Chapter-1:
Introduction

1.1: Introduction:

The introductory chapter throws light upon the key concept of Subaltern Studies and Discourse Analysis. It gives the basic idea of postcolonialism as it is necessary to know about postcolonialism to understand subaltern theory. The postcolonial theory studies the ‘Third World’ nations as they are put in the margin by the ‘First World’ nations. Postcolonial literature is internally a diverse cluster of writers and critics. The postcolonial writers are involved in the struggle against the colonialism/imperialism and such works are as odd as the struggle against it. The postcolonial writings reflect the new consciousness of the writers. Postcolonialism helps to see how and why the differences are created between the ‘First World’ and the ‘Third World’ nations. In western literature, the white man takes on his own myth and creates a mythology which reflects western culture; the culture which has dominated the world culture by marginalizing or excluding non-western traditions and forms of cultural life and expression.

Edward Said, well-known for his *Orientalism* (Said), is attracted to Foucault’s version of poststructuralism because it allows him to link the theory of discourse with real social and political struggle. Said challenges the western discourse and follows the logic of Foucault’s theory and writes that no discourse is fixed for all time; it is both cause and effect. It not only wields power but also stimulates resistance and opposition. As resistance and opposition comes from the below so postcolonialism examines the ‘power from the below’. The post-colonial writers and critics, in an aggressive mood, look at the ‘First World’ nations as they struggle to regain their identity. They are suppressed and exploited by the dominant class and their ultimate aim is to dismantle the systems of domination. By writing back, the post-colonial writers and critics try to create their space as writers and intellectual individuals. Post-colonial writers and critics are involved in an act of resistance and they try to reclaim and reconstitute their identity in a language that is now but was not their language. This introductory chapter will also throw light on the key word ‘subaltern’. This will help to see that how the writers of the ‘Third World’ and the native people come into the category of subaltern. Furthermore, the chapter is about the basic
idea of discourse. It also throws light upon the general views of critics about Discourse Analysis. The chapter also covers the six major types of Discourse Analysis. As it is difficult to understand the concept of subaltern without understanding postcolonialism, the chapter starts with the general and basic idea of postcolonialism.

1.2: Postcolonialism:

The world is divided into the West and the rest. The basic of such difference is binary opposition between the black and the white. In this context the ‘whites’ are seen as superior and the ‘blacks’ are treated as the ‘racy black’. The conjunction ‘white’ has put the rest of the world in the margins. The rest of the world is always positioned outside the mainstream. They are often being treated as the object of white people. Colonial or imperial rule has portrayed the colonized people as inferior, feminine, childlike, uncivilized and incapable of looking after themselves. The colonized people look at the western world with their own understanding, having their own perspective and they assume about the colonizers.

Based on the differences of the white and black, the word ‘civilization’ has got a new meaning. Far from white people’s perspective, civilization is limited to white men’s culture - on the basis for ideas of legitimate government, law, economics, science, language, music, art, literature. They look at non-western culture - culture as uncivilized and barbaric.

It is the need to talk about the world in which the non-Western live. It is the time to fight for the very existence of non-Western people. They struggled a lot to find a way to talk about their life, their experiences. It is the first question the writers and the critics of postcolonialism try to answer. Postcolonialism has developed a body of writing which views the world of major minority and minority major. It attempts to analyze the relationship between the two by turning the world upside down. The reality is that the one who is not western is deliberately excluded from the western culture by the dominant voices. The one is inside yet outside. Postcolonialism offers a way of seeing things differently.

Postcolonialism claims for the equal rights of all human beings. In postcolonialism, the writers and critics try to make equilibrium between the West and the rest. In a way,
postcolonialism claims for material and cultural well being for all human beings. Post-colonial writers raise their voices of resistance against the dominant class. In the history, the resistance and opposition became a political movement.

Postcolonialism argues for the nations of three non-western continents (Africa, Asia, Latin America) are largely in a situation of subordination to Europe and North America and in a position of economic inequalities.

In this politics of difference, postcolonialism asserts the rights of non-Western people against the dominant ideology for their material well being and also for the dynamic power of their culture because the non-Western culture has started to transform the societies. In postcolonialism the cultural analysis has been concerned with the elaboration of theoretical structures that contest the previous dominant western ways of seeing things. In this context feminism can be linked with postcolonialism as master-slave relationship between man-woman and the colonizers and the colonized are based on the same logic. Postcolonial writers and critics deconstruct the theory of power and look back at the Western world from the margin. The same way in Feminism, feminist critics critically studies the position of women in the patriarchal culture. Feminist critics examine that how an image of ‘woman’ is created in male dominated culture. So the position of women and the colonized others is the same as they both are treated as racial and gender stereotypes. The theories of postcolonialism and feminism play of the connections between women, land or nations.

A notable and debatable point in cultural analysis is feminism. There was a time when everything was seen from a male’s point of view. There was not a book, a speech, a film or anything in which a woman was treated as a subject, as a human being. Her presence was there but she was muted and was put in the margin. A woman, in this patriarchal world suffered from male gaze. She was looked at as an object only. She was never an observing eye. Women’s writing was treated as non-series, trivial, domestic and gossip. In patriarchal culture women were dominated, exploited and physically abused by men. In this politics of difference some feminists raised their voice against the victimization of women. Their attitude extended into the whole of culture, social relations, politics, law, medicine and the arts, popular and academic language.
In general writers in postcolonialism and women share the same problems. Both of their voice remained unheard. They struggled hard; in fact, they are struggling hard for their voices to be heard. They write back against unjust; unjust done from political to domestic to law and language. Postcolonial writing is about political and social hierarchies that exist between the rest and the west and between women and men. In postcolonialism the writers have come from many different walks of life and worked towards common goals but of course they differ in their style and in method. They worked for the emancipation and empowerment. They work for their right to make decisions that affect their own lives. They claim their right to have equal access to the law, to education, to medicine, and to the workplace.

Postcolonialism helps to study the politics of the subaltern; that is, subordinated classes and peoples. Linking Subaltern theory with postcolonialism helps to examine that to what extent colonial power succeeded in silencing the colonized others- be they women, non-whites, non-Europeans, the lower classes or the oppressed casters. It helps to see that how dominant ideologies work and transform the culture of the colonized other.

1.3: Subaltern Studies:

To know about subaltern, the first and for most necessary thing is to know about the persons who are displaced, both externally and internally. One must know about unsettled, uprooted and forcefully translated mass that have been forced to shun their root from their mother land, their tradition, and their culture in general from their own ‘self’, their identity. Such types of people live their life in distress. It has been fractured and fragmented. Stabilities in simple, local, social existence have been destabilized after the forceful immigration, physical and emotional.

People here face violent disruption of capitalism, the end of the comforts of the common place. These forcefully moved off people find themselves in a new lunch in a new culture where they have to accept the new culture by leaving their identity, their self behind. Putting the two different cultures together is an experience of pain because it brings uncertainty in life. It makes a human being an object in the eyes of the world. The world is interested in knowing the
experience of suppressed. This suppressed class has to kill their self every day. They have to tear themselves for their body, beliefs, language, desires, habits, affections because they are put in unrecognizable worlds.

“Everything that happens in this raw, painful experience of disruption, dislocation and dis-remembering paradoxically fuels the cruel but creative crucial of the postcolonial.” (Young, Postcolonialism: A Very Short Introduction)

In this unrecognizable world the one who is treated as an intruder, speaks only for his/her need. He/she never shows interest in sharing experiences as he/she never wants to translate the story of his/her life as a representative of the other. In a way he/she is silenced forcefully. The world is divided into many places. Everybody is seeking for knowledge. But the question is what knowledge is? Who has authorized it? Who has framed it? When we realized the situation it seems that knowledge brings inequalities, differences as knowledge gives power. The ‘Third World’ has become a term originally invented on the model of the Third Estate of the French Revolution. The world was divided according to the major political system, capitalism and socialism; these were the first and the second worlds. The third world was made up of what is left over; the new independent nations that had formerly made up the colonies of the imperial powers. The term ‘The Third World’ gradually became associated with economic and political problems that such countries encountered and consequently with poverty, famine, unrest: ‘The Gap’.

In postcolonialism subaltern means dispossessed. Subalterns look at the world not form above, but from below.

For example, Frantz Fanon’s writing is very much influential and reputable in postcolonialism. In fact he has given new meanings, new definitions to postcolonialism. His writings have created new horizons. He has changed the subject. Reading of his own experience of being treated as the fairest skinned fellow among other Negros and suddenly treated as a Negro as an ‘other’ reflects his pain. Moreover we can understand that how does one feel whose is decentred or dislocated and is forced to change his/her identity. That’s what postcolonial
critics and writers means by looking at the world from the below. The pain of a Negro can be felt in Fanon’s own words:

“I came into the world imbued with the will to find a meaning in things, My spirit filled with the desire to attain to the source of the world and then I found that I was an object in the midst of other objects.” (Read)

Fanon’s first response is to experience the pain of the ‘other’ as he puts it, being ‘sealed into that crushing objecthood.’ The problem goes even deeper being turned into an object of a pointing finger and a deriding gaze, is only the exterior part. What also happens is that those in such situation come to internalize this view of themselves, to see themselves as different, ‘other’, lesser.

The concept of ‘other’ is based on boundaries – political – social – cultural boundaries, inside and outside. These boundaries create difference in culture- dominant culture and marginal culture, in such condition an individual’s identity is distorted and he/she is in nervous condition. The original culture of native is superimposed with a colonial or dominant culture. The native continuously tries to assimilate both the cultures which is completely impossible. Though the colonized one tries to mix up with the dominant culture he/she is always treated as an outsider. A non-white’s attempts to become white by changing his/her race and class by assimilating with the dominant culture remains half because there are layers of different value systems which is beyond a non-white’s reach. The individuals in such a society are the subject to the painfulness of what Fanon recognizes as a hybridized spirit existence, trying to live as a two different, incompatible people at once. In such situation the suppressed class’s aggressive reaction comes out which is the gesture of liberation or of powerlessness. Moreover such reactions are uncontrollable. By doing such things the subordinates tries to make settlement and he/she uses any means for this- because it is considered as a nationalist attack on minority cultures which is destructive. This system is destructive because it destroys knowledge, histories as well as people.

The writer of the ‘Third World’, Salman Rushdie has also written on this difference. His position was complex because up to that point he had been one of the most noticeable proponent
and anti-racism in Britain voicing the politics and perspectives of the migrate community. Suddenly it became clear that within the communities of the ethnic minorities for who he spoke there were different latitudes from Rushdie’s perspective of multicultural mixture in his word ‘chutnification’, enclosed by other ethnic minorities writers, such as Hanif Kureishi, and also by media. There is a deep split between celebratory multiculturalism and the real situation of many minorities who experience oppression in their everyday life.

The division is based on superiority and minority. First they accept assimilation and then they want to retain their unsullied cultural identity. For minorities in the west, or for those living outside the west, the divisions are less clear-cut. It is not unusual for individuals to want both at the same time. The nervous condition of postcolonial desire finds itself hunted by an ungovernable ambivalence.

“The conflict of cultures and community around The Satanic Verses has been mainly represented in spatial terms and binary geopolitical polarities - Islamic fundamentalists vs. Western literary modernists, the quarrel of the ancient (ascriptive) migrants and modern (ironic) metropolitans. This obscures the anxiety of the irresolvable, borderline culture of hybridity that articulates its problems of identification and its diasporic aesthetic in an uncanny, disjunctive temporality that is, at once, the time of cultural displacement, and the space of the ‘untranslatable’. ” (Bhabha)

The philosophy of subaltern is found on a simple but powerful message of the empowerment of the suppressed class. In their anti-colonial struggle they try to translate rhetoric into the language of civil rights. Salman Rashdie’s concept of a ‘translated man’, means someone who is ‘translated’ across cultures. When people are translated across cultures their experience of being translated is not passive. Garvey’s (the founder of the VNIA) political, philosophy is based on a simple, powerful message of black power and pride. Garvey’s call for the restitution of the dignity of the black man was a call to self-translation. Translation is a way of thinking about languages; people and culture are transformed as they move between different places. It can also
be used more metaphorically as a way of describing how the individual or the group can be transformed by changing their sense of their own place in society.

There are invisible lines to which divided and translate people are put. They are forcefully abandoned from their homes and their families. During the process of ‘translating people’ the entire villages must have been massacred during nights. The suppressed class must have passed insomniac nights.

“The West won the world not by the superiority of its but Superiority in applying organized violence. Westerns often forget this fact, non-westerns never do.”

(Huntington)

Westerners became violent to transform the attitude to non-westerners. They keep coming and bombing as if it has become their right. The subordinate class by any means tries to sleep out from their grasp. In a way both have become a threat to each other when the westerners say that their imperial era is over now. The end of the era is just for them. It will never end for suppressed, for migrants, and for subalterns. Even after years, in present time the effect of imperialism and colonialism is felt. In the writing of postcolonial writers and critics what the world reads is the aftermath of that painful era. The people from the third world were craving for their freedom. Freedom itself has become a very complicated term in postcolonialism. But for these simple people the meaning of freedom was getting their land back. Because the problem of landlessness was/is one of the most immediate and significant issues faced by these people.

The first step taken by the westerners was to drive off the native from their land because they wanted to create vast farms and estates. This was one of the reasons of forceful migration. In the slums of big cities were found heaps of non-westerners where they were treated as a second class citizen. They were not given their rights; in fact their life was sealed. So the world of postcolonialism is the world in which justice and equality between westerners and non-westerners is impossible. This also has included the status of women in society. Even the problem of landlessness remains a central issue to the politics of any country. Such types of problems make the people the wretched of the Earth, in Fanon’s context. In such type of
situations women have to face double wretchedness—suppressed by the colonial and patriarchal power. The movements and religion and the act of resistance against the system is a continuous process because the experience of dispossession and landlessness is also typical of rattler colonialism and is historically most difficult to resolve. The suppressed class who was treated as the wretched of the Earth struggled a lot to get their ‘native title’ back. The struggle of subaltern in postcolonialism typically deals with colonial power. The concept of landlessness implies a person who has become landless, exiled from their land. Majority of the subalterns face the same problem. Either they are exiled from their land or they are treated as an ‘other’ in their own land. The question of landlessness is emphasized here because for the native people— their desire is not their property, their possession. For them it is their home, their mother land. But for the colonial power it becomes other land. This can be seen as both the problem of property and also the problem of what is proper. The transformation of indigenous culture is based on economic, cultural and social transformation. This forceful transformation is a process to destroy the nation. The nation becomes an empty space. The subalterns try hand to rebuild their nation again but the question is Does anything really makes up a nation apart from its borders? Are there nations without physical borders? What difference do the borders make? Sometimes borders create limit of the nation. It is also the border that allows a nation recognize as the nation. To fill the identification the subalterns use race, religion, culture, history or the land because by using any means they want to get their national identity back.

1.4: An Introduction to Discourse Analysis:

Defining discourse depends on the subject area and the contextual use of language. Definition of discourse and discourse analysis depends on the epistemological stance of the theorist. It is used in different disciplines, in different ways, with different contents or the meanings of the concept. Discourse studies both the text and the context. Discourse analysis is essentially multidisciplinary. It involves linguistics, poetics, semiotics, psychology, sociology, anthropology, history, and communication research. Discourse analysts study language in use in relation to social, political and cultural aspects.
The term ‘Discourse’ is wide spread. Discourse is language and therefore discourse analysis is the analysis of language, the language in use. Discourse analyst investigates what the language is used for. Broadly speaking discourse studies language in use. Discourse is more related with speech than with written document. The main focus in discourse analysis is the study of ‘text’- written and oral. It studies the ‘text’ used in a particular ‘context’. Language is always used in a situational or cultural context. The discourse analysts investigate the meaning in interaction because language is a system of signs and signs are arbitrary. The basic elements of a language for Saussure are signs. Signs unite a sound-image (signifier) and a concept (signified). Saussure is concerned with the arbitrary nature of the sign and it means that there is no natural relationship between signifier and signified. To understand the meaning Saussure insists on the identification of signs within the context. Language comprises a system of linguistic and conceptual forms whose identities are not fixed by reference to objects in the world, but by their internal difference. To understand the relational difference between signs Saussure has introduced the concept of linguistic value. In structuralism Saussure studies the social relationships between signs and language. The meaning is not inside the text but outside the text. Meanings are attributed to the things by the human mind. Saussure has given the example of the game of chess. He argues that language is created within the context to explain or understand the game. Within the game the ‘signs’ become real. They have their significance, importance or value within the situational context only. Discourse analysts study expressed meanings in human interpretation. Language creates and represents social phenomena and hence language is viewed as a social performance or social action.

1.5: Critics views about Discourse Analysis:

David Crystal’s attempt to pin down the meaning of ‘discourse’ within linguistics, by contrasting it to the use of the term ‘text’:

“Discourse analysis focuses on the structure of naturally occurring spoken language, as found in such ‘discourses’ as conversations, interviews, commentaries and speeches. Text analysis focuses on the structure of written language, as found in such ‘texts’ as essays, notices, road signs and chapters. But
this distinction is not clear-cut, and there have been many other uses of these labels. In particular, ‘discourse’ and ‘text’ can be used in a much broader sense to include all languages unite with a definable communicative function, whether spoken or written. Some scholars talk about ‘spoken or written discourses’, others talk about ‘spoken or written text’. ” (Crystal 116)

As explained in this definition David Crystal distinguishes between written and spoken language/discourse. The term ‘discourse’ is associated with spoken language. It studies the use of language in speech, the way language is used differently in dialects and slangs. As written in this definition the analysis of text focuses on the structure of written language. It is the analysis of signs, the way they are used contextually in the written language. Structuralism makes a clear distinction between written and spoken language by using ‘langue’ and ‘parole’. But in this definition the distinction is not clear-cut. ‘Discourse’ and ‘text’ can be used in a much broader sense for the communicative function for written and spoken language.

Geoffrey Leech and Michael Short argue that:

“Discourse is linguistic communication seen as a transaction between speaker and hearer, as an interpersonal activity whose form is determined by its social purpose. Text is linguistic communication (either spoken or written) seen simply as a message coded in its auditory or visual medium.” (Hawthorn 189)

Geoffrey Leech and Michael Short defined ‘discourse’ as a linguistic communication. It is a communication process between the speaker and hearer. It is the exchange of ideas and message is encoded within the text. The purpose of the communication is social.

Emile Benveniste contrasts discourse with ‘the language system’, when he states:

“The sentence, an undefined creation of limitless variety, is the very life of human speech in action. We conclude from this that with the sentence we leave the domain of language as a system of signs and enter into another universe, that of
language as an instrument of communication, whose expression is discourse.”
(Benveniste, Problems in General Linguistics 110)

Emile Benveniste studies the language system. According to him a sentence plays a vital role in human speech. As written by Emile it is ‘the life’ of human speech in action. He is of the point that a sentence is a system of signs which helps the speaker or the hearer to enter into another universe. So in communication language is used as an instrument and its expression is discourse.

**Emile Benveniste:**

“Discourse must be understood in its widest sense: every utterance assumes a speaker and a hearer, and in the speaker, the intention of influencing the other in some way... it is every variety of oral discourse of every nature form trivial conversation to the most elaborate oration... but it is also the mass of writing that reproduces oral discourse or that borrows its manner of expression and its purposes: correspondence, memories, plays, didactic works, in short, all genres in which someone addresses [themselves] as the speaker, and organizes what [they say] in the category of person. The distinction we are making between historical narration and discourse does not at all coincide with that between written language and the spoken. Historical utterance is today reserved for the written language, but discourse is written as well as spoken. In practice, one passes from one to the other instantaneously. Each time that discourse appears in the midst of historical narration, for example, when the historian reproduces someone’s words or when [they themselves intervene] in order to comment upon the events reported, we pass to another tense system, that of discourse.” (Benveniste, Problems in General Linguistics)

Emile Benveniste studies discourse in the widest sense. From sentence he goes down to the utterance and says that the speaker intends to influence the hearer by the variety of discourse.
It is the discourse which makes the written or oral language elaborated. Oral discourse borrows its expression from written language, from all types of genres. Emile Benveniste studies the historical utterance and written language. He argues that even in a historical narration discourse appears when the historian comments upon the events or reproduces someone’s words.

**Michel Foucault comments:**

“Instead of gradually reducing the rather fluctuating meaning of the word ‘discourse’, I believe I have in fact added to its meanings: treating it sometimes as the general domain of all statements, sometimes as an individualizable group of statements, and sometimes as a regulated practice that accounts for a number of statements.” (Foucault 80)

In his definition of Discourse Foucault completely differs from other critics. He treats discourse as the general domain of all statements. This part of the definition gives broad idea and understanding of discourse. It means all utterances or texts which have meaning and which have some other effects in the real world, count as discourse. In the second part of the definition “as an individualizable group of statements” Foucault discusses about the particular structure within the discourse. Foucault’s definition of discourse contains layers of meanings as it also talks about the discourse of femininity, the discourse of imperialism and so on. In the third part of the definition Foucault is less interested in the actual utterances or texts that are produced than in the rules and structures which produce particular utterances and texts.

There are six tradition of discourse analysis in literature. They are: Conversation analysis, interactional sociolinguistics, discursive psychology, critical discourse analysis, Bakhtinian discourse analysis, and Foucauldian discourse analysis.
1.6: Six Schools of Discourse Analysis:

1.6.1: Conversation analysis:

Talk is a complex activity and can be understood when people act out their sociality, when they speak. That is why conversation analysts emphasize on the study of talk rather than language. Conversational analysis is an approach which studies talk-in-interaction. It grew out of ethnomethodological tradition in sociology developed by Harold Garfinkle (Garfinkel). The main ideas for the approach are established in *Studies in Ethnomethodology*. Garfinkle studies the social structure of everyday lived experience. He also studies how the structure of our everyday activities is ordinarily and routinely produced and maintained. In Ethnomethodologists’ views social order is not a pre-existing framework, but it is constructed in the minds of individuals who engage in social event i.e. talk-in-interaction. Each and every member of society encounters sense impressions and experiences and they also organize them into a coherent pattern. The members who are involved in this social event must make others aware about the activity in which they are engaging. To get the meaning from this every day event one must be familiar with the social reality, and therefore the only thing worth studying, is the reality of commonly understood methods of communication. So that one can get to know how language is use in day today life, in conversation. Erving Goffman has emphasized on the study of actual instances of social interaction. He asserted that the ordinary activities of our daily life are an important subject for study. In Erving Goffman’s view it is possible to discover how human beings engage socially by studying their everyday events and situations. He was able to show how matters of great social significance could be found in everyday activities. Goffman’s approach to research was a qualitative one in which description and analysis were the primary tools for developing and understanding of social processes. Goffman’s emphasis is on the need to study ordinary instances of speaking, which had in his views been neglected. Philip Manning in *Erving Goffman and modern sociology* has written about Goffman’s views. He argues that

Talk is socially organized, not merely in terms of who speaks to who in what language, but as a little system of mutually ratified and ritually governed face-to-face action, a social encounter. (Manning)
Goffman argued that the study of instances of speaking was not just a matter of linguistic description of language, but rather interaction had its own system of rules and structures which were not intrinsically linguistic in nature. This means that the study of language in purely linguistic terms could not adequately account for the nature of language-in-use. Garfinkle and Goffman, in their works, are concerned with the orderliness of everyday life hence they have provided an impetus for the development of conversational analysis. These things were also taken up by Gail Jefferson in his book *Harvey Sacks: Lectures on Conversation* (Jefferson) from the early 1960s. In his lectures Sacks has developed an approach to the study of social action. Sacks emphasized on the investigation of the social order as it was produced through the practices of everyday talk. By the late 1960s and early 1970s, through the works of Sacks and his colleagues Emmanuel A. Schegloff and Gail Jefferson, Conversational Analysis began to emerge from sociology as an independent area of inquiry oriented towards understanding the organizational structure of talk because the disciplines of social science are concerned with human communication and is always influenced by talk. Conversational Analysis drew from ethnomethodology a concern for understanding how order was achieved in social interaction and empirically based methodology based on micro-analytic studies.

Conversational analysis also developed from the work of Harvey Sacks. Sacks approach to the study of conversation is characterized by a view of as an activity through which speakers accomplish things in interaction. Strategically talk can be employed to achieve communicative goals. For Sacks the strategic use of talk is not a set of rules that by using it human beings accomplish their action but rather it is the production of interactional effects. These interactional effects are achieved through the use of talk in particular context. In Sacks’s views conversation was orderly and this order was manifested at all points. The orderly nature of talk results from the recognizable achievement of the same outcome through similar methods in similar context. In order to undertake particular actions in particular contexts speakers deploy sets of practices through which conversation is realized. Here language is the main source of analysis because language functions as social action.

The core assumptions of Conversational Analysis are as follows:
1. Order is produced by orderliness. That is, order does not occur of its own accord nor does it pre-exist the interaction, but is rather the result of coordinate practices of the participants who achieve orderliness and the interact.

2. Order is produced, situated and occasioned. That is, order is produced by the participants themselves for the conversation in which it occurs. The participants themselves orient to the order being produced and their behavior reflects and indexes that order. This means that in analyzing conversation as an academic activity, orderliness being documented is not externally imposed by the analyst but internally accomplished by the participant. This observed order is not the result of pre-formed conceptions of what should happen, nor is it a probabilistic generalization about frequencies.

3. Order is repeated and recurrent. The patterns of orderliness found in conversation are repeated not only in the talk of an individual speaker but across group of speakers. The achieved order is therefore the result of a shared understanding of the methods by which the order is achieved.

These three formulations make it clear that conversation is an overwhelming order in Conversation Analysis. Random or unstructured conversation is impossible. However, the order observable in conversation does imply an overarching uniformity in conversational structure which is generalizable across conversations. Instead the participants themselves construct conversations in orderly way.

As mentioned in *Harvey Sacks: Lectures on Conversation* by Gail Jefferson, according to Sacks a key idea in Conversation Analysis is the notion of recipient design which is the most general principle of conversational interaction. The participants assume that they share their knowledge when they talk. The talk must be understood by the interlocutor. So the term ‘recipient design’ refers to the talk or the idea designed by the participants in their talk. It means that conversational contributions are designed appropriately with a recipient in mind. Recipient design is not a resource which speakers use to design talk but it is a useful resource for listeners, too. To interpret the talk listeners can use the recipient design and they are also motivated to hear a turn- the turn which is designed for them. This means that recipient design is the salient feature of talk and the organization of talk, and therefore it is one aspect of the produced orderliness of

Conversation. The task of the analyst is to discover and describe the produced orderliness of which is created by conversationalists during conversation. Such an analysis makes the conversation visible.

Conversation Analysis as an approach is not just related to talk-in-interaction. In some ways it is a misnomer if it is limited to study conversation, only. In fact, in broader sense Conversation analysts see talk-in-interaction as a social process because to understand the social situation they use talk. So Conversation Analysis studies the organization and orderliness of social interaction.

Conversation is one of the most powerful uses of human language. Human language develops because of conversation or vice versa. Conversation is a natural process for human being. The human society depends upon conversation.

“Social interaction is the primordial means through which the business of the social world is transacted, the identities of its participants are affirmed or denied, and its cultures are transmitted, renewed and modified.” (Charles Godwin)

Conversation is a medium through which human beings are involved in the process of socialization. They develop and sustain their relationship with each other by engaging themselves in conversation. When people converse they engage in a form of linguistic communication. But a linguistic code is not the only thing in communication there is much more going on in conversation. In conversation not only language but also eye-gaze, body posture, silence, and the real world context in which the talk is produced are considered as the important parts. The first and the foremost thing in conversational analysis are to see how language creates maximum effects in social actions. Conversation is everyday activity and a social event. It is structured within the culture or a specific time that’s why it varies from culture to culture and changes over time.

Conversational analysis studies verbal interaction. The primary data in conversational analysis are audio. The core intention of this type of methodology is to understand social interaction and the role of discourse in everyday life. Conversational analysis discovers and describes the architecture of interaction. Verbal interaction shapes and forms structures. It invites or limits the range of actions. In common sense language functions as a mechanism which helps
individuals to exchange ideas. Sacks believes that language has a social organization. In conversation utterances, phrases, clauses and even single words are systematically designed and perform a major role in the activity of interaction. The goal of this analysis is to investigate the nature of the interaction.

1.6.2: Interactional sociolinguistics:

Gumperz and Goffman developed interactional sociolinguistics view of discourse from the perspective of sociology and anthropology—"as a social interaction in which the emergent construction of meaning is facilitated by the use of language". (Schiffin 134)

Gumperz argue that social and cultural forces affect language and cognition and therefore "a general theory of communication which integrates what we know about grammar, culture and interactive conventions into a single overall frame work of concepts and analytical procedures" (Gumperz, Discourse Strategies) is needed for discourse analysis.

Interactional sociolinguistics, the term and the perspective are grounded in work of John Gumperz. Interactional sociolinguistics as an approach to Discourse Analysis is concerned with how speakers signal and interpret meaning in social interaction. This approach helps the analysts to interpret what participants intend to convey in everyday communication. The development of Interactional sociolinguistics is found in an anthropological context of cross-cultural comparison. The work which provided a basis for interactional sociolinguistics focused largely on contexts of intercultural miscommunication. This perspective has been extended to cross-gender communication, by most notably Deborah Tannen (1990), and it has also been applied to the performance of social identity through talk. The framework can be applied to any interaction, however, and much of the empirical work that falls under the rubric of discourse analysis in communication, linguistic anthropology, sociology, discursive psychology, and socially oriented linguistics owes a debt to this perspective. In Conversation Analysis talk is culturally and contextually embedded but how socio-cultural and linguistic knowledge is linked in the communication of meaning was not specified. Gumperz in Interactional sociolinguistics study the dimension of this relationship. In his views socio-cultural knowledge is not an external aspect of interaction, but rather is internally woven with the talk and behavior of interaction itself. At a theoretical level, this undermines a conduit metaphor or information theory: a notion of
communication, in which context is presumed to be discrete and separate from communicative content. Gumperz has introduced three concepts in order to build upon his earlier ideas:

1. Contextualization cues ("signaling mechanisms such as intonation, speech rhythm, and choice among lexical, phonetic and syntactic options...said to affect to expressive quality of a message but not its basic meaning [Gumperz 1982a: 1(b)] and by helping to signal contextual presuppositions, contextualization...influence both the expressive quality of a message and its basic (prepositional) meaning.
2. contextual presuppositions; and
3. situated inference. (Gumperz, Discourse Strategies)

These contextualization cues are the marginal features of language and are related with the contextual knowledge that contributes to the presuppositions necessary to the accurate inferencing of what is meant. In Gumperz's views another important aspect needed for situated inference is involvement. According to Gumperz (1982a:3) a general theory of discourse must begin by: "specifying the linguistic and sociocultural knowledge that needs be shared if conversational involvement is to be maintained, and then go on to deal with what is about the nature conversational inference that makes more culture, subculture and situational specificity of interpretation" (Gumperz, Discourse Strategies). According to Schiffrin (1994:105), Goffman focus on social interaction complements and Gumperz's focus is on situated inference. In his views 'self' is a social construction and one way of viewing it as such is through the notion of 'face'. In social interaction 'self' and 'face' both have to be maintained. To sum up, "Goffman describes the form and meaning and of the social and interpersonal contexts that provide presuppositions for the decoding of meaning (Schiffrin, Approaches to Discourse 105). Gumperz's interpretation of context and Goffman's the organization of social life show that language is indexical to the social world: and index to the cultural background and to the social identities and relationships.

In Schiffrin's view language contextualizes and is contextualized. Multiple interpretations are possible for a single word or sentence. Interpretations are related with different social
identities which can be understood by having the knowledge of different background. Schiffrin has given three basic points to understand his view. They are:

1. “social contextualization of the utterance,”
2. “the interpersonal and interactional consequences in an exchange,” and
3. “speaker's identity creates different contexts in which utterance meaning is situated.” (Schiffrin, Approaches to Discourse)

Gumperz argue that when people communicate they rapidly shift interpretive frames through conventionalized surface forms. In his term it is known as **contextualization cues**. According to Gumperz (1982a) contextualization cues reflect contexts. In the process of communication speakers give signals and listeners interpret. In this two way process each sentence is related to what precedes and follows. These contextualization cues help to understand the semantic content. These surface forms include varied phenomena such as prosody, code and lexical choices, formulaic expression, sequencing choices, and visual and gestural phenomena. They are united in a common, functional category when used in communication. Sometimes content plays dual function in communication stream as both referential content and a context in which to interpret that very referential content. Contextualization clues within the performance of the utterance can suggest the frame in which the utterance is to be interpreted. Contextualization cues do not directly index or refer to a specific interpretive frame. They serve as prods to inferential processes. Speakers use intonation pattern in communication. The same intonation pattern evokes different meanings in different contexts. The same intonation functions as a contextualization cue to different contexts and provide different contextual presuppositions necessary for different situated inferences and that is how it yields to multiple interpretations.

An utterance is a dispositional reaction to the contextual reaction. It is dispositional because there is a choice operating in each and every utterance. Thus, utterances are motivated by contexts only. This context is a crucial factor in the propositioning of the utterance. However, the choice as well as the textualization of the utterance goes beyond context: it is equally dependent on the speaker's intentionality and linguistic repertoire. If speakers do not know linguistic repertoire they can use the utterances. Interactional sociolinguistics approach has not considered the role of intentionality for speech acts and linguistic repertoire for textualization of
speech act which also structure the coherence and sequence in discourse. Interactional sociolinguistics considers how but not why and in what language an utterance reflects and creates the particulars of an interactional order (Schiffrin, Approaches to Discourse 29-31).

Schiffrin points out that "social meanings of acts can be formulated in terms of their interpersonal and interactional consequences, thus providing another context in which utterance meaning is situated" (Schiffrin, Approaches to Discourse 115). Speakers communicate by using utterances and the same utterance can have multiple meanings. This multiple interpretations depend upon interpersonal relationships because interpersonal relationships alter social meaning. In interpersonal relationships attitude is the most important thing because it is the product of individual disposition. This depends upon social distance and moreover responses should not be biased.

According to Schiffrin speaker's identity is another most important thing in interaction. The social status and power of speaker plays a major role and situate utterance meaning. It helps in identifying the relationships between the speaker and the hearer. An individual's expertise, social status, habits and interpersonal relationships, in general dispositionality of an individual, determine the lingual reaction to a turn in discourse and not other factors such as context, and culture by themselves alone.

1.6.3: Discursive psychology:

The social constructionist forms of discourse analysis have been developed in the field of social psychology. Discourse analysis has become one of the most social constructionist approaches within social psychology. Discursive psychology treats written and spoken language as constructions of the world oriented towards social action. Language shapes social world. It constructs identities and social relations and helps in understanding the world. Language is a dynamic form of social practice. In Discourse Analysis as Theory and Method (Marianne W Jorgensen) by Marianne W Jorgenson and Louise J. Philips it is mentioned that Discursive psychology draws partly on Ludwig Wittgenstein's later philosophy in which it is emphasized that claims about psychological states should be treated as social activities instead of as manifestations of deeper 'essences' behind the words. Utterances are always used in specific social context and their meanings are therefore dependent on the particular use to which they are
put. Thus, language is context bound and occasioned. It is language use in this sense that discursive psychologists define as discourse. Discursive psychology is developed from the works of Jonathan Potter and Margarate Wethrell. *Discourse and Social Psychology* (Jonathan Potter) (1987) by Jonathan Potter and Margarate Wethrell was central in the emergence of discursive psychology. Discursive psychology studies variations in people's talk, where by people contradict themselves. Whether something is understood as consistent or inconsistent depends on the social situation and on the individual. Consistency and inconsistency are themselves variable conditions and one of the aspects in which discursive psychology has special interest is how consistency and inconsistency are used as rhetorical strategies in situated language use.

Discursive psychology argues for the social construction of attitudes, social groups and identities. According to discursive psychology, language does not merely express experiences; rather, language also constitutes experiences and the subjective, psychological reality. Discursive psychology tries to understand self and identity.

According to discursive psychology discourses do not describe external world - "the world out there" rather discourses create a world that looks real or true for the speaker. Here language is not seen as a channel that transparently communicates a pre-existing psychological reality which is the basis of experience; rather subjective psychological realities are constituted through discourse, defines as situated language use or language use in everyday texts and talk (Whiteside 60).

Discursive psychology begins with psychology because it faces people living their lives. Discursive psychology studies how psychology is constructed, understood and displayed as people interact everyday and most institutional situations. There are many questions about a speaker; such as how does s/he show that they are not prejudiced when involved in social actions? How are actions coordinated? How is the mood of the speaker displayed? To answer such questions it is required to understand the psychology of people as they act and interact in particular settings. Discursive psychology does not start with a ‘technical’ story of mental processes, behavioral regularities or neural events that are happening somewhere below and behind the business of interaction. Rather it starts with the categories, constructions and orientations through which a sense of agency, say, or severe distress or a moment of understanding are displayed in a piece of interaction in a particular setting. Discursive psychology is interested in the psychology of language, i.e. language use that is why it does not
focus on discourse. Discursive psychology starts with a view of people social and rational, and with psychology as a domain of practice rather than abstract contemplation. It focuses on discourse as it is the primary arena for action, understanding and intersubjectivity.

There are three major observations about the nature of discourse. Discursive psychology is built from these three core observations. The first is, discourse is constructed and constructive. Discourse is made up of linguistic building blocks: words, categories, idioms, repertoire and so on. These are used in a wide range of ways to present certain versions of the world. For example, "let's have a glass of juice." The first part of this simple utterance "let's have" invokes other people in action. The word "juice" differentiates between types of drinks, i.e. tea, coffee, etc. It also invokes action of "drinking". It clarifies "not to eat" because food is not mentioned. These versions of the words are a product of the talk itself. There is nothing which exists there prior to the talk putatively so Discourse is constructive in this sense.

The second main principle is that discourse is action-oriented. People primarily carry out actions when they ‘talk’ and ‘write’. Talking and writing are actions in themselves. When people talk they blame, compliment, invite, justify and so on. Discourse is a medium for social activities. The third and the final principle is that discourse is situated. It is situated within a specific environment. Words are understood in relation to each other. This is very near and similar to the conversation analysis that talk is occasioned. It is situated within a particular institutional setting, such as a school, temple, and family mealtime. Discourse is also situated rhetorically, within a particular argumentative framework. One way of describing something will always be countering – either explicitly or indirectly – alternative ways of describing the same thing. Thus, to understand discourse fully, one must examine it in situation, how and why it happens, bound up with its situational context.

These principles have been developed by Bill Nichols in Representing Reality (Nichols) published in 1991 and Derek Edwards in Discourse and Cognition (Edwards) published in 1997. In the former text, Potter develops a systematic account of the way versions are built as objective, as mere descriptions of actions or events. This addresses the question of how speakers manufacture the credibility of versions, and how this building can be challenged and undermined. Taking the example of attitudes again, this work considers the way in which versions can be produced to generate evaluations as features of the objects and events rather than positions or dispositions of speakers. This is clearly a key task when talk is about delicate or
controversial topics, where motives and dispositions may be closely inspected. Thus constructing
a version of a minority group that simultaneously produces negative characteristics (e.g.
involvement with sexual violence) combined with a display of ‘sympathetic’ motivation toward
that group (perhaps drawing on one of the culture repertoires discussed above) can work to avoid
being seen as having racist attitudes. It should be noted the way the relationship between ‘mind’
and ‘the world’ is reworked here in the talk. One of the achievements of Discursive psychology
has been to highlight how crucial this relationship as a practical feature of interaction. People
construct versions of the world that have implications for their own disposition and thoughts; and
they construct versions of that psychological stuff to have implication for actions and events in
the world. Here the focus is on how people perform particular activity when they talk.

For example, how categories of ‘mind’ or ‘body’ are constituted through description to
reduce one’s accountability for an event. Emotions like ‘anger’, for example, can be worked up
as physical, uncontrollable events (‘boiling over’, ‘burning up with rage’) to characterize an
event as a brief ‘lapse’ in one’s usual demeanor. Discursive Psychology here is developing the
constructionist approach to emotion in a more specifically analytic and interactional direction.

1.6.4: Critical Discourse Analysis:

Critical discourse analysis is concerned to analyze how social and political inequalities
are manifest in and reproduced through discourse. It is associated with researchers such as
Norman Fairclough, Teun A. van Dijk, and Ruth Wodak. Critical Discourse Analysis provides
theories and method for the empirical study of the relation between discourse and social and
cultural developments in different social domains. Critical Discourse Analysis is used as a label
in two different ways: Norman Fairclough uses it both to describe the approach that he has
developed and as the label for a broader movement within discourse analysis of which several
approaches, including his own, are parts. Fairclough’s approach consists of a set of philosophical
premises, theoretical methods, methodological guidelines and specific techniques for linguistic
analysis, the broader critical discourse analytical movement consists of several approaches
among which there are both similarities and differences.

The five common features can be identified among the different approaches to CDA. Texts are produced (created) and consumed (interpreted) through discursive practices. Discursive
practices are viewed as an important form of social practice. It constitutes to the social world including social identities and social relations. The social and cultural reproduction and change take place partly through discursive practices in everyday life. It follows some societal phenomena are not of linguistic discursive character.

The aim of Critical Discourse Analysis is to shed light on the linguistic discursive dimension of social and cultural phenomena and processes of change in late modernity. Research in critical discourse analysis has covered areas such as organizational analysis (e.g. Mumby and Clair 1997), pedagogy (Chouliaraki 1998), mass communication and racism, nationalism and identity (e.g. Chouliaraki 1999; van Dijk 1991; Wodak et al. 1999), mass communication and economy (Richardson 1998), the spread of market practices (Fairclough 1993) and mass communication, democracy and politics (Fairclough 1995a, 1995b, 1998, 2000). Discourse covers not only written and spoken language but also visual images. It commonly accepted the texts which contain visual images as it must take account of the special characteristics of visual semiotics and the relationship between language and images. In critical discourse analysis there is a tendency to analyze pictures as linguistic texts. Critical discourse analysis studies the texts which make use of written language, visual images and sound.

For critical discourse analysts discourse is both constitutive and constituted. It constitutes social world and is constituted by other social practices. As social practice, discourse is in dialectical relationship with other social dimensions. It not only contributes to the shaping and reshaping of social structure but also reflects them. When Fairclough analyses how discursive practices in the media take part in the shaping of new forms of politics, he also takes into account that discursive practices are influenced by the structure of political system and the institutional structure of the media that do not have a solely discursive character. This conception of ‘discourse’ distinguishes the approach from more poststructuralist approaches, such as Laclau and Mouffe’s discourse theory. In critical discourse analysis, language-as-discourse is both a form of action through which people can change the world and a form of action which is socially and historically situated and in a dialectical relationship with other aspects of the social. In Fairclough’s views social structure influences discursive practices. Social structures play an independent role in forming and circumscribing discursive practices in society. These practices, relationships and identities were originally discursively constituted, but have become sedimented in institutions and non-discursive practices.
“The discursive constitution of society does not emanate from a free play of ideas in people’s heads but from a social practice which is firmly rooted in and oriented to real, material social structures.” (N. Fairclough, Language and Power 66)

Here Fairclough suggests that, if discourse is only seen as constitutive, this corresponds to claiming that social reality emanates only from people’s heads. There is disagreement among theorists as to whether the view that discourse is fully constitutive amounts to this form of idealism. Laclau and Mouffe, for example, argue strongly against the accusation of idealism on the grounds that the conception of discourse as constitutive does not imply that physical objects do not exist but, rather, that they acquire meaning only through discourse. Critical discourse analysis engages in concrete, linguistic textual analysis of language use in social interaction. This distinguishes it from both Laclau and Mouffe’s discourse theory which does not carry out systematic, empirical studies of language use, and from discursive psychology which carries out rhetorical but not linguistic studies of language use.

In critical discourse analysis, it is claimed that discursive practices contribute to the creation and reproduction of unequal power relations between social groups; it creates a difference, rather a gap between social groups – for example, between social classes, women and men, ethnic minorities and the majority. These effects are understood as ideological effects. In contrast to discourse theorists, including Foucault and Laclau and Mouffe, critical discourse analysis does not diverge completely from the Marxist tradition on this point. Some critical discourse analytical approaches do ascribe to a Foucauldian view of power, power as a force which creates subjects and agents – that is, as a productive force – rather than as a property possessed by individuals, which they exert over others. Critical Discourse Analysis approaches diverge from Foucault. They enlist the concept of ideology to theorize the subjugation of one social group to other social groups. Critical Discourse Analysis focuses on the discursive practices which construct the representations of the world, social subjects and social relations, including power relations. The discursive practices play a major role within social groups. Fairclough defines critical discourse analysis as an approach which seeks to investigate systematically.
“Often opaque relationships of causality and determination between (a) discursive practices, events and texts and (b) broader social and cultural structures, relations and processes […] how such practices, events and texts arise out of and are ideologically shaped by relations of power and struggles over power […] how the opacity of these relationships between discourse and society is itself a factor securing power and hegemony.” (N. Fairclough, Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language 135)

Critical Discourse Analysis aims to reveal the role of discursive practice in the maintenance of the social world, including the social relations which involve unequal relations of power and in this sense critical discourse analysis is ‘critical’. Its aim is to contribute to social change along the lines of more equal power relations in communication processes and society in general.

Critical discourse analysis does not, therefore, understand itself as politically neutral, but as a critical approach which is politically committed to social change. In the name of emancipation, critical discourse analytical approaches the side of oppressed social groups. Critics aim to uncover the role of discursive practice in the maintenance of unequal power relations, with the overall goal of harnessing the results of critical discourse analysis to the struggle for radical social change.

Fairclough has constructed a useful framework for the analysis of discourse as social practice. Fairclough’s framework contains a range of different concepts that are interconnected in a complex three-dimensional model. In Fairclough’s approach discourse is an important form of social practice which both reproduces and changes knowledge, identities and social relations including power relations, and at the same time is also shaped by other social practices and structures. Thus, discourse is in dialectical relationship with other social dimensions. Fairclough sees social structure as social relation both in society as a whole and in specific institutions, and as consisting of both discursive and non-discursive elements. Fairclough claims that discursive practice not only reproduces an already existing discursive structure but also challenges the structure by using words to denote what may lie outside the structure. By concentrating on building a theoretical model and methodological tools for empirical research in everyday social interaction Fairclough diverges from poststructuralist discourse theory. His emphasis is on the
systematic analysis of spoken and written language. Fairclough’s approach is a text-oriented form of discourse analysis that tries to unite three traditions:

- Study of textual analysis in detail within the field of linguistics (it includes Michael Halliday’s functional grammar).
- Analysis of social practice at macro-sociological level (including Foucault’s theory, which does not provide a methodology for the analysis of specific texts).
- The micro-sociological, interpretative tradition within sociology (including ethnomethodology and conversation analysis). In this third point, everyday life is treated as the product of people’s actions in which they follow a set of shared ‘common-sense’ rules and procedures.

Fairclough analyses text in detail to gain insight into how discursive processes operate linguistically in specific texts. He criticizes linguistic approaches because they concentrate exclusively on textual analysis. They focus just on a simplistic and superficial understanding of the relationship between text and society. In Fairclough’s views text analysis is not enough and sufficient for discourse analysis because it does not shed light on the links between texts and societal and cultural processes and structures. An interdisciplinary perspective is needed because it combines textual and social analysis. Social practices are shaped by social structure and power relations and that people are often not aware about these processes. The contribution of the interpretative tradition is to provide an understanding how people actively create a rule-bound world in everyday practices. The understanding of discourse as both constitutive and constituted is central to Fairclough’s theory. He conceives of the relationship between discursive practice and social structures as complex and variable across time, diverging from approaches to critical discourse analysis which assumes a higher degree of stability.

Fairclough applies the concept of discourse in three different ways. The first is discourse refers to language use as social practice. Secondly, discourse is understood as the kind of language used within a specific field. And thirdly, in the most concrete usage, discourse is used as a count noun, referring to a way of speaking which gives meaning to experiences from a particular perspective. Here, in the last sense, the concept refers to any discourse; the discourse which can be distinguished from other discourses such as, for example, a feminist discourse, a
Marxist discourse, a neoliberal discourse, a consumer discourse or an environmentalist discourse. Discourse contributes to the construction of:

- Social identities;
- Social relation; and
- System of knowledge and meaning.

Thus discourse has three functions: an identity function, a ‘relational’ function and an ‘ideational’ function. Here, Fairclough draws on Halliday’s multifunctional approach to language.

In any analysis, two dimensions of discourse are important focal points:

- the communicative event – an instance of language use such as a newspaper article, a film, a video, an interview or a political speech (Fairclough 1995b); and
- the order of discourse – the configuration of all the discourse types which are used within a social institution or a social field. Discourse types consist of discourses and genres. (N. Fairclough, Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language 66)

A genre is a particular usage of language which participates in, and constitutes, a part of a particular social practice. Discourse creates and is created within an order. Within an order of discourse, there are specific discursive practices through which text and talk are consumed and produced and interpreted. Discourse(s) are used in a particular way.

In Fairclough’s three-dimensional approach every instance of language use is a communicative event.

- it is a text (speech, writing, visual image or a combination of these);
- it is a discursive practice which involves the production and consumption of texts; and
- it is a social practice.
The framework of all these three-dimensions should be covered in a specific discourse analysis of a communicative event. The analysis should focus on (1) linguistic features of the text (2) processes relating to the production and consumption of the text (3) the wider social practice to which the communicative event belongs. In Fairclough’s views text and discursive practice represent two different dimensions and should be separated analytically. Analysis of discursive practice focuses on how authors of text draw on already existing discourses and genres in the consumption and interpretation of the texts.

In text analysis the concentration is on the formal features such as vocabulary, grammar, syntax, and sentence coherence from which discourses and genres are realized linguistically. People use language to produce and consume texts. Texts shape and are shaped by social practices. Therefore the relationship between text and social practice is mediated in discursive practice. At the same time text influences both the production and the consumption process. Those discourses and genres which are articulated together to produce a text, and which its receivers draw on in interpretation, have a particular linguistic structure that shapes both the production and consumption of the text. The analysis of a communicative event thus includes:

- analysis of the discourses and genres which are articulated in the production and the consumption of the text (the level of discursive practice);
- analysis of the linguistic structure (the level of the text); and
- considerations about whether the discursive practice reproduces or, instead, restructures the existing order of discourse and about what consequences this has for the broader social practice (the level of social practice).

Critical Discourse Analysis aims to explore the links between language use and social practice. The focus is the role of discursive practices in the maintenance of the social order and in social change. The general purpose of Fairclough’s three dimensional model is to provide and analytical framework for discourse analysis. The model promotes, and is based on the principle that text can never be understood or analyzed in isolation. They can only be understood in relation to other texts or in social context. Fairclough’s three dimensional models represent the basic framework for discourse analysis. It depicts the relation between text and context in a highly pedagogical way.
Fairclough understands the relationship between the communicative event and the order of discourse as dialectical. The discourse order is a system, but not a system in a structuralist sense. Communicative events not only reproduce orders of discourse, but can also change them through creative language use. The order of discourse is the sum of all the genres and discourses which are in use within a specific social domain. The order of discourse is a system in the sense that it both shapes and is shaped by specific instances of language use. Thus it is both structure and practice. The use of discourses and genres as resources in communication is controlled by the order of discourse because the order of discourse constitutes the resources that are available. It delimits what can be said. But, at the same time, language users can change the order of discourse by using discourses and genres in new ways or by importing discourses and genres from other orders of discourse. Orders of discourse are particularly open to change when discourses and genres from other orders of discourse are brought into play.

Fairclough relates orders of discourse to a specific institution. He emphasizes that discourse and orders of discourse can operate across institutional boundaries. Interdiscursivity occurs when different discourses and genres are articulated together in a communicative event. Through new articulations of discourses the boundaries change both within the order of discourse and between different orders of discourse. Creative discursive practices in which discourse types are combined in new and complex ways, in new ‘interdiscursive mixes’, are both a sign of and a driving force in discursive and thereby socio-cultural change. On the other hand, discursive practices in which discourses are mixed in conventional ways are indications of, and work towards, the stability of the dominant order of discourse and thereby the dominant social order. Discursive reproduction and change can thus be investigated through an analysis of the relations between different discourses within an order of discourse and between different orders of discourse. (N. Fairclough, Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language 56)

Interdiscursivity is a form of intertextuality. Intertextuality refers to the condition whereby all communicative events draw on earlier events. One cannot avoid using words and phrases that others have used before. A particularly pronounced form of intertextuality is manifest intertextuality, whereby texts explicitly draw on other texts, for instance, by citing them (N. Fairclough 117). A text can be seen as a link in an intertextual chain (N. Fairclough, Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language 77): a series of texts in which each text incorporates elements from another text or other texts.
Intertextuality refers to the influence of history on a text and to a text’s influence on history, in that the text draws on earlier texts and thereby contributes to historical development and change. Whereas some poststructuralists see intertextuality and interdiscursivity as a manifestation of the extreme instability and changeability of language; Fairclough sees it as a mark of both stability and instability, both continuity and change. Change is created by drawing on existing discourses in new ways, but the possibilities for change are limited by power relations which, among other things, determine the access of different actors to different discourses.

“The seemingly limitless possibilities of creativity in discursive practice suggested by the concept of interdiscursivity – an endless combination and recombination of genres and discourses – are in practice limited and constrained by the state of hegemonic relations and hegemonic struggle.” (N. Fairclough, Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language 137)

Discursive relations are sites of social struggle and conflict:

“Orders of discourse can be seen as one domain of potential cultural hegemony, with dominant groups struggling to assert and maintain particular structuring within and between them.” (N. Fairclough, Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language 56)

That a society is not controlled by one dominant discourse does not mean that all discourses are equal. For instance, it is obvious that some discourses have a stronger impact on the mass media than others. It is more difficult for a purely academic discourse to be taken up in the media than it is for a hybrid discourse that combines academic discourse (from the order of discourse of the university) and popular discourse (from the order of discourse of everyday life). Ideology, for Fairclough, is “meaning in the service of power” (N. Fairclough, Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language 14). More precisely, he understands ideologies as constructions of meaning that contribute to the production, reproduction and transformation of relations of domination.
Ideologies are created in societies in which relations of domination are based on social structures such as class and gender. According to Fairclough’s definition, discourses can be more or less ideological, the ideological discourses being those that contribute to the maintenance and transformation of power relations.

Fairclough understands ideology as embedded in discursive practice draws on John Thompson’s view of ideology as a practice that operates in processes of meaning production in everyday life, whereby meaning is mobilized in order to maintain relations of power (Thompson 1990). This focus contrasts with the conception of ideology in many Marxist approaches. Many Marxists have not been interested in the structures of particular ideologies, or in how ideologies are articulated in particular social contexts. Instead they have treated ideology as an abstract system of values that works as social cement, binding people together and thus securing the coherence of the social order.

In common with Thompson and many other social and cultural theorists who have formulated approaches to ideological practice, Fairclough draws on the work of Althusser and, to a greater extent, Gramsci. Both of these theorists represent important forms of Cultural Marxist perspectives and both of them ascribe to the production of meaning in everyday life an important role in the maintenance of the social order. Fairclough also adheres to the consensus within critical cultural studies in rejecting parts of Althusser’s theory on the grounds that Althusser regards people as passive ideological subjects and thus underestimates their possibilities for action. Within communication and cultural studies, there is now a consensus that the meaning of texts is partly created in processes of interpretation. Fairclough shares this consensus position. Texts have several meaning potentials that may contradict one another, and are open to several different interpretations.

“Subjects are ideologically positioned, but they are also capable of acting creatively to make their own connections between the diverse practices and ideologies to which they are exposed, and to restructure positioning practices and structures.” (N. Fairclough, Discourse and Social Change 91)

Fairclough also rejects Althusser’s understanding of ideology as a totalizing entity. Fairclough believes that people can be positioned within different and competing ideologies, and
that this can lead to a sense of uncertainty, the effect of which is to create an awareness of ideological effects (Fairclough 1992b). This standpoint draws on Gramsci’s idea that ‘common-sense’ contains several competing elements that are the result of *negotiations of meaning* in which all social groups participate (Gramsci 1991). Hegemony is not only dominance but also a process of negotiation out of which emerges a consensus concerning meaning. The existence of such competing elements bears the seeds of resistance since elements that challenge the dominant meanings equip people with resources for resistance. As a result, hegemony is never stable but changing and incomplete, and consensus is always a matter of degree only – a “contradictory and unstable equilibrium” (N. Fairclough, Discourse and Social Change 93).

According to Fairclough, the concept of hegemony gives us the means by which to analyze how discursive practice is part of a larger social practice involving power relations: discursive practice can be seen as an aspect of a hegemonic struggle that contributes to the reproduction and transformation of the order of discourse of which it is part (and consequently of the existing power relations). Discursive change takes place when discursive elements are articulated in new ways.

In his three-dimensional model, Fairclough distinguishes between discursive practice, text and social practice as three levels that can be analytically separated.

Analysis of the discursive practice focuses on how the text is produced and how it is consumed. By detailed analysis of the linguistic characteristics of a text using particular tools, it is possible to cast light on how discourses are activated textually and arrive at, and provide backing for, a particular interpretation.

Fairclough proposes a number of tools for text analysis. Those with a background in linguistics will probably recognise the following selection:

- interactional control – the relationship between speakers, including the question of who sets the conversational agenda (Fairclough 1992b: 152ff.);
- ethos – how identities are constructed through language and aspects of the body (1992b: 166ff.);
- metaphors (1992b: 194ff.);
- wording (1992b: 190);15 and
All of these give insight into the ways in which texts treat events and social relations and thereby construct particular versions of reality, social identities and social relations.

1.6.5: Bakhtinian Discourse Analysis:

Bakhtin conceptualizes language as dialogic. He does this in the sense that specific uses of language or ‘utterances’ contribute dynamically to meaning-making because they are embedded in socio-cultural and historical contexts. Importantly, language is looked at as a site of struggle envisaging individuals engaged in creating a sense of themselves against dominant forms of institutional expectations. These crucial understandings converge with the main tenet proposed by Critical discourse analysis (cf. Fairclough, 1995; Kress and van Leeuwen, 1996) who examine ideological basis of texts and their uses as media as political or social control, and the maintenance of power structure. In Bakhtinian approach all texts are viewed as “critical sites for the negotiation of power and ideology.” (Anne Burns 138)

Bakhtin particularly focuses on the discourse in the novel. In his view the novel does not consist in a single, unified form. The novel as genre subsumes several sub-genres. In Bakhtin’s own words the novel is “several heterogeneous stylistic unities.” (Bakhtin 261) Secondly, the novel is not monological. It does not express a single point of view that is to be of the author’s. The novel is dialogical or heteroglot. The novel expresses the multiplicity of points of view. In short, as Bakhtin puts it, the novel is “multiform in style and variform in speech and voice” (Bakhtin 261). These voices or perspectives include:

- the author’s own voice, so-called direct authorial interventions (these are passages in which the author’s own voice can be clearly heard commenting upon the action or articulating some moral sentiment that may have little to do with the progression of the plot itself);
- the narrator’s voice (usually following a particular literary style or convention);
- the voices of various characters (usually in an oral or semi-literary style).

In other words, the author’s voice is just one among other voices to be found in the novel.

For Bakhtin, these points of view or voices are less the solipsistic expressions of the points of view of particular individuals than broader class-based perspectives. It is through this
diversity of voices and concomitant speech genres or types that *heteroglossia*, i.e. the "internal stratification of any single national language into social dialects" (Bakhtin 262), each of which correspond to the ideological perspective of a particular class, enters the novel. The novel's centrifugal dispersion (as opposed to centripetal unification) is what constitutes its "dialogisation" (Bakhtin 263).

It is precisely because the novel is heteroglot in this way that criticism of the novel must be simultaneously formalist and sociological in orientation. Bakhtin puts it this way: the internal social dialogism of novelistic discourse requires the concrete social context of discourse to be exposed, to be revealed as a force that determines its entire stylistic structure, its *form* and *content*. That is, the novel must be forced to reveal the "social and historical voices populating language . . . which provide language with its particular concrete conceptualisations" (Bakhtin 300).

Bakhtin claims that the language of poetical discourse i.e. is monological. It is only with the one voice, the poet’s voice. Poetry is the direct expression of poet’s intention. In short, lyrical poetry is neither multiform in style nor variform in voice. Bakhtin argues that most critical approaches to the novel are oriented towards the interpretation of poetry. As a result, they most often reduce the novel’s ideological and stylistic diversity to the ideological monologism and stylist unity of poetry.

Bakhtin argues that the novel does not fit into the criteria of the existing critical framework because poetry ignores the fact of heteroglossia. With this point of view, any utterance in the novel, takes shape in relation to a particular historical moment and within the socially specific environment. In Bakhtin’s view, language is dialogical (rather than monological) in nature in that it is an arena in which the competing socio-linguistic points of view or fixes on reality that correspond to the several classes which comprise that society, as opposed to a single dominant perspective (the dominant ideology, that of the ruling class), struggle for ascendancy. Within a single, seemingly unified national language and the broad "socio-ideological conceptual horizon" (Bakhtin 275) which it subtends, consequently, there are many class-specific sub-languages and outlooks.

Language is dialogic in nature but literary criticism has ignored the dialogic nature of language. Here the novel is viewed as a monologue. Bakhtin’s views on the heteroglot nature of the novel offer an important critique of both Humanist and Marxist notions of Realism.

"concrete discourse (utterance) finds the object at which it was directed already . . . overlain with qualifications, open to dispute, charged with value, already enveloped . . . by the ‘light’ of alien words that have already been spoken about it. It is entangled, shot through with shared thoughts, points of view, alien value judgments and accents. The word, directed towards its object, enters a dialogically agitated and tension-filled environment of alien words, value judgments and accents, weaves in and out of complex inter relationships, merges with some, recoils from others, intersects with yet a third group: and all this may crucially shape discourse, may leave a trace in all its semantic layers, may complicate its expression and influence its entire stylistic profile.” (Bakhtin 276)

From this point of view, any "artistic representation" (Bakhtin 277) which purports to offer an "‗image’ of the object" (Bakhtin 277) is necessarily "penetrated by this dialogic play of verbal intentions that meet and are interwoven in it" (Bakhtin 277).

Poetry, Bakhtin claims, forgets that the object of description “has its own history of contradictory acts of verbal recognition” (Bakhtin 278). By contrast, in prose fiction the object reveals . . . the socially heteroglot multiplicity of its names, definitions and value judgments. Instead of the virginal fullness and inexhaustibility of the object itself, the prose writer confronts a multitude of routes, roads and paths. . . laid down in the object by social consciousness. (Bakhtin 278).

For authors the most important thing is that his voice must sound among other voices. Bakhtin argues that other voices create the necessary background for his own voice. For more emphasis Bakhtin argues that all discourse is always oriented toward the already uttered and already known.

When a writer writes, he writes with the view of readers in his mind. The responses, agreement, disagreement etc…depends upon the reader’s point of view because the reader understands the word in its conceptual system. Such reaction is the result of the dialogic nature of language.
In short, the dialogical nature of language and, by extension, the heteroglot nature of the novel implies the "possibility" (Bakhtin 328), indeed, the inevitability of “another's point of view” (Bakhtin 328) intruding between the author and the object of his description. For the novelist, there is seemingly “no world outside his socio-heteroglot perception” (Bakhtin 330) precisely because the "‘already bespoke quality of the world is woven together with the ‘already uttered’ quality of language" (Bakhtin 331). This is why Bakhtin claims that what the novel represents or offers an image of is not reality per se but language (i.e. what people say about reality). The central problem of the novel, Bakhtin argues, is that “of *artistically representing language, the problem of representing the image of a language*” (Bakhtin 336).

The characters in the novel represent a particular class. They are ‘speaking human beings’ and have ideological points of views. The characters bring out their own ideological discourse and their own language. In Bakhtin’s views the novel is an intentional hybridization of languages, and creates an artistic image of various sociolects which exist in competition with each other. The plots of the novels function to represent and oppose individuals, their discourses and the world views that these imply. The result is that the novel is a literary hybrid, an “artistically organized system for bringing different languages in contact with one another” (Bakhtin 361) without, however, offering any resolution or transcendence of these competing perspectives.

Bakhtin contends that there are three basic devices for “creating the image of a language” (Bakhtin 358) which, although separable for the purpose of analysis, are in fact “inextricably woven together” (Bakhtin 358):

- “pure dialogues” (Bakhtin 358) where characters literally engage in dialogue with each other;
- “hybridisations” (Bakhtin 358), that is, a “mixture of two social languages within the limits of a single utterance, an encounter, within the arena of an utterance, between two different linguistic consciousnesses, separated from one another by an epoch, by social differentiation or by some other factor” (Bakhtin 358); sometimes, this intentional or deliberate but sometimes it is unconscious or unintentional;
• “dialogised interrelation of languages” (Bakhtin 358): the difference between this and hybridisation is a subtle one, to be precise, in the former “there is no direct mixing of two languages within the boundaries of a single utterance – rather only one language is actually present in the utterance, but it is rendered in the light of another language. The second language is not, however, actualized and remains outside the utterance” (Bakhtin 362). With the dialogized interrelation of languages, however, two or more languages are present within a given utterance.

Bakhtin gives the term parodic stylization to the process by which authors, by incorporating various (literary) languages, parody the logical and expressive structures of these discourses. This takes two principal forms:

• In the case of stylization per se, a writer borrows or appropriates a style and/or ideas from another writer but not polemically, i.e., with the desire to ‘populate’ it with his own intention. (Bakhtin insists, however, that even the very act of borrowing in this way installs a certain difference from the original.)

• In the case of parody per se, a writer appropriates others’s discourses but with a desire to subject the same words to a different intention, to re-place them in a different context, to abrogate them, as it was.

In short, each utterance (parole) is a hybrid construction (it is multi-voiced, multi-accented), that is, in the utterance of a single speaker intersects two or more different styles and corresponding world views. In incorporating these, the novel thereby offers an image of the multiplicity of languages and verbal-ideological systems that these imply in a given place and at a given time. Of course, in so doing, the work as a whole also interacts dialogically with other ideological horizons, thereby opposing one value system to another. By using a variety of languages, however, the author avoids giving himself up to any one of them.

Bakhtin’s critique of Realism has important implications for traditional assumptions concerning the Author and the process of ‘self-expression.’ From at least ‘Longinus,’ as M. H. Abrams reminds us in The Mirror and the Lamp (Abrams), lyric poetry in particular has frequently been viewed as, to a greater or lesser degree, the original expression of some poet’s
innate and unique genius. Such attitudes towards the author persisted historically even in the
course of the rise to prominence of Lockean Empiricism which so shaped the corresponding ‘rise
of the novel,’ according to Ian Watt. David Lodge argues in *After Bakhtin* that even when it
comes to the golden age of the novel in the nineteenth century, for example, it is more accurate
to speak of *Expressive Realism*. By this Lodge intends the popular (sometimes explicit,
sometime implicit) view of the novel as simultaneously the “more or less powerful expression of
a unique sensibility or world view – the author’s – and as more or less truthful representations of
reality” (Lodge 12). In short, the view predominated that the truly classic author, whether
novelist or poet, has an accurate understanding of reality which he is able to express in some
unique way. To put this another way, expressive realism implies an emphasis upon both the

“idea of the author as a uniquely constituted individual subject, the originator and
in some sense owner of his work . . . [and] on the mimetic function of verbal art,
its ability to reflect or represent the world truthfully and in detail.” (Lodge 14)

Such a view of authorship is clearly undergirded in part by a referential or mimetic model of
consciousness (one’s ideas can label or refer to the referent) and in part by an expressivist or
instrumentalist view of signification (ideas about reality exist in the writer’s consciousness
without the aid of or prior to language, signs being merely vehicles by which to express and
communicate them with others).

According to Bakhtin, however, given the dialogic nature of signification, authors necessarily
have intentions but these are at least in part not of their own choosing. To put this in a more
Bakhtinian way, the semantic centre of a novelist’s own personal intentions is supplemented by
intentions and tones alien to him / her as the novelist compels signs, already populated with the
social intentions of others, to serve his own particular intentions. His / her own voice coexists
and competes with those of others that lurk in his / her ‘own’ creation. In other words, the
novelist necessarily and often unwittingly ‘appropriates’ a wide range of discourses (paroles) that
pre-exist him / her in order to rearrange (and even abrogate) them in alternate ways to suit his or
her own intentions. The consequence of this is that the necessarily heteroglot language which an
author makes use of serves sometimes to express his intentions, sometimes to refract them and
sometimes even to deny them. That is, the novelist’s view of reality is always already mediated
by other’s views thereof which he or she regurgitates at least to some degree in his or her own work and as a result of which his/her novel is not monologic but dialogic. In a novel, the author’s perspective is important but it is not the sole point of view. Perspective is fragmented in the novel, dispersed in several different and competing directions. The author’s voice must coexist with those, for example, of his various characters who all possess to varying degrees a certain amount of ideological autonomy. Bakhtin suggests that point of view in a novel is dispersed in at least four directions:

- through direct authorial intervention;
- through the use of a narrator / teller (the author uses a posited teller / narrator to illuminate the object in question, to shed a new light on it and thereby to refract his own intentions through another's utterance);
- through the languages used by characters which are to some degree verbally and semantically autonomous, embodying their particular value systems at the same time that they reflect / refract the author's intentions (in other words, the characters' speeches are themselves inherently dialogical: each utterance is really a double-voiced discourse and serves two speakers, simultaneously expressing two different intentions (the author's and the character's). Heteroglossia is not merely a dialogising background: each character is an ideologue whose words are always ideologemes that reflect a particular way of viewing the world. Characters' languages stratify authorial language by introducing heteroglossia. Each character's mode of speech demarcates a definite ideological positionality. Speech is not the index of character, rather of an ideology: any use of language ought to be placed within quotation marks because the inherently intertextual nature of language destroys any illusion of originality;
- through the incorporation of sub-genres: each genre consists of verbal and semantic forms for assimilating reality. The novel is a "secondary syncretic unification of other seemingly primary verbal genres" (Bakhtin 319) for "appropriating reality" (Bakhtin 319). The novel incorporates genres drawn from both artistic and nonartistic sources (e.g. the letter): the effect of this is to stratify the novel's sociolinguistic unity, each layer existing in various degrees of proximity to authorial intentions.
From this point of view, the author is something akin to a ventriloquist or choir conductor: the polyphony (or medley) of voices / stylistic sub-unities in a novel is ‘artistically organised,’ as Bakhtin puts it, i.e. assembled in a particular way by the novelist, to form the "higher stylistic unity of the work as a whole" (Bakhtin 261).

In short, the novel’s "structured stylistic system" (Bakhtin 300) serves to express the “differentiated socio-ideological position of the author amid the heteroglossia of” (Bakhtin 300) his or her place and time. Novelists do not simply ‘express’ the dominant ideology of a given society nor do they simply oppose it. Any novel is an ideologically complex discourse in that although the novelist is necessarily from a given class, given the dialogic nature of the sign, his / her novel necessarily also incorporates voices not belonging to his / her own class. The reason for all this is that any individual’s consciousness is necessarily the product of the struggle for hegemony over the individual of competing ideological discourses. The ideological coming to consciousness of a human is the process of selectively assimilating the languages of others (whether these be authoritative [i.e. those of important personages such as teachers or priests] or non-authoritative [friends]). It is therefore wrong to speak of the autonomous subject, i.e of a free, unique and undetermined individual, because no individual is so unfettered ideologically-speaking. In each individual's parole, there is an ongoing dialogue between his or her own ideological value-system and that which informs others’ paroles. Each individual's utterance implies a socio-lect(s), a concrete socio-linguistic (verbal-ideological) belief-system which he or she partly carves out for him/herself and which is partly carved out for him/her within the boundaries of the general language or verbal-ideological system of a given society.

Given the foregoing, it ought to be clear that Bakhtin offers a model of intertextuality which reinserts parole, diachrony, and agency where the Structuralists and Deconstructionists emphasize langue, synchrony, and impersonality without reverting to the expressivism of models of literary history rooted in the nineteenth century. Just as signs are inevitably caught up in a dialogue of social voices, so too is each literary text. Each use of a sign is a rejoinder to previous uses thereof as much as it also anticipates future responses. Thus, each writer may be said to be always in the process of ‘writing back’ to other writers, sometimes deliberately, sometimes accidentally, sometimes explicitly and sometimes implicitly. Linda Hutcheon’s point in both The Politics of Postmodernism (Hutcheon, The Politics of Postmodernism ) and A Poetics of Postmodernism: History, Theory, Fiction (Hutcheon) is that all literary texts parody each other
but that the hallmark of Postmodernist fiction is that it does so self-consciously. In short, no text is an island unto itself because writers inevitably ‘abrogate and appropriate,’ to use the famous formulation of Ashcroft, and co., the writings of other writers. Bakhtin argues that literature should be studied in terms of its socio-historical context, rather than as an autonomous object, in terms of both continuity and discontinuity (to be precise, how the work of each writer is simultaneously indebted to previous discourses in circulation and attempts to differentiate itself therefore), rather than either continuity (Taine) or discontinuity (Structuralism). Consequently, no literary text or, by extension, movement should be studied as if it exists in a vacuum: writers and their literary texts must be studied in terms of their relationship to their precursors and their successors. The history of any body of literature begins with the literatures which preceded it and from which it is derived and from which it attempts to distance itself in some ways.

Bakhtin offers a view of the novel that is different both from conventional Empiricist accounts and Marxist conceptions. The novelist ‘appropriates’ different verbal-ideological discourses already in circulation and rearranges them to different effect within his own literary paroles. Moreover, texts are not saturated solely with the dominant ideology. Just as the sign is dialogic in nature, so is the novel, it is multi-voiced. Each novel is heteroglot, the voices of different social classes coexisting with each other and vying for ascendancy in the text in the form of the various sociolects belonging to particular characters, the narrator, and the author himself/herself. Writers are always involved in the process of ‘writing back’ to their predecessors and, in turn, anticipating the future responses of others.

1.6.6: Foucauldian Discourse Analysis:

The French philosopher Michel Foucault studied not language, but discourse as a system of representation. Normally the term 'discourse' is used as a linguistic concept. The term Foucauldian discourse analysis (FDA) is associated with the work of researchers such as Ian Parker, Erica Burman and Wendy Hallway. The term is widely known as Foucauldian discourse analysis or the analysis of discourse because it is related with Foucault’s writings. It has come from many theoretical sources. FDA can be performed upon various types of communication and textual meaning in short wherever meaning exists FDA can be performed. Foucauldian
Discourse Analysis (FDA) offers a particular critical approach to researching psychological and social worlds by considering broader contexts, rigorously dissecting discourses rather than imposing a single theoretical framework. In his quest to reveal power relations, the French post-structuralist philosopher and historian Michel Foucault claimed discourses comprise bodies of knowledge which systematically create and reproduce particular social institutions. Foucault wanted to reveal how certain discourses help sustain networks of social meaning which regulate and control people in ways that appear natural. He popularized discourse analysis by exposing links between textual sources and powerful social institutions, drawing concerns about domination and subordination associated with the intellectual traditions of Marxism and Feminism.

Burman (1996) cites four main intellectual influences. First, there is the kind of historical analyses offered by Foucault. Broadly, he tried to identify the regulative or ideological underpinnings of dominant discourses: vocabularies which constrain the way in which we think about and act in the world. Second, he cites the work of Derrida, who argued that dominant ways of categorizing the world inevitably rely on suppressed or hidden oppositional conceptions. He urged the deconstruction of texts to reveal the latent oppositional alternatives on which dominant perspectives depend. Third, a significant strand of FDA draws ideas from psychoanalysis to investigate how notions of subjectivity are implicated in personal and institutional arrangements.

FDA begins with clear political intent. For example, Parker (1990) argues that language is structured to reflect power relations and inequalities in society. Discourses are taken to be systems of meanings which reflect real power relations, and which in turn are a consequence of the material and economic infrastructure of society. In Parker’s views discourses support some illustration in society, and have ideological effect.

Foucault uses the term “discourse” according to the standard usage of the term in the 1930s in which “discourse refers to a unit of language larger than a sentence, and discourse analysis is the study of these sequences of sentences” (Sawyer 434).

Foucault’s definition of discourse is about text and the analysis of the text and therefore it limits the meaning. In his *The Archaeology of Knowledge* he defines the term discourse as follows:
“Discourse is constituted by a group of sequences of signs, in so far as they are statements, that is, in so far as they can be assigned particular modalities of existence.” (Foucault 107)

Hence, discourse is an activity, a practice that can be initiated by a single author or person. Foucault gives the following definition of discourse: “We shall call discourse a group of statements in so far as they belong to the same discursive formation” (Foucault 117). On discursive formation he writes that “Whenever one can describe, between a number of statements, such a system of dispersion, whenever, between objects, types of statement, concepts, or thematic choices, one can define a regularity (an order, correlations, positions and functionings, transformations), we will say, for the sake of convenience, that we are dealing with a discursive formation” (Foucault 38).

Discursive formation, in the sense of Foucault, has four indispensable characteristics; these are that statements refer to the same object, are enunciated in the same way, share a common system of conceptualizations and have similar subjects or theories. A central concept in Foucault’s outline is the statement which he defines as “an enunciative function that involved various units (these may sometimes be sentences, sometimes propositions; but they are sometimes made up of fragments of sentences, series or tables of signs, a set of propositions or equivalent formulations); and, instead of giving a meaning to these units, this function relates them to a field of objects, instead of providing them with a subject, it opens up for them a number of possible subjective positions; instead of fixing their limits it places them in a domain of coordination and coexistence; instead of determining their identity, it places them in a space in which they are used and repeated” (Foucault 106).

Thus, on the one hand, the illustration of the discursive formation demonstrates the specificity of a statement; on the other hand, the description of statements and organisation of their enunciation lead to the individualization of the discursive formation. To describe a statement means to define the conditions of its specific existence. It is the description of what is said, namely as it has been said “exactly”. It is a precise description and therewith, in the view of Foucault, it is no interpretation or the search for what “really” has been said or what lies behind what was said. Rather it is the description of the meaning of the formation of the occurrence of statements in a particular time at a particular place. It is the description of how meaning is
produced in texts. This study thus, is no interpretation of the philosophical discussion as it took place around 1930, but the reconstruction of this discussion and how meaning has been constructed through this discussion. Statements are always in deficit, because they are always dependent on the vocabulary that is available at a particular time and place. In other words, an archaeological discourse analysis is a historical snapshot. For this reason, the description or study of statements is to define a limited system of the present and the discursive formation as dissemination of gaps, voids, limitations, or disagreements.

Positivity plays a part in what Foucault calls the “historical a priori” (Foucault). That is an a priori which, beside the fact that discourse has not only meaning and truth, also includes the history of the discourse that can be attributed to the rules of the discursive practice. Because these discursive practices can change, even this a priori of the positivity can change. Discursive practices include systems with which statements are reasoned as events or things. Foucault calls these systems “archives”. Archives determine what can be said and how.

Archives cannot be described in their totality, their presence is unavoidable and they appear in fragments, different areas and levels. Their description makes difference visible and gives a reason for this difference. The discovering of the archive, the description of discursive formations, the analysis of positivities, the mapping of the enunciative field, Foucault calls “archaeology” (Foucault).

If we observe language in use we will find that linguistic communication is not possible just by individual units of language such as sounds, words or sentences. People, primarily and essentially, communicate through combinations of these language units. These language units constitute a special or a distinct kind of expression. This expression is called ‘texts’. So while using language people communicate through texts. The term ‘text’ is restricted to written language. The function which language serves in the expression of ‘content’ is described as **transactional** and the function involved in expressing social relations and personal attitudes is described as **interactional**.
1.7: About the Authors:

1.7.1: Ngugi Wa Thiong’o:

Ngugi Wa Thiong’o, a Kenyan writer and coming from colonial background, has created a huge body of work. In his novels he makes and unmakes the colonial culture. His novels would provide the generation with a framework for understanding the politics and poetics of underdevelopment. These works articulated and dramatized the crisis of independence in uncompromising ways. They provide their readers with a grammar for articulating the need for social and civil rights in a postcolonial situation often defined and driven by ephemeral material concerns and power politics. Ngugi’s works are a key to understand the history of colonialism and nationalism in East Africa.

According to Ngugi, African writers are haunted by their past simply because the historical narratives that they thought would make their experiences more intelligible have instead confronted them the opacity of the past. The turn to fiction is one important way of clarifying the confusions created by historical events: A writer responds with his total personality to a social environment that changes all the time.

During his undergraduate years, Ngugi had gained recognition as a fiction writer by winning an English-language novel writing competition, and he tried his hand at journalism by writing regularly for a Nairobi newspaper. Apart from this Ngugi was a famous playwright, essayist and literary critic. He is the first known East African to write a book of social criticism, Homecoming.

Formerly known as James Ngugi, the artist dropped his Christian name following a public declaration at the Fifth General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of East Africa at Nairobi, on 12th March, 1970. Ngugi’s literary works cover a wide range in which the recurring issues are his concerns for the plight of the oppressed are expressed.
1.7.2: Critical comments on Ngugi Wa Thiong’o’s Novels:

*The River Between* (1965) is set in the landscape of riverHonias. The protagonist of the novel is Waiyaki who is a missionary educated local leader. Basically the novel is about Gikuyu community which is under the effect of colonialism and Christianity. The two villages are in conflict as one village is dominated by traditional culture and religion and the other is dominated by Christianity. The river Honia is between the two villages and it divides them. The novel deals with the roots of African predicaments. Waiyaki sees the spots of beauty in white men’s religion. He is in dilemma whether to go with white men’s religion or to preserve their tradition. Waiyaki’s attempts to make his traditional followers see the sign of positivity in white men’s religion are in vain. He tries to bridge a gap between two villages and Christianity and traditional culture but fails to do so. In this earlier work we see Africa confused and the union between the two is unwanted.

*Weep not, Child* (1964) is an African tragedy told from the point of view of a child Njoroge, who lives in his little world of innocence and illusion at the time of growing national unrest. The novel is divided into two parts, ‘Waning Light’ and ‘Darkness Falls’. Both the parts respectively deal with Njoroge’s unbounded optimism in spite of the worsening social climate and with the despair that overwhelms him when his dreams are swept away on the outbreak of violence. The village is divided by class differences and has become a semi-urbanized area. The core of the novel is the expropriation of peasants' implication of the problem. In Weep Not, Child, the dispossessed Ngotho tells his children how, after being forcibly sent to fight in the white man’s war (World War I). When Ngotho comes back the war he finds himself a landless peasant. They have hope on their nationalist leader Jomo Kenyatta. Ngotho becomes the hero of the day and fights for the freedom and restoration of peasants’ land. The exploited group struggles to regain land, freedom and dignity. Njoroge remains a child throughout the novel. Weep Not, Child becomes the story of the uncommitted individual, or better still, the individual committed only to his selfish goals believing it possible to insulate himself from society, but who is soon swept away by the social torrents he thought he had carefully avoided.

*A Grain of Wheat* (1967)) is Ngugi’s most hailed work up to now. The time is the eve of ‘Uhuru’. The novel swings in past and present. The characters are unable to save themselves from the clutches of the past, the experience so traumatizing and intricately woven into people’s
lives that it can hardly be separated from the present. *A Grain of Wheat* covers up issues like dispossession, betrayal, Mau Mau rebellion, emergency, the Oath, detention camp, suffering, and death. The history of individual characters is mingled with the national history. The novel is about the national past. Mugo is the un-heroic hero of the novel. He is tortured by his fragmented past. For others Mugo is the hero but he feels guilty in his own eyes because he has committed treachery that no one knows. It also covers the Mau Mau rebellion. *A Grain of Wheat* becomes gradually a panoramic human drama of all races, with its actors either faithful to or betrayers of oaths and causes, struggling among themselves or against inborn contradictory forces. The novel starts with the eve of Uhuru and the characters are busy in the preparation of the celebration but it is only an illusion. The novelist has intentionally used the word ‘Uhuru’. The word Uhuru makes the reader confused. The reader throughout the novel struggles to get the meaning of it. The same way people fail to understand the real meaning of freedom. The question here arise is whether the people are reaping the fruits of freedom or not. Waiyaki is the first one to sacrifice his life for the nation. He becomes the first grain of wheat whose death gives birth to other grains of wheat. The whole novel hinges on the betrayal of Kihika, the Mau Mau leader, by Mugo, an uncommitted individual. Ngugi's treatment of Mugo's treachery is a masterpiece in the psychology of betrayal. At the end of the novel Mugo confesses his crime and feels redeemed. From the opening till the end the readers focus upon the emergency in Kenya. The readers still look at the past in presence.

In *Petals of Blood* ((1977) Ngugi demonstrates his belief that the highest human act is through commitment to improve human life, the positive transformation of the African. The character overtly concerned with this theme of commitment is Godfrey Munira. Munira is portrayed at the outset as an uncommitted, alienated individual, who chooses not to choose, and thus adopts the position of the "neutral" onlooker on the margins of society. Munira’s character is a complex one. His disengagement with the society is based on no obvious social hardships. Munira is educated at the country’s only secondary school. He is both attracted to and repelled by the material success and hypocritical religiosity of the family. He wants to escape from his present life with dreams of happiness but he is unable to maintain his easeful dream against the odds of life. In *Petals of Blood*, the theme of commitment reflects the prevailing images of disintegration, decay, and despair. In such a society, non-commitment generally becomes a form of rebellion without a clear program, of rejecting what is while lacking a vision of what should
be. In such a society Munira is committed to the vision of a new world to replace the present corrupt one. In this novel Ngugi is concerned with the plight of Kenyans. The more he portrays their negative conditions of life, the more he is drawn into the struggle to change these conditions.

In *Devil on the cross* (1980), Wariinga is a female protagonist. In this novel the characters on one hand are defending national cause and on the other hand they fighting for the partisans of corruption and self-interest. This novel differs from other novels as the protagonist is a female character. In this novel Ngugi’s concern is no longer revolves around an overriding national cause, as he brings into focus the plight of the most wretched victim of African society, the African woman. As a story about Wariinga Jacinta, *Devil on the Cross* shows the very intimate link between the quality of the individual and the prevalent social milieu. By projecting the effect that social reality has on the individual, the novel's intent is to bring out the extreme weight with which reality presses on Wariinga, so that judgement of her has to be attenuated if not dismissed entirely. The novel presents a series of vignettes that portray Wariinga as a placid, fragile, simple young woman preyed upon by unscrupulous, ruthless males. This story, which is supposed to be characteristic of the plight of the African woman, not only reflects Wariinga's own predicament but, like Wanja's, shows the inevitable doom awaiting all the women. The most stunning aspect of Kenyan society to her is her realization of the complete reversal of values. She was shocked to see that irresponsibility, corruption and lasciviousness are the constituents of the rule. Unlike that of Wariinga, the fate of Wangari, the other female character, is meant to expose the general policy of victimization of peasants by the system in place. Wangari is a woman whose farmland had been taken from her because she could not make timely payment for a loan she contracted to send her child to school. Having fled to the city in the hope of finding some odd jobs, she is arrested for loitering and is judged as a thief by a white man. Wangari is aware about Neocolonialism and is frustrated by Mau mau dreams. As a partisan of the national cause, Muturi is presented as a trade unionist. Muturi is both the representative of labor unions and the symbol of workers' power.

The novel projects the tragi-comic atmosphere of the much publicized feast, actually a competition in which thieves struggle to outdo each other in cunning and mastery of their trade. One small thief is dragged out kicking and screaming--a thief who steals because of need fails to
qualify for this particularly important competition and the big shots find such an appearance a slur on their international reputation.

In general, Ngugi focuses on the complexity of human character and motivation. Ngugi’s heterogeneous collection of misfits, revolutionaries, withdrawn or merely ideologically alienated men and women, constitutes a barometer of African society.

Wizard of the Crow (2006) is an experimental work by Ngugi Wa Thiong’o. Things were worst in Kenya and it was impossible to write directly about the situation so Ngugi wrote an allegory. The novel is a story of a neo-colonial Kenya. It is set in an imaginary nation Aburiria. The unnamed ruler is the sovereign authority in the nation and people remain busy to win the favour of the ruler. On the other side the voice of common people is heard in the novel. The people of the nation struggle for survival because it was difficult for them to get a job. Educated people were unemployed. Whenever they went for job they were seduced as the system was corrupted. The nation is not safe for women to go out freely in the streets. The new enemies were their own people. The black bourgeois had the power. In neo-colonial Kenya we can see the raise of class differences. To fight with the situation the protagonist of the novel Kamithi and Nyawira used the technique of disguise. They became the wizard of the crow to help common people. In Wizard of the Crow Ngugi brings out the grave reality of modern Kenya.

1.7.3: Buchi Emecheta:

The Nigerian-born novelist Buchi Emecheta, resident mainly in London, is a cross-cultural figure. She writes in the African tradition, drawing on African materials and experience. She has also selected as one of the Best Young British Writers. She is a feminist and her fiction gives expression to the aspirations and problems of African and black women, and this makes it a valuable reference-point in the literature written by African women. Emecheta’s novels challenge the hegemony of male authors. Her novels are the representation of African women in literature. As a novelist she has written about women. She questioned the societal assumptions and practices hostile to women. Emecheta’s rhetoric is not just restricted to feminist protest. Her texts question metropolitan assumptions with regards to African culture.
1.7.4: Critical Comments on Buchi Emecheta’s Novels:

*The Bride Price* (1976) is a story of a young girl Aku-nna who is kind, gentle, shy and lonely. In this novel Emecheta describes the fight of a young girl against the tradition. When the novel begins Aku-nna lives with her family in Lagos. At the beginning of the novel Aku-nna laments over the death of her father. With her brother Nna-ndo and her mother Ma Blackie she has to go back to her village Ibuza. In this novel also Emecheta surprises her readers with different Nigerian tradition. After the death of Aku-nna’s father her uncle inherits the property of her father including herself, her brother and her mother. Emecheta has not given a chance to Ma Blackie to oppose which shows subordination of women. Aku-nna’s uncle and her would be father Okonkwo is interested in getting the bride price of her. Once again Emecheta introduces her readers with her customs. The custom of bride price is a kind of invisible chain which does not allow women to marry according to their choice. The same thing happens with Aku-nna. She loves Chike who as believed in Ibuza belongs to slaves’ family. Aku-nna’s new father would not allow her to marry him. Chike is the only one who is kind to Aku-nna. Aku-nna is kidnapped by Okoboshi and is forced to marry her. But on her wedding night Aku-nna said that she is not virgin and any how manages to escape. She eloped with Chike but she feels that her matrimonial life is going to be ruined as her Chike has not paid her bride price. The novel is a tragedy of Aku-nna’s life. At the end of the novel Aku-nna gives birth to a daughter and she is named Joy. After giving birth to her daughter Aku-nna dies. The novel is a love story. Emecheta has woven it with the strange African tradition. Bride price makes the girl a thing only. She becomes a source of earning for her father. Women have accepted the law of the father. Once again Emecheta in this novel targets upon hegemonic relationship between men and women and favors women.

*Double Yoke* (1983) by Buchi Emecheta is also a very critical novel. The story is of two lovers, Ete Kamba and his beloved Nko. In this novel Emecheta throws light on the yoke of tradition and modernity which has to be carried by male and female both. Ete Kamba and Nko want to study in the university. Emecheta has shown modern Nigeria in this novel. The lovers get admission in the university. They believed that education was the key to solve all problems. But it was their mere illusion. In the university campus girls were the victims of Professors. Girls were forced to give their body to the professors to get good marks. Nko is seduced by Prof. Ikot. She gave birth to his child. Even after getting education and knowledge Ete could not change his
views about women. Women suffered a lot as they had to carry the yoke of tradition and modernity. Young modern boys like Ete wanted an educated wife but they also wanted an obedient wife who would not raise her voice against her husband.

*The Slave Girl* (1977) by Buchi Emecheta moves around the fortunes of Ogbanje Ojebeta. The novel is a story of a Nigerian woman who was an orphan as a child. Becoming an orphan was a tragedy but her life was cursed as she was sold into slavery in her own land by her own brother Okolie. Ojebeta was sold to Ma Palagada. Ma Palagada was her master. As a child Ojebeta trusted on her elder brother. For her Okolie was her ‘little father’. She failed to recognize the devil in his eyes because just for a very small sum, not more than seven pound. Ojebeta has become a domestic slave. At Ma Palagada’s house Ojebeta is not the only slave there were other girls, too. Ma Palagada’s notorious son and her husband harassed the girls. Emecheta here shows a very gloomy picture of her culture in which women were sold, used and manipulated by men. The irony is that these women have accepted slavery. They did not find any other option left for them. The title is very much symbolic as it limits the identity of a girl as a slave only. She is not independent. Her life before marriage depends upon her father and brother/s and after marriage she has to devote herself to her husband. So Emecheta is trying to show the relationship between man and a woman, it is always that of a master-slave. Her husband has to pay her bride price for her and this kind of selling is accepted by all in society, even by women. Ojebeta grew up and is liked by Ma Palagada’s son but he never returns for her. She married Jacob. Jacob had to pay eight pounds to Clifford as that much amount was paid by his mother Ma Palagada for Ojebeta. With this slavery system Emecheta also shows the effect of Christianity. Ojebeta learned Christian manners and has accepted a Christian name. She does not reply if someone calls her just Ogbanje Ojebeta. She has to be called as Ogbanje Alice. If femininity is related with the nation, if the nation is called ‘mother land’, the word ‘slave’ is for both, a woman and the nation. Africa is not going to get freedom from the clutches of imperialism. It will always be colonized; emotionally and mentally.

*Second-Class Citizen* (1974) is a story of Adah whose birth was a disappointment to her parents, to her immediate family and, to her tribe. She was born during the war time. The novel is Adah’s journey from childhood to womanhood, from ignorance to maturity. Adah wanted to study and she struggled hard to make her dreams come true. She fought with her elders, with her
teachers, with her classmates, in general with society. She married Francis. She was a working woman. She earned for her family, for her husband. She moved to England with her Nigerian student husband. Adah differs from Emecheta’s other protagonists. She is also thwarted by her husband and rejected by British society. She emerges as a strong character and shows capacity to fight back against the odds of life. England is her dream land but Adah lives nightmarish life over there. She is treated there as a second class citizen. Though she is in England she is not free from the clutches of her customs. In England she has to struggle feed her family because her husband is a student. She has to give birth to children against her wish. She is left to manage everything for herself, her household work, child birth and her job. Adah’s relation with Francis is unequal even in England. Emecheta tries to show place/land/nation is not a matter with a woman, her situation is the same. She finds herself a victim as if she is punished for being a woman. Adah tries to break these invisible chains by giving birth to her “brain child”. It is her first creative work, her novel which she names The Bride Price. But this brain child is destroyed by her husband and Adah takes the final move in her life. She decides to leave her husband. This decision makes her a modern woman. Emecheta tried to make her free from imprisonment of marriage but the end of the novel ambiguous. She met her friend who misunderstood that Adah and Francis are still husband and wife and Adah is dropped at her husband’s home by her friend once again to live life in a cage.

*The Joys of Motherhood* (1979) is Emecheta’s very critical work. The title of the novel is ironic. It is a satire on the role given to women in African culture. Emecheta is against the so called notion of wifeism. It is a story of Nnu Ego. She marries twice but is neither happy with her first marriage and nor with her second marriage. In her life she faces paradoxical situations because with her first marriage she lives economically comfortable life. Since she is unable to bear a child her first marriage breaks up. She marries second time with Naife. Even in her hard times and unhappy matrimonial life she gives birth to so many children. The novel starts with the death of her first born child and Nnu Ego runs out to end up her life. The year is 1934 in Lagos. Nnu Ego’s father pays homage to Nnu Ego’s chi who is a slave woman. After this Nnu Ego gives birth to a boy child. With this Emecheta has shown African tradition. Emecheta has touched upon the issue of child birth. With this issue she has also covered the tradition of sharing husband. The death of Agbadi’s first wife is result of this pain. When Nnu Ego was conceived the senior wife was secretly watching everything. She could not stand the matter and she died a
naturally death alone. Later on in the novel when Naife’s brother died he inherits his younger brother’s wife and Nnu Ego has to share her husband with her. A woman is balconized and constantly struggles to get her lost identity. Naife’s second wife Adaku turns to prostitution. The only intention is to earn more money for her daughters’ wellfare. Apart from this Emecheta has also criticized the politics of war. Nigerian men were taken forcefully into the army. But the irony is none of them were aware about the opposite army, what they are fighting for and who the enemy is. The novel ends with the death of the protagonist. Though Nnu Ego is the mother of nine children she dies alone on the road. After her death she is canonized. Other women of the village come to worship her for children. Nnu Ego fails to give a child to any of them and is cursed by these women. Even after her death Nnu Ego is not free. Through the character of Nnu Ego Buchi Emecheta has tried to give voice to Nigerian women who have been silenced by patriarchy and imperialism.

This introductory chapter throws light upon the key words like Postcolonialism and Discourse Analysis. In this chapter the researcher has talked in detail about the six school of Discourse Analysis. The researcher has also defined the concept of subaltern. In this chapter the researcher has given a brief introduction of the authors and a brief summary of the select works by the authors. This chapter can be the base of the research work as it is the background study of the relevant theories. After this background study the researcher has picked up the concept of Subaltern and Foucauldian Discourse analysis to examine the select works critically. In next chapter is about the review of critical theories, the theories which are the tools to operate the select works.
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