Chapter 4  Critical discourse analysis, intertextuality and the present study

4.1. Introduction

The previous chapter reviewed three traditions of genre studies, namely, the new rhetoric, systemic functional and ESP perspectives on genre. While new rhetoric genre analyses focus on the interrelation between text and context and SFL genre studies stress the linguistic analysis of text, ESP approaches to genre take an approach that is some way between these two. This chapter extends the discussion of genre into other domains of discourse analysis. It reviews the theoretical frameworks of critical discourse analysis and intertextuality with the aim of providing further frameworks and analytical techniques for examining the genre under investigation.

4.2. Introduction to critical discourse analysis

Critical discourse analysis (CDA) is a rapidly developing area of language study. It regards discourse as ‘a form as social practice’ (Fairclough & Wodak, 1997, p.258), and takes consideration of the context of language use to be crucial to discourse (Wodak, 2001). It takes particular interest in the relation between language and power. CDA may be described as neo-Marxist; claiming that cultural and economic dimensions are significant in the creation and maintenance of power relations. The key figures in this area include Fairclough (1992a, b, c, 1993, 1995a, b, 1996, 1998, 2000, 2001, 2003), van Dijk (1993, 1997, 1998a, b, 1999, 2001), Gee (1999, 2005), van Leeuwen (1993, 1995, 1996), Wodak (1996, 2000, 2001) and Scollon (2001). It is generally agreed that CDA cannot be classified as a single method but is rather viewed as an approach, which consists of different perspectives and different methods for studying the relationship between the use of language and social context.

This section of the thesis reviews general principles of CDA, outlines the research approaches of Fairclough and Wodak, and presents a critique of CDA with the aim of further establishing the analytical framework for the study.
4.2.1. General principles of CDA

Many theorists in CDA present the general principles of CDA in their own terms (van Dijk, 1993; Wodak, 1996; Fairclough & Wodak, 1997; Meyer, 2001). Some of them represent the common ground of all CDA approaches, while some are more controversial. The most widely cited view is Fairclough and Wodak’s (1997) eight principles of CDA. What follows is a summary of these principles.

The first principle is that CDA addresses social problems. CDA not only focuses on language and language use, but also on the linguistic characteristics of social and cultural processes. CDA follows a critical approach to social problems in its endeavours to make explicit power relationships which are frequently hidden. It aims to derive results which are of practical relevance to the social, cultural, political and even economic contexts (Fairclough & Wodak, 1997).

The second principle is that power relations are discursive. That is CDA explains how social relations of power are exercised and negotiated in and through discourse (Fairclough & Wodak, 1997).

The next principle is that discourse constitutes society and culture. This means that every instance of language use makes its own contribution to reproducing and transforming society and culture, including relations of power (Fairclough & Wodak, 1997).

Discourse also does ideological work. In other words, ideologies are often produced through discourse. To understand how ideologies are produced, it is not enough to analyse texts; the discursive practice (how the texts are interpreted and received and what social effects they have) must also be considered (Fairclough & Wodak, 1997).

Another important principle is that discourse is history. Thus discourses can only be understood with reference to their historical context. In accordance with this CDA
refers to extralinguistic factors such as culture, society and ideology in historical terms (Fairclough & Wodak, 1997; Wodak, 1996, 2001).

Another important principle is that the link between text and society is mediated. CDA, thus, is concerned with making connections between sociocultural processes and structures on the one hand, and properties of texts on the other (Fairclough & Wodak, 1997; Wodak, 1996, 2001; Meyer, 2001; Scollon, 2001). CDA does not take this relationship to be simply deterministic but invokes an idea of mediation (Fairclough, 1992a, 1995a; Scollon, 1998, 1999, 2001). Fairclough studies this mediated relationship between text and society by looking at ‘orders of discourse’ (Fairclough, 1992a, 1995a). Wodak (1996), like van Dijk (1997, 2001), introduces a ‘sociocognitive level’ to her analysis, and Scollon studies mediation by looking at ‘mediated action’ and ‘mediational means’ (Scollon, 1998, 1999, 2001).

The next principle is that CDA is interpretative and explanatory. CDA goes beyond textual analysis. It is not only interpretative, but also explanatory in intent (Fairclough & Wodak, 1997; Wodak, 1996, 2001). These interpretations and explanations are dynamic and open, and may be affected by new readings and new contextual information. Meyer (2001) calls this process a hermeneutic process and maintains that compared with the analytical-inductive process employed in some other fields, hermeneutics can be understood as a method of grasping and producing meaning relations by understanding the meaning of one part in the context of the whole. He further argues that hermeneutic interpretation in particular requires detailed documentation such as an explicit linguistic analysis of texts.

Discourse from the point of view of CDA, then, is a form of social action. The principle aim of CDA is to uncover opaqueness and power relationships. CDA is a socially committed scientific paradigm. It attempts to bring about change in communicative and socio-political practices (Fairclough & Wodak, 1997).

4.2.2. Methodology of CDA

CDA involves a principled and transparent shunting back and forth between the microanalysis of texts using varied tools of linguistics, semiotic, and literary analysis and the macroanalysis of social formations, institutions, and power relations that these texts index and construct (Luke 2002, p. 100).

Consequently, attempts to systematize CDA draw from theories and models of text analysis on one hand, and from contemporary political and sociocultural theories on the other. Some approaches, such as Fairclough (1992a, 2001) and Wodak (1996), rely much on a linguistic analysis of texts, especially Halliday’s (1985/1994/2004) systemic functional linguistics (SFL), beginning with systematic analysis of lexical resources, moving through an analysis of syntactic functions to the analysis of genre and text metafunction. In contrast with approaches of Fairclough and Wodak, van Dijk (1997) and Gee (1999, 2005) both develop toolkits that are less oriented to lexicosyntactic features of texts and more focused on cultural and social resources and contexts. Van Dijk’s (1997) approach is based on four categories: action, context, power and ideology, while Gee’s (1999, 2005) methodological heuristics is based on six categories: semiotic building, world building, activity building, identity and relationship building, political building, connection building.

Luke (2002, p.101) argues that “a linguistic and text analytic metalanguage, no matter how comprehensive, cannot ‘do’ CDA in and of itself. It requires the overlay of a social theoretic discourse for explaining and explicating the social; contexts, concomitants, contingencies and consequences of any given text or discourse.”
Pennycook (2001) also claims that what texts ‘do’ in the world cannot be explained solely through text analysis or text analytic language.

With regard to macro analyses, CDA attempts to move beyond text analysis to the critical analysis of the visible practices of text interpretation and use. Fairclough (1992a), Gee (1999, 2005), and Chouliaraki and Fairclough (1999) engage with a range of major social theories as they do this. There are still, however, many disagreements and arguments in this area. (Please see 4.2.3. for details.)

As mentioned above, there are two major streams of doing a critical discourse analysis. One stream is represented by the work of Fairclough. This work is characterised by detailed textual analyses, while the other stream represented by van Dijk and Gee, is characterised by a focus on social variables such as action, context, power and ideology. This study is based largely in the linguistic stream of a CDA drawing on the work of Fairclough and Wodak as the basis for its analytical framework. A brief summary of Fairclough’s and Wodak’s approaches of CDA follows.

4.2.2.1. Outline of Fairclough’s CDA

The following are the key terms used in Fairclough’s approach (Fairclough, 1992a, b, c, 1993, 1995a, b, 2000, 2001, 2003) of CDA:

The first term that is crucial in a understanding of CDA is text, which in Fairclough’s words refers to “the written or spoken language produced in a discursive event” (Fairclough, 1993, p. 138). Fairclough emphasizes the multi-semiotic character of texts and adds visual images and sound –using the example of television language – as other semiotic forms which may be simultaneously present in texts (see Fairclough, 1995a).

The key term is genre, which, for Fairclough, is “the use of language associated with a particular social activity” (Fairclough, 1993, p. 138). For him, “different genres are
different means of production of a specifically textual sort, different resources for

texturing” (Fairclough, 2000, p.441). Genre is also a means of textual structuring and
a set of relatively stable conventions, which are both creative and conservative. That
means that genre is both relatively stable and at the same time open to change.

**Discourse**, used as an abstract noun, refers to the “language use conceived as social
practice” (Fairclough, 1993, p.138). When discourse is used as a countable noun, it
refers to a “way of signifying experience from a particular perspective” (Fairclough,
1993, p.138). Fairclough further points out

the question of discourse is the question of how text figure (in relation to
other moments) in how people represent the world, including themselves
and their productive activities. Different discourses are different ways of
representing associated with different positions (Fairclough, 2000, p.170).

Discourse as an abstract noun, is not only concerned with language in use, but also the
pervasive and often invisible sets of values, beliefs and ideas in that social
circumstance.

**A discursive event** is an “instance of language use, analysed as text, discursive
practice, social practice” (Fairclough, 1993, p.138). Discursive event, thus, refers to
text, discursive practice (production and interpretation of the text), and social practice
(including situational, institutional and societal practice).

**Orders of discourse** concern the “totality of discursive practices of an institution and
relationship between them” (Fairclough, 1993, p.138). They are usually associated
with particular institutions or domains of social life. For example, there are particular
orders of discourse associated with schools. In describing orders of discourse, one is
concerned with specifying what discourse types are used in the domain, and the
relationships between each discursive practice (production and interpretation of
discourse).
CDA sees the relationship between language and society being dialectical. This means that the relationship between language and society is two-way: on the one hand, language is influenced by society; on the other hand, society is shaped by language. Describing discourse as social practice implies that language and society bears a kind of dialectical relationship. This means that discourse constitutes situations, objects of knowledge and the identities of people. Discourse constitutes the social status quo and at the same time it is shaped by the situation.

CDA for Fairclough is concerned with the investigation of the relation between two assumptions about language use: that language use is both socially shaped and socially shaping. He bases this idea on Halliday’s systemic functional linguistics (SFL) (see details in Section 3.4. of Chapter 3). Through the notion of multifunctionality of language in texts, Fairclough operationalises the theoretical assumption that texts and discourses are socially constitutive: “Language use is always simultaneously constitutive of (i) social identities, (ii) social relations and (iii) systems of knowledge and beliefs” (Fairclough, 1995a, p.134). The ideational function of language constitutes systems of knowledge; the interpersonal function creates social subjects or identity and the relationship between them; and the textual function creates discourse. This implies that every text contributes to the constitution of these three aspects of society and culture. Fairclough claims that these three aspects are always present simultaneously and one may take precedence over the others (Fairclough, 1995a).

According to Fairclough, language is not only socially constitutive but also socially shaped. The process of being socially shaped is a very complex one. On one hand very different types of discourses may coexist within the same institution, while on the other hand the relationship between the language use and the underlying conventions and norms is not always a simple linear one (Fairclough, 1995a). The term ‘mediation’ has been widely employed to describe the relation between language use and society, which means that the relationship of language and society is not
direct, and language or discourse is just the medium to bring out values, beliefs, conventions and norms of society.

Critical discourse analysis considers the relationship between language use and wider social and cultural structures. In Fairclough’s term this means the relationships between a specific communicative event, such as newspaper coverage of an event, and the total structure of an order of discourse, as well as modifications to the order of discourse and its constituents, genres and discourses (Fairclough, 1995a).

For the operationalization of these theoretical considerations Fairclough develops an analytical framework (Fairclough, 1992a, 1995a), drawing on the concepts of intertextuality (that is the relationship between texts ‘before’ and ‘after’), interdiscursivity (that is the combination of genres and discourses in a text) and hegemony (the predominance in and the dominance of political, ideological and cultural domains of a society) (Fairclough, 1995a). He attributes these three dimensions to each discursive event. According to Fairclough, a discursive event is simultaneously text, discursive practice (including the production and interpretation of texts) and social practice.

Fairclough’s analysis is based on three components—description, interpretation and explanation. Linguistic properties of texts are described (text analysis), the relationship between the productive and interpretative processes of discursive practice and the texts is interpreted, and the relationship between discursive practice and social practice is explained (Fairclough, 1995a). In doing this, Fairclough attempts to establish a systematic method for exploring the relationship between text and its social context. The dimensions on which the method is based are shown in Figure 4.1.
This analytical framework informs the present study in the following ways. First, the multi-layered analysis incorporates textual, processing and social levels of discourse analysis. Second, text is at the core of the analysis. Text are, thus, analysed for linguistic evidence for claims made out of the discourse analytical work.

4.2.2.2. Wodak’s discourse-historical model of CDA

Like Fairclough, Wodak is also a linguistically orientated CDA scholar. She sees discourse as

a complex bundle of simultaneous and sequential interrelated linguistic acts, which manifest themselves within and across the social fields of action as thematically interrelated semiotic, oral or written tokens, very often as “texts”, that belong to specific semiotic types, i.e. genres (Reisegl and Wodak, 2001, p. 66).

Wodak’s approach is a discourse-historical perspective on CDA. In this approach the connection between fields of action, genres, discourses and texts is described and modelled, and context is understood mainly historically. The discourse-historical
approach is both hermeneutic and interpretative, with some influence from cognitive science (Wodak, 1996). This approach is understood not as a sequence of separate operational steps but as a cycle in which the three analytical dimensions (see above) are systematically and recursively related to the totality of contextual knowledge. The exact description of individual texts and the analysis of larger corpora of data allow statements to be made at both micro and macro levels. The general principles of the discourse-historical approach may be summarized as follows.

First, setting and context should be recorded as accurately as possible, since discourse can only be described, understood and interpreted in its specific context. Second, the content of an utterance must be confronted with historical events and facts. Third, texts must be described as precisely as possible at all linguistic levels. Categories of analysis at the linguistic level highly depend on the research question (Wodak, 2001).

Wodak (2001) summarizes the procedures of the discourse-historic approach to CDA:

- Gather information about the co- and context of the text (social, political, historical, psychological, and so on).
- Establish the genre and discourse to which the text belongs, then sample more ethnographic information; locate texts on similar topics, texts with similar arguments, macro-topics, field of action, and genres.
- Formulate precise research questions and explore neighbouring fields for explanatory theories and other aspects that need to be considered.
- Operationalize the research questions into researchable linguistic categories.
- Apply these categories sequentially to the text using theoretical approaches to interpret the findings that result from the research questions.
- Draw up the context diagram for the specific text and the fields of actions.
- Make an extensive interpretation of the data, returning to the original research questions and the problem under investigation.
This methodology aims to be pragmatic since the categories of analysis are developed in line with the research questions, with a constant movement back and forth between theory and empirical data. The historical context is always analysed and integrated into the interpretation, although there exists no stringent procedure for this task.

4.2.3. Critiques of CDA

Criticism of CDA comes from scholars in the area of conversation analysis (CA) and other fields of text analysis. The antecedent to the debate between CDA and CA is a paper written by Schegloff, titled ‘Whose text? Whose context?’ (Schegloff, 1997) and a reaction by Wetherell (1998) to this paper.

Schegloff argues that CDA is often short on detailed, systematic analysis of text or talk, for instance as it is carried out in conversation analysis. He writes:

I understand that critical discourse analysts have a different project, and are addressed to different issues, and not to the local co-construction of interaction. If, however, they mean the issues of power, domination, and the like to connect up with discursive material, it should be a serious rendering of that material…Otherwise the critical analysis will not ‘bind’ to the data, and risks ending up merely ideological (Schegloff, 1997, p.20).

Wetherell (1998) agrees that scholars in CA do good work on talk in interaction, but also finds that their work avoids further social analysis and critiques. She further argues that CA and CDA are not in conflict even though they are in some way incompatible research areas. Some good CDA-oriented works use conversations as data and analyse these at least partly from a CA perspective, and also some good CA-oriented work on talk addresses societal, political and critical issues. While CDA is interested in social problems, CA is concerned with structure problems in the organization of conversation. These, she argues, could be regarded as complementary rather than contradictory.
Along with the general debate about CDA, a specific discussion has developed between Norman Fairclough (1996) and Henry Widdowson (1995, 1998) over CDA. Widdowson claims that the term ‘discourse’ as it is used in CDA is as vague as it is fashionable: “discourse is something everybody is talking about but without knowing with any certainty just what it is: in vogue and vague” (Widdowson, 1995, p.158). Widdowson also criticizes the lack of a clear demarcation between text and discourse. Furthermore, he argues that CDA is an ideological interpretation and therefore not an analysis. The term critical discourse analysis is a contradiction in terms, he says. Widdowson believes that “CDA is, in a dual sense, a biased interpretation: in the first place it is prejudiced on the basis of some ideological commitment, and then it selects for analysis such texts as will support the preferred interpretation” (Widdowson, 1995, p.169). Analysis, he argues, ought to mean the examination of several interpretations and, in the case of CDA, this is not possible because of prior judgments. Fairclough (1996), in reply to this criticism, draws attention to the open-endedness of results required in CDA. He also points out that CDA, unlike most other approaches, is always explicit about its own position and commitment.

Toolan (1997, 2002) and Stubbs (1997) also make some criticisms of CDA, arguing for a strengthening of the theorization of CDA. Toolan (1997) argues that some theoretical distinctions in CDA, such as the difference between description and interpretative explanation need to be further clarified. Second, CDA needs to be more critical and more demanding of the text linguistics it uses. Third, in doing CDA thorough and strong evidence should be collected for the arguments made while simple presentation of the analytical findings should be pursued.

After pointing out several fundamental criticisms of CDA, such as CDA’s methods of data collection and text analysis, Stubbs (1997) puts forward eleven ‘essential questions’ in an effort to ‘rescue’ CDA from the circularity of theory. In Stubbs’ view, CDA provides no systematic comparisons between texts and norms in the language, and “language and thought can only be related if one has data and theory pertinent to
both: otherwise the theory is circular” (Stubbs, 1997, p. 100). By this, he means that if language use influences a person’s view of reality, there must be non-linguistic evidence of a pattern of beliefs and behaviour to support this claim. If we have no independent evidence for what we claim, but infer beliefs from language use, then the theory is circular.

Although there are criticisms of CDA, these do not distract from the value of work in the area of CDA. Many theorists share strong political starting points for doing CDA, with their major focus on revealing hidden values, beliefs and bias of texts, and studying power relationships behind texts. Many of them, however, establish operationalised research frameworks for exploring relationships between language use and social context. The work of Fairclough, Wodak and van Leeuwen especially have helped to operationalise the principles of CDA and are of value to answering the research questions of the present study. In this regard, the words of van Dijk in his 2001 article “Multidisciplinary CDA: a plea for diversity” makes an important contribution. He writes,

In my many years of experience as editor of several international journals, I have found that contributions that imitate and follow some great master are seldom original. Without being eclectic, good scholarship, and especially good CDA, should integrate the best work of many people, famous or not, from different disciplines, countries, cultures and directions of research. In other words, CDA should be essentially diverse and multidisciplinary (van Dijk, 2001, p.95-96).

CDA, then, is a comprehensive approach to studying the relationship between language use and its social context. Van Dijk’s words cast insights on the present study and its research framework.
4.3. Intertextuality

The notion of intertextuality offers a perspective of both reading and writing texts as a way of looking at a text’s interactions with prior texts, writers, readers, and conventions. Thibault (1994, p.1751) explains this perspective stating: “all texts, spoken and written, are constructed and have the meanings which text-users assign to them in and through their relations with other texts in some social formation”.

It is widely believed that Kristeva coined the term intertextuality on the basis of Bakhtin’s work (Kristeva, 1986). Bakhtin (1986) argues that every text (or utterance) is dialogical, in the sense that it gains its meaning in relation to other texts. Kristeva (1981, p.36) points out that a given text is “a permutation of texts, an intertextuality: in the space of a given text, several utterances, taken from other texts, intersect and neutralize one other”. Kristeva’s use of the term aims to describe the complex and heterogeneous nature of discursive materials which intersect in particular textual production. For her, text is a kind of ‘productivity’ in which various semiotic codes, genres, and meaning relations are both combined and transformed. Kristeva refers to texts in terms of two axes: a horizontal axis connecting the author and reader of a text, and a vertical axis, which connects the text to other texts (Kristeva, 1980, p.69). Thus, Kristeva, as does Bakhtin (1935/1981), sees all texts as being constituted out of, and understood in relation to, other texts in the same social formation (Thibault, 1994). While foregrounding relationality and interconnectedness, an intertextual perspective also undermines literary values such as originality, singularity and autonomy (Allen, 2000).

Scholars in different fields consider the notion of ‘intertextuality’ from different perspectives for different purposes. These scholars could be roughly categorised into two groups. The first group is the scholars from semiotics, mainly from so-called literary semiotics. Key figures include Kristeva (1981), Riffaterre (1978), Frow (1986), Culler (1981), Meinhof and Smith (2000) and Chandler (2005). These scholars concern themselves with exploring the complex and heterogenous nature of
literary works by appropriating the concept of intertextuality. Their studies range from
the search for influences or antecedents for a particular literary work to the analysis of
literary conventions and codes as prerequisites for literary communication. This work
has recently been extended from literary writing to studies of mass media
communication, such as advertisements, TV dramas and web pages. The second
group are from the area of discourse analysis and critical discourse analysis, such as
Fairclough (1992a, b, c, 1995a, b), Scollon (2004), Bazerman (1993, 2004), Devitt
(1991), Beaugrande and Dressler (1981), Lemke (1983, 1985, 1988a,b, 1995a,b) and
White (2002). For this group of scholars, their major concern is with non-literary
works. Many scholars perceive intertextuality not only as a form through which texts
are interrelated, but also as a social practice that involves particular socially regulated
ways of producing and interpreting discourse (Fairclough, 1992a, b, c, 1995b).

There is no single approach to analysing the complex phenomenon of intertextuality
in writing production and interpretation. Approaches range from focusing on
linguistic conventions such as White (2002) to social conventions such as Lemke
(1995a). An elementary type of analysis is to examine the intertextual composition of
a single text, describing both the explicit (e.g. the direct quotation) and implicit (e.g.
mentioning of a belief or issue of the context).

According to Fairclough (1992a, b, c, 1995b), intertextuality “points to how texts can
transform prior texts and restructure existing conventions (genres, discourses) to
generate new ones” (Fairclough, 1992b, p.270). It is concerned with how texts are
produced in relation to prior texts and how texts help to construct the existing
conventions in producing new texts. In his 1995 book Media Discourse, Fairclough
puts forward a three-dimension framework for analysing intertextuality in media
discourse. This is the analysis of ‘discourse representation’, generic analysis of
discourse types, and an analysis of discourses in texts (Fairclough, 1995b). To
Fairclough (1992a, b, 1995b), ‘discourse representation’ is a form of intertextuality in
which parts of specific texts are incorporated into a text and are usually, but not
always, explicitly marked with devices such as quotation marks and reporting clauses. In media discourse, discourse representation accounts for a major part of what news is: representations of what newsworthy people have said. Fairclough also introduces the concept of ‘discourse type’ for configurations of genres and discourses. Fairclough suggests that analysing discourse types may involve complex configurations of several genres and several discourses. Discourse, in Fairclough’s words (1995b, p.76), is “a particular way of constructing a particular (domain of) social practice”, and genre is “a way of using language which corresponds to the nature of the social practice that is being engaged in”. By analysing intertextuality, researchers aim to specify which fields (topics, subject-matters) are associated with a genre, and which discourses are drawn upon to construct these fields. Fairclough further argues that intertextual analysis is an interpretative activity, which depends highly on the researcher’s personal judgement and experience (Fairclough, 1995b). Fairclough’s main interest is in analysing intertextual relations as power relations, suggesting that intertextuality can become a locus of contestation and struggle (see Fairclough, 1992a, b).

Scholars such as Devitt (1991) and Bazerman (1993, 2004) from the new rhetoric tradition have analysed intertextuality in non-literary texts. They approach intertextual relations as social practice, as more or less stable conventions of a particular discourse community. Devitt’s (1991) study of the writing of tax accountants reveals that all genres that tax accountants use have strong intertextual connections with the legal tax code, but these intertextual connections are displayed and used differently in different genres. Bazerman (1993) compares the rhetorical presentation of cited articles in modern scientific articles to the texts of the original articles to uncover the ways in which the authors construct the intertextual field to position their own argument as a powerful antidote. In his 2004 article, Bazerman puts forward basic concepts and a procedure of analysing intertextuality. The basic concepts he describes include levels of intertextuality, techniques of intertextual representation, intertextual distance or
reach, and translation across contexts/recontextualization. The basic procedure Bazerman (2004) outlines can be briefly summarised as follows.

- Identify your purpose for doing intertextual analysis and what questions you hope to answer by doing it;
- Identify the specific texts you want to examine; in other words, identify your corpus;
- Identify the traces of other texts by examining explicit overt references to other authors;
- Start making observations and interpretations by considering the reference in relation to the context of what the author is saying;
- Look for more subtle clues to cater for your analytical purpose;
- Start looking for a pattern from which you can start developing a conclusion.

Bazerman (2004, p. 94) states further that “intertextuality is not just a matter of which other texts you refer to, but how you use them, what you use them for, and ultimately how you position yourself as a writer to them to make your own statement”.

The study of intertextuality, for Lemke, is “concerned with the recurrent discourse and activity patterns of the community and how they are constituted by, instanced in, and interconnected or disjoined through, particular texts” (Lemke, 1995a, p.86). That is, by exploring intertextuality, the relationship between a specific text and a genre could be revealed, or, the relationship between a text and its cultural context could be partially understood.

For Lemke, it is through intertextuality that the text instantiates the context of culture. Intertextual analysis of meaning, thus, is crucial to finding the meaning of a text. The reason for its central importance is that all texts gain their meaning not only intratextually but also, and in a more fundamental way, intertextually. Intertextual relations transcend the context of situation and depend on the context of culture.
(Malinowski, 1923, 1935; Hasan, 1985). The immediate situation, while the most specific, is never the widest context for the meaning of text or discourse. The meanings made in different situation-types are connected in ways that are characteristic of a community’s culture.

Intertextuality, then, offers a bridge or interface between the context of culture and the text. In the case of the present study, intertextuality is crucial to understanding how the genre rules (i.e. the use of discourse patterns in a culture) have influenced the production of a text (i.e. the use of lexicogrammatical resources).

Intertextual analysis allows us to see the ‘bigger picture’ of a text in terms of what its meanings are and how they relate to other meanings held in the society as framing a particular text. In this way it can be seen to be putting on display socially established patterns of meaning that are held against the larger background of the potential of all the meanings that could be held.

For the purpose of analysing intertextuality, White’s (2002a, b) framework for analysing ‘engagement’ is especially relevant to a linguistic consideration on intertextual analysis. In ‘appraisal analysis’, ‘engagement’ “is concerned with the sourcing of attitude and acknowledgement of alternative voices”(Martin, 2002, p.58) in a text. Within ‘engagement’, White (2002a) distinguishes two broad categories of resources. They are termed ‘intra-vocalisation’ and ‘extra-vocalisation’. ‘Intra-vocalisation’ is concerned with the internal voice of the writer or speaker which proclaims, disclaims or probabilises, while ‘extra-vocalisation’ is concerned with resources which involve the inclusion in the text of some explicitly external voice. White considers extra-vocalisation under the resources of ‘attribution’. Attribution involves quoting or referencing the statement or points of view of external sources. In other words, it is concerned with identifying linguistic resources for including outside sources and looking closely at the choices available for evaluating these sources (Droga & Humphrey, 2002). This extra-vocalisation contrasts with intra-vocalisation in which the voice is involved in an internal voice, that is to say, the voice of the
speaker or author or writer. White considers intra-vocalisation under the resources of ‘modality, proclaims and disclaims’. He has developed a detailed analytical framework for analysing ‘attribution’ (that is concerned with extra-vocalisation) which will be part of the analytical system employed in this study (for further details see Chapter 7).

4.4. Summary

This chapter has highlighted theoretical frameworks in the area of critical discourse analysis and intertextuality that inform and provide guidelines for the study. Specifically, the chapter has outlined Fairclough’s three-layer model of CDA, and Bazerman’s and White’s models for analysing intertextuality, which provide a basis for the theoretical framework of the present study. In addition, this chapter has reviewed the major theoretical principles and presented general critiques on CDA as an approach to research. The final part of the chapter has outlined the concept of intertextuality and discussed some perspectives and analytical approaches to intertextuality.

The following chapter will put the theoretical frameworks reviewed together and present the research methodology employed in the present study. It will also discuss the principles of the research design, data collection and the data analysis procedures used in the study.