



Minerva Access is the Institutional Repository of The University of Melbourne

Author/s:
Bianco, JL

Title:
Critical discourse analysis (CDA) and language planning (LP): Constraints and applications of the critical in language planning

Date:
2009-12-01

Citation:
Bianco, J. L. (2009). Critical discourse analysis (CDA) and language planning (LP): Constraints and applications of the critical in language planning. Le, T (Ed.). Le, Q (Ed.). Short, M (Ed.). *Critical Discourse Analysis an Interdisciplinary Perspective*, (1), pp.101-118. NOVA SCIENCE PUBLISHERS, INC.

Persistent Link:
<https://hdl.handle.net/11343/116691>

Lo Bianco, Joseph (2009) *Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) and Language Planning (LP): Constraints and Applications of the Critical in Language Planning*. In T. Le, Q. Le, M. Short (Eds) *Critical Discourse Analysis: An Interdisciplinary Perspective*. Nova Science Publishers, pp. 101-118

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) and Language Planning (LP): Constraints and Applications of the Critical in Language

Joseph Lo Bianco

ABSTRACT

This chapter explores aspects of the relation between critical discourse analysis and language planning. These two broad sub-fields of applied linguistics have close connections with socio-linguistics but are only rarely applied together. However critical textual analysis can play a vital role in democratically oriented projects of language policy. Drawing on recent Australian experience in language the chapter discusses some of the aims and methods of critical discourse analysis, but argues that too many critical language projects have adopted a relentlessly critical disposition and have devoted too little attention to productive or positive projects of discourse analysis proposing alternative futures ameliorating or resolving injustices, in equalities and problems. A long-held assumption of many critical language projects has been that exposure of the operations of power in texts is emancipatory, but experience of a now-long tradition of CDA suggests this is, predictably, an overly optimistic belief. Deconstructive activity however can play a role in exposing and helping to reverse negative language ideologies adopted by some groups of minority language speakers towards their forms of speech or writing, but to have productive effects this kind of CDA will need to be incorporated into positive language planning and language policy projects.

Keywords: Australian language policy, language policy and planning, critical discourse analysis, public texts, public discourse, performative action

Introduction

In this paper I discuss the relation between two sub-fields that belong both to applied linguistics and socio-linguistics. These are language policy and planning on the one hand, and critical analysis of language, specifically critical discourse analysis, on the other. The relations between these two distinct areas of activity are elaborated via their connection to language policy and planning in general and to recent Australian experience in particular.

The energetic language policy and planning activity in Australia in the past three decades represents a particularly strong investment by the Australian state in the management of its available language resources, the cultivation of new language resources, and interaction of the state with interest groups and constituencies. This sustained and complex language planning effort offers a rich instance of ideological, symbolic and material interests of the state and various constituent components of state agency (Ozolins, 1993; Moore, 1996; Wickert, 2001). It should represent a field of considerable interest for critical language scholars to explore the manifold ways in which language planning, both the activity and its scholarly description, operate. More problematically, as I shall argue, it offers a challenge for critical discourse analysis since language planning involves practical engagement, both citizenship based and scholarly, for participation in public intervention on language questions. This latter challenge raises the issue of the limits of the critical.

My conclusion will be that a ripe opportunity for critical linguistic reflection has been squandered and that this exposes a considerable weakness at the centre of the project of critical language studies, namely the unreliability and exaggeration of its claim that exposing ideological interests in the workings of language results in the unmasking of interests and that this unmasking of concealed ideologies makes available potential for more equitable practices of communication and human social

relations to emerge.

Language Planning (LP)

To a large extent the activity of language policy making resides in the legal-political practice of issuing laws, regulations and reports on questions of language, and to this extent LP constitutes the body of statements declared by authoritative bodies. However, observation of diverse national policy making styles suggests that existing social practices, public and private attitudes, public 'discussion' of language issues and the communicative activity, or performance, of authoritative individuals also influence language choices and behaviour and as such ought to be considered as particular kinds of language planning. Adopting this more expansive view, we can see LP as an "ensemble of activities, some of which are textual (laws, reports, authorizations), others of which are discursive (speeches, radio debates), while still others involve the public performance of behaviours that powerful individuals or institutions hold up as models to be followed" (Lo Bianco, 2008a, p.157) and that these are applied to domains which Davis (1994) has distinguished as the intended, the enacted and the experienced.

When we look to find instances of language planning typically we look to two main sources: public texts and public discourses. In this way language planning is analogous to a motivated conversation about how the community of communication, which constitutes any language speaker population, talks to itself about its principal communicative resource, i.e., language. Language changes are unlike other fields of public policy to the extent that they require a large quotient of participation to be effective; if large numbers of language users refuse to use new language forms mandated by an authority the innovation or policy will fail. In this way language planning is ultimately dependent on a kind of mass validation in practices of language use.

This does not deny that language capabilities and power are not stratified, particularly the social spread of key meaning resources, especially literacy, which are distributed unequally and combine with other language resources to make access to material and symbolic power unequal kinds of cultural capital (Bourdieu, 1982, 1991). In policy conversations, however, as in all conversations, participants engage in moments of speaking and listening, and, because this term is also used metaphorically, we can say that participants write and read their intentions and the intentions of others, on their means of communication. Language planning conversations are crucial sites for the participation of teachers, interpreters, and other language professionals whose implementation of intended changes influences the effectiveness and traction of policy declarations.

Public texts distil accommodations (language policies and plans) particular to given settings and times, and reflect prevailing political and ideological forces. Public discourses about language are the dynamic here-and-now discussions about language, which might seek to entrench or enact those accommodations or to change, extend, or subvert them.

The third field of activity which constitutes a rich source of language planning activity, I call performative action. Performative action refers to the practice of language use, both those uses of language only focused on conveying messages, therefore mundane, and the usage of language for socialisation of the young, therefore teaching, or other professional enactments of language policy intentions, such as interpreting and translating, language research, dictionary writing etc.

Public Texts

The term "public texts" refers to the official documentation of a sovereign state, or an agency entrusted with state jurisdictional authority to influence language. Public texts for the most part have a declarative function, announcing, and in so doing constituting, the authority of a given language position.

A national constitution is the most obvious example of a public or official state text. In the constitutions of many states there are formal declarations about the status, role and standing of languages. The constitution is a source of information, the most authoritative and ultimately decisive source of information, for identifying the linguistic intentions of states. Constitutions tell several stories about the

roles of languages, the intentions for their social presence, their relations; the authors of these statements are lawyers, politicians, the military, key figures from culture and economic life. Even a constitution can be imagined as a conversational practice. Although participation turns in constitutional formation are slow and encumbered by legalistic process, they nevertheless form a "multi-logue" (Tully, 1997) in which participatory expression is possible and on which constitutionalism itself depends.

Public texts are the most officialised and authorised level of communicative practice, carrying sanction for their violation, and are therefore both practical and symbolic. They seek to express not simply political accommodations but to symbolise nationality, that is, to order the ways in which it is assumed a given polity wishes to express itself and its collective life. The state however is differentially organised and powers are distributed according to a diverse set of ways.

Constitutions are typically very general statements and subject to interpretation, and a key provision of constitutions is to make available the authorised juridical means whereby intended meanings can be clarified. The constitution is therefore the most public and declared mode of language planning, the ultimate public text, and involves laws, regulations, and formal operations of planning and implementation.

However, not all states have declared official, or national, languages, indeed, not all states have full or comparable constitutions, and the standing and public use of languages is often determined according to other procedures.

Public Discourse

If the term public texts refers to language planning in official documentation of constitutions, laws, regulations etc., then public discourse refers to ongoing debates, discussions and arguments on issues of languages. The subjects of such public conversation often are the public texts that declare the role, standing, and relationships of languages within a polity. Public discourse is therefore a collection of statements, discussion and public attitudes that accompany or respond to or precede public texts. Such discourse is an essential component of all language planning because formal declarations are not always implemented, and sometimes involve political rhetoric, interests and ideologies.

Discourse is also important because constitutional language provisions are often only very general declarations and what is actually done in specific settings can differ. An example of this is that in 1918 amendments to education laws in several Australian states declared instruction in languages other than English to be illegal (Ozolins, 1993). Over time these provisions became redundant as innovations and change in language education brought about local experimentation in language education (Clyne, 2005).

During the mid 1970s there was considerable agitation, experimentation and innovation in community languages in Australia. Many schools commenced using the languages of minority populations, both immigrant minority languages and indigenous languages, in programs intended both to teach these languages and assist their retention across generations, but also to improve the general educational attainments of minority children and specifically their acquisition of English (Nicholls, 2001; Scarino and Pademetre, 2001; Singh, 2001).

While such initiatives were sometimes based on the intuition of teachers and schools that early bilingualism would be cognitively and linguistically enriching, there was also emerging at this time a substantial new body of evidence indicating the educational soundness of early bilingual instruction. The same government which was making available funding for such initiatives and declaring itself in public discourse, reports, press statements, ministerial announcements, radio and television news interviews, and campaigning politically to enshrine the multilingual and multicultural character of the community in education was operating with formal legal instruments that potentially could have made impossible those same measures. It was not for some decades that the law was adjusted to remove the prohibiting clauses (Clyne, 2005). Here we see language planning in practice differ substantially from formally declared statements. Public discourse can and does shape language planning in a more immediate and applied mode than formal texts which are usually unable to anticipate change and

innovation in methodology.

Attitudes and ideologies alter over time and new circumstances arise which displace previous understandings of issues, or alter the ways in which political interests align and compromise. However, the previous public text was, inevitably, an outcome of public discourse prevailing in during 1918 and in the circumstances, problems, and ideologies then current. In this way therefore the public texts represent a distillation of political arrangements that apply at a given point in time and enshrine political solutions current to the configurations of power that prevail. This dynamic time based relationship between discourse and text is taken one step further in the third mode in which language planning occurs, which I will call performative action.

Performative Action

In its most general way performative action refers to daily enactment of language that is the myriad personal and professional communication which constitutes language practice. Language practice for language planning purposes is of two kinds: the ordinary use of language, reflecting the standards, norms and communicative pattern taken for granted by a community at any one time; and the purposive use of language, which models, indicates, or promotes language usage patterns.

In conventional sociolinguistics the ordinary use of language is correlative, i.e., it varies according to existing social categories and how they use language. The purposive use of language is constitutive; i.e., its use helps form and shape and influence patterns of language, social relationships and meanings. The purposive use of language also models communicative behaviour for learners to follow.

For the most part it is powerful and significant individuals, institutions and entities who in their communicative practice provide models for linguistic and cultural behaviour (Weinstein, 1983). Performative action interacts closely with public discourse in which direct and informing statements are made about language planning, and with public texts which distil agreements, compromises or powerful accommodations about language issues and problems at a given point in time and in a given place and social setting. Performative action can enact and in this way reinforce, the language accommodations and language planning enshrined in public texts and public discourse.

This is done when language used performatively instantiates the declared policy and discourse under standings that prevail. However in private or professional use, in institutional settings, such as classrooms, courtrooms and other public settings, performative action can extend, play with and elaborate existing language planning, or modify, contest, destabilise, contradict and subvert such understandings.

In this dynamic relationship between language usage and language planning a continuum of action is produced such that language planning is not a practice removed from instances of communication. Instead, language planning is aligned on a continuum from public texts, to public discourses to performative action. Language teaching and learning, interpreting and translation, and participation in acts of debate, argumentation and persuasion on issues of language are reflexive, as purposive uses of language whose aim is to influence language.

Interests of State

Schooling, schools, teaching and teachers are central to language planning since language planning often involves change to existing language accommodations, or resistance and reaction to changes proposed. This central role of education has ancient precedents, and in tunes of radical reconstruction of social arrangements, or in periods of turmoil and transformation it becomes acute.

Recruiting teachers to the job of fashioning the language futures of society was a central objective of the radicals of the French Revolution, committed to abolishing all "vestiges of feudalism", such as those residing in regional and social dialects. In 1791 the nobleman and diplomat, Talleyrand, pronounced at the French Convention that aimed to invent this new political entity conceived totally differently from all preceding forms of state, that the essential role of displacing tradition with

modernity was in part vested in primary schools.

Referring to the spread of standard French abroad although colonial expansion while in regional areas and among the urban poor non standard varieties continued to be used he asserted that: "Elementary education will put an end to this strange inequality. In school all will be taught in the language of the Constitution and the Law and this mass of corrupt dialects, these last vestiges of feudalism will be forced to disappear" (cited in Wright 2004, p.62). Brunot's (1927) documentation of French linguistic consolidation considers the critical moment was the state's clear decision that families should be deprived of exclusive rights over the lingual ways of their children. Because formal education is systematic its cultural effects become repeatable. This was explicitly achieved early in France; with the original target of schooling being dispersion of the language of state and law, standard literate French, an investment in national cultural capital. In the late 18th century expansion and domestic consolidation coincided as French spread internationally but remained unknown in many French villages and some whole regions.

This historical legacy of state investment in national language planning extends to multilingualism in the complex demographics of contemporary nations. Challenged by the declining sovereignty of global economic interdependence language planning has become a ubiquitous practice in contemporary society.

Hence formal education was charged with the secondary socialisation of the young as they moved vertically into citizenship. Later, with population mobility, education served this same function again, not with the young but with adult foreigners, admitted horizontally into citizenship; and through global expansion formal education again served the nationing goals of the state on the colonised, by effecting assimilation.

In this way, for the young, the new and the colonised, the national state set up the most successful self-reproduction process ever devised. No other institution in history has been so successful. So much so that statehood based on nationality, while a construct of relatively recent history, is taken to be normal, natural, inevitable, and even primordial.

Everywhere education systems are intimately connected to the goals and aspirations of the state though sometimes these are muted through devolution of education administration to professional civil organisations, to religious communities and organisations, or to regional and sub-regional administrative structures. These jurisdictions broadly or tightly continue to reflect influence of linguistic choices and practices from national education systems under whose tutelage they operate.

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA)

The language polymath George Steiner makes perhaps the strongest assertion about what I will call the possibilising power of language. This is well expressed in the following remarks from his famous work, *After Babel*:

It is the miraculous...capacity of grammars to generate counter-factuals, "if '-propositions and, above all, future tenses, which have empowered our species to hope, to reach far beyond the extinction of the individual. We endure, we endure creatively due to our imperative ability to say "No" to reality, to build fictions of alterity, of dreamt or willed or awaited 'otherness' for our consciousness to inhabit...the utopian and the messianic are figures of syntax (1998, p.xiv).

CDA shares a quota of the possibilising potential which Steiner proclaims, although most adherents to critical language studies trace their intellectual inheritance to active political theory rather than to the reflections of a literary translator. Steiner configures the new in talk in the molecular structure of language, such as tense forms and conditionals. CDA is directly cognate with this in its aspiration and claim that systematic study of discourse to expose agendas, interests, ideologies, purposes and politics that lie concealed or lurking can be transformative, improving or socially beneficial.

CDA is a project of exposure, unmasking and renovating social relations and conditions. The strength and power of critical discourse analysis lie in the precise documentation of connections between texts to contexts and the subsequent connection of these to interests. However, CDA is limited and

deficient to the extent that it gives rise to undue optimism that such processes of exposure produce change, or that the change that is produced is emancipatory.

Both the assets and the liabilities of CDA are on full show when we look to language policy and planning, the field with which I have been most closely engaged, the professional community with which I have the closest connection, and to which I argue CDA has contributed least and least productively. LP is an ancient activity, but a neophyte field of scholarship; critical reflection on language is also ancient and normal, people always and everywhere have noticed patterns in talk and writing that connect to social categories and interests, but critical discourse analysis in its various guises is even more recent than language policy and planning as a field of study.

Since the time of the full emergence of modern political structures the production of public texts of language and the accompanying public discourses have become one of the most characteristic activities of nations. Preceding the existence of national states (Lo Bianco, 2005) national communities of communication were conceived and 'narrated into existence' by language strategists, such as poets (Weinstein, 1979) in performative activity of language expression.

Today, the world's newest nation, Timor Leste, continues precisely the same ancient political practice of fashioning for itself a distinctive set of language norms both to reflect its existing, or self-conscious statehood, but also to help bring its nationhood into being (Hajek, 2000).

National formation involves inculcation of ethos, abilities, knowledge and attachments in processes broadly conceived as nationing and particularly where statehood is recent or contested language planning "administrative efficiency" (Fishman, 1973), activities of national consolidation which when achieved are often relegated into routine and "banal" (Billig, 1995) activity. In extremis, but not rarely, language planning enacts overtly hostile practices against linguistic pluralism and non-privileged communicative forms in its drive to forge a mythic sense of oneness capable of obliterating difference. This search for the linguistic creation of community, a community of communication (Wright, 2004) is always more dense and frequent within national boundaries than outside of them. This is the activity of nationing.

Nationing is the principal activity not of nations directly so much as an activity devolved to authority structure nations devise to carry out their work, i.e., the state, most strongly in the school, mostly through the teacher and specifically through teacher talk.

Teacher talk is the instrument for making diverse populations resemble the imagined unity of culture and identity that states and especially states based on nationality, desire. Bourdieu's description of the linguistic consolidation of France demonstrates both the micro process of dialect consolidation to produce a state-unifying way to talk, but also the symbolic capital that becomes attached to this. Through rewards, and punishments, a linguistic marketplace arises where language exchange results in producing the nation the state plans for.

Inevitably these processes mean incorporation of marginalised populations (regional, indigenous, immigrant or colonised), naturalising its ambition via the discourse of dealing with self-evident "language problems", or bringing about "national unity" or "cultural authenticity". A key aim is the desire for language and culture to be smoothed out, differences to be done away with, for culture and language to be internally consistent, stable over time and aligned in imagined space with the vertical structures of state authority.

Industrialisation adds to this search for culturally homogenous populations a search for skills "which are codified, standardised and certified, most often mono-lingual standard and universal literacy. The cost is the silencing of possibilities for multilingual or pluralist alternatives, but also the violence through which such practices of language planning are enacted and experienced. There are few texts of language planning that have been subjected to critical discourse analysis by CDA scholars, not even in Australia which has both enjoyed and endured productive and socially emancipatory language policy making (Clyne, 2005) and also bitterly contested language planning to effect linguistic assimilation of indigenous Australians under the liberal guise of participation and inclusion (Nicholls, 2001).

In one of the earliest systematic texts of critical discourse analysis, by one of its most prolific and

impressive scholars, Ruth Wodak (1989, 1996) helps define the emergent broad field by stressing the methodological importance of a diverse range of theoretical and scholarly concepts for analysing issues which are perceived to be of "social relevance". The ambition of this critical perspective in the linguistic sciences is to expose "inequality and injustice" grounding their exploration to concrete settings and historically specific junctures. By this reasoning, unmasking the operation of power in texts will be ineffective by relying on abstractions, which, though they might be conceptually appealing or scientifically compelling, ultimately depend on direct resonance in social context and historical time, the past and the setting, for their effectiveness. In a similar vein Gunther Kress (1990) stressed the "overtly political agenda" of CDA, as distinct from other kinds of discourse analysis, elaborated into a classification by Norman Fairclough (1989, 1992, 1995) between textually oriented discourse analysis and critically oriented discourse analysis. The former is concerned with text and its regularities, rather than social or political purposes, while critically oriented discourse analysis deals overtly with the presence of power in texts. Power is seen to have corrosive ideological effects and to frequently naturalise its presence and so the exposure of concealed ideology is accompanied by a political commitment to expose both its presence and its effects in the interests of emancipation.

More recently Alastair Pennycook has sub-divided critically oriented discourse analysis by identifying two "domains of CDA" (2001, p.81). One of these links power and linguistic interactions and the other links power and meaning. In this schema power and linguistic operations is essentially concerned with analysing control over communicative or linguistic phenomena such as topics, interactions and turn-taking in speech; while power and meaning involves analysis of how ideology is realised linguistically. This schema conserves the now recurring assumption that exposure of how "ideology is realised" contains emancipatory potential.

From the work of such scholars a tradition of CDA has arisen notable for three characteristics:

1. Precision or even surgical analysis of language, its molecules and micro-structures;
2. A sophisticated method, using either systemic functional grammar and its elaborations (especially notable in the work of Jim Martin and Gunther Kress) into educational linguistics or multi-literacies, or other language theories, tracking these language descriptions onto what Kress has called the "materiality of language" (1990);
3. A declared positionality, what Blommaert (1999) calls political linguistics, or 'taking sides', which he argues, is "unavoidable: it comes with doing a particular type of questioning of linguistic reality. An attempt at providing a history of language which takes into account social and political factors forces us to voice interpretations of these factors. And in social and political reality, interpretations are partisan, and they almost automatically align the one who formulated the interpretation with one or another political bloc. So be it" (Blommaert 1999, p.437).

Not all of CDA or "linguistic questioning" is always associated with explicitly socially transformative agendas but emancipatory assumptions are immanent in a great deal of the discourse of critical discourse research and theorising. Texts are targeted to exposure for the ways in which their choices of lexicon, syntax, and other grammatical elements, as well as communicative practices, guide readers or listeners or interactants, to interpretations that are privileged, and silence or distance alternatives.

This "structuring of interpretation" has achieved elaborate specification by the addition of cognitive psychology as in Teun van Dijk's work in the 1980s and 1990s in Europe on racism and the media (1991), and in the US applied to political engagement in the work of George Lakoff (2002) and the Rockridge Institute¹ famously in the case of the best seller *"Don't Think of an Elephant"* (2004).

¹ <http://www.rockridgeinstitute.org/>

Van Dijk's critical move in CDA linked ideology to processes of cognition, whereby ideology inheres as 'interpretation frameworks' or organised psychological schemata, which make available privileged sets of attitudes about social phenomena. Lakoff's use of "cognitive foundation" specifically refers to how short-term memory triggers activate long-term presuppositions about the world and operate via politicised decoding, privileging in this way implicitness in communication and its non-arbitrary connection with political action and belief. The Rockridge Institute¹ is dedicated to dissecting the success of the conservative political discourse of neo-liberalism, especially in the so-called Anglosphere, the US and the UK, but also Australia, with the use of a Whorfian belief that conservatives had successfully "set a trap" with "words draw you into their worldview" (Lakoff, 2004, p.4).

It would be falsely unifying to attach singular coherence or even sequence to what is a large and multifarious body of writing on CDA. However differences of method, concepts and topics do not preclude a broadly shared project of deconstructive ambition, a search to identify and unmask associations of discourse and power, a project of exposing both processes and effects of meaning-making in texts in the direct service of the interests of power.

Deconstructive CDA originates in a kind of linguistics identified with rhetoric, vastly more ancient than its incarnation in applied linguistics, and operates to unpack nominations, euphemism and dysphemism, or grammatical realisations of unequal relations of power, displayed, performed or imposed through texts of writing and speech, locating truth in its realisation in texts.

However deconstructive CDA creates a philosophical dilemma, a dilemma about human subjectivity, for just as it may be the case that others' power and ideologies are realised linguistically so too must ours.

Our alternatives are not quarantined from interest, ideology, desire for power to prevail and have our preferred versions of what to think either posited or made natural. The textual and the critical orientations in applied linguistics and discourse analysis must remain connected for the practice of CDA to have credibility. It remains important to democratic citizenship as much as to linguistic scholarship to critique texts produced by political parties to expose mechanisms whereby they mislead, or texts produced by corporations to show how they might smuggle morally disturbing ideologies into apparently innocuous material, or how routine operations of institutions can sustain specific interests and ideologies and enshrine these in their mundane operations. The concrete or transactional talk many CDA practitioners want to propose however is not unproblematically acceptable either. Alternative texts are neither beyond interest, ideology, or selectivity because CDA practitioners produce them.

CDA has been a project of considerable scholarly importance, shaking the complacency of applied linguistics, opening lines of questioning of how consent is manufactured, especially when such consent appears to work against the interests of consent-givers. A principal source of the stimulus for doing CDA in the first place lies in Gramsci's notion of hegemony (Ives, 2004) who transformed earlier understandings of hegemony as being concerned with the predominance of one nation over another to "describe the intricacies of power relations in many different fields....redefined...to mean the formation and organisation of consent" (Ives, 2004, p. 2). However, Gramsci offers a counter-hegemonical analysis, a language and a practice not just for deconstruction but for building alternatives, and one that is always seen as an alternative but also an interested political construction.

Relentlessly Critical

Unfortunately many critical language projects have failed to inspire a search for alternative modes even of conversational and linguistic practices, let alone of the social, economic, political and ideological structures and relations which linguistic forms index and help constitute. Reliance on an assumption of exposure has had the dispiriting effect of continuous exposure of inequitable or dehumanising interests pursuing an emancipatory politics that never comes. Language policy and planning, not its description or analysis, but citizenship based activation of policy processes for intervening in education especially but across a broad field of language policy and planning fields, is a practice of intervention in which applied linguistics comes closest to a union of theory and practice.

Most critical language projects have remained mired in critique of texts and social practices and the relations or interests those texts realise or imply. The topics that have been addressed have been wide-ranging and the methods applied have been innovative and powerful, but few have been convinced by the optimistic claims of many CDA practitioners that change would result merely from revealing the operations of power lurking inside the sinews of texts. By the middle of the 1990s a proliferation of relentless, unproductive critique characterised the field. This was taken up by Kress who called for critical language projects to "... develop apt, plausible theories ... to move from critical reading, from analysis, from deconstructive activity, to productive activity..."(Kress 1996, p.15-16).

The failure of exposure of camouflaged interests smuggled into apparently unproblematic texts suggests that substantive change, or alternatives, require specification and dissemination, negotiation and processes of citizenship and public engagement rather than scholarly writing. Social organisation, human subjectivities, and human social practices fail to emerge from the work of revealing the operation of inequity, or ideology in texts through which social relations are transacted. CDA then becomes itself located in time and place, an artefact of a particular configuration of textual, ideological and institutional positions, a "historical phenomenon ... not ... naturally there" as Kress (2000) puts it as he moves to focus on the specification of alternatives.

while critique looked at the present through the means of past production, design shapes the future through deliberate deployment of representational resources in the designer's interest ... the task of the critic is to perform analysis on an agenda of someone else's design. As a result a considerable degree of inertia is built into this process... design sets aside past agendas, and treats them and their products as resources setting an agenda of future aims, and in assembling means and resources for implementing that (Kress, 2000, p.160-161).

This sense of the iterative production of new designs is already available in Raymond Williams (1958) whose formulation on culture and ideology in language weaves a dynamic temporal pattern of the *archaic* mode (the inherited designs of meaning and language from the past, the bulk of our language use), *residual* mode (the deployment in speech acts in the here-and-now of the archaic mode to accomplish transactional purposes), and the *emergent* mode (referring to how future meaning possibilities are negotiated and produced using the archaic inherited language in residual communication for forging new and original possibilities).

Kress's push for a productive modality for discourse analysis is tied to a feature of language policy and planning, the production of designs for multiliterate and multi-semiotic capabilities, eschewing reductive notions of reading and writing. Literacy policy within broad based language planning to take up the consequences of technology mediated multi-modal literacies can be usefully informed by language planning concepts and methods as public education systems struggle to incorporate and address multiplying forms of linguistic difference.

This break from endlessly deconstructive text analysis helpfully focuses attention on how even archaic structures of inherited language are utilised for productive change, even while they predispose users to their particular meanings. The inherited language is not a prison house of communication precluding either the conclusion of transactional purposes in the here-and-now, nor the realisation of new and qualitatively different and improved social and inter-personal arrangements.

Alongside Kress's focus on the social-semiotics of design, Jim Martin (2000, 2002) and others increasingly deploy a CDA inspired by Systemic Functional Linguistics connecting textual practice to extra-textual contexts of culture and situation. These are elaborated in meaning-centred grammatical accounts and are consistent with the point I develop here about the deleterious effect of relentless critique in much CDA. In Australian language policy and planning during the 1980s and early 1990s systematic participation by applied linguistics in public, democratic and broad-based language planning generated rights-based language policy dispensations at state and Federal level. These were designs for new communicative futures that achieved remarkable political success, and were bitterly contested by the nation's most senior and conservative political forces. Although forced into retreat during the period of extreme neo-liberal governance for the bulk of the 1990s what is relevant here is the absence of the discourse of CDA, and most of its key proponents, in the nation's most productive exploration of alternative language futures.

Martin proposes a shift away even from the name CDA, offering "positive discourse analysis" (2004),

as an exploration of how minority voices, repressed narratives and productive new community construction processes can occur in talk and writing, how the resources of archaic language can be utilised to foreground alternatives that critique oriented discourse studies do not show.

Neither Kress nor Martin claims for new directions and more productive orientations in discourse studies engage with the field of language policy and planning except in the most incidental way. Instead, reflecting exhaustion with relentless critique, while acknowledging that critique is neither redundant nor misguided, they move to propose design of communicative alternatives. CDA has shown convincingly that public texts often carry agendas they conceal and "surgical linguistics" can productively expose both message and mechanism of concealment. Cognitively based critical scholarship has also revealed structures of interpretation through which ideology operates.

Exhaustion with relentless critique and with the immodesty and implausibility of the claim that social transformation or even modest change would derive from CDA does not deny the essential premise that texts carry more than propositional meanings. Instead it poses a different problem. A more active participation by critical scholars in alliance with language planners around concrete problems, such as citizenship, multilingualism, literacy education and reversing language shift and extinction, to take some pressing challenges that language planning addresses, is needed. Broad based teams of language planning are likely to offer greater prospects for democratic language policies. The struggle of indigenous people for a practice of language planning that helps to *keep language diversity alive* is a good case in point. Reversing language shift (Fishman, 2001) is an intensely complex social reconstruction activity requiring three kinds of tightly interrelated activity: *ideological work* to contest past negative constructions of minority languages and the internalisation of these negative attitudes by minority language speakers, *social and economic work* to establish material conditions for the communicative roles of these languages and *socio-linguistic work* in which language speakers reconstruct their expressive resources (Lo Bianco, 2008b). Textual analysis is a central component of language revitalisation positively oriented towards contexts of policy application and speaker sentiment in close collaboration with speakers and language planners.

There is another reason for turning the page from relentless pursuit of further demonstrations of the critical agenda in linguistics, in applied linguistics and in discourse studies. This has to do with the questionable claim of many critical discourse studies that the alternative to a politicised practice of applied linguistics involves a servile position of technicism, or a "pretence to science", or a-historical and a-social scholarship.

Even a cursory look at general research on discourse shows that textually oriented applied linguists have a prior claim over their 'critical cousins' regarding interest in power, politics and status differentials. Before CDA was even conceptualised and even before the critical turn in language studies generally pragmatics and sociolinguistics foregrounded a scholarly approach to power, interest and status. We find such concerns in the work of applied linguists like Alan Davies and Henry Widdowson.

In pragmatics, speech act theory in the hands of language philosophers like Austin and Searle from the early 1960s recognisably noted the systematic relation between social categorisations and linguistic and communicative phenomena. It was always understood in their work that what Searle had called the 'felicity conditions' of speech act interpretation required attention to and theorised the role of power, politics and status differentials. For many speech acts to be 'interpreted', or to become perlocutions, i.e., to succeed, they critically depend on interactants mutually recognising power differentials in their relations (Searle, 1969). While the scholarly aim was to produce standards of rationality in understanding ordinary language, implicitly recognised were some of the social hierarchies which occupy CDA scholars.

It is not the case that prior to the formalisation of CDA based on political theorising from ideological, neo-Marxist and post-structural traditions that all language study was in thrall to the abstract systems of Chomsky and Saussure or the psychologisation of communication.

Another example of early and systematic awareness of power, politics and status differentials in linguistics outside of the critical tradition is the work on politeness theory by Brown and Levinson (1987) building on early insights on facework by Erving Goffmann (1967). They and others acknowledged and theorised the roles of power, politics and status differentials between speakers.

Their discussions of face, the use and effect of face threatening acts, face saving, giving face, and other practices of identity relations, and interaction, were marked crucially by how social power was brought into linguistic activity.

A third basis for a more constrained future practice of CDA is the unfortunate tendency of inflated and immodest claims sometimes made for critical studies, especially for their socially transformative effects. Exposing the politicisation of discourse is important, but does not straightforwardly, necessarily or even at all, lead to social change. Instead the real outcome of some, perhaps most, critical linguistics is critical linguistics. Scholarly publications and awareness are important but much of this scholarly work claims to change the world. Particularly disturbing is some writing on CDA which confounds awareness of the textual operations of power with social change and transformation. But exposure doesn't necessarily lead to change. The archaic dimension of language is deeply patterned by past politicisation but we are still able to deploy it to produce new and subverting meanings. The practice of CDA itself is fashioned from communicative tools the vast majority of which precede all its practitioners. The transactional purposes of residual use of language co-exist with emergent construction of future possibilities, frequently overturning the conditions of their own production. Critical discourse analysis directed at change of discursive practices is a form of language planning which has of course produced major change, since all institutions of power and human relations are linguistically mediated and can be re-made.

In New Caledonia and East Timor and other colonised societies political rebellion and struggle against colonial masters is often conducted in the language of the colonial master. Language planning that has aimed to replace languages of domination has rarely succeeded, but projects of national autonomy which have made use of dominant languages often have. Feminist language planning that has wanted to expose the structuring effects of masculinist bias in language has succeeded both in promulgating practices of more inclusive language and wider social change, and in raising consciousness that language can and does constitute identities and social formations, but few projects of radical language reconstruction have proceeded and yet progressive discourses and agendas have often moved ahead.

This is an odd problem to beset CDA given that CDA demands attention to the operations of hegemony, conscious and subconscious domination and thinks through relations between identity, thinking and consciousness. The overtly political designs in talk and texts that CDA practitioners are sensitive to, social, personal and political, however, require a theory of interests as well as a theory of ideology.

Ironically, the struggle within CDA to be productive, to open up new arenas of imaginative, struggled over or insisted upon meanings, results from its own efficiency. This is because CDA constantly applies its often brilliantly incisive cutting-up of language to expose omissions and commissions in all parts of language, such as the use of language (turns, routines, talk time), or the grammar, semiosis or organisation of language, to lay bare how apparently innocuous texts go about silencing, euphemising and dysphemising.

CDA and LP

Language policy is mostly conducted through texts, texts that are essentially political in nature, persuasive in intent, and which have profound and long lasting effects. The public texts are mostly state authored, public discourse around language is more amenable to the effects of research based evidence and participation, and performance of language policy in education settings, among others, opens spaces for interpretation, and even subversion of other processes of language planning. This sequence of the intended, the enacted and the experienced domains of language planning suffers from being located within bureaucratic systems which require managerial processes of decision making. This makes language planning vulnerable to repudiation by CDA but in this repudiation CDA scholars run the risk of not appreciating the potential for genuine democratic and progressive improvements in the communicative lives of many people and among the most disadvantaged social categories.

As a 'science' LP has been critiqued by CDA and found wanting. Luke, McHoul and Mey (1990) using Habermas, scathingly critique its 'pretence to science', showing how it ends up serving state interests

as it goes about the business of reducing space for small languages, small language communities, and the identities and communities they make possible, in the interests of efficiency, homogenous populations and mass basic literacy.

This is undoubtedly true of language planning, in Australia (Nicholls, 2001; Power, 2001; Ozolins, 2001; Scarino and Papademetre, 2001; Singh, 2001), as elsewhere. Nevertheless, it must be said that during the 1970s and 1980s Australian language policy debate was characterised by high levels of participation, generating attitudinal improvements and major public resourcing. This unprecedented and productive phase in national language planning yielded major progress towards recognising pluralism, language rights, and concrete action towards ameliorating persistent discrimination and disadvantage, during which, it must also be said, practitioners of CDA were largely absent and silent.

They were also absent and silent when, during the mid 1990s, these progressive language policies were dismantled, and again when they were demolished under the competitive free market neo-liberal ideologies. Generating the public texts of language policy requires engagement with the discourses of language planning, and in turn requires engagement with processes of state and administration which, like opera, impose a certain "suspension of disbelief". Refusal to participate in the activism of public policy because it is inevitably tied to bureaucracies and administration ends up being damaging to CDA's loftiest aspirations and claims, even if in the short term such refusal to engage can appear like refusal to be appropriated.

Conclusion

Participating in the productive design of new images, roles and patterns for languages in society runs the risk of severe critique by some of the exacting standards of some practitioners of CDA, but to honour the stated claim of CDA to not only expose interested and ideologically biased language but to contribute to social transformation requires CDA to move beyond its charmed circle of self-approbation and invest in a reinvigorated discourse analysis.

While this new CDA will require more modesty in its claims and more self-criticism of its method, both of these can be internally generated. What is more important is collaborative engagement with minority communities, marginal populations, and language planners charting new designs for literacy and languages as well as discourse.

References

- Billig, M. (1995), *Banal nationalism*. London: Sage Publications.
- Blommaert, J. (ed), (1999). The debate is close. In J. Blommaert (Ed.), *Language ideological debates* (pp. 425-438). Berlin : Mouton de Gruyter.
- Bourdieu, P. (1982). The economics of linguistic exchanges. *Social Science Information*, 16, 645-68.
- Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and symbolic power*. Cambridge, MA : Harvard University Press.
- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Davis, K.A. (1994). *Language planning in multilingual contexts. Policies, communities and schools in Luxembourg*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and power*. London: Longman.
- Fairclough, N. (Ed.) (1992). *Critical language awareness*. London: Longman.
- Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis*. London: Longman.
- Goffman, E. (1967). On facework: An analysis of ritual elements in social interaction. In A. Jaworski & N. Coupland (Eds.), *The discourse reader* (pp. 306-321). London: Routledge.
- Hajek, J. (2000). Language planning and the sociolinguistic environment in East Timor: Colonial practice and changing language ecologies. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 1(3), 400-414.
- Ives, P. (2004), *Language and hegemony in Gramsci*. London and Ann Arbor, Mi: Pluto Press.
- Kress, G. (1990), Critical discourse analysis. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 11, 84-99.
- Kress, G. (1996). Representational resources and the production of subjectivity: questions for the theoretical development of critical discourse analysis in a multicultural society. In C. R. Cadas-Coulthard & M. Coulthard (Eds.), *Texts and practices: Readings in Critical Discourse Analysis* (pp. 15-31). London: Routledge.
- Kress, G. (2000). Design and transformation, new theories of meaning. In B. Cope & M. Kalantzis

- (Eds.), *Multiliteracies* (pp. 153-162). London: Routledge.
- Lakoff, G. (2002). *Moral politics: How liberals and conservatives think* (2nd Edition). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lakoff, G. (2004). *Don't think of an elephant*. Melbourne: Scribe Publications.
- Lo Bianco, J. (2005). Globalisation and National Communities of Communication. *Language Problems and Language Planning*, 29(2), 109-135.
- Lo Bianco, J. (2008a), Tense Times and Language Policy. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 9(2), 155-178.
- Lo Bianco, J. (2008b). *Keeping Language Diversity Alive*. Alexandria, VA: TESOL.
- Luke, A., McHoul, A.W., & Mey, J.L. (1990). On the limits of language planning: Class, state and power. In R.B. Baldauf Jr., & A. Luke, *Language Planning and Education in Australasia and the South Pacific* (pp. 25-44). Clevedon, Avon: Multilingual Matters.
- Martin, J. (2000). Beyond exchange: Appraisal systems in English. In S. Hunston & G. Thompson (Eds.), *Evaluation in text* (pp. 142-175). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Martin, J. (2002). Blessed are the peacemakers: Reconciliation and evaluation. In C. Candlin (Ed.), *Research and practice in professional discourse* (pp. 187-226). Hong Kong: City University of Hong Kong Press.
- Martin, J. (2004). Positive discourse analysis: Solidarity and change. *Revista Canaria de Estudios Ingleses*, 49 (Special Issue on Discourse Analysis at Work: Recent Perspectives in the Study of Language and Social Practice), 179-200.
- Moore, H.M. (1996). Language policies as virtual realities: Two Australian examples. *TESOL Quarterly*, 30(1) (Autumn), 473-497.
- Nicholls, C. (2001). Reconciled to what? Reconciliation and the Northern Territory's bilingual education program, 1973-1998. In J. Lo Bianco & R. Wickert (Eds.), *Australian policy activism in language and literacy* (pp. 107-129). Melbourne: Language Australia.
- Ozolins, U. (1993). *The politics of language in Australia* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ozolins, U. (2001). Inventiveness and regression: Interpreting/Translating and the vicissitudes of Australian language policy. In J. Lo Bianco & R. Wickert (Eds.), *Australian policy activism in language and literacy* (pp. 107-129). Melbourne: Language Australia.
- Pennycook, A. (2001). *Critical applied linguistics, a critical approach*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Power, D. (2001). Deafness and sign language in government policy documents, 1983-1990. In J. Lo Bianco & R. Wickert (Eds.), *Australian policy activism in language and literacy* (pp. 107-129). Melbourne: Language Australia.
- Scarino, A., & Papademetre, L. (2001). Ideologies, languages, policies: Australia's ambivalent relationship with learning to communicate in "other" languages. In J. Lo Bianco & R. Wickert (Eds.), *Australian policy activism in language and literacy* (pp. 305-325). Melbourne: Language Australia.
- Schmidt, A. (1990). The loss of Australia's Aboriginal language heritage. Institute report series. Canberra : Aboriginal Studies Press.
- Singh, M. (2001). Advocating the sustainability of linguistic diversity. In J. Lo Bianco & R. Wickert (Eds.), *Australia, Policy Activism in Language and Literacy* (pp. 107-129). Melbourne: Language Australia .
- Searle, J. (1969). *Speech Acts: An essay in the philosophy of language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Steiner, G., (1998). *After Babel: Aspects of language and translation* (3rd edition) Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Van Dijk, T. (1991). *Racism and the press*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Wodak, R. (1989). *Language, power and ideology*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Wodak, R. (1996). *Disorders of discourse*. London: Longman.
- Weinstein, B. (1979). Language strategists: Redefining political frontiers on the basis of linguistic choices. *World Politics*, 31(3), 344-364.
- Weinstein, B. (1983). *The civic tongue: Political consequences of Language choices*. New York: Longman.
- Wickert, R. (2001). Politics, activism and processes of policy production: Adult literacy in Australia. In J. Lo Bianco & R. Wickert (Eds.), *Australian policy activism in language and literacy* (pp. 67-84). Melbourne: Language Australia.
- Williams, R. (1958). *Culture and society, 1750-1950*. London: Chatto and Windus.