Critical Discourse Analysis in Education: A Review of the Literature

**Rebecca Rogers, Elizabeth Malancharuvil-Berkes,
Melissa Mosley, Diane Hui, and Glynis O'Garro Joseph**
Washington University in St. Louis

*During the past decade educational researchers increasingly have turned to
Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) as a set of approaches to answer ques-
tions about the relationships between language and society. In this article the
authors review the findings of their literature review of CDA in educational
research. The findings proceed in the following manner: the multiple ways in
which CDA has been defined, the theories of language included in CDA
frameworks, the relationship of CDA and context, the question of methods,
and issues of reflexivity. The findings illustrate that as educational
researchers bring CDA frameworks into educational contexts, they are
reshaping the boundaries of CDA.*

This year marks the 25th anniversary of the publication of two seminal books: *Language and Control,* by Roger Fowler, Robert Hodge, Gunther Kress, and Tony Trew, and *Language As Ideology,* by Robert Hodge and Gunther Kress. These two books have influenced the way in which scholars approach questions of language and society and have become cornerstones in what we know as Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). Of course, the history of the critical study of discourse can be traced back much farther to language philosophers and social theorists such as Bakhtin (1981), DuBois (1903/1990), Pecheux (1975), Volosinov (1930/1973), and Wittgenstein (1953), among others. We might also think of the history of critical discourse studies in terms of the emergence or the evolution of the term Critical Discourse Analysis, which has been attributed to the publication of Fairclough's *Language and Power* in 1989.

The emergence of the interest in relating the study of discourse to social events did not take place in isolation. The 1970s were characterized by the transformation of linguistic theories and methods in the social sciences, from traditional linguistics to interactional linguistics, to critical linguistics. Indeed, during that decade, linguists became aware that traditional linguistics needed to consider questions related to society. Michael Halliday's (1975, 1978) theory of systemic functional linguistics, which informed critical linguistics and then CDA, emphasized language as a mean-ing-making process, complete with options; Halliday's theory was synergistic with the critical study of language. At the same time, there was dissent and revolution in

society at large. We can look to the Vietnam War and the peace movement, the women's movement, the disability movement, and the civil rights movement in the United States, to name just a few examples. All of this was accompanied by a broader linguistic turn in the social sciences, a movement away from methodological individualism, and the proliferation of post-structural and post-modern theories.

The intellectual work of combining social theories with linguistic work was, at first, conducted by a disparate group of scholars, each at their own universities. However, in the early 1990s a group of scholars (Fairclough, Kress, van Dijk, van Leeuwen, and Wodak) spent two days at a symposium in Amsterdam discussing theories and methods specific to CDA. These scholars came from somewhat diverse academic backgrounds, and CDA reflects their interdisciplinary approach (van Dijk, 2001).

Education researchers turned to discourse analysis as a way to make sense of the ways in which people make meaning in educational contexts. Early examples of linguistic analysis in education research grew out of the work of sociolinguistics (Gumperz, 1982; Labov, 1972; Sinclair & Coulthard, 1976), linguistic anthropology (Silverstein & Urban, 1996), and the ethnography of communication (Gumperz & Hymes, 1964; Hymes, 1972). Sinclair and Coulthard, for example, introduced an elaborate framework for coding teachers' and students' discourse acts in classroom talk. Their intention was to provide an extensive structural model of discourse organization in classroom interactions. The classic work of Cazden (1988/2001) grew out of such descriptive analyses of classroom talk. Around the same time that scholars were describing the micro-interactions that occurred in classrooms, scholars from fields such as sociology and cultural studies were also looking to classrooms and schools to theorize about the ways in which social structures are reproduced through educational institutions (Bourdieu, 1979/1984; Bowles & Gintis, 1976; Oakes, 1986; Willis, 1977).[1] Drawing on critical social theory, these studies sought to examine the ways in which macro-structures play out in the interactions, rituals, and traditions of the classroom. Cultural theorists, however, do not often turn to a close analysis of discourse structures (see Bernstein, 1971, for an exception). On the other hand, linguistic anthropologists and conversation analysts often do not turn to social theory or attempt to connect their micro-level analyses with broader social forces. Critical Discourse Analysis was an attempt to bring social theory and discourse analysis together to describe, interpret, and explain the ways in which discourse constructs, becomes constructed by, represents, and becomes represented by the social world.

During the past decade, education researchers increasingly have turned to Critical Discourse Analysis as an approach to answering questions about the relationships between language and society. This proliferation in scholarship, as we demonstrate in this review, poses a series of focused questions for education researchers interested in CDA. Indeed, discourse analysis of all types comes from fields outside education, and much of it is tied to linguistics in one way or another. As such work crosses into the boundary of education, interesting and substantive concerns arise about how it is applied to educational issues, how it affects other research and approaches in education, and how it might be reviewed in the non–education research traditions from which it came.

This article provides a critical, integrative review of CDA across five databases in the social sciences. We present a review of the literature and we interrogate the theory, methods, and implications of the literature reviewed. We intend that this review of CDA in the field of education be viewed in the context of the original CDA founders. The following questions frame our review: What happens when Critical Discourse Analysis crosses the boundaries into education research? In what ways do education researchers use CDA? How can the use of CDA in educational contexts inform us about method and theory?

Critical Discourse Analysis: Key Concepts

Critical discourse studies stem from three overlapping intellectual traditions, each emphasizing the linguistic turn in the social sciences. These traditions are discourse studies (e.g., Benveniste, 1958/1971; Derrida, 1974; Foucault, 1969/1972; Pecheux, 1975), feminist post-structuralism (e.g., Butler, 1990; Davies, 1993), and critical linguistics (e.g., Fowler, Hodge, Kress, & Trew, 1979; Halliday & Hasan, 1989; Hodge & Kress, 1979/1993; Pecheux, 1975; Pennycook, 2001; Willig, 1999). Critical Discourse Analysis focuses on how language as a cultural tool mediates relationships of power and privilege in social interactions, institutions, and bodies of knowledge (see, for example, Bourdieu, 1977; Davies & Harre, 1990; Foucault, 1969/1972; Gee, 1999; Luke, 1995/1996).

Gee (2004) makes the distinction between the capitalized term "Critical Discourse Analysis" (which the abbreviation CDA represents) and "critical discourse analysis" in lowercase letters, a distinction that is quite relevant to this review. He argues that CDA refers to the brand of analysis that has been informed by Fairclough, Hodge, Kress, Wodak, van Dijk, van Leeuwen, and followers. Lowercase "critical discourse analysis" includes a "wider array of approaches" (p. 20)—Gee's own form of analysis (1992, 1994, 1996, 1999), that of Gumperz (1982), Hymes (1972), Michaels (1981), and Scollon, & Scollon (1981), and the work of other discourse analysts in the United States and elsewhere. These scholars are conducting critically oriented forms of discourse analysis but do not specifically call their work CDA. Gee (2004) points out that critical approaches to discourse analysis "treat social practices in terms of their implications for things like status, solidarity, distribution of social goods, and power" (p. 33). Because language is a social practice and because not all social practices are created and treated equally, all analyses of language are inherently critical.

In the next section we discuss some foundational principles that are relevant in any discussion of Critical Discourse Analysis. The discussion is structured around the key constructs: "critical," "discourse," and "analysis"

What Is "Critical" About CDA?

The Frankfurt school, the group of scholars connected to the Institute of Social Research at the University of Frankfurt, focused their attention on the changing nature of capitalism and its relation to Marxist theories of economic determinism. Adorno, Marcuse, and Horkheimer—the scholars most commonly connected with the Frankfurt School—initiated a conversation with the German tradition of philosophical and social thought of Marx, Kant, Hegel, and Weber. While rejecting the strict economic determinism (the view that economic factors determine all other aspects of human existence) associated with Marxism, they continued the view that injustice and oppression shape the social world. The Frankfurt school and scholars from across disciplines engaged with critical theory and attempted to locate the multiple ways in which power and domination are achieved (Kinchloe & McLaren, 2003).

Thus the Frankfurt school and other neo-Marxist scholars of society and language (e.g., the Bakhtin Circle) opened the debate about whether language belongs to the economic base or the cultural superstructure, and whether it is determined by material conditions or, in fact, determines these conditions (Ives, 2004). It is important to remember that at the same time that the Frankfurt school was rising in academic popularity, the works of W. E. B. DuBois (1903/1990) and Carter Woodson (1933/1990) also mounted serious challenges to the dominant Euro-American scholarly paradigm. However, Horkheimer, Adorno, and Marcuse are commonly associated with critical theory, whereas DuBois and Woodson remain invisible in the scholarly canon in critical theory (Ladson-Billings, 2003). This is important because critical theory, a set of theories that attempt to locate and confront issues of power, privilege, and hegemony, has also been critiqued for reproducing power knowledge relations and constructing its own regime of truth. Or, as Yancy (1998) puts it, critical theory is often "the words of white men engaged in conversations with themselves" (p. 3). Evidence of this can be seen in the striking absence of issues of race in much of critical theory.

Critical theory is not a unified set of perspectives. Rather, it includes critical race theory, post-structuralism, post-modernism, neo-colonial studies, queer theory, and so on. Critical theories are generally concerned with issues of power and justice and the ways that the economy, race, class, gender, religion, education, and sexual orientation construct, reproduce, or transform social systems. Although there are many different "moments" when research might be considered critical, the various approaches to critical research share some assumptions. Critical theorists, for example, believe that thought is mediated by historically constituted power relations. Facts are never neutral and are always embedded in contexts. Some groups in society are privileged over others, and this privilege leads to differential access to services, goods, and outcomes. Another shared assumption is that one of the most powerful forms of oppression is internalized hegemony, which includes both coercion and consent (Gramsci, 1973; Ives, 2004). Critical researchers are intent on discovering the specifics of domination through power. However, power takes many forms: ideological, physical, linguistic, material, psychological, cultural. Critical theorists generally agree that language is central in the formation of subjectivities and subjugation.

Post-structuralism, the intellectual movement with which Michel Foucault is often associated, was a rejection of the structuralist movement of the earlier 20th century and is intimately related to critical theory. Structuralism assumed that relationships existed between structures in systems and that examining those relationships could help us to understand the entirety of a system. The theory of structuralism permeated across disciplines and could be seen in studies of the economy (Marx), language (Saussure), psychology (Freud), and anthropology—specifically, culture and kinship relations (Levi-Strauss). Foucault, once himself a structuralist, broke from structuralism and argued that we cannot know something based on a system of binaries and static relationships. Post-structuralism pointed out the inevitable slipperiness of social constructs and the language that constructed and represented such constructs (Peters & Burbules, 2004). Foucault's (1969/1972) concept of discourse and power has been important in the development of CDA, as discussed in the next section.

Scholars who situate themselves within the CDA tradition often separate their work from other forms of "non-critical" discourses analyses by arguing that their

analyses move beyond description and interpretation of the role of language in the social world, toward explaining why and how language does the work that it does. Critical discourse analysts begin with an interest in understanding, uncovering, and transforming conditions of inequality. The starting point for the analysis differs depending on *where* the critical analyst locates and defines power. Critical discourse analysts locate power in the arena of language as a social practice. Power, however, can take on both liberating and oppressive forms.

What Is Discourse in CDA?

Recent developments in Critical Discourse Analysis are rooted in much longer histories of language philosophy (Austin, 1962; Gramsci, 1973; Searle, 1969; Wittgenstein, 1953); ethnomethodology (Garfinkel, 1967; Cicourel, 1974), the functional linguistics tradition in the United States (Gumperz, 1982; Silverstein & Urban, 1996), and Systemic Functional Linguistics in England, Canada, and Australia (Halliday & Hasan, 1976).[2] There are many subsections of discourse analysis within the social tradition, including speech act theory (Goffman, 1959, 1971), genre theory (Bakhtin, 1981; Martin, 1985; Hasan & Fries, 1995), intertextuality (Bakhtin, 1981; Kristeva, 1980, 1986, 1989; Lemke, 1992), discursive formations (e.g., Foucault, 1972, 1979, 1981; Lemke, 1992), conversation analysis (Collins, 1986; Gumperz, 1982; Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson, 1974; Schegloff, Ochs, & Thompson, 1996), narrative analysis (Gee, 1992, 1994; Labov, 1972; Michaels, 1981; Propp, 1968; Scollon & Scollon, 1981; Wortham, 2001), discursive psychology (Davies & Harre, 1990; Edwards & Potter, 1992), ethnography of communication (Hymes, 1972), multi-modal analysis (Gee, 2003; Hodge & Kress, 1988; Kress & van Leeuween, 1996; Scollon & Scollon, 2003), and critical discourse analysis.

The word "discourse" comes from the Latin *discursus,* which means "to run to and fro." The word "current" comes from the same Latin root. Within a CDA tradition, discourse has been defined as language use as social practice. That is, discourse moves back and forth between reflecting and constructing the social world. Seen in this way, language cannot be considered neutral, because it is caught up in political, social, racial, economic, religious, and cultural formations. CDA is what Fairclough (1992) has referred to as a textually oriented form of discourse analysis (TODA). To develop this textual analysis, Fairclough brought together the linguistic theory of Systemic Functional Linguistics (Halliday & Hasan, 1976; Halliday, 1985) with the social theory of discourse as it evolved in the work of Foucault (1969/1972, 1979, 1981).

Systemic functional linguistics (SFL) explains language use in terms of the form and function of interactions. SFL theorists posit that every interaction can be understood at three levels: textually, interpersonally, and situated in a wider societal context. Furthermore, as language users we choose from the meaning-making potentials that are available to us to represent and construct dialogue. Thus language use is a creative practice. Young and Harrison (2004) point out that SFL and CDA share several characteristics. First, both view language as a social construction. Second, both view language dialectically, which means that language influences the contexts in which it occurs and the contexts influence language production. And third, both emphasize the cultural and historical acts of meaning making.

Foucault's theories of discourse have had a tremendous impact on the social sciences. Foucault ultimately rejected the tenets of structuralism (that there exist binary distinctions between constructs and that we could remove ourselves from

the structure of language) and began the intellectual movement known as post-structuralism. Foucault theorized that the traditional distinction between speech and language (*parole* and *langue*) did not provide explanatory power. Rather, Foucault sought to understand the history and evolution of constructs that were considered natural (normality, justice, intellect, and so forth) and how such constructs are a product of power/knowledge relationships. Orders of discourse, a key construct in Foucault's understanding of social practices, are the discursive practices in a society or institution and the relationships among them. Fairclough distinguishes between Foucault's analysis of discourse and his own approach, which he refers to as a textually oriented approach to discourse analysis (TODA).

Gee's (1996, 1999) theory of discourse has been particularly important for education researchers in the United States. Gee's theory is inherently "critical" in the sense of asserting that all discourses are social and thus ideological, and that some discourses are valued more than others. Gee distinguished between ("little d") discourse and ("big D") Discourse. "Big D" Discourse refers both to language bits and to the cultural models that are associated with Discourses. For instance, there is a university Discourse that includes certain language bits that may be particular to academia, and there are also associated ways of thinking, believing, and valuing that are connected with membership in the Discourse of the university. "Little d" discourse refers to the linguistic elements—the language bits—that connect with such Discourses. Of course, the language bits (little d, discourse) and the social and cultural models (big D, Discourse) are constitutive and work together to construct, maintain, and transform interactions. The important thing to keep in mind about Discourse (both big and little d) is that they are social and political and have histories of participation that are saturated by power relations.

CDA brings together social theory and textual analysis. To provide a succinct overview of the shared assumptions about discourse held by many within the CDA tradition, we turn to Fairclough and Wodak (1997), who outlined common tenets of discourse under a critical umbrella, paraphrased here:

- Discourse does ideological work.
- Discourse constitutes society and culture.
- Discourse is situated and historical.
- Power relations are partially discursive.
- Mediation of power relations necessitates a socio-cognitive approach.
- CDA is a socially committed scientific paradigm that addresses social problems.
- Discourse analysis is interpretive, descriptive, and explanatory and uses a "systematic methodology."
- The role of the analyst is to study the relationships between texts and social practices.

What Is the "Analysis" in CDA?

There are many approaches to CDA, including French discourse analysis (Foucault, 1969/1972; Pecheux, 1975), social semiotics (Hodge & Kress, 1988; Kress, 2003), sociocognitive studies (van Dijk, 1993), the discourse historical method (Wodak, 1996; Wodak, Meyer, Titscher, & Vetter, 2000), and multi-modal methods (Hodge & Kress, 1988; Kress & van Leeuween, 1996). CDA departs from

discourse analysis and sociolinguistic analyses in its movement from description and interpretation to *explanation* of how discourse systematically constructs versions of the social world. Furthermore, critical analyses position subjects in relations of power (both liberatory and oppressive aspects of power) rather than analyzing language as a way of explaining the psychological intentions, motivations, skills, and competencies of individuals (Luke, 1995/1996). Each of these perspectives on CDA has been applied to relevant social problems in a wide range of disciplines, including policy, social work, linguistics, and education. Each perspective has developed its own set of analytic tools that might be brought to bear on a set of problems or questions.

Fairclough (1989, 1992, 1995) outlined a three-tiered framework that is very common among critical discourse analysts (see Fairclough, 1989, for a visual heuristic of this framework). The framework includes analysis of texts, interactions, and social practices at the local, institutional, and societal levels. The first goal of the analyst is to describe the relationships among certain texts, interactions, and social practices (this is accomplished by describing the grammatical resources that constitute such relations, an issue to which we will return). A second goal is to interpret the configuration of discourse practices. A third goal is to use the description and interpretation to offer an explanation of why and how social practices are constituted, changed, and transformed in the ways that they are.

Fairclough's analytic framework is constituted by three levels of analysis: the text, the discursive practice, and the sociocultural practice. In other words, each discursive event has three dimensions: It is a spoken or written text, it is an instance of discourse practice involving the production and interpretation of texts, and it is a part of social practice. The analysis of the text involves the study of the language structures produced in a discursive event. An analysis of the discursive practice involves examining the production, consumption, and reproduction of the texts. The analysis of sociocultural practice includes an exploration of what is happening in a particular sociocultural framework.

Analysis at the textual level involves use of Halliday's systemic functional linguistics and the three domains of ideational, interpersonal, and textual analysis. The ideational functions include meta-narratives that circulate in society. Analysis at this level includes transitivity, which involves the different processes, or types of verbs, involved in the interaction. The interpersonal functions are the meanings of the social relations established between participants in the interaction. Analysis of this domain includes an analysis of the mood (whether a sentence is a statement, question, or declaration) and modality (the degree of assertiveness in the exchange). The textual domain involves the thematic structure of the text.

Fairclough's second dimension, discursive practice, involves analysis of the process of production, interpretation, distribution, and consumption. This dimension is concerned with how people interpret and reproduce or transform texts.

The third dimension, sociocultural practice, is concerned with issues of power—power being a construct that is realized through interdiscursivity and hegemony. Analysis of this dimension includes exploration of the ways in which discourses operate in various domains of society.

Proliferation of CDA in Education research

Critical discourse analysts tend to work on applied topics in a wide range of domains, including political discourse, ideology, racism, economic discourse,

advertisement with promotional culture, media language, gender, institutional discourse, education, and literacy (Blommaert & Bulcaen, 2000). This is seen in the proliferating number of journals, conferences, and special editions of journals devoted to CDA. These journals include *Language and Politics; Critical Inquiries in Language Studies: An International Journal; Critical Discourse Studies; Text; Linguistics and Education; Language and Society; Discourse & Society; Discourse Studies;* and *Discourse.* In addition, there are many online resources for critical discourse studies, including *Critics-L* and *Language in the New Capitalism,* to name just two. The Linguist List *(http://www.linguistlist.org/)* maintained at Wayne State University, is a very accessible website with many resources for discourse studies, including book reviews, major conferences, journals, a list of linguists, and language resources. A study group of approximately 20 people meets regularly at major literacy conferences. There are university programs established for the study of critical discourse at the University of Lancaster and a minor at Alfred University. Two inaugural Critical Discourse Analysis conferences were held in 2004. The first International Conference in Critical Discourse Analysis was held in 2004 *(http://www.uv.es/cdaval/)* in Valencia, Spain. The School of Education at Indiana University held the first U.S. conference devoted to CDA in June of 2004. In December of 2004, the National Reading Conference (NRC) held a series of workshops focused on methodology, and CDA was the focus of one of the sessions (Burns & Morrell, in press). In the same year, the National Council of Teachers of English held a pre-conference workshop devoted to CDA.

CDA has not gone without critique, and the critiques are part of the overall context in which we intend this review to be read. The three most common critiques are (a) that political and social ideologies are read into the data; (b) that there is an imbalance between social theory, on the one hand, and linguistic theory and method, on the other; and (c) that CDA is often divorced from social contexts (Flowerdew, 1999; Price, 1999; Schegloff, 1999; Widdowson, 1998). How does CDA conducted in educational contexts hold up to these critiques? To answer this question, we reviewed the proliferating database of education research using CDA.

Methodology

Review of Databases

We reviewed five databases in the social sciences with the search term "critical discourse analysis" from the years 1980 through 2003. The databases were Web of Science, MLA, PsycINFO, ERIC, and ArticleFirst. We also used bibliographic branching and referrals from other researchers. We reviewed 1991–2003 abstracts of articles from *Linguistics and Education* (Vols. 3–14), the tables of contents of *Discourse & Society* from 1993 through 2003, and the abstracts in *Language in Society* from 1998 through 2003. We reviewed only research that was published in peer-reviewed journals. We required that the authors use the terms "critical discourse analysis" somewhere in the article. We did not review dissertation abstracts.

We integrated important books throughout the review where appropriate, because emerging theories and research often appear in books first, and later in articles. Examples of such books are *Critical Language Awareness* (Fairclough, 1992); *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis* (Gee, 1999); *Analyzing Discourse: Textual Analysis for Social Research* (Fairclough, 2003); *Discourse in Late*

Modernity (Chouliaraki & Fairclough, 1999); *Classroom Discourse Analysis* (Christie, 2002); *An Introduction to Critical Discourse Analysis in Education* (Rogers, 2004); *Literacy and Literacy: Texts, Power, and Identity* (Collins & Blot, 2003); *Systemic Functional Linguistics and Critical Discourse Analysis: Studies in Social Change* (Young & Harrison, 2004); and *A Critical Discourse Analysis of Family Literacy Practices* (Rogers, 2003).

We reviewed only studies that were conducted in or that pertained to formal education (in classrooms) or informal education (e.g., after-school programs, museums, family literacy programs) or that pertained to an educational issue (policy documents). Our rationale was that we wanted to see the range of perspectives, approaches, and theories in the pool of research that specifically referred to CDA. The search term "Critical Discourse Analysis" resulted in a total of 803 references. Many of these articles include critical perspectives, critical thinking, and discourse analysis. We read all of the abstracts to determine whether the authors were using CDA as a theory or method and not simply providing critical perspectives on discourse analysis or critical thinking and discourse analysis. This next level of analysis found 284 works that used Critical Discourse Analysis. Of these, 56 were situated in the discipline of education. Of those 56 articles, 16 were overlapping references across the databases. Therefore, the original search resulted in a total of 40 articles that used CDA in the context of education. We collected an additional 6 references through bibliographic branching.

Analytic Procedures

We developed a codebook to standardize our reviews (see Appendix A). We used our research questions and each study's features to develop a coding scheme. We also included aspects of CDA that were relevant to research in education (theory of discourse, implications for education). During literature retrieval, we used sample studies to refine the coding scheme. After reviewing and coding a subset of the studies, we selected 10 studies to determine interrater reliability. We each highlighted parts of the article that dealt with the issues in the codebook. Each of the articles was read twice—once by the lead researcher and once by a research assistant. The codebooks were compared for reliability. All disagreements were discussed and resolved. Our analysis was ongoing, informed by the literature, and constant-comparative. That is, as we reviewed studies we sought out similarities and differences across the studies and made note of themes. Once all of the articles were reviewed and the codebooks filled out, we began to summarize each of the articles (see Appendix B). This level of analysis helped to clarify trends in the data. From there, we pulled out four major themes (which we report on below) that ran across all of the articles. In addition, we asked two scholars who work in CDA to review the summary chart (Appendix B) and try to suggest other writings that we might include in the review.

Limitations

We do not claim to have included every article on Critical Discourse Analysis and education, particularly research published after 2003. We have taken on a review of research articles in education that explicitly define themselves as CDA and are set in an educational context. Because CDA is a relatively new "discipline" (whether it might be or should be considered a discipline is open for debate), we sought to bring together diverse lines of education research to take stock of what

had been done so far. In doing so, we have inevitably made the field seem more synthesized than it really is. However, we maintain that the present is a suitable point in the history of CDA in education research for such a synthesis.

In limiting our review to studies that have explicitly called themselves CDA or Critical Discourse Analyses, we have inevitably left out important lines of scholarship—lines that include discourse analyses conducted from critical perspectives and those that assume that all language is ideological and thus critical. Many articles have multiple perspectives and draw on social semiotics, hermeneutics, intertextuality, post-structuralism, popular culture, and media studies that bring together various critical theories and modes of discourse analysis. Authors who write within these traditions have shaped the types of analyses that have been conducted. We also did not review studies in intertextuality, though we realize that important work has been done in this subset of CDA (Beach & Anson, 1992; Fairclough, 1992; Hartman, 1992; Kamberelis & Scott, 1992; Lemke, 1992; Short, 1992). We recognize that what we have offered in this review is a modest synthesis of current education research that is informed by and informs CDA.

Organization of the Review

In the following sections, we present the findings of the review. The first section is a summary of the findings across all of the reviews. Next, we present five of the themes that ran across all of the studies. Table 1 is a summative table of the findings from the review. We provide a description of the findings that emerged from each theme and subset of the theme and identify studies that illustrate each particular theme. To be as succinct as possible, we describe only those studies that best represent the findings. In some cases, studies illustrated more than one theme; therefore we describe the study under the theme it mostly illustrates. Finally, we summarize all of the results in a discussion section, with particular attention focused on implications and future research with CDA in education.

TABLE 1
Findings by theme

Theme	Findings
Articles reviewed	$N = 46$
Empirical articles	$N = 39$
Theoretical articles	$N = 7$
Mode of language in empirical articles	66% (26/39) Interactional (analysis of spoken language, or spoken and written language)
Theory of language	33% (13/39) Analysis of written language 28% (11/39) No theory of language
Context	85% (22/26) Took place in middle school, high school, or higher education 15% (4/26) Took place in elementary school or with children under the age of 10
Analysis	20% (8/39) Empirical articles did not comment on their analytic procedures

Findings

Appendix B is a descriptive chart of the findings from the 46 articles reviewed, organized by the main sections of each of the articles (definition of CDA, research focus, context, data sources, and data analysis). There is an interdisciplinary group of scholars using CDA to analyze and theorize about educational issues. We have designated the geographic location of the authors next to their names in this chart. The type of article is abbreviated as either "E" (empirical) or "T" (theoretical).

The chart demonstrates that while all of the articles we reviewed were situated within an educational context or pertained to educational issues, there was a great deal of diversity in the focus of the articles. The research focus of these articles varied from exploring the relationship between personhood and literacy, to how history standards are presented to the public, to how knowledge is constructed in chemistry classrooms.

In what follows we report on the major themes across the articles. We begin by exploring the multiple ways in which CDA has been defined in education research. Next, we explore whether and how education researchers using CDA have overcome the written language bias that historically has characterized CDA. From there, we explore the context in which CDA work is situated and the relationship of CDA to context. We then turn to the question of methods and the ways in which education researchers using CDA have taken up the methodological aspects of CDA. Reflexivity is an important aspect of any critical work, and in the next section we illustrate the ways in which education researchers have dealt with issues of reflexivity. Finally, in the discussion, we turn to the findings of the articles reviewed to answer the question, What do we know as a result of CDA work done in education research?

The Multiple Meanings of CDA

As Fairclough and Wodak (1997) pointed out, there are many different approaches to CDA, including French discourse analysis (Foucault, 1969/1972; Pecheux, 1975), social semiotics (Hodge & Kress, 1988; Kress, 2003), sociocognitive studies (van Dijk, 1993), and the discourse historical method (Wodak, 1996; Wodak, Meyer, Titscher & Vetter, 2000). Each of these perspectives on CDA has been applied to relevant social problems in a wide range of disciplines including policy, social work, linguistics, and education. Despite the many different perspectives of CDA, most of the research we reviewed drew mainly on Fairclough (1989, 1991, 1993, 1995). We were surprised that despite Wodak's contribution to the development of CDA as a theory, method, and research program (Wodak, 1996; Wodak, Meyer, Titscher, & Vetter, 2000, Wodak & Reisigl, 2001) and her work as the director of the Wittgenstein Research Center on Discourse, Politics, and Identity, there were very few references to her (see Corson, 2000, and Rogers, 2003, for exceptions).

The articles reviewed here defined CDA in four ways. First, they defined CDA in relation to post-structuralism. It is clear that CDA work in education research continues to draw on the relationship between CDA and post-structuralism, particularly post-structuralist feminism and Foucault. While CDA draws heavily on post-structural theory, Fairclough (1995) made a distinction between CDA and Foucault's theory of language. He aimed for CDA to be a textually oriented

discourse analysis (TODA), whereas post-structural analyses were often lacking in close textual analysis.

Second, the articles defined CDA in terms of its goals, aims, or functions. The articles that defined CDA in such terms asserted that aims of CDA are to disrupt discourses, challenge restrictive pedagogies, challenge passive acceptance of the status quo, and reveal how texts operate in the construction of social practices. More research tended to define and use CDA as a tool of critique than as a tool for re-imagining the social world. A third group of authors defined CDA on the basis of its association with Systemic Functional Linguistics, critical linguistics, or interactional sociolinguistics. A fourth set of authors defined CDA through a description of the analytic framework that they employed. Each of the authors referred to the CDA framework as a three-tiered framework and made reference to Fairclough's work. Some authors merged Fairclough's description with other frameworks (Chouliaraki, 1998; Collins, 2001). All of the authors seem to agree that the framework brings together a micro and macro analysis and offers a description, interpretation, and explanation of social events. Three articles mentioned CDA but did not define it.

Mode of Language Analyzed and Theories of Language: Overcoming Written Language Bias

CDA sets out to describe, interpret, and explain the relationships between language, social practices, and the social world. Language indexes social relations, expresses social relations, constitutes social relations, and challenges social relations. Language, in this framework, is dialogic, intertextual, and historically based. CDA has been seriously critiqued for failing to address interactional or dialogic texts and focusing instead primarily on written texts (newspapers, lists, policy documents, health care documents). Teo (2000) wrote, "CDA typically concentrates on data like news reporting, political interviews, counseling, and job interviews that describe unequal encounters, or embody manipulative strategies that seem neutral or natural to most people" (p. 12). Similarly, Rampton (2001) pointed out that interaction and dialogism are rarely brought out in Critical Discourse Analysis. We wondered, as we began this review, if this critique would hold up with analyses conducted in educational contexts. It did not. It appears as if education researchers using CDA are beginning to overturn this critique as more and more studies are using CDA with interactional data. Of the 39 empirical articles reviewed, 26 (or 66%) used interactional data (either just interactional data or interactional data and written data). See Appendix B for a description of articles that included either written or interactional data.

While an impressive number of studies focused on analyses of interactional data (rather than on written texts), the analysts did not frame their analyses within the history of discourse analysis and socio-linguistic analysis. CDA has also been critiqued for not paying attention to socio-linguistic predecessors (Schegloff, 1993; Sawyer, 2002). A few studies mentioned the relationship between different discourse analytic traditions. Peace (2003), for example, discussed the pros and cons of "top-down" (critical discourse analysis that draws on post-structuralism) and "bottom-up" (ethnomethodology and conversation analysis) theories of language and asserted that "both approaches can be problematic" (p. 164). While it is true that the two approaches to discourse analysis have some incompatible tenets, most

critical analyses draw on elements of earlier discourse analyses but do not explicitly mention CDA's connection with other forms of discourse analysis (for exceptions, see Collins, 2001; Heller, 2001; Moje, 1997; Rampton, 2001).

We then wondered about the relationships between the *type* of text analyzed (written, interactional or a combination of written and interactional) and the *theory of language* brought to bear on the analysis. We learned that emphasis placed on theories of language varied widely across the studies from a careful description of post-structural theories of discourse and SFL to a description of post-structural discourse theory or a description of SFL, to no description of language at all. We found this surprising because CDA is a discursively based framework, and we expected there to be more careful attention to and description of theories of language.

A number of studies, particularly those conducted in the United States and in literacy studies, collapsed Gee's theories of discourse under that of critical discourse analysis (Brown & Kelly, 2001; Egan-Robertson, 1998; Hinchman & Young, 2001; Rogers, Tyson, & Marshall, 2000; Johnson, 2001; Orellana, 1996; Young, 2000). While Gee's discourse theory and analysis assumes language is political and social and thus "critical," he does not refer to his brand of discourse analysis as CDA, a point that he made specifically in Gee (2004). Nevertheless, Rogers, Tyson, and Marshall (who, in a 2000 study of three children, their families, teachers, and principals across two schools, explore the interplay of discourses, or living dialogues, in their neighborhood) classify Fairclough, (1989, 1992), Gee (1996), and Lemke (1995) together under critical discourse theories. Furthermore, Johnson (2001), in a study of pre-service teachers' visual narratives of a student teaching experience, draws on Gee's theory of discourse in his definition of CDA. Egan-Robertson (1998), in a study of how personhood is communicated through writing in a community writing program, cites Gee's theory of discourse.

Of the studies reviewed, 28% (11 of 39) do not address language theory at all. Bartu (2001), Bergvall and Remlinger (1996), Comber (1997), Collins (2001), Kumaravadivelu (1999), Thomas (2002), Stevens (2003), Johnson and Avery (1999), and Fox and Fox (2002) all lack a discussion of language. One area that critical discourse analysts need to be more conscious of is that the theories of language that are being used are predominantly based on European languages. This is important because, as we will demonstrate in the next section, CDA is often used in work with historically marginalized groups of people, and such groups are likely to have linguistic variation at the syntactic and morphological level as well as discourse patterns that may not be accounted for in a European-language-based discourse framework. We return to this point in the discussion.

Critical Discourse Analysis in Context

An ongoing discussion in the journal *Discourse & Society* has focused on the relationship between conversation analysis and CDA (Billig, 1999; Schegloff, 1999). The big question is how much of the context—beyond the here and now of the interaction—is important, or necessary, to understanding the interaction. Critical discourse analysts pay attention to the macro context—the societal and the institutional as well as the local level of a text and the grammatical resources that make up the text. Conversation analysts, on the other hand, believe all that is

relevant is the "here and now" of the interaction, not what came before or after it. This group of scholars argues that CDA does not attend closely enough to the linguistic resources that constitute interactions but instead focus on how macro relations are mapped onto micro interactions (Billig, 1999; Widdowson, 1998). Context also has been important because CDA has often been critiqued as "out of context," meaning that bits of texts and talk are analyzed outside the context of their production, consumption, distribution, and reproduction.

CDA has also been critiqued by another group of scholars (primarily linguistic anthropologists) for not paying enough attention to ethnographic contexts—the criticism being that the analyses are often based on decontextualized texts (speeches, policy documents, excerpts of talk) rather than on grounded, interactional data that occur within a larger frame of interactions (see *Critique of Anthropology*, volume 21, issues 1–2 for an in-depth discussion of this issue). It appears that CDA conducted in educational contexts may offer a way out of this theoretical and methodological quagmire. As we describe in the following sections, education researchers are bringing CDA frameworks into a variety of educational settings and asking questions that demand attention both to the linguistic details of the interaction and to the larger social, historical, and cultural contexts in which the interactions emerge.

As was mentioned earlier, 33% (13 of 39) of the studies reviewed for this article were analyses of written texts where the context was the text itself, for example, policy documents, newspaper articles, textbooks, and transcripts of videos (Ailwood & Lingard, 2001; Barnard, 2001; Collins, 2001; Hays, 2000; Luke, 1997; Pitt, 2002; Stevens, 2003). However, all of the studies were located in educational contexts (meeting, classroom, interviews, writing club). Of the interactional studies, 85% took place in middle school, high school, or higher education settings. Only 15% (4 of 26) took place in elementary schools (Gebhard, 2002; Orellana, 1996; Rogers, Tyson, & Marshall, 2000; Young, 2000). Of all of the empirical studies (39), 15% (6 of 39) of the studies were set in a higher education context (Corson, 2000; Fairclough, 1993; Fox & Fox, 2002) or in university classrooms (Bartu, 2001; Bergvall & Remlinger, 1996; Heberle, 2000).

We found that the studies covered a wide range of contexts, including science classes (Moje, 1997; Myers, 1996), a social studies class (Brown & Kelly, 2001); literature classes (Hinchman & Young, 2001), after-school programs (Egan-Robertson, 1998; Rogers, 2002c), home schooling experiences (e.g., Young, 2000), interviews (e.g., Collins, 2001; Nichols, 2002), special education meetings (Rogers, 2002b), administrative school meetings (e.g., Corson, 2000; Orellana, 1996), or written documents (e.g., Ailwood & Lingard, 2001; Anderson, 2001; Davis, 1997).

All of the empirical studies (100%) used some form of anthropological or ethnographic method (participant-observation recorded in fieldnotes, document collection, and debriefing) (Chouliaraki, 1998; Comber, 1997; Hughes, 2001; Hinchman & Young, 2001; Egan-Robertson, 1998; Rogers, Tyson, & Marshall, 2000; Rogers, 2002a; Young, 2000), interviews or focus groups (Brown & Kelly, 2001; Collins, 2001; Nichols, 2002; Peace, 2003; Johnson & Avery, 1999; Young, 2000). The studies varied in the detail and description provided about fieldwork (length and duration), data sources (written texts, interactional texts, interviews), and research participants (ethnicity, how they were selected). Some studies provided a clear and

detailed description of their data sources (Comber, 1997; Egan-Robertson, 1998; Hughes, 2001; Hinchman & Young, 2001; Moje, 1997; Rogers, 2002a; Rogers, Tyson, & Marshall, 2000; Young, 2000). Others lacked such descriptions.

Some authors had innovative ways of including context in their analyses. Nichols (2002), in a study that explored the gendered nature of parents' accounts of their children, built three contexts into the interview protocol (memories of their own literacy experiences, descriptions of home literacy practices, and observations of their children's literacy related behaviors). While Hays (2000) situated her analysis primarily on newspaper texts covering educational conditions in Botswana in Southern Africa, she did make reference to the ethnographic fieldwork that she had conducted there in her explanation of the newspaper texts (references of this kind are rare in the analysis of written texts). Similarly, Stevens (2003), in a study of how the federal government defined reading, combined her observations of the Reading Leadership Academy in 2002 with a textual analysis of the documents from that conference. Other studies (Bergvall & Remlinger, 1996; Chouliaraki, 1998; Fox & Fox, 2002; Peace, 2003) recorded interactional data in classrooms through participant observation or conducted interviews but did not specify the amount or the duration of fieldwork. Peace (2003) also reported that someone else had collected the interviews that he analyzed.

The diversity of the research participants represented in these studies was quite broad. As mentioned earlier, the vast majority of articles focused on participants of middle school age or older. Furthermore, most of the research participants were students (with the exception of Comber's 1997 analysis of a teacher). The ethnicity of the participants varied as widely as the contexts in which the studies occurred. See Appendix B for the diversity of the research participants across the articles. Overall, the researchers defined context in terms of the field of study and participants and did not theorize the role of context in conducting CDA. What we learn is that CDA is being "put to work" in context, but the multiple meanings of context have not yet been theorized.

The Question of Methods

Van Dijk (2004) has proposed changing the name Critical Discourse Analysis to Critical Discourse *Studies* because the term "analysis" suggests that researchers are interested mainly in analysis, without much theory—when, in fact, CDA is a combination of theory and method (van Dijk, 2004). As reviewed in the introduction, there are many ways of approaching CDA in the social sciences, from semiotic, to historical, to multi-modal analyses. The problem or object of study may be shared, but the authors are eclectic in their methods; that is, they use methods that they think will help them learn more about the problem under study. Analysts bring a range of theoretical and methodological tools to bear on their research problems and perspectives.

Researchers and scholars of CDA vary on the question of whether the analytic procedures of CDA should be more standardized across research or whether standardization runs counter to the epistemological and ontological tenets of a critical paradigm. Verschueren (2001) and Martin (2000), for example, argued that CDA should be applied more systematically and more rigorously. Those who argue for more systematic analytic procedures are trying to counter critics who say that CDA researchers search their data for examples of what they are trying to prove, instead

of letting the data "speak." These critics recommend that critical discourse analysts examine actual language patterns with some degree of explicitness and reconnect these patterns with the social and political themes that inform their work. In response to the issue of a more systematic CDA, Bucholtz (2001) wrote:

> Any attempt to foolproof guidelines in an acceptable critical discourse analysis will be defeated by its own universalistic urge. . . . It is difficult to imagine what might constitute adequate formal analysis in advance of actually carrying it out: must all analyses attend to phonetic detail? To syntactic structure? (p. 176)

Others (Bucholtz, 2001; Gee, 1999) argue that there needs to be a diversity of approaches and that such diversity strengthens the framework and the method.

Our review of the literature indicated that the actual analytic procedures of CDA were carried out and reported on (or not reported on) in a vast range of ways. The authors used Fairclough's three-tiered framework, post-structural discourse frameworks, or discourse analysis (not CDA, despite calling their procedures CDA), or did not specify their analytic procedures. See Appendix B for a summary of the analysis carried out in each of the articles.

Although all of the articles claimed to conduct a Critical Discourse Analysis, some presented a discourse analysis, not particularly a Critical Discourse Analysis. Brown and Kelly (2001), in a study of the narratives of African Canadian high school students who discussed the relevancy of the social studies curriculum in their classrooms, argued that "their goal is to highlight and examine discourse production and interpretation as it intersects with the 'life-worlds' of a particular subject grouping, i.e., the high-school student of African descent" (p. 503). The authors provided conversations between students but did not include a discourse analysis of the conversations. Rather, they presented themes or social narratives rather than an analysis of the discursive construction of texts (either written or spoken). Discourse analysis in this sense seems to be interpreted at the social rather than the textual level and does not attempt to move beyond description to interpretation and explanation.

One cluster of studies presented broad themes from their analyses and then used examples of discourse to support the themes (Bergvall & Remlinger, 1996; Rogers, Tyson, & Marshall, 2000; Nichols, 2002; Peace, 2003; Tunstall, 2001). Rogers, Tyson, and Marshall described their analysis as categorizing utterances into three broad themes. There was no mention of what constitutes an utterance or how the themes were determined. Nichols (2002) analyzed the parents' interview using the broad themes and the research literature to demonstrate the themes. Similarly, Peace (2003), in a study that explored the ways in which women socially construct masculinities through cross-gender undergraduate student group discussions, used a grounded approach to discourse analysis. He wrote: "[T]the interview transcripts were read repeatedly; as broad categories began to emerge they were increasingly related to the literature and analyzed in terms of what they may achieve" (pp. 165–166). He does not include for *what* specific linguistic properties he analyzed the texts.

The question that these analyses raise is, Why did the author choose certain parts of the text to analyze and not others? It appears from the analytic sections of these articles that the authors assumed that, if they had a critical orientation and

attended to *some* aspects of language in their analysis, then they would be conducting a critical discourse analysis. CDA, in a Faircloughian tradition, draws on SFL that assumes that linguistic form is related to linguistic function and that certain categories of linguistic functions do particular social "work." However, the authors are not clear on how an analysis of transitivity relates to the ideological commitment of a text. They are also not clear about how over-lexicalization (the availability of many words for one concept) relates to the representation of the history standards in one way but not in another. Several studies combine social theories with the CDA framework (Chouliaraki, 1998; Collins, 2001; Woodside-Jiron, 2004). Collins merged the Natural Histories of Discourse framework (referential, interactional, and metadiscursive levels) with Fairclough's three-tiered framework (textual, discursive, and society-wide).

In general, the authors used aspects of Fairclough's three-tiered framework but failed to specify what linguistic resources accompany which set of functions. This may be, in part, because Fairclough did not specify in his earlier work (1992, 1995) what grammatical resources correspond to each level of analysis. However, Chouliaraki and Fairclough (1999) and Fairclough (2003) moved closer to the SFL framework and described the specific linguistic resources that may be used for analysis at each of the corresponding CDA levels. Overall, there was lack of connection between linguistic practices, social practices, and wider social formations. Twenty percent (8 of 39) of the empirical articles did not describe their analytic procedures at all (Ailwood & Lingard, 2001; Barnard, 2001; Bartu, 2001; Brown & Kelly, 2001; Fox & Fox, 2002; Hughes, 2001; Pitt, 2002; Thomas, 2002). We return to discuss this in the concluding section.

Reflexivity and Role of the Researcher

Chouliaraki and Fairclough (1999) cited reflexivity as an important agenda for CDA research. Similarly, Bucholtz (2001) called for a heightened self-awareness in discourse analysis. She called for a reflexivity where, "the analyst's choices at every step in the research process are visible as a part of the discourse investigation, and critique does not stop with social processes, whether macro-level or micro-level, but rather extends to the analysis itself" (p. 166). Reflexivity includes at least three aspects: participatory construction of the research design, reciprocity, and turning the analytic frame back on the researcher.

Reflexive intentions vary from building rigor in the research to questioning the authenticity of the researcher (Alvesson & Skoldberg, 2000). The intention of reflexivity depends on whether researchers view their aim as strengthening the rigor of social science research or questioning the epistemological and ontological foundations of the knowledge claims that can be made. For example, Myerhoff and Ruby (1982) define reflexivity as "structuring communicative products so that the audience assumes the producer, process and product are a coherent whole . . . scientists have also been engaged in reflexive activities . . . scientists continuously test their own assumptions and procedures" (pp. 6–9). This statement implies that being reflexive is synonymous with being scientific. While Bourdieu and Wacquant (1992) call into question the ideological nature of "monitoring" one's own thoughts and actions, their reflexive intention is to "strengthen the epistemological moorings" of the research (p. 46). This intention might be viewed in much the same way as are traditional claims to validity, which often safeguard researchers

from a self-reflexive research paradigm. That is, if we triangulate our data, member-check with participants, engage in peer review, establish and maintain a paper trail of our theorizing and analytic moves, we can claim that our Critical Discourse Analysis is valid—or an accurate representation of "reality." Such a view is problematic, especially in a Critical Discourse Analysis framework that rejects the view of an objective and neutral science.

Reflexivity within a CDA framework arises from a concern about the stabilization of knowledge claims and the slipperiness of language. That is, the fundamental nature of language hinders empirical research that is aimed at establishing the "truth." Indeed, Chouliaraki and Fairclough (1999) assert that reflexivity is caught up in social struggle and that reflexivity assumes a discursive element that posits that researchers are part of the language practices they study. The intention of the reflexive stance depends on the claims to knowledge and reality of the researcher and the extent to which the researchers turn these frameworks on themselves, either methodologically or theoretically.

Reflexivity is crucial in research agendas involving Critical Discourse Analysis in education research. Education researchers are often researchers of familiar educational settings. As members and ex-members of the school communities that we study, we bring with us (often successful) histories of participation in those institutions as students, teachers, and parents. Thus we have embodied what Fairclough (1992) refers to as "members' resources," or what Gee (1999) refers to as "cultural models" around our participation in school that includes beliefs, assumptions and values within these contexts. Thus the classic tension between distance and closeness in the research setting is often blurred in education research.

To turn back to the articles reviewed and the issue of reflexivity, most of the analyses that dealt primarily with written texts did not include a high degree of researcher reflexivity (Ailwood & Lingard, 2001; Anderson, 2001; Barnard, 2001; Bloome & Carter, 2001; Fairclough, 1993; Johnson & Avery, 1999; Luke, 1997; Pitt, 2002; Thomas, 2002). In these studies, the researchers often positioned themselves as if they were outside the texts. Of course, we know that this is not true—and that any discourse analysis is a process of constructing meaning. Hays (2000) was a notable exception to this rule (see below). Although some studies involved interactional analyses, the researchers still did not locate themselves in the research (Bergvall & Remlinger, 1996; Chouliaraki, 1998; Fox & Fox, 2002; Johnson, 2001; Moje, 1997).

In a number of studies, the researchers positioned themselves mainly as text analysts, even though they were clearly the data collection instruments (Anderson, 2001; Baxter, 2002; Corson, 2000; Hinchman & Young, 2001; Peace, 2003; Nichols, 2003; Hughes, 2001; Stevens, 2003). In her 2003 study, Stevens does not address her role in the research other than naming herself as the state reading specialist; however, in another publication she does deal closely with matters of CDA and reflexivity (Stevens, 2004).

In other studies (Brown & Kelly, 2001; Collins, 2001; Young, 2000; Egan-Robertson, 2000; Rogers, 2002a, 2002b, 2002c), the authors do position themselves in the research and comment on issues of reflexivity. Collins (2001), in a study of how teachers take up (or resist) the discourses of educational standards and the ways in which the standards echo larger socio-political educational reforms, presents himself as a text analyst or researcher and also as a member of the educational community within the district that he is writing about and a parent

of a child in the same district. Young (2000), in a study that explores how critical literacy activities in a home schooling setting sustain or transform the participants' awareness of gendered identities and inequities in texts, writes the following:

> As a middle and high school literacy teacher, I explored many alternative literacy practices and instructional options in an effort to find ways to encourage students to become readers, writers, and learners. As a mother, I have often longed for my sons' school literacy experiences to be different from traditional textbook methods. (p. 312)

Young (2000) squarely positions herself in her research as a mother and teacher, one aspect of reflexivity. She does not, however, turn the critical discourse analysis framework back on herself to analyze how her participation in the research contributed to the reproduction or disruption of power relations. Overall, we found very few examples of this type of reflexivity in the studies that we reviewed—an issue to which we return in the conclusion. At present we move to summarize our findings and point to implications and future research.

Discussion and Conclusion

What do we know as a result of CDA conducted in education research? The studies reviewed provide education researchers with a closer look at the ways in which educational issues are constructed and represented at micro and macro levels through public documents, speeches, interactions in classrooms, informal sites of learning, and across the lifespan. The emphasis on interactional data gives us insight into the ways in which the micro and macro contexts are linked together and the ways in which competing discourses come into play. Indeed, in this corpus of studies we have seen how discourses of education draw on hybrid and intertextual discourses, such as business and management (Anderson, 2001; Comber, 1997).

A strong thread running through many of the findings was the identification of unintended consequences of educational decisions, policies, and social practices. That is, educators often intended to open up liberatory spaces in meetings, policies, teaching decisions, and classroom lessons; but a closer analysis revealed that their actions had *unintended consequences* that resulted in further oppression (Ailwood & Lingard, 2001; Chouliaraki, 1998; Corson, 2000; Comber, 1997; Fox & Fox, 2002). Along the same line, the analyses that we reviewed provided a detailed investigation of the subtleties of power and privilege, the ways in which power is linked to histories of participation in various contexts, and how power is internalized rather than reinforced from above. With that said, most of the analyses focused on the ways in which power is reproduced rather on how it is changed, resisted, and transformed toward liberatory ends. Luke (2004) argues that, historically, most critical analyses have focused on uncovering the discursive places where oppression and domination occur rather than on places of liberation. Luke (2004) stated:

> We need more research and scholarship that documents and analytically explicates analyses that focus on affirmative, emancipating and redressive texts and discourse practices—turning our attention to instances where discourse appears to lead systematically to the redistribution of wealth and power. (p. xi)

We concur with this assertion.

Overall, this review has outlined the major areas of emphasis, as well as the strengths and weaknesses, of CDA in education research. We can also return to the common critiques of CDA (political and social ideologies are read into the data; there is unequal balance between social theory and linguistic theory; and CDA is often divorced from social contexts) and ask, How do education researchers using CDA fare with these critiques?

It appears that CDA that is conducted in educational settings is moving toward overcoming written language bias. Indeed, 66% of the empirical articles analyzed interactional language. Much of the research that has been conducted with CDA outside the field of education has analyzed written texts (e.g., speeches, policy documents, letters, textbooks). In the context of education research, we have seen a shift from the analysis of written texts to the analysis of spoken texts. This shift could potentially reshape each of the levels of the CDA framework ("critical," "discourse," and "analysis"). As a result of bringing CDA into dynamic learning settings, researchers change, modify, and adjust the framework to suit the needs of their research designs and particular questions. We might reflect on how researchers are shaped to think in certain ways because of the frameworks that exist and how the research that we are conducting is, in fact, reshaping the framework itself. This analytic move keeps CDA as a usable, reflexive framework, open to adjustments and adaptations, given the demands of the research questions, the contexts, and the theoretical frameworks that are brought into line with it.

While 66 % of the articles focused on interactional data, many of the articles did not provide a clear description of their linguistic framework—an oddity given that CDA is a discourse-based framework. Such unbalanced attention to language theory in CDA in education research may be due, in part, to the lack of training that education researchers receive in language studies. A real problem for education researchers who are interested in Critical Discourse Analysis is their relative lack of experience in dealing with the micro-structure of texts. This is compounded by the relative lack of attention to SFL in the American context.

All of the studies that focused on interactional data used ethnographic methods of participant observation recorded in fieldnotes, interviews, document collection, and debriefing with participants. Some studies included data across time and contexts (Moje, 1997; Rogers, 2002a). All of the studies attended to both ethnographic and linguistic contexts, although the weight placed on one or the other varies. The attention paid to local, institutional, or societal contexts varied as well. The research in this review did not theorize the role of context beyond the field of study and the participants in the study. More theorization of the role of context in critical discourse studies would be an important next step.

Although most of the studies focused on what Luke (2004) calls the "deconstructive" rather than the "reconstructive" aspects of power, the focus on classroom discourse and interactional data opens up possibilities for investigating the ways in which people resist and transform social relations toward emancipatory ends. Interactional data tend to be more hybrid (or less stable) than written texts and thus open to the possibility of change. More analyses of the intricacies of classroom talk, within a democratic framework, could offer descriptions, interpretations, and explanations of how agency, productive literate identities, and a sense of community are formed and sustained.

The focus on interactions in classrooms in the studies reviewed also resulted in a discussion of the role of critical discourse studies in learning. Several of the articles discussed viewing learning in terms of changing discourse practices across time (Rogers, 2002b). Furthermore, *An Introduction to Critical Discourse Analysis in Education* (Rogers, 2004), provides a collection of empirical chapters that illustrate the ways in which CDA can illuminate learning by studying shifts in discourse practices across time and contexts. More research is needed to investigate how shifts in discourse patterns can provide educators insight into the ways in which people of various ages learn.

An overwhelming 85% of the studies involved participants who were of middle school age or older. Only 15% of the studies included participants who were in elementary school and under 10 years old. Ideologies are reproduced and transformed at very young ages. Therefore, descriptions and explanations of how this occurs and, more important, how the acquisition of counterproductive ideologies is interrupted, are necessary. This suggests the importance of extending CDA inquiries to primary grades. It also raises the question whether the critiques of integrating critical literacy into primary grades extend to the usefulness of CDA as a theoretical and methodological framework in primary grade classrooms.

It was not surprising to see in this review that CDA was mostly used with participants who have historically been oppressed (e.g., women, African Americans, the poor and working classes). As Wodak & Reisigl (2001) pointed out:

> Language is not powerful on its own—it gains power by the use powerful people make of it. This explains why Critical Linguistics often chooses the perspective of those who suffer, and critically analyzes the language use of those in power, who are responsible for the existence of inequalities and who also have the means and opportunities to improve conditions. (p. 10)

What *was* refreshing is that researchers in education also looked closely at the language of those who suffer (students, parents in meetings, teachers) and found places of agency, creativity, and resistance. We need to proceed cautiously with conducting research *on* groups of people who have been oppressed historically, as opposed to conducting research *with* these people (an issue discussed earlier). The majority of the studies reviewed here took the former approach. Luke (1995/1996) writes, "[W]hat is needed is a systematic attempt to build on minority discourses in schools, classrooms, and other public institutions" (p. 39). We might extend our analyses beyond verbal data to the nonlinguistic and emotional aspects of suffering, oppression, hope, and liberation.

In the corpus of studies we reviewed, there were more analyses of gender (Bergvall & Remlinger, 1996; Pitt, 2002; Young, 2000) than of race (Brown & Kelly, 2001). The difference seems to be related to the ways in which race is silenced in education research (Greene & Abt-Perkins, 2003; Tate, 2003). Critical discourse analyses should more consciously draw on the history of scholarship in Critical Race Theory (Bell, 2004; Crenshaw, 1988; Delgado, 1995; Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995; Tate, 1997), especially when engaging issues of race, racism, and anti-racism. This is important because CDA frameworks traditionally draw on Euro-American epistemological traditions, both in theoretical and analytic frameworks. Such frameworks have continued to silence and oppress historically marginalized groups of people.

The studies that we reviewed included multiple analytic methods. However, they surprisingly uniform in terms of the framework that the analysts drew upon in their analysis. None of the studies that we reviewed drew on multi-modal analyses. The use of CDA as a methodology is rapidly growing in education research. Many of the studies draw on Fairclough's approach—rather than on the approaches of van Dijk, Wodak, Kress and Van Leeuwen, and so forth. This homogeneity in approach is a trend that van Dijk (2001) warned against because of the multidisciplinary nature of CDA. Future studies should pull from a hybrid set of approaches that can help to bring fresh insights to educational questions.

The weakest link in all of these studies seems to be the connection between linguistic resources and social practices. That is, although some of the authors focused on the linguistic details of interactions and made social claims, they failed to represent the relationship between the grammatical resources and the social practices. Not even the studies that provided an analysis of the micro-linguistic aspects of texts gave a rationale for *why* those aspects were included or explained how they are connected to social practices. On the other hand, researchers were equally inclined to point out social practices through broad themes or discourses without indicating how such discourses were constructed or constrained by grammatical resources. Clearly, establishing a link between the two levels is necessary. Indeed, Meyer (2001) argued that often a range of linguistic indicators and variables are used to analyze texts with no theoretical coherence or grammar theory supporting the analysis.

It seems important to be clear about *what* grammatical resources are being inquired into (pronouns or modality) and *why*. That is, SFL argues that every utterance performs three simultaneous functions: It presents ideas, it positions people in certain ways, and it performs a textual function of organizing the coherence of talking and/or writing. It is important to clarify which aspects of language perform which functions to avoid being criticized for reading ideologies into the data. Analysts can take responsibility for adopting a more grounded approach and letting the ideologies appear—as networks of practices—and be read from the data. Education researchers should spend more time incorporating SFL theory and method (or compatible linguistic models) into their analyses.

There was alarmingly little reflexivity in the articles that we reviewed. Some of the articles did include a researcher role section—a rhetorical strategy that is commonplace in publishing qualitative research. However, many of the authors did not move from reflection to reflexivity. This is a problem, especially in education research, where researchers often have successful histories of participation within the education contexts where they are conducting research. There were some surprises. Hays (2000), for example, included a moment of reflexivity in her analysis of newspaper articles. This is the only reflexive section in a written language analysis that we found. Despite not using reflexivity to its full potential, some authors outlined their analytic decisions very carefully, thus allowing the reader to assess them.

We reported that very few of the articles reviewed here moved toward emancipatory action with the results of their analyses. There were exceptions, such as Rogers, Tyson, and Marshall (2000), Young (2000), and Rogers (2002a, 2002c), where each of the researchers also worked as a literacy tutor and planned critical interventions with the people with whom he or she was working. The lack of action in the rest of the studies is surprising, given that many of the authors defined CDA in terms of its liberatory goals and aims (as was discussed earlier). Bucholtz (2001) asserted that it is not possible for scholars who do critical work to separate their research from their political positions. Similarly, van Dijk (2001) referred to CDA as "discourse analysis with an attitude" (p. 96). What is important for continued work in CDA is a methodology that allows political positions to arise from the data rather than being read into them. The twin goals of a rigorous analysis and a social justice agenda need not be incompatible.

Bucholtz (2001) points out that CDA should not strive to enforce stricter methodological guidelines, because more rigorous and scientific methodologies would inevitably move researchers away from recognizing the construction of their discourse analysis. Instead, researchers should closely attend to the specific conditions that shape peoples' lives and bring the researcher's role more clearly into vision. Based on the review of CDA in education, we would agree with Bucholtz (2001) that a formalized set of methodological criteria for CDA will not silence the critiques of the theory and method. Indeed, CDA, by design, is a hybrid set of theories and methodologies. The continued work within and across frameworks allows CDA to adapt and respond to ever-changing conditions in a late capitalist society. We depart from her assertion, however, after this review of CDA in education. As we have demonstrated in this review, many studies have not reported an analytic procedures section. Many studies included a linguistic analysis but were not clear about why certain aspects of texts were chosen. Still others made sweeping explanatory statements—of the type that are often easy to state even before the analysis has been conducted—without attention to the links between the micro and the macro. If CDA as a theory and method is to move beyond the present critiques, researchers might attend to the following: (a) the links between the micro and the macro; (b) explaining why certain linguistic resources are analyzed and not others, and (c) clear analytic procedures outlining the decision making of the researcher.

Directions for Future Research

Despite this robust collection of literature, there are areas where theories of learning are underdeveloped or not attached at all to "critical" discourse theory and social transformation. CDA offers a synergistic framework with social constructivist and community of practice models of learning. Indeed, CDA can be used to trace changes in discourse patterns over time and across contexts—changes that we might refer to as learning. Future research might focus on bringing sociocognitive models to bear on CDA. Clearly, more research is needed in primary grade classrooms, particularly with interactional texts. There is also a need for research analyzing multi-modal texts (Web surfing, hypertexts, channel surfing, network communication). We might also study genre mixing within and across research sites and projects.

An issue not explored in this article, but which may be of considerable interest to education researchers interested in CDA, is the representation of the analysis and the findings. Clearly, given the space constraints of publishing in academic journals, it is not possible to represent all aspects of multi-vocal and multi-layered analyses. Authors make choices, and it is hoped that they are clear about their choices. This issue speaks to the need to consider the limitations of print-based journals as the primary outlet for work in CDA. Researchers might consider other multi-modal outlets for their work, such as electronic journals and books.

We might also look more closely at how studies that defined CDA as having liberating aims were related to the research participants and the role of the researcher. Future studies might offer descriptions of the nuances of learning described through a CDA framework (productive, constructive CDA approaches) rather than simply a critical framework. This last recommendation for research often seems to be placed last on the agenda of scholars in education who are using CDA. We hope that more action will be taken as a result of the CDA studies. Perhaps multiple studies conducted with CDA can be used to help shape constructive interventions in policy and practice in educational contexts.

Notes

This review of CDA in education research started as a project in a doctoral seminar in discourse analysis that the first author (Rebecca Rogers) taught in 2001. Earlier drafts of the article were presented at the CDA Conference in Bloomington, Indiana (June 2004); the first annual CDA Conference in Valencia, Spain (May 2004); and the University of Albany (November 2004). We would like to thank members of the audience at these workshops for their helpful comments, questions, and feedback. We are also grateful to the CDA study group that meets regularly at the National Reading Conference, for providing an ongoing conversation about theoretical and methodological issues involved with CDA. And, finally, we thank Cynthia Lewis and the anonymous reviewers for helpful feedback on earlier drafts of this article.

[1] See Seigel and Fernandez, 2002, for an overview of critical approaches in education.

[2] An in-depth treatment of the history of discourse analysis and its sociolinguistic roots is beyond the scope of this article. However, many articles and books have been written that focus on that history (e.g., Coupland & Jaworski, 1997; Jaworski & Coupland, 1999). In addition, Stef Slembrouck's website answers the question "What is meant by discourse analysis?" *(http://bank.rug.ac.be/da/da.htm)*. The site includes a detailed history of discourse analysis, with bibliographic references.

References

Ailwood, J., & Lingard, B. (2001). The endgame for national girls' schooling policies in Australia? *Australian Journal of Education, 45*(1), 9–22.

Alvesson, M., & Skoldberg, K. (2000). *Reflexive methodology: New vistas for qualitative research*. London: Sage.

Anderson, G. (2001). Disciplining leaders: A critical discourse analysis of the ISLLC National Examination and Performance Standards in educational administration. *International Journal of Leadership in Education, 4*(3), 199–216.

Austin, J. (1962). *How to do things with words*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Bakhtin, M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination: Four essays by M. M. Bakhtin* (C. Emerson & M. Holoquist, Trans.). Austin: Texas University Press.

Barnard, C. (2001). Isolating knowledge of the unpleasant: The rape of Nanking in Japanese high-school textbooks. *British Journal of Sociology of Education, 22*(4), 519–530.

Bartu, H. (2001). Can't I read without thinking? *Reading in a Foreign Language, 13*(2), 593–614.

Baxter, J. (2002). Competing discourses in the classroom: A Post-structuralist discourse analysis of girls' and boys' speech in public contexts. *Discourse & Society, 13*(6), 827–842.

Beach, R. (1997). Critical discourse theory and reader response: How discourses constitute reader stances and social contexts. *Reader, 37,* 1–26.

Beach, R., & Anson, C. (1992). Stance and intertextuality in written discourse. *Linguistics and Education, 4*(3), 335–358.

Bell, D. (2004). *Silent covenants:* Brown vs. Board of Education *and the unfulfilled hopes for racial reform*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Benveniste, E. (1958/1971). Subjectivity in language. In E. Meck (Ed.), *Problems in general linguistics* (pp. 223–230). Coral Gables, FL: University of Miami Press.

Bergvall, V., & Remlinger, K. (1996). Reproduction, resistance, and gender in educational discourse: The role of critical discourse analysis. *Discourse & Society, 7*(4), 453–479.

Bernstein, B. (1971). *Class, codes, and control*. London: Paladin.

Billig, M. (1999). Conversation analysis and the claims of naivety. *Discourse & Society, 10*(4), 572–576.

Blommaert, J., & Bulcaen, C. (2000). Critical Discourse Analysis. *Annual Review of Anthropology, 29,* 447–466.

Bloome, D., & Carter, S. P. (2001). Lists in reading education reform. *Theory into Practice, 40*(3), 150–157.

Bourdieu, P. (1977). *Outline of a theory of practice*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1984). *Distinction: A social critique of the judgment of taste* (R. Nice, Trans.). London: Routledge. (Original work published in 1979)

Bourdieu, P., & Wacquant, L. (1992). *An invitation to reflexive sociology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Bowles, S., & Gintis, H. (1976). *Schooling in capitalist society: Educational reform and the contradictions of economic life*. New York: Basic Books.

Brown, D., & Kelly, J. (2001). Curriculum and the classroom: Private and public spaces. *British Journal of Sociology of Education, 22*(4), 501–518.

Bucholtz, M. (2001). Reflexivity and critique in discourse analysis. *Critique of Anthropology, 21*(2), 165–183.

Burns, L., & Morrell, E. (in press). Critical discourse analysis in literacy research. *National Reading Conference Yearbook,* 56. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Butler, J. (1990). *Gender trouble: Feminism and the subversion of identity*. London: Routledge.

Cazden, C. (2001). *Classroom discourse: The language of teaching and learning* (2nd ed.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. (Original work published 1988)

Chouliaraki, L. (1998). Regulation in progressivist pedagogic discourse: Individualized Teacher-pupil talk. *Discourse & Society, 9*(1), 5–32.

Chouliaraki, L., & Fairclough, N. (1999) *Discourse in late modernity: Rethinking Critical Discourse Analysis*. Scotland: Edinburgh University Press.

Christie, F. (2002). *Classroom discourse analysis: A functional perspective*. New York: Continuum Press.

Cicourel, A. (1974). *Cognitive sociology: Language and meaning in social interaction*. Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin Education.

Collins, J. (1986). Differential instruction in reading groups. In J. Cook-Gumperz (Ed.), *The Social Construction of* Literacy (pp. 117–137). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Collins, J. (2001). Selling the market: Educational standards, discourse and social inequality. *Critique of Anthropology, 21*(2), 143–163.

Collins, J., & Blot, R. (2003). *Literacy and literacies: Texts, power, and identity*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Comber, B. (1997). Managerial discourses: Tracking the local effects on teachers' and students' work in literacy lessons. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 18*(3), 389–407.

Corson, D. (2000). Emancipatory leadership. *International Journal of Leadership in Education, 3*(2), 93–120.

Coupland, N., & Jaworski, A. (1997). *Sociolinguistics: A reader.* New York: St. Martin's Press.

Crenshaw, K. (1988). Race reform, retrenchment: Transformation and legitimation in anti-discrimination law. *Harvard Law Review, 101*(7), 1331–1387.

Davies, B. (1993). *Shards of Glass: Children Reading and Writing Beyond Gendered Identities.* Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.

Davies, B., & Harre, R. (1990). Positioning: The discursive production of selves. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behavior, 20*(1), 43–63.

Davis, J. (1997). Educational reform and the babel (babble) of culture: Prospects for the standards of foreign language learning. *Modern Language Journal, 81*(2), 151–163.

Delgado, R. (1995). Legal storytelling: Storytelling for oppositionists and others: A plea for narrative. In R. Delgado (Ed.), *Critical race theory: The cutting edge* (pp. 60–70). Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Derrida, J. (1974). *Of grammatology.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

DuBois, W. E. B. (1990). *The souls of black folks.* New York: Vintage Books. (Original work published 1903)

Edwards, D., & Potter, J. (1992). *Discursive psychology.* London: Sage Publications.

Egan-Robertson, A. (1998). Learning about culture, language, and power: Understanding relationships among personhood, literacy practices, and intertextuality. *Journal of Literacy Research, 30*(4), 449–487.

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

Fairclough, N. (1991). *Discourse processes and social change.* Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and social change.* Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Fairclough, N. (1993). Critical discourse analysis and the marketization of public discourse: The universities. *Discourse & Society, 4*(2), 138–168.

Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language.* New York: Longman.

Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analyzing discourse: Textual analysis for social research.* New York: Routledge.

Fairclough, N., & Wodak, R. (1997). Critical discourse analysis. In T. van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse as social interaction* (pp. 258–284). London: Sage.

Figueiredo, D. (2000). Critical discourse analysis: Towards a new perspective of EFL reading. *Illha do Desterro: A Journal of Language and Literature, 38,* 139–154.

Flowerdew, J. (1999). Description and interpretation in critical discourse analysis. *Journal of Pragmatics, 31*(8), 1089–1099.

Foucault, M. (1972). *The archeology of knowledge and the discourse on language.* New York: Pantheon Books. (Original work published 1969)

Foucault, M. (1979). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison.* Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin Books.

Foucault, M. (1981). *History of sexuality* (Vol. 1). Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin Books.

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

Fox, R., & Fox, J. (2002). The power-discourse relationship in a Croatian higher education setting. *Education Policy Analysis Archives, 10*(5), 1–16.

Garfinkel, H. (1967). *Studies in ethnomethodology.* New York: Prentice Hall.

Gebhard, M. (2002). Fast capitalism, school reform, and second language literacy practices. *Canadian Modern Language Review, 59*(1), 15–52.

Gee, J. P. (1992). *The social mind: Language, ideology, and social practice.* New York: Bergin & Garvey.

Gee, J. P. (1994). First language acquisition as a guide for theories of learning and pedagogy. *Linguistics and Education, 6,* 331–354.

Gee, J. P. (1996). *Social linguistics and literacies: Ideology in discourses* (2nd ed.). London: Taylor & Francis.

Gee, J. P. (1999). *An introduction to discourse analysis.* New York: Routledge.

Gee, J. P. (2003). *What video games have to teach us about learning and literacy.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Gee, J. P. (2004). What is critical about critical discourse analysis? In R. Rogers (Ed.), *An introduction to Critical Discourse Analysis* (pp. 19–50). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Goffman, E. (1959). *The presentation of self in everyday life.* New York: Doubleday Anchor.

Goffman, E. (1971). *Relations in public: Microstudies of the public order.* New York: Harper & Rowe.

Gramsci, A. (1973). *Letters from the prison notebooks* (L. Lawner, Trans.). New York: Harper & Rowe.

Greene, S., & Abt-Perkins, D. (2003). *Making race visible: Literacy research for cultural understanding.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Gumperz, J. (1982). *Discourse strategies.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Gumperz, J. & Hymes, D. (Eds.) (1964). The ethnography of communication. *American Anthropologist, 66*(6), 1–34.

Halliday, M. A. K. (1975). *Learning how to mean.* London: Edward Arnold Press.

Halliday, M. A. K. (1978). *Language as social semiotic: The social interpretation of language and meaning.* London: Edward Arnold Press.

Halliday, M. A. K. (1985). *Spoken and written language.* Geelong, UK: Deakin University Press.

Halliday, M. A. K., & Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English.* London: Longman.

Halliday, M. A. K., & Hasan, R. (1989). *Language, context and text: Aspects of language as a social-semiotic perspective.* Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Hartman, D. (1992). Intertextuality and reading. *Linguistics and Education, 4*(3/4), 295–311.

Hasan, R., & Fries, P. (Eds.). (1995). *On subject and theme: A discourse functional perspective.* Amsterdam: Benjamins Press.

Hays, J. (2000). Anguished laments: A critical discourse analysis of education, representation, and development of the San of Botswana. *Journal of the African Activist Association, 28*(3), 23–41.

Heberle, V. (2000). Critical reading: Integrating principles of critical discourse analysis and gender studies. *Illha do Desterro: A Journal of Language and Literature, 38,* 115–138.

Heller, M. (2001). Critique and sociolinguistic analysis of discourse. *Critique of Anthropology, 21*(2), 117–141.

Hinchman, K., & Young, J. P. (2001). Speaking but not being heard: Two adolescents negotiate classroom talk about text. *Journal of Literacy Research, 33*(2), 243–268.

Hodge, R., & Kress, G. (1979/1993). *Language as ideology* (2nd ed.). London: Routledge.

Hodge, R., & Kress, G. (1988). *Social semiotics.* Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Hughes, G. (2001). Exploring the availability of student scientist identities within curriculum discourse: An anti-essentialist approach to gender-inclusive science. *Gender and Education, 13*(3), 275–290.

Hymes, D. (1972). Models of the interaction of language and social life. In J. Gumperz & D. Hymes (Eds.), *Directions in sociolinguistics* (pp. 35–71). New York: Blackwell Press.

Ives, P. (2004). *Gramsci's politics of language: Engaging the Bakhtin circle and the Frankfurt school*. Toronto, Ontario, Canada: University of Toronto Press.

Johnson, G. (2001). A cautionary tale: A dialogic re-reading of a student teacher's visual narrative. *Narrative Inquiry, 11*(2), 451–478.

Johnson, T., & Avery, P. G. (1999). The power of the press: A content and discourse analysis of the United States history standards as presented in selected newspapers. *Theory and Research in Social Education, 27*(4), 447–471.

Kamberelis, G., & Scott, K. (1992). Other people's voices: The coarticulation of texts and subjectivities. *Linguistics and Education, 4*(3), 359–404.

Kinchloe, J., & McLaren, P. (2003). Rethinking critical theory and qualitative research. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *The landscape of qualitative research: Theories and issues* (2nd ed., pp. 433–488). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Kress, G. (2003). *Literacy in the New Media Age*. London: Routledge.

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

Kristeva, J. (1980). *Desire in language: A semiotic approach to literature and art*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishing.

Kristeva, J. (1986). Word, dialogue, and the novel. In T. Moi (Ed.), *The Kristeva reader* (pp. 35–61). New York: Columbia University Press.

Kristeva, J. (1989). *Language—The unknown: An initiation into linguistics* (A. M. Menke, Trans.). New York: Columbia University Press.

Kumaravadivelu, B. (1999). Critical classroom discourse analysis. *TESOL Quarterly, 33*(3), 453–484.

Labov, W. (1972). The transformation of experience in narrative syntax. In W. Labov (Ed.), *Language in the inner city: Studies in the Black English Vernacular* (pp. 354–396). University of Philadelphia Press.

Ladson-Billings, G. (2003). Racialized discourses and ethnic epistemologies. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *The landscape of qualitative research: Theories and issues* (2nd ed., pp. 398–432). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Ladson-Billings, G., & Tate, W. (1995). Towards a critical race theory of education. *Teachers College Record, 97*(1), 47–68.

Lemke, J. (1992). Intertextuality and educational research. *Linguistics and Education, 4*(3), 257–268.

Lemke, J. (1995). *Textual politics: Discourse and social dynamics*. London: Taylor & Francis.

Luke, A. (1995–1996). Text and discourse in education: An introduction to critical discourse analysis. *Review of Research in Education, 21*, 3–48.

Luke, A. (1997). The material effects of the words: Apologies, "stolen children" and public discourse. *Discourse: Studies in the cultural politics of education, 18*(3), 343–368.

Luke, A. (2004). Notes on the future of critical discourse studies. *Critical Discourse Studies, 1*(1), 149–152.

Martin, J. (1985). *Factual writing: Exploring and challenging social reality*. Geelong, UK: Deakin University Press.

Martin, J. (2000). Close reading. In L. Unsworth (Ed.), *Researching language in schools and communities*. Washington, DC: Cassell.

Meyer, M. (2001). Between theory, method, and politics: Positioning of the approaches to CDA. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (pp. 14–31). London: Sage.

Michaels, S. (1981). "Sharing time": Children's narratives styles and differential access to literacy. *Language and Society, 10*(4), 423–442.

Moje, E. B. (1997). Exploring discourse, subjectivity, and knowledge in chemistry class. *Journal of Classroom Interaction, 32*(2), 35–44.

Myerhoff, B., & Ruby, J. (1982). *A crack in the mirror: Reflexive perspectives in anthropology*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Myers, G. (1996). Out of the laboratory and down to the bay: Writing in science and technology studies. *Written Communication, 13*(1), 5–43.

Nichols, S. (2002). Parents' construction of their children as gendered, literature subjects: A critical discourse analysis. *Journal of Early Childhood Literacy, 2*(2), 123–144.

Oakes, J. (1986). *Keeping track: How schools structure inequality*. Connecticut: Yale University Press.

Orellana, M. (1996). Negotiating power through language in classroom meetings. *Linguistics and Education, 8*(4), 335–365.

Peace, P. (2003). Balancing power: The discursive maintenance of gender inequality by wo/men at university. *Feminism and Psychology, 13*(2), 159–180.

Pecheux, M. (1975). *Language, semantics and ideology*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Pennycook, A. (2001). *Critical applied linguistics: A critical introduction*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Peters, M., & Burbules, N. (2004). *Poststructuralism and educational research*. New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Pitt, K. (2002). Being a new capitalist mother. *Discourse & Society, 13*(2), 251–267.

Price, S. (1999). Critical discourse analysis: Discourse acquisition and discourse practices. *TESOL Quarterly, 33*(3), 581–595.

Propp, V. (1968). *Morphology of folk tale*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Rampton, B. (2001). Critique in interaction. *Critique of Anthropology, 21*(1), 83–107.

Rogers, R. (2002a). Between contexts: A critical analysis of family literacy, discursive practices, and literate subjectivities. *Reading Research Quarterly 37*(3), 248–277.

Rogers, R. (2002b). A Critical Discourse Analysis of the special education process. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly 33*(2), 213–237.

Rogers, R. (2002c). "That's what you're here for, you're supposed to know": Teaching and learning critical literacy. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy 45*(8), 772–787.

Rogers, R. (2003). *A critical discourse analysis of family literacy practices: Power in and out of print*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Rogers, R. (2004). *An introduction to critical discourse analysis in education*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Rogers, T., Tyson, C., & Marshall, E. (2000). Living dialogues in one neighborhood: Moving toward understanding across discourse and practices of literacy and schooling. *Journal of Literacy Research, 32*(1), 1–24.

Sacks, H., Schegloff, E., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language, 50*, 696–735.

Sawyer, K. (2002). A discourse on discourse: An archeological history of an intellectual concept. *Cultural Studies, 16*(3), 433–456.

Schegloff, E. (1993). Reflections on quantification in the study of conversation. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 26*(1), 99–128.

Schegloff, E. (1999). "Schegloff's texts" as "Billig's data": A critical reply. *Discourse & Society, 10*(4), 558–572.

Schegloff, E., Ochs, E., & Thompson, S. (1996). *Interaction and grammar*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Scollon, R., & Scollon, S. (1981). *Narrative, literacy, and face in interethnic communication*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Scollon, R., & Scollon, S. (2003). *Discourses in place: Language in the material world*. London: Routledge.

Searle, J. (1969). *Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Short, K. (1992). Researching intertextuality within collaborative classroom learning environments. *Linguistics and Education, 4*(3), 313–334.

Siegel, M., & Fernandez, S. L. (2000). Critical approaches. In M. Kamil, P. Mosenthal, P. D. Pearson, & R. Barr (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research* (Vol. 3, pp. 141–152). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Silverstein, M., & Urban. G. (Eds.). (1996). *Natural Histories of Discourse*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Sinclair, J., & Coulthard, M. (1975). *Toward an analysis of discourse*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Stamou, A.G. (2002). The representation of non-protesters in a student and teacher protest: A critical discourse analysis of mews reporting in a Greek newspaper. *Communication Abstracts, 25*(2), 143–181.

Stevens, L. (2003). Reading first: A critical policy analysis. *The Reading Teacher, 56*(7), 662–668.

Stevens, L. (2004). Locating the role of the critical discourse analyst. In R. Rogers (Ed.), *An introduction to critical discourse analysis in education* (pp. 207–224). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Tate, R. (2003). The "race" to theorize education: Who is my neighbor? *Qualitative Studies in Education, 16*(1), 121–126.

Tate, W. (1997). Critical race theory and education: History, theory, and implication. *Review of Research in Education, 22,* 191–243.

Teo, P. (2000). Racism in the news: A Critical Discourse Analysis of news reporting in two Australian newspapers. *Discourse & Society, 11*(1), 7–49.

Thomas, S. (2002). Contesting education policy in the public sphere: Media debates over policies for the Queensland school curriculum. *Journal of Education Policy, 17*(2), 187–198.

Tunstall, P. (2001). Assessment discourse and constructions of social reality in infant classrooms. *Journal of Education Policy, 16*(3), 215–231.

van Dijk, T. (1993). Principles of critical discourse analysis. *Discourse & Society, 4*(2), 249–283.

van Dijk, T. (Ed.). (1997). *Discourse as social interaction*. London: Sage

van Dijk, T. (2001). Multidisciplinary CDA: A plea for diversity. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (pp. 95–120). London: Sage.

van Dijk, T. (2004, May). *Critical Discourse Analysis and context*. Presentation at the First Annual International Conference of Critical Discourse Analysis, Valencia, Spain.

Verschueren, J. (2001). Predicaments of criticism. *Critique of Anthropology, 21*(1), 59–81.

Volosinov, V. (1973). *Marxism and the philosophy of language*. Berkeley: University of California Press. (Original work published in 1930)

Widdowson, H. G. (1998). The theory and practice of critical discourse analysis. *Applied Linguistics, 19*(1), 136–151.

Willig, C. (Ed.). (1999). *Applied discourse analysis: Social and psychological interventions*. Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.

Willis, P. (1977). *Learning to Labor: How working class kids get working class jobs*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Wittgenstein, L. (1953). *Philosophical investigations* (G. E. M. Anscombe, Trans.). New York: MacMillan.

Wodak, R. (1996). *Disorders of discourse*. London: Longman.

Wodak, R., Meyer, M., Titscher, S., & Vetter, E. (2000). *Methods of text and discourse analysis*. London: Sage.

Wodak, R., & Reisigl, M. (2001). *Discourse and discrimination: Rhetoric of racism and anti-Semitism*. London: Routledge.

Woodside-Jiron, H. (2004). Language, power, and participation: Using critical discourse analysis to make sense of public policy. In R. Rogers (Ed.), *An introduction to critical discourse analysis in education* (pp. 173–206). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Woodson, C. (1990). *The mis-education of the Negro*. Trenton, NJ: Africa World Press. (Original work published 1933)

Wortham, S. (2001). *Narratives in action*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Yancy, G. (Ed.). (1998). *African American philosophers: Seventeen conversations*. New York: Routledge.

Young, J. P. (2000). Boy talk: Critical literacy and masculinities. *Reading Research Quarterly, 35*(3), 312–337.

Young, L., & Harrison, C. (Eds.). (2004). *Systemic functional linguistics and critical discourse analysis: Studies in social change*. New York: Continuum Press.

Authors

REBECCA ROGERS is an Assistant Professor of Literacy Education in the Department of Education at Washington University in St. Louis, Campus Box 1183, One Brookings Avenue, St. Louis, MO 63130; rogers3948@aol.com. Her research focuses on the discursive construction of literate subjectivities across the lifespan, with a particular interest in teacher and student learning within anti-racist learning contexts.

ELIZABETH MALANCHARUVIL-BERKES is a doctoral student in the Department of Education at Washington University in St. Louis, Campus Box 1183, One Brookings Drive, St. Louis, MO 63130; eberkes@wustl.edu. She uses a graduate-level background both in education and in molecular and cellular genetics to examine scientific discourse practices in classrooms from kindergarten to college and in informal science settings, with a particular interest in understanding how specific pedagogical practices affect persistence in scientific communities.

MELISSA MOSLEY is a doctoral student in the Department of Education at Washington University in St. Louis, One Brookings Drive, Campus Box 1183, St. Louis, MO 63130; mrmosley@wustl.edu. She uses CDA and other qualitative methods to analyze teacher and student discourse in the field of literacy and urban education.

DIANE HUI is a doctoral student in the Department of Education at Washington University in St Louis, One Brookings Drive, Campus Box 1183, St. Louis, MO 63130; diane.hui@wustl.edu. Her current research examines the possibilities and constraints of online communities in supporting teacher learning for both experienced and novice teachers.

GLYNIS O'GARRO JOSEPH is a doctoral student in the Department of Education at Washington University in St. Louis, One Brookings Drive, Campus Box 1183, St. Louis, MO 63130; gogarro@wustl.edu. In her current research she focuses on the social and academic experiences of Black girls in a suburban elementary school; she employs ethnographic research procedures to examine the interconnection of race and gender.