad populum* (populist appeals), *argumentum ad ignorantiam* (appeal to ignorance), *argumentum ad verecundiam* (supporting one's views with the use of authorities) or *secundum quid* (hasty generalizations).

The second key category in the analysis of argumentative strategies is the notion of topos. Nowadays, topoi are seen as "headings under which arguments can be classified" (Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca 1969: 83 as cited in Krzyżanowski 2010: 83). The notion of topos is also used in pragma-dialectical approach which sees it as argumentation schemes. It means that topoi are 'signals' (summaries) which let interlocutors know what is the (strategic, i.e. often extra-linguistic) aim of the argument. For the use of the current study, we define topoi as

"certain headings of arguments which, in a way, summarise the argument while also providing it with a necessary 'skeleton' which is fleshed over by respective discourse contents. Therefore, the analysis aims to discover the links which are established in the course of analysis between the levels of mapping of those contents (i.e. topics) and establish the argumentation schemes (i.e. *topoi*) deployed, and related linguistic aspects" (Krzyżanowski 2010: 85),.

The most common topoi used in racist and discriminatory discourses are, in ter alia, (cf. Reisigl and Wodak, 2001): the topos of danger/threat (e.g. immigrants are a

threat to 'our' country), topos of burdening (immigrants are burden to 'our' country so something should be done), topos of finances (providing immigrants with welfare is too costly), topos of reality (economic realities have changed so authorities should act accordingly), topos of numbers (most of immigrants – here statistics - are criminals), topos of authority (something is true because the mayor says so), topos of history (history repeats itself), topos of culture (ethnic minorities have different culture) and the topos of abuse (if help for immigrants is abused, the help should be withdrawn). Generally, argumentation strategy gives justification for negative or positive attributions.

Then, the fourth strategy, of *perspectiviation*, framing or discourse representation strategy, is used by speakers to indicate the degree of their involvement in discourse. It may be realized by the use of quotations, reporting, narration or description. Speakers/writers may show either their involvement (it is manifest in turn-taking, repetitions, intensity markers, gestures etc.) or detachment (e.g. by means of relative clauses, prepositional clauses, nominalizations or indirect speech).

The intensifying/mitigation strategy is very much connected with the previous one. As Reisigl and Wodak describe, it modifies the epistemic status of propositions. It intensifies or mitigates the illocutionary force, hence it sharpens or softens discriminatory utterances. As Burgoon (1994: 233) states, also metaphors may serve as a tool for increase intensity of language, they should not be excluded from the analysis.

### **3.2.2. The Representation of Social Actors**

The second method of analysis, very often used in combination with strategies of self- and other-presentation described above, is that of Representation of Social Actors as introduced by van Leeuwen (1996). This method attempts to find answers to the following questions: "What are the ways in which social actors can be represented in English discourse? Which choices does the English language give us for referring to people?" (van Leeuwen 1996: 32). The scope of the study is later narrowed to the crucial question: "[H]ow are the relevant social actors represented in an instance of a particular kind of racist discourse?" (van Leeuwen 1996: 32). Despite the fact that van Leeuwen focuses only on English language, this method may be

expanded to other languages. He describes 9 types of representation of social actors which he names: exclusion, role allocation, genericisation and specification, assimilation, association and dissociation, indetermination and differentiation, nomination and categorization, personalization and impersonalisation, and last, overdetermination.

The first representation, as the very name suggests, relies on including or excluding social actors in a way that suits the purposes and interests of writers (speakers etc.). Social actors exclusion may be divided into two strategies, *suppression* and *backgrounding*. The difference between these two concepts may be briefly summarized as follows: in suppression the social actor is totally absent in the text, whereas in the case of backgrounding, the social actor is present elsewhere in the text and can be inferred “with reasonable (though never total) certainty who they are” (van Leeuwen 1996: 39). Suppression is generally realized through passive agent deletion, non-finite clauses or nominalizations. Regarding backgrounding, it is important to analyse which actors are pushed into the background and which are put into the foreground.

The next type of representation is very much connected to the previous one. Role allocation focuses on the specific roles of the social agents, namely who in the text is an agent (and why) and who is a patient (and why). The most important subtypes of role allocation, according to van Leeuwen, are *activation* and *passivisation*. In the case of activation, social actors are represented as “active, dynamic forces in the activity” whereas passivisation occurs when the social actors are “‘undergoing’ the activity, or as being ‘at the receiving end of it’” (van Leeuwen 1996: 43-44).

Genericisation and specification are other important aspects of social actors representation. They can be either presented as classes or specific individuals. Genericisation may be achieved through the use of mass nouns or plurals (e.g. non-European immigrants), both without an article.

The previous type of representation is closely related to the next, specifically assimilation. *Individualization* takes place if social actors are presented as individuals and *assimilation* if they are referred to as groups. Van Leeuwen distinguishes two subtypes of assimilation, *aggregation* and *collectivization*. The difference between

them is that the former quantifies these groups and treats them as 'statistics'. Assimilation usually is realized by plurality, mass nouns or collective nouns.

One more way of presenting social actors as groups is association. It refers to groups which are not labeled in the text, usually by means of parataxis, e.g. "*They believed that the immigration program existed for the benefit of **politicians, bureaucrats, and the ethnic minorities**, not for Australians as a whole*" (van Leeuwen 1996: 50-51 emphasis mine, MW). This group is rather an 'alliance', not an institutionalized and stable group.

Another category distinguished by van Leeuwen is that of indetermination and differentiation. The former occurs when social actors are unspecified and 'anonymous in the text and it is mostly realized by the use of indefinite pronouns in a nominal position (e.g. 'someone') or generalized exophoric reference (e.g. 'they'). The latter differentiates social actors (or groups of actors) from similar actors (or groups). Differentiation created the division between 'the self' and 'the other'.

Nomination and categorization in van Leeuwen's terms are slightly different from what Reisigl and Wodak (2001 and above) presented under the same label. Nomination here is understood as representing social actors with respect to their unique identity (for instance, formal nomination – 'Mr. Wilson') and categorization when social actors are nominated in terms of their functions. However, the clear-cut division between these two concepts is sometimes difficult to establish. Van Leeuwen later distinguishes two subtypes of categorization, namely *functionalisation* and *identification*. To be more specific, functionalisation appears when social actors are nominated with respect to what they do, whereas identification occurs when they are presented in terms of what they are. Numerous example of categorization are presented in the table in the previous section.

The above-mentioned representational choices generally personalize (present as human beings) social actors but impersonalisation plays also a significant role. There are two kinds of impersonalisation, objectivation and abstraction. Objectivation employs the metonymical reference, which is a reference to a thing or a place associated with a social actor. Among the most frequently used types there are spatialization, utterance autonomisation, instrumentalisation and somatisation.

Abstraction, on the other hand, assigns quality to social actors, such as ‘the Roma problem’ or ‘the poor’.

The last category described by van Leeuwen is overdetermination. It appears when social actors are as participants in two or more social practices. He distinguishes four different kinds of overdetermination, namely inversion, symbolization, connotation and distillation. Inversion occurs when social actors participate in two social practices which are each other’s opposite. Symbolisation means using a fictional character in order to represent non-fictional social actors in social practices. Connotation appears when “a unique determination (...) stands for a classification or functionalisation” (van Leeuwen 1996: 63). Connotation is closely connected to the cultural tradition. The last type of overdetermination, distillation, “connects social actors to several social practices by abstracting the same feature from the social actors involved in these several practices” (van Leeuwen 1996: 65).

### **3.3. Case study: Public Discourses about Roma in Poland and the UK**

In order to present and illustrate how Discourse Historical Approach and its methods work in practice, we present fragments of analysis aimed at investigating the discriminatory discourse against the Roma and unveiling specific discriminatory strategies employed in the British and Polish media (cf. Witkowska 2012). The empirical material consisted of 181 news reports from four newspapers, the Guardian (29 news reports) and the Daily Telegraph (28) from Great Britain and Gazeta Wyborcza (70) and Rzeczpospolita (54) from Poland. The analysis focused on press reporting of events from mid 2010 when the French authorities expelled and ‘de-legalised’ members of the Roma minority. The time frame for the empirical material is from 18.07.2010 up to 30.09.2010. The analysis, conducted by Witkowska in line with the Discourse Historical Approach in critical discourse studies, operated at two levels, namely preliminary thematic analysis (Krzyżanowski 2010) and in-depth analysis based on strategies of self – and other presentation (Reisigl and Wodak 2001).

Thematic analysis, conducted as an introduction to the more detailed in-depth analysis, revealed an interesting tendency among the news reports, namely the empirical material could be divided into four phases: (a) War on Crime, (b) Expulsions (c) International Reactions and (d) Denial of Discrimination. These

phases differed not only in terms of prevailing macro-topics but also sub-topics raised in the news reports. Consequently, the results of the entry-level analysis raised a question if one could expect variations in the use of Strategies of Self- and Other Presentation among the phases. The in-depth analysis proved in line with the above-mentioned speculations. This observation shows the importance of this preliminary step of analysis. However, since the aim of this subsection is only to illustrate how the methods of analysis work when put into practice, just the first phase will be briefly outlined with some examples.

Summarising key results of the analysis carried out by Witkowska (2012), the War on Crime phase identified above was generally characterized by six referential/nomination strategies, namely ethnification, collectivization, spatialisation, actionalisation, politicization and social. The most frequent strategy appearing in all the news reports (which is not surprising) is ethnification, with the “Roma” and “Gypsies” (in Polish “Romowie” i “Cyganie” respectively) ethnonyms applied, as in the example:

(1) *Half of France’s illegal **Gipsy** camps “will be dismantled within three months while Bulgarian and Romanian **Gipsies** will be sent back home if they break the law” (Daily Telegraph 28.07.2010, all emphases mine, MW).*

Of approximate frequency are also the strategies of collectivization and spatialisation which strip the Roma of their individuality, humanity or distinctive features:

(2) *Nicolas Sarkozy has been accused of stigmatizing one of France’s most marginalized **communities** as he prepares to hold a meeting at the Elysee Palace tomorrow to discuss tough new strategies for dealing with the Traveller, Gypsy and Roma **populations**. (...) Sarkozy announced the meeting last week in a bid to evaluate the situation nationwide and to order “the expulsion of all illegal **encampments**” (Guardian 27.07.2010)*

By the use of these two strategies, the minority is presented as a whole and, therefore, it is more difficult for the readers to sympathise or identify with the Roma people with little reference to specific individuals. The next strategies, actionalisation and politicisation, tend to deprive the Roma of their political rights and achieve this

effect by the application of actionyms and anthroponyms, such as immigrants or migrants:

(3) *W swoim przemówieniu Sarkozy odniósł się również do problemu nielegalnych **imigrantów** (...) W tym kontekście podkreślił, że należy na nowo rozważyć prawa i świadczenia przysługujące we Francji **imigrantom** o nieuregulowanej sytuacji*

*'Sarkozy, in his speech, mentioned also the problem of illegal **immigrants** (...) In this context, one should consider changing the rights and benefits illegal **immigrants** are entitled to' (Gazeta Wyborcza 30.07.2010).*

The strategy of actionalisation works in tandem with the strategy of social problematisation, and more precisely with criminalization:

(4) *Nicolas Sarkozy mówił o "wojnie totalnej" przeciwko przestępczości i **sprawcom napadów** na policjantów podczas posiedzenia Rady Ministrów. Prezydent powiedział ministrom, że rząd musi prowadzić „wojnę przeciwko **handlarzom narkotyków** i innym **przestępcom**"*

*'Nicolas Sarkozy, during the government meeting, was talking about a „war” against crime and **perpetrators of the attacks** on policemen. The President told his minister that the government had to “go to war against **drug dealers** and other **criminals**” (Rzeczpospolita 21.07.2010).*

Employing criminonyms results in the impression that the majority of the Roma are involved in illegal activities.

As already stated in the description of the Strategies of Self- and Other-presentation, the referential strategies are closely connected and interacting with predicational strategies. In this phase, the predicational strategies emphasise the above-mentioned criminalization strategy. The key word in the first phase is “illegal”, which appearing even in a possibly neutral context changes the perception into a negative one:

(5) *Po nim minister spraw wewnętrznych Brice Hortefeux zapowiedział, że „w ciągu następnych trzech miesięcy połowa, czyli około 300, **nielegalnych obozów i squatów [nielegalnie zasiedlonych budynków]** zostanie zlikwidowana”*

*'After him, the Minister of Internal Affairs announced that „in three months the half, about 300, **illegal camps and squats [illegally inhabited buildings]** will have been liquidated” (Gazeta Wyborcza 30.07.2010)*

This, together with descriptions of the Roma camps as dens of criminals:

(6) *He pushed for a change in France's immigration law to make such expulsion easier “for reasons of public order”. He said illegal gipsy camps “will be systematically evacuated, calling them **sources of trafficking, exploitation of children and prostitution**” (Daily Telegraph 28.07.2010).*

reinforces the criminal label on the Roma.

This stereotypical label, which is attained by various referential and predicational strategies, takes a significant part in the activation of the topos of danger and justice. In the case of this analysis, the encampments of the Roma constitute a danger to the majority population of France:

(7) *Mr Sarkozy called the meeting of ministers and police chiefs to review what he called “the situation of travelling people and Roma and **the problems that certain members of these communities pose to public order and safety**” (Daily Telegraph 28.07.2010).*

Therefore, Nicolas Sarkozy and the French authorities need to act in order to protect their native citizens:

(8) ***Zamieszki w Saint Aignan skłoniły Sarkozy'ego do zajęcia się – jak to określił – problemami, które powoduje zachowanie niektórych Romów***

***'The riots in Saint Aignan induced Sarkozy to take care – as he said – of problems caused by the behaviour of some Roma'** (Rzeczpospolita 29.07.2010).*

The topos of justice also activates the argumentation that since the law is equal for all, the Roma should be punished if they break regulations. On this basis, Nicolas Sarkozy and other French authorities threaten to punish the Roma:

(9) ***Jeśli okaże się, że ich mieszkańcy przebywają we Francji nielegalnie, zostaną z kraju wyrzuceni***

*'If it turns out that the inhabitants reside in France illegally, they will be thrown out' (Gazeta Wyborcza 30.07.2010)*

Another topos appearing in these news reports is the one of burdening which suggests that the minority is described as extremely poor and backward, and for that reason they receive social benefits and are a burden to the French social welfare system:

(10) *He also sanctioned the tearing down of illegal Gipsy camps and **promised a review of all welfare payments** to migrants (Daily Telegraph 02.08.2010).*

In one of the newspapers, two interesting topoi appeared, the topos of integration and the topos of rights. The notion of integration divides the Roma into the "good Roma" and "bad Roma", where the former assimilate with and melt into the majority population and the latter maintain their diversity or simply fail to integrate, as in the rather straight-forward example:

(11) ***Very few of the people** coming here **try to integrate, to fit in**, and huge numbers of minors are **involved in drug trafficking networks** (Guardian 27.07.2010).*

*'The anthropologist Marc Bordigoni mentioned in the weekly magazyn "L'Express" that three quarters of the Roma in France lead a settled way of life and generally **these people are integrated with local communities**' (Rzeczpospolita 22.07.2010).*

The topos of rights is usually employed in order to defend this minority, for instance by reminding of the Besson law:

(12) *Why are Travellers in France living in illegal settlements? One reason is that **France's government has failed to respect its own law**, the so-called Besson law from 2000, which requires the state to build adequate accommodation for Travellers. (Guardian 03.08.2010).*

The Roma, as equal citizens are ascribed some rights and obligations and there are international bodies which monitor the process of implementing these rights.

All the strategies of perspectivisaion, framing and discourse representation identified in the analysis belong to the strategies of detachment. By the use of quoting or

indirect speech, authors of the news reports dissociate themselves from both, explicit racist utterances and criticism of the French authorities actions:

(13) *Mr Sarkozy called the meeting of ministers and police chiefs to review what he called "the situation of travelling people and Roma and the problems that certain members of these communities pose to public order and safety" (Daily Telegraph 28.07.2010).*

This strategy is used in order to trigger an impression that the authors are objective and neutral in reporting. Simultaneously, using passive voice or nominalization in covering the expulsions blurs the responsibility, since there is no agent of the action itself. It is contrasted with the use of active voice in describing criminal actions of the Roma:

(14) *Half of France's illegal Gipsy camps will be dismantled within three months while Bulgarian and Romanian Gipsies will be sent back home if they break the law, according to the country's interior minister (Daily Telegraph 28.07.2010).*

Regarding intensification strategies, the application of metaphors does not only intensify the discriminatory discourse but also to some extent reveals the attitude of the writer, just to mention the WAR metaphor (which is not surprising taking into consideration the name of the first phase):

(15) *Last week, Mr Sarkozy declared a 'war on crime', referring in part to the gipsy incident and also to unrelated riots in a poor suburb of Grenoble, southeastern France (Daily Telegraph 28.07.2010)*

and the metaphor of RUBBISH:

(16) *Sarkozy wyrzuca Romów z Francji*

*'Sarkozy is throwing the Roma out' (Rzeczpospolita 29.07.2010).*

As has been shown by Witkowska (2012) in her analysis presented above, the analysed news reports employed a vast array of strategies which contributed to the clearly discriminatory image of the Roma in the Polish and British news reports.

#### 4. Conclusions

Summarising the main points of this paper, we have shown that the perspective of CDA – and especially that of DHA – is very efficient in analyses of public discourse about migrants and minority groups including Roma. As the main goal of both CDA and DHA is to question the status quo of social inequalities, the analysis presented above shows how that inequality is, in fact, discursively constructed and disseminated by means of public channels of communication (politics, the media, etc.) to the broader society. The above-described methods proposed by scholars working within DHA constitute, we argue, an effective tool for analysts of discriminatory discourse in different spaces and genres of contemporary public communication.

#### References:

- Austin, John Langshaw. 1962. *How to Do Things With Words*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Barthes, Roland. 1964. 'Eléments de sémiologie'. *Communication* 4.
- Bauman, Richard and Joel Sherzer. (eds.). 1974. *Explorations in the ethnography of speaking*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Bernstein, Basil. 1990. *The Structuring of Pedagogic Discourse*. London: Routledge.
- Chapman, M. 1994. "The emergence of genres: Some findings from an examination of first-grade writing", in: *Written Communication*, 11,3.
- Chouliaraki, Lilie. and Norman Fairclough. 1999. *Discourse in Late Modernity*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Cope, Bill and Mary Kalantzis. 1993. "Introduction: How a genre approach to literacy can transform the way writing is taught", in: B. Cope, B. and M. Kalantzis. (eds.) *The powers of literacy: A genre approach to teaching writing*. London: Falmer Press.
- Dressler, Wolfgang. 1972. *Einführung in die Textlinguistik*. Tübingen: M. Niemeyer.
- Duranti, Alessandro (ed.). 2001. *Linguistic Anthropology: A Reader*. Malden, MA: Blackwell
- Duszak, Anna. 1998. *Tekst, Dyskurs, Komunikacja Międzykulturowa*. Warsaw: Wydawnictwa Naukowe PWN.

- Eco, Umberto. 1976. *A Theory of Semiotics*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Fairclough, Norman and Ruth Wodak. 1997. "Critical Discourse Analysis". in: van Dijk, Teun A. (ed.) *Introduction to Discourse Analysis*, London: Sage.
- Fairclough, Norman. 1993. "Critical Discourse Analysis and the Marketisation of Public Discourse: The Universities". *Discourse & Society* 4,2.
- Fairclough, Norman. 1985. "Critical discourse analysis and the marketization of public discourse", in: *Discourse and Society* 4,2.
- Galasińska, Aleksandra, and Michał Krzyżanowski (Eds.)(2008). *Discourse and Transformation in Central and Eastern Europe*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Garfinkel, Harold. 1967. *Studies in Ethnomethodology*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Goffman, Erving. 1959. *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday.
- Grice, Herbert Paul. 1975. "Logic and Conversation", in: Cole, P. and N. L. Morgan (eds.), *Syntax and Semantics, vol. 3: Speech*. New York: Academic Press.
- Gumperz, John J. 1982. *Language and Social Identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Habermas Jürgen. 1977. *Erkenntnis und Interesse*. Suhrkamp: Frankfurt am Main, 4. Aufl.
- Halliday, Michael A. K. and Ruqaiya Hasan. 1976. *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.
- Hymes, Dell H. 1972. "Models of the interaction of language and social life", in: Gumperz J. J. and D. Hymes (eds.) *Directions in sociolinguistics: The ethnography of communication*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Kress, Gunther. 1993. "Against arbitrariness", *Discourse and Society* 4(2).
- Kress, Gunther and Theo van Leeuwen. 1990. *Reading images*. Geelong: Deakin University Press.
- Krzyżanowski, Michał. 2010. *The Discursive Construction of European Identities*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Krzyżanowski, Michał and Ruth Wodak. 2009. *The Politics of Exclusion – Debating Migration in Austria*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.
- Lemke, Jay. 1995. *Textual Politics: Discourse and Social Dynamics*. New York:

- Taylor & Francis.
- Reisigl, Martin and Ruth Wodak. 2009. 'The Discourse-Historical Approach (DHA)', in: R. Wodak and M Meyer (eds) *Methods of Ccritical Discourse Analysis*. London: Sage.
- Reisigl, Martin. 2007. "Der Wiener Ansatz der Kritischen Diskursanalyse". *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung*, 8,2 (<http://www.qualitative-research.net>).
- Reisigl, Martin and Ruth Wodak. 2001. *Discourse and Discrimination*. London: Sage.
- Sacks, Harvey and Emanuel A. Schegloff and Gail A. Jefferson. 1974. "A Simplest Systematics for the Organization of Turntaking for Conversation". *Language* 50.
- Schank, Roger C., and Robert P. Abelson. 1977. *Scripts, Plans, Goals, and Understanding: An Inquiry into Human Knowledge Structures*. Hillsdale, N.J. Erlbaum
- Searle, John Rogers. 1969. *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. London: Cambridge U.P.
- Schaenen, Inda. 2010. "'Genre Means...': A Critical Discourse Analysis of Fourth Grade Talk About Genre", *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies* 7,1.
- van Dijk, Teun A. 2008. *Society and Discourse: How Social Contexts Influence Text and Talk*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- van Dijk, Teun A. 2007. 'The study of discourse: an introduction' in: van Dijk, Teun A. (ed.), *Discourse Studies*. London: Sage.
- van Dijk, Teun A. 2001. "Critical Discourse Analysis", in: Tannen, D., D. Schiffrin and H. Hamilton (eds.), *Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- van Dijk, Teun A. 1995. "Aims of Critical Discourse Analysis". *Japanese Discourse* 1,1.
- van Dijk, Teun A. 1993. *Elite Discourse and Racism*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- van Dijk, Teun A. 1993. "Principles of critical discourse analysis", in: *Discourse & Society*, 4,2.
- van Dijk, Teun A. 1986. *Discourse and communication: New approaches to the analysis of mass media discourse and communication*. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- van Dijk, Teun. 1985. "Discourse analysis: Its development and application to the structures of news". *Journal of Communication* 33,2.

- van Dijk, Teun A. 1983. "Dialogue and cognition", In: L. Vaina & J. Hintikka, (eds.) *Cognitive constraints on communication*. Dordrecht: Reidel.
- van Dijk, Teun A. 1977. *Text and Context. Explorations in the Semantics and Pragmatics of Discourse* . London: Longman.
- van Dijk, Teun A. 1972. *Some Aspects of Text Grammars. A Study in Theoretical Linguistics and Poetics*. The Hague: Mouton.
- van Leeuwen, Theo. 1996." The Representation of Social Actors", in: Carmen, Rosa Caldas-Coulthard and Malcolm Coulthard (eds.) *Texts and Practices: Readings in Critical Discourse Analysis* . London: Routledge.
- Witkowska, Monika Maria. 2012. The image of the Roma in the media: The contrastive analysis of the British and Polish news reports. [Unpublished MA thesis, Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań].
- Wodak, Ruth and Norman Fairclough. 2010. "Recontextualizing European higher education policies: the cases of Austria and Romania". *Critical Discourse Studies*, 7,1.
- Wodak Ruth. 2006. "Critical Linguistics and Critical Discourse Analysis", in: Verschueren, Jef, Jan-Ola Östman and Eline Versluys (eds.) *Handbook of Pragmatics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Wodak, Ruth and Brigitta Busch. 2004. "Approaches to media texts", in: John D. H. Downing (ed.) *The Sage handbook of media studies*. Thousand Oaks, London, New Delhi: Sage Publications.
- Wodak, Ruth. 2002. "What CDA is about – a summary of its history, important concepts and its developments: in: Wodak, Ruth (ed.) *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Sage.
- Wodak, R. 2001. "The Discourse-Historical Approach", in: Wodak, R. and M. Meyer (eds.) *Methods of critical discourse analysis*. London: Sage.
- Wodak, Ruth and Rudolf de Cillia and Martin Reisigl and Karin Liebhart. 1999. *The Discursive Construction of National Identity*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Wodak, Ruth. 1996. *Disorders of Discourse*. London: Longman.
- Wodak, Ruth and Michał Krzyżanowski (Eds.)(2008) *Qualitative Discourse Analysis in the Social Sciences*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

