



COVER SHEET

Kettle, Margaret (2005) Critical Discourse Analysis and hybrid texts: Analysing English as a Second Language (ESL). *Melbourne Studies in Education* 46(2):pp. 87-105.

Accessed from <http://eprints.qut.edu.au>

Copyright 2005 Monash University.

Critical Discourse Analysis and hybrid texts: Analysing English as a Second Language (ESL)

Margaret Kettle
School of Education
The University of Queensland
St. Lucia. Q. 4072

m.kettle@uq.edu.au

Author's bionote

Margaret Kettle is currently completing a PhD in the School of Education at The University of Queensland. Email: m.kettle@uq.edu.au. Her research focuses on the emergent subjectivities and academic practices of a group of mainly ESL international students undertaking postgraduate studies in Australia. Of particular interest are issues of agency and access.

Critical Discourse Analysis and hybrid texts: Analysing English as a Second Language (ESL)

Abstract

This paper focuses on Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) and English as a Second Language (ESL) texts, that is texts produced in interactions between native and non-native speakers of English. Such texts are hybrid in that they comprise a blending of ‘standard’ and ‘non-standard’¹ English forms. In these times of globalised English and the increasing prevalence of non-native speaker models of English, research is increasingly likely to encounter ESL texts. The issue for the critical analysis of such ‘new’ texts is that CDA generally utilises ‘standard’ linguistic models for its analytical apparatus. Fairclough (2003), arguably the most widely-recognised proponent of CDA, bases his analytical framework on Standard English. The question is whether and if so how CDA can accommodate hybrid texts, specifically those with a blend of linguistically ‘standard’ and ‘non-standard’ forms of English. In this discussion, I consider the application of Fairclough’s model of CDA to the analysis of an interview with a Thai ESL student beginning postgraduate studies in Australia. I argue that the analysis is made more effective by drawing on principles from Second Language Acquisition (SLA) research, in particular communication strategies.

Introduction (H1)

Critical discourse analysis (hereafter CDA) uses linguistic and other semiotic² features as its entry point into text. Fairclough (2001, p. 4) identifies the focus of his model of CDA as the analysis of ‘social interactions in a way which focuses upon their linguistic elements, and which sets out to show up their generally hidden determinants in the system of social relationships, as well as hidden effects they may have upon that system’. He cautions, however (2003), that the CDA enterprise can attribute causal effects to linguistic forms only through a careful account of meaning and context. The assumption is that the language choices made by people in social interactions are not arbitrary; rather, they are a deliberate selection from a set of choices available in the particular context. From a discourse perspective, the spoken and written texts that people produce are the instantiations of discourses that regulate and constrain their social lives (Janks 1997). It follows that an investigation of discourse can shed light on how the language choices in text realise the meanings that people make of the social and institutional conditions impacting on their lives.

This paper explores the implications for CDA when there is interference or ‘static’ in the process of meaning-making; that is, when the layers of social and cultural understanding are not readily available to all the participants in an interaction, or when limited linguistic resources hamper the production and interpretation of meaningful texts. CDA is an approach that strongly relies on linguistic categories (Meyer 2001). Its mobilisation depends ‘on linguistic concepts such as actors, mode,

time, tense, argumentation, and so on' (2001, p. 25). But what happens when the texts are produced by language learners who do not have full mastery of the linguistic systems needed to accomplish meaning?

These questions arose out of my own analysis. I was attempting to analyse the transcript of an interview with Woody³, a Thai student participating in my PhD study. The study looked at the discursive practices of a postgraduate Education course and the ways in which a group of international students engaged with these practices. As I was analysing the linguistic features of the interview text, it became clear that they were often 'deviant' from 'standard' English. In line with Fairclough's (2001) warnings about assumptions and Billig's (2003) call for CDA to reflect on its own practice, I decided that I could not assume that all was well and simply proceed with the analysis. First it was necessary to consider whether and if so, how, CDA as a linguistically-oriented method of analysis could accommodate Woody's non-native, 'non-standard' language forms.

A search of a number of databases and journals revealed no other studies that had dealt specifically with the issue. I scanned Fairclough's work closely for explicit references to the analysis of non-standard texts. While his primary concern (e.g. Fairclough 2001) is the relation between discourse and power within social practice, and he acknowledges the inequitable power relations in discursive practices such as the privileging of standard English in job interviews, his work does not present an explicit engagement with texts produced by non-native English speakers. I also reviewed Wodak's (e.g. 1993) work because she has looked extensively at racism discourses directed at migrants in Austria. These discourses, however, are produced primarily by native speakers of German which means that the language for analysis is, again, the first language (L1).

This discussion, then, is a quest to find answers to these questions about CDA and what I have called English as a Second Language (ESL) texts. It foregrounds method, specifically the analytical capacity of CDA, or the extent of its analytical 'stretch'. During my investigation, I found that I needed to understand the ways in which native and non-native speakers negotiate meanings in interaction. To do this I drew on Second Language Acquisition (SLA) research, particularly the area of communication strategies. This move is in keeping with CDA's openness to interdisciplinary dialogue and its pursuit of new theories and methods for analysing 'new' texts as they appear in social processes (e.g. Chouliaraki & Fairclough 1999, Fairclough 2003). CDA is an effective tool for uncovering the ways that social subjects construct and are constructed by their social worlds through an analysis of the language choices that they make in socially-occurring text. I wanted to ensure that this type of commentary was available to linguistically-hybrid ESL texts such as my interview with Woody.

Sorting out the terms in world English (H2)

At this point, I want to introduce a number of terms related to English and English language usage. At present English is ascendant as *the* language of globalisation (Fishman 1998-1999). As such, it has power (Kachru 1992, p. 355, in Sonntag 2003), evident in the world-wide demand for English qualifications and English usage in areas including business, science, technology and the media (Jenkins 2003). The use

of English by an increasing number of people in a growing number of regions throughout the world has led to a metamorphosis of the language: English is becoming 'Englishes' (Jenkins 2003).

One of the more influential attempts to capture the diversity of English use has been Kachru's (1992) typology using three concentric circles – the Inner Circle, the Outer Circle and the Expanding Circle. These circles are geographically-orientated and represent groupings of users who speak English primarily as: a native language (e.g. Australia); as a second language (e.g. Singapore); and as a foreign language (e.g. Thailand). An interesting feature of countries where English is a second language (ESL) is that it has 'indigenised' into local varieties (Sonntag 2003). In the Expanding Circle countries such as Woody's country Thailand, English is a foreign language (EFL) with little or no official function in-country.

Kachru's typology is not without its problems, for example many people in EFL contexts are in regular contact with English through business, mass media and the internet. Indeed most of the world's English communication is as a *lingua franca* between L2 speakers without a native speaker present (Jenkins 2003). However, for the purposes of this discussion, Kachru's ESL/EFL distinction remains useful. Woody's context changed from EFL to ESL when he came to Australia. In Thailand, English was foreign and removed from daily life. However, when he came to Australia he was required to use his own 'indigenised' form of English for everyday activities, including study: English became his second language. I will refer to him as an ESL speaker; English is his second language (L2). As well I will use the terms non-native speaker (NNS) and native speaker (NS), as they have currency in SLA research, but acknowledge that they are contested as they privilege native speaker forms at a time when the relevance of the native speaker as a category is diminishing (see Ammon 2000, Firth & Wagner 1997, Rampton 1990). Similarly, issues related to 'standard' and 'non-standard' Englishes are also being keenly debated (see Widdowson 1993).

In this paper an ESL text is a text produced in an interaction between a native speaker and a non-native speaker of English. The defining features of such a text are that it is hybrid, with 'standard' and 'non-standard' forms, and meaningful: it is a semantic unit (Halliday & Hasan 1985) which derives its meaning from being in use. Issues of hybridity have been discussed extensively in the literature with regard to the 'mixing' of discursive elements in native speaker talk (e.g. Chouliaraki & Fairclough 1999). The focus on 'mixing' articulations is the reason why the term 'hybrid' is used here to describe the co-occurrence of 'standard' and 'non-standard' English forms in a text.

In my interview with Woody, the language in use was English, my L1 and Woody's L2, which had myriad implications for meaning and the ways we conducted our interaction. Woody's limited linguistic resources often led to the meaning being obscured and unclear. However, unlike much SLA research which adopts a cognitivist position that limited linguistic resources mean defective communication, this paper takes the view that meaning is always negotiated and that most people using an L2 are successful in communicating even with limited resources (Firth & Wagner 1997). The

question for this paper is how Woody and I conjointly constructed the interaction, and the implications of this process for the critical discourse analysis of the text.

Critical Discourse Analysis (H1)

In this section I consider the main tenets of CDA, with particular emphasis on methodology. My focus is Fairclough's model of CDA (Chouliaraki & Fairclough 1999, 1992, 2001, 2003), because it is familiar to many people using CDA in Australia and is based on English. Afterwards I highlight the problem which presents itself when applying this model to the analysis of an ESL text.

In trying to make sense of Fairclough's prodigious body of writings, I found that his work can be divided roughly into two interrelated categories: first, that dealing with what he calls his social theory of discourse (Fairclough 1992); and second, his method. The development of his method has been a process of refinement and elaboration, with the framework proposed in later work (Chouliaraki & Fairclough 1999, 2003) subsuming the original three-stage approach of *description*, *interpretation* and *explanation* (see Fairclough 1989). These stages, however, remain central to the analysis of discourse and are the part of his work where I want to focus much of my discussion.

Fairclough (e.g. 1992) has linked the three analytical stages to his definition of discourse. The premise underlying his analytical model is that language is social practice, or what he calls discourse. The accounts that people offer in social situations are seen as 'speaking' their social worlds; the relationship is reflexive – the social both constitutes and is constituted by the linguistic. He identifies three ways in which language operates as discourse: (1) as text; (2) as the social processes of producing and interpreting a text, or the interaction; and (3) as the social conditions for the production and interpretation of the text, or the social context. These dimensions of discourse link directly to the three-stage approach he advocates for analysis, namely *description* of the text, *interpretation* of the relationship between the text and the social processes of the interaction, and *explanation* of the relationship between the social processes and the social context (Fairclough 2001). This tri-focal approach commits the analyst to 'analysing the relationship between texts, processes, and their social conditions, both the immediate conditions of the situational context and the more remote conditions of institutional and social structures' (2001, p. 21).

At the text level, the *description* stage involves identifying and 'labelling' the linguistic features in the text, drawing on the machinery in Fairclough's framework (e.g. 2003). The view is that the linguistic (e.g. vocabulary and grammar) and paralinguistic (e.g. rising volume and intonation) features are social in the sense that they are used by people in social settings. As such, they are socially determined and have social effects.

At the level of social interaction, the role of the analyst is to *interpret* the participants' meanings and understandings as they manifest in their linguistic choices in an interaction. The participants' discursive choices are seen as responses to the social constraints which they consider to be operating in the particular situation. To do this, people draw on an array of 'resources', or 'Members' Resources' (MR) (Fairclough 1992), which include language knowledge and proficiency; understandings,

assumptions and beliefs about the natural and social worlds; values and so on. These resources comprise their understandings of the prevailing social order and the linguistic competence to ‘speak’ this order.

The nexus between the social and the linguistic is pivotal in Fairclough’s analytical framework. It provides the basis for making claims about the social based on the linguistic. Discourse mediates the link because it is both social and linguistic. Social meanings are determined by understandings of the prevailing social order and realised discursively in particular ways of acting and interacting, of representing the social and physical worlds, and of being and self-identifying. These meanings are, in turn, realised linguistically in text as particular ‘mixings’ of genres, discourses⁴ and styles.

The third level of analysis, *explanation*, involves the analyst in re-describing the linguistic choices made by participants in terms of a particular theoretical orientation towards issues of ideology and power relations (Chouliaraki & Fairclough 1999). This level relates to the third dimension of discourse and the understanding that the process of producing and interpreting texts is determined by the social and institutional structures that contextualise a situation. Of particular interest to the analyst is how participants’ assumptions about culture, social relationships and social identities are manifest in texts and work ideologically to either sustain, challenge or change existing power relations (Fairclough 2001).

The Problem (H2)

Despite these three stages of analysis, Chouliaraki and Fairclough (1999) maintain that a great deal of CDA has focused on the linguistic analysis of texts in abstraction from interaction. They argue that some analyses have failed to engage with meanings and understandings; indeed, Fairclough has been accused of sometimes privileging the micro-analysis of the text over interaction (Chouliaraki & Fairclough 1999). My own starting point for this paper was the description and labelling of linguistic features and the realisation that many of the lexical and grammatical constructions in Woody’s English fell outside Fairclough’s analytical categories.

The issue for my analysis was that Fairclough’s model makes no provision for linguistic resources that are limited or ‘aberrant’ in terms of ‘standard’ English. Indeed some criticism has been levelled at CDA generally that it does not pay enough attention to the issues of accessibility to and availability of linguistic-communicative resources in text production (see Blommaert & Bulcaen 2000). While there is no doubt that Fairclough is concerned about the links between a lack of access to the dominant language and marginalisation in society (e.g. 1989), his analytical framework remains based on assumptions that the participants in social situations have full access to understandings of the socio-cultural context and the necessary linguistic tools to ‘speak’ the society appropriately. So while the process of undertaking CDA traditionally involves the straightforward identification and categorisation of linguistic features as the springboard into interpretations of discourses and social meanings, the process in the case of a linguistically-hybrid ESL text is much ‘messier’.

The ‘messiness’ derives from the collaborative ‘work’ that the participants undertake to negotiate a common meaning and keep an interaction going. Firth and Wagner (1997) note that it is in the turn-taking that the participants accomplish, demonstrate and transform meaning in an ongoing way. In our interview, Woody and I deployed a variety of strategic measures within our turn-taking to supplement and support his linguistic resources. These measures facilitated both language and meanings and often involved a protracted number of turns. This negotiation process distinguishes an ESL text and is a major contributor to the difficulties in applying Fairclough’s framework for CDA.

The strategies that Woody and I used in our interview are known as communication strategies and constitute a part of SLA research. Such strategies represent a ‘division of labour’ and account for the ways in which participants in an ESL interaction ‘conjointly accomplish meaningful communication with the resources – however seemingly imperfect – at their disposal’ (Firth & Wagner 1997, p. 290). I outline these strategies in the following section.

Native/non-native speaker interactions (H1)

SLA research has been traditionally reluctant to engage with issues of power and subjectivity (Fairclough 1992, Kumaravadivelu 1999), although it does acknowledge that the perceived, or actual, higher status of the native speaker may influence the interaction in particular ways (Gass 1997). One way in which native speakers exert influence on interactions is through their preference for questions to initiate topic shifts (Larsen-Freeman & Long 1991). Questions draw the ESL speaker into conversation; they reduce the linguistic load, especially through yes/no questions; and they allow the native speaker to check their assumptions about what the L2 speaker has said. Other linguistic adjustments undertaken by native speakers include a slower rate of delivery, more careful articulation, more well-formed utterances, more comprehension and confirmation checks, more clarification requests, more expansions and more repetition. As well, native speakers often do extra semantic work to keep the interaction going (Larsen-Freeman & Long 1991). In a study of native/non-native English speaker interviews, the native speaker interviewers were found to have initiated most of the moves to keep the interaction going (*dynamic moves*) (Perrett 2000).

Non-native speakers have also been observed employing a variety of strategies to maintain the interaction and negotiate meaning (Larsen-Freeman & Long 1991). One well-known typology was devised by Tarone (1977), who defines communication strategies as ‘a mutual attempt of two interlocutors to agree on a shared meaning in situations where requisite meaning structures are not shared’ (1980, p. 420). Tarone’s typology lists three major categories, or strategies, with subcategories for each of them; each strategy reflects a different sort of decision about how to solve a communication problem. The major categories are *paraphrase*, *transfer* and *avoidance*.

Paraphrase involves the rewording of a message in ‘an alternate, acceptable target language construction, in situations where the appropriate form or construction is not known or not yet stable’ (Tarone 1977, p. 198). Within this category are the strategies of approximation, word coinage and circumlocution. Circumlocution is the (often

extended) process in which the learner describes the elements or characteristics of an object or action instead of using the appropriate target language form. The major category of *transfer* has four manifestations: literal translation, language switch, appeal for assistance, and mime. The strategy of *avoidance* comprises topic avoidance and topic abandonment, two deliberate decisions that learners make when confronted by linguistic challenges.

Woody and I utilised a number of these strategies which led to a particular ‘texturing’ of the interview, with particular implications for analysis. In the next section I briefly introduce Woody before going on to examine these points in the analysis of an extract of the interview transcript.

Introducing Woody (H1)

Woody was a 33-year-old English communication skills teacher at a sports institute in northern Thailand before coming to Australia to begin a Master of Education program in 2003. This period in Australia was characterised by an imperative to ‘internationalise’ universities and by greater linguistic and ethnic diversity on campuses (Luke 2001). At the time, international students comprised about 20% of the total tertiary student body, with Woody’s home country, Thailand, ranked as Australia’s eighth biggest source country (AVCC 2003). Woody’s admission into the Master’s program required evidence of a certain proficiency in English which he provided by sitting the International English Language Testing System (IELTS) test. He scored an overall grade of 7, which rated his English usage as ‘good’: ‘Has operational command, though with occasional inaccuracies, inappropriacies and misunderstandings in some situations’ (IELTS 2003, p. 4).

I first met Woody in the Educational Leadership course that I was researching. In the course, he rarely contributed to class discussion, although he did make comments several times on the margins of group discussions. He failed the course but repeated it successfully in his final semester the following year.

Analysing the interview with Woody (H1)

In this section I analyse an extract of the transcript from my interview with Woody. The interview was semi-structured in that I had prepared a list of topics that I wanted to cover but the direction was reasonably free-wheeling and relaxed, aimed at opening up a space for Woody to respond ‘authentically’ (Silverman 1994). The topics were focussed primarily on Woody’s responses to academic work in Australia and his ‘practices of subjectivity’ (Gubrium & Holstein 2000), for example whether he thought he had changed since arriving in Australia, and why and how. I conducted the interview in his first semester, after he had been immersed in the course for just one month. The extract was noteworthy because it was a ‘crux’ (Fairclough 1992) – that is, a point of tension or interest in the data – at which Woody presented particularly intensive representations of his efforts to adapt to Australian academic conditions.

I undertake the analysis following Fairclough’s model described above. What becomes apparent is that the meanings in the text as they manifested in the genres, discourses and styles were constructed both with and through various communication strategies. Indeed, meaning could not have been accomplished without the strategies

deployed by both parties. In the transcript Woody's turns are identified as 'Woody' while mine as interviewer are 'MK'. For the conventions of writing talk, see Hutchby and Wooffitt (1998).

The interview transcript (H2)

- | | | |
|-----|-------|---|
| 1. | MK | no you already have. That's fine. So, how is it for you then? How do you feel when you come from this system in Thailand to this system here? Okay, you've said that, in class, you feel a little bit nervous about participating in case your grammar's not right. Um also, how do you feel then about from there to here? |
| 2. | Woody | ah here I think for the first time, it was very difficult to get myself ah to involved in class activity. In Thailand, there's no problem that ah it's okay if a student just sits and listen and the course ends so they can't go anywhere but here, ↑I FEEL JUST LIKE AH, oh you are (.) ah this was very ashamed for myself after, I don't I don't have any participation in class just like ah, just like ah, I am NOBODY. I CAN'T EVEN express my ideas in class. It's very hard and very uncomf comfor ah |
| 3. | MK | uncomfortable |
| 4. | Woody | uncomfortable for me [so |
| 5. | MK | [so you feel pressure? You feel that you should participate[.] but you can't |
| 6. | Woody | [but I can't yeah. I think I've tried very much to cope with this problem but (.) you know for a first time, I don't even ah know what other students express because of ah language so I'm not familiar with ah their styles or their expressions [but |
| 7. | MK | [and of their accent as well. |
| 8. | Woody | yeah yeah but right now I think I'm better, I'm know more what they want to express and ah what still a problem for me and how to express my ideas and ah I think when I have more confidence, more everything's better, I think it help me to have more ah action, more reaction in class. |
| 9. | MK | and you know, as you say, you already feel better, you are already understanding the students, their accents, what they're going to say, starting to understand the system a little bit better? |
| 10. | Woody | yeah |
| 11. | MK | So, maybe um next semester, you'll have new subjects then you can start trying or even after Easter start trying to say things. It's very difficult what you are doing. |
| 12. | Woody | Yeah. Because (.) I I don't want to wait until next semester. But this semester I think I try, I try very much and [I |

Negotiating text and meaning (H2)

In the series of turns, Woody contrasts academic practices in Thailand and Australia and expresses his attempts to change his own practice. The process of change and

adaptation evokes time and requires shifting time references, but as listener and interviewer I am initially confused about whether Woody is referring to his past or present situation. In Woody's first turn (turn 2), the grammatical cues point overwhelmingly to the present. The turn can be seen in two parts, which are set up in a contrastive meaning relation through the use of the conjunction *but*. The first part refers to the beginning of his study in Australia, using the time/place adverbials of *here for the first time*. The associated tense form is past – *was*. He highlights his initial difficulty with class involvement by referring to Thai classroom practices that condone 'just' sitting and listening. Later in the contrasting section of the turn, the tense forms change and are predominately present (e.g. *feel, are, don't have, am, can't even express, is*) except for one past form – again *was*. The verb processes are primarily existential (*was, am, I'm better*), mental (*don't even know, think*) and verbal (*can't even express, express*), which is not surprising given the focus of the interview. The contrast is magnified by Woody's self-attribution as 'nobody' and the emotion expressed in his rising intonation and volume and number of false starts. These features – the intensity of his emotion, the present tense verb forms and the adverbial of place (*here*) – lead me to conclude that he is referring to his present situation. In response, I continue to use present forms (turn 5) and Woody follows, also contextualising his subsequent turn in the present (turn 6).

A dramatic shift occurs in his next turn. In this turn (8), Woody makes the statement *but right now I think I'm better* which sends me scrambling to retrieve previous meanings and to recontextualise them in the past. *Right now* embeds the turn in the present, and through the use of the conjunction *but* he establishes a contrast between *right now* and the previous set of turns associated with *for the first time* (turns 2-7). It becomes clear that everything referred to in turn 2 and subsequently is, in fact, contextualised in the past. Woody is indicating that *Right now, he is better*; but back then, he was *nobody*. There has been a transition and it has been mediated by time. I instantly adjust the time references in my next turn (9) by using the adverb of time *already*. *Already* links past and present moments (Swan 1995) and indicates a mutual understanding that Woody's 'recovery', and by implication the vanquishing of his concerns, started in the past and continues to this present point. I even reaffirm – *as you say* – and pitch the question as a request for confirmation that my understanding is correct. Woody confirms with *yeah* (turn 10).

The negotiation of temporalities continues in turn 8. While Woody makes no clear use of future forms, his use of *when* indicates a time shift to an as-yet-unrealised future time *when I have more confidence* (turn 8). In response, and buoyed by his confirmation that all is well in the present, I 'leap-frog' off his future reference to a suggestion for future action, that he could try to increase his participation in class discussions (turn 11). In his next turn, Woody makes a false start, pauses and then, in quite direct terms, rejects my suggestion – *Because (.) I I don't want to wait until next semester* (turn 12). My change in role from interviewer to academic counsellor points to the hybridity of the interview as a genre and multiple subjectivities operating in the interview.

Fairclough's analytical model (2003) states that tenses are one form of time marker and shifting tenses can point to shifting temporalities. The immediate problem for conducting CDA on an ESL text is the extent to which tense use can be inconsistent

and unpredictable, as shown above. In Woody's case, it is likely that his shifting tenses are more related to, in SLA terms, interference from his first language, Thai (see Smyth, 1987) and his developing mastery of grammatical morphemes (Larsen-Freeman & Long, 1991) than to communicative intent. Applying the analytical model becomes difficult in the face of the inconsistent forms.

Closer examination of the text reveals Woody and me deploying a range of measures to resolve the problems of time and to scaffold meaning generally. My question in turn 1 is a wh-question, elaborately constructed in four parts. It consists of three short sentences, which are in effect paraphrases of the same question, and a cohesive link to a previous point made by Woody; they are an effort on my part to scaffold Woody's understanding of the question. Turn 5 functions as a request for clarification to Woody about the pressures to participate. While my request is obviously intended to clarify a point of meaning, such requests have also been identified as having actional and relational intent. They are usually initiated by the interviewer and work to keep the interaction going by opening up a space for the ESL participant to provide more information (Perrett 2000). In turn 3, I assist Woody with the word *uncomfortable*. Also in listening subsequently to the recording I noticed that I had adjusted to Woody as an ESL speaker by slowing down my delivery. Woody for his part made use of lexical approximations such as *very ashamed for myself* (turn 2) and called on my help with appeals for assistance, for example in his turn before this extract (*but ah how to answer this question*). As well, his turns were often circuitous and circumlocutionary (e.g. turn 2) as he mobilised all his available linguistic resources to try and articulate a particular idea. His frequent use of the filler 'ah' could well be a strategic circumlocutionary device aimed at buying him time to source words and plan his next move.

Bringing it all together (H1)

In examining the strategies that Woody and I used, it is interesting to note that many of those used by me as native speaker interviewer are designed to maintain the interview. I articulate the questions in particular ways; impose requests for clarification and confirmation; link meanings in an attempt to make the text cohere; change roles; provide support. They are related to ways of acting and relating in the interview and can be tied to the power inherent in my position as native speaker researcher and also to my research imperative. This observation is in keeping with Perrett's (2000) finding that the native speaker interviewers in ESL interviews instigate most of the dynamic moves. My work to maintain the cohesion and coherence in the interaction also resonates with SLA findings that native speakers often do extra semantic work to keep the interaction going (Larsen-Freeman & Long 1991). For Woody, on the other hand, many of the strategies he used were related to content and designed to supplement his limited linguistic resources and furnish clearer articulations of his meanings.

In this way, the communication strategies we used served to enhance the efficacy of our ways of acting and relating and our ways of representing the world. In text terms, the language of the strategies fed into our respective articulations of genres and discourses. This is not to say that the other form of text meaning, ways of self-identification, was ignored. Indeed the collective meanings in the interview were dedicated to negotiating and resolving meaning about Woody's changing subjectivity. In the extract Woody and I co-construct the understanding that his 'Australian'

subjectivity is developing over time and that his bringing of it into existence is underpinned by his increasing knowledge of and access to Australian academic practices. He constructs himself as an agent who is able to recognise different ways of being and take up and enact these alternatives (Davies 1990, Kettle 2005). This meaning constituted one of the discourses operating in the interview.

How to: CDA of an ESL text (H2)

The point from the analysis, in the light of the question posed at the beginning of this paper, is that certain contingencies exist when undertaking analysis of an ESL text which, if they exist, are not foregrounded in Fairclough's model of CDA. To explore the issue of analysing ESL texts, I brought together communication strategies and their function of supporting meaning in interaction, and Fairclough's model of CDA which makes claims about meanings in socially-produced texts. As noted previously, communication strategies are social and contextual. They work in interaction as the means by which a native speaker and a non-native speaker negotiate meaning and maintain the interaction. In CDA, social meanings are responses to the situational and wider contextual conditions and manifest in interactions as discourse: that is, as particular ways of acting and relating, ways of representing the world, and ways of self-identifying. Communication strategies facilitate these social meanings, with certain strategies appearing to be preferred by the different parties because they align with that person's position and purpose in the interaction.

The text provides an audit trail of the negotiation process. It can show the lengthy negotiation of temporalities over a protracted series of turns. The point is that an ESL text is not just a repository of social meanings; it is also a repository of the strategic means called into action to broker these meanings. It is not possible to simply identify the linguistic features as part of a stable linguistic system and then 'read off' attendant social meanings. Rather, the description of the linguistic features of an ESL text involves a pronounced engagement with interactive processes. The text and the interaction meld because the interaction is heavily involved in creating the text. The negotiation is of both the message and the medium. The implication for CDA is that the description and interpretation stages blur.

It follows that the analysis of an ESL text requires the implementation of two different analytical approaches. The first is when the linguistic forms are relatively 'standard' and 'correct', and comply with Fairclough's framework. In these instances, the descriptive analysis can proceed with identification and categorisation. Similarly at the interpretive level, once linguistic meanings have been established, the 'reading off' of discourses can continue with ease. The explanation phase of the analysis can also proceed, although it needs to engage with the close relation between power and the ways that access to linguistic resources contextualise and impact on the interaction.

The hybridity of the text has most acute ramifications for analysis when the language forms become problematic for one or both parties during the interaction and are negotiated and renegotiated until meaning is resolved. At these points, the analysis needs to orientate to both the linguistic and interpretive, and follow the turn-taking

and deployment of strategies until a common understanding is reached, or not reached in some cases.

The implication for the analyst is that the analysis of an ESL text, notably at those points where the linguistic forms are most hybrid, requires a foregrounding of the interaction. This means a deeper reading of the text in the sense that she/he is not focusing on the linguistic in order to 'read' the social but is deeply involved in charting how the meaning is made – that is, the process of co-construction being undertaken by the participants. Inherent in this approach is the understanding that while CDA assumes that social meanings can be 'read off' the linguistic features in a text, the features of an ESL text are tenuous and transient. They are not manifestations of a stable language system proficiently 'speaking' and 'reading' the prevailing social system. They are, rather, the manifestations of an intermediary language system, an 'interlanguage' (Selinker 1972), which is constantly supplemented by an array of strategies from both parties. There is a necessary deferment of the analysis. The resolution of meaning is deferred by the negotiation process in which the participants artfully deploy communication strategies to bolster the limited linguistic resources of the ESL speaker, in an ongoing and collaborative effort to coax the meaning potential out of the interaction. The more the text moves away from standard forms and becomes hybridised, the more negotiative work is needed by both participants to resolve a common meaning. As Tarone (1980) notes, communication strategies are about both speakers attempting any number of alternatives in order to reach agreement on one person's meaning. The issue for the analyst is to be able to recognise the strategies at work and to identify when resolution is reached.

Conclusion (H1)

This discussion examined the considerations for conducting CDA on ESL texts. In these 'New Times' (Hall 1989) of globalised English and English as the lingua franca in an increasing number of situations, it is necessary that researchers have the tools to analyse such 'new' ESL texts and their non-standard English features. The availability of and access to linguistic resources is part of a person's political economy which means that the analysis of ESL texts lies well within the purview of CDA. The point from this discussion is that in order to understand how the meaning is accomplished in an ESL text as part of an L1/L2 interaction, it is necessary to recognise and understand the language-related strategies that the respective speakers call upon. This is the extra dimension to CDA in the analysis of ESL texts.

Future research will no doubt look to SLA and other disciplines to provide more detailed tools for critically analysing such texts both in terms of power and language. An interesting area will be applying CDA to texts created in ESL/ESL speaker interactions. Given that most of the world's English communication is between L2 speakers without a native speaker present (Jenkins 2003), such research is increasingly relevant. Another possibility is the application of this model of analysis to other hybrid texts which feature a mixing of 'standard' and 'non-standard' forms. Such research will require understanding of the strategies employed by people to make meaning in these contexts, and would necessitate the drawing together of other disciplines and CDA. Such 'dialogue' would highlight the relevance of CDA and underline its ongoing applicability to 'new texts' as they emerge within changing social practices.

Endnotes

1. As a way of acknowledging the contested nature of terms such as 'standard' and 'non-standard', I use them in single quotation marks, e.g. 'non-standard'. They remain, however, a commonly-understood way of talking about these issues.
2. I acknowledge that linguistic features are just one form of semiotic practice. Other forms of signification and communication include gestures, visual images and graphics. However, this discussion is mainly concerned with linguistic features and so for the sake of brevity, I will often use the term 'linguistic'.
3. This is Woody's real name. He wanted this name and not a pseudonym to be used in my research reports.
4. Fairclough uses the term 'discourse' as both a countable and uncountable noun. In its uncountable form, 'discourse' is abstract and refers to 'an element of social life which is closely interconnected with other elements' (Fairclough 2003, p. 3). In this paper 'discourse' is being used in its countable form and refers to particular ways of representing the social and natural world, such as the managerial discourses of Australian Higher Education.

References

- Ammon, U. (2000) Towards more fairness in International English: Linguistic rights of non-native speakers? in R. Phillipson (ed.), *Rights to Language: Equity, Power and Education*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- AVCC (2003) *Key Statistics*.
[http://www.avcc.edu.au/policies_activities/resource_analysis/key_stats/international.pdf]. Accessed 23.02.04.
- Billig, M. (2003) Critical discourse analysis and the rhetoric of critique, in G. Weiss & R. Wodak (eds.), *Critical Discourse Analysis: Theory and Interdisciplinarity*, pp. 35-46. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Blommaert, J. & Bulcaen, C. (2000) Critical Discourse Analysis. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 29: 447-466.
- Chouliaraki, L. & Fairclough, N. (1999) *Discourse in Late Modernity: Rethinking Critical Discourse Analysis*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Davies, B. (1990) Agency as a form of discursive practice: A classroom scene observed. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 11(3): 341-361.
- Fairclough, N. (1989) *Language and Power*. London: Longman.
- Fairclough, N. (1992) *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Fairclough, N. (2001) *Language and Power* (2nd ed.). Essex: Pearson Education Limited.
- Fairclough, N. (2003) *Analysing Discourse: Textual Analysis for Social Research*. London: Routledge.
- Firth, A. & Wagner, J. (1997) On discourse, communication, and (some) fundamental concepts in SLA research. *The Modern Language Journal*, 81(3): 285-300.
- Fishman, J. A. (1998-1999) The new linguistic order. *Foreign Policy*, 113: 26-40.
- Gass, S. M. (1997) *Input, Interaction, and the Second Language Learner*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Gubrium, J. F. & Holstein, J. A. (2000) Analyzing interpretive practice, in N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (2nd ed.), pp. 487-508). Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.
- Hall, S. (1989) The meaning of New Times, in S. Hall & M. Jacques (eds.), *New Times: The Changing Face of Politics in the 1990s*. London: Lawrence & Wishart.
- Halliday, M. A. K. & Hasan, R. (1985) *Language, Context, and Text: Aspects of Language in a Social-semiotic Perspective*. Melbourne, Victoria: Deakin University Press.

- Hutchby, I. & Wooffitt, R. (1998) *Conversation Analysis: Principles, Practices and Applications*. Oxford: Polity Press.
- IELTS (2003) *IELTS - International English Language Testing System Handbook*. [http://www.ielts.org/pdf/ielts_hb_2003.pdf] Accessed 11.3.04.
- Janks, H. (1997) Critical discourse analysis as a research tool. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 18(3): 329-342.
- Jenkins, J. (2003) *World Englishes: A Resource Book for Students*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Kachru, B. (1992) Teaching world Englishes., in B. Kachru (ed.), *The Other Tongue: English across Cultures* (2nd ed.), pp. 335-65. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Kettle, M. (2005) Agency as discursive practice: From 'nobody' to 'somebody' as an international student in Australia. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 25(1): 45-60.
- Kumaravadivelu, B. (1999) Critical classroom discourse analysis. *TESOL Quarterly*, 33(3): 453-484.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. & Long, M. H. (1991) *An Introduction to Second Language Acquisition Research*. London & New York: Longman.
- Luke, C. (2001) *Globalization and Women in Academia: North/west-south/east*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- 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, Thousand Oaks, CA, New Delhi: Sage.
- Perrett, G. (2000) Researching second and foreign language development, in L. Unsworth (ed.), *Researching Language in Schools and Communities: Functional Linguistic Perspectives*, pp. 87-110. London and New York: Cassell.
- Rampton, M. B. H. (1990) Displacing the 'native speaker': Expertise, affiliation, and inheritance. *ELT Journal*, 44(2): 97-101.
- Selinker, L. (1972) Interlanguage. *International Review of Applied Linguistics*, 10: 209-231.
- Silverman, D. (1994) *Interpreting Qualitative Research*. London: Sage.
- Smyth, D. (1987) Thai speakers, in M. Swan & B. Smith (eds.), *Learner English: A Teacher's Guide to Interference and Other Problems* (pp. 252-263). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sonntag, S. (2003) *The Local Politics of Global English: Case Studies in Linguistic Globalization*. Lanham, Maryland: Lexington Books.

- Swan, M. (1995) *Practical English Usage* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Tarone, E. (1977) Conscious communication strategies in interlanguage: A progress report, in H. D. Brown, C. A. Yorio & R. C. Crymes (eds.), *On TESOL '77: Teaching and learning ESL* (pp. 194-203). Washington, DC: TESOL.
- Tarone, E. (1980) Communication strategies, foreigner talk and repair in interlanguage. *Language Learning*, 30: 417-431.
- Widdowson, H. (1993) The ownership of English, in J. Jenkins (ed.), *World Englishes: A Resource Book for Students*, pp. 162-168. London and New York: Routledge.
- Wodak, R. & Matouschek, B. (1993) 'We are dealing with people whose origins one can clearly tell just by looking': Critical discourse analysis and the study of neo-racism in contemporary Austria. *Discourse and Society*, 4(2): 225-248.