

Discourse & Society

<http://das.sagepub.com/>

Critical Discourse Analysis and the Marketization of Public Discourse: The Universities

Norman Fairclough

Discourse Society 1993 4: 133

DOI: 10.1177/0957926593004002002

The online version of this article can be found at:

<http://das.sagepub.com/content/4/2/133>

Published by:



<http://www.sagepublications.com>

Additional services and information for *Discourse & Society* can be found at:

Email Alerts: <http://das.sagepub.com/cgi/alerts>

Subscriptions: <http://das.sagepub.com/subscriptions>

Reprints: <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsReprints.nav>

Permissions: <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav>

Citations: <http://das.sagepub.com/content/4/2/133.refs.html>

Critical discourse analysis and the marketization of public discourse: the universities

Norman Fairclough

UNIVERSITY OF LANCASTER

ABSTRACT. This paper sets out the author's view of discourse analysis and illustrates the approach with an analysis of discursive aspects of marketization of public discourse in contemporary Britain, specifically in higher education. It includes a condensed theoretical account of critical discourse analysis, a framework for analysing discursive events, and a discussion of discursive practices (including their marketization) in late capitalist society, as well as analysis of samples of the discourse of higher education. The paper concludes with a discussion of the value of critical discourse analysis as a method in social scientific research, and as a resource for social struggle.

KEY WORDS: critical discourse analysis, discourse and authority, discourse and identity, higher education, promotional culture, marketization

The objective of this paper is, first, to set out my own view of critical discourse analysis, and, second, to illustrate the practice of critical discourse analysis through a discussion of marketization of public discourse in contemporary Britain. The first section of the paper, 'Towards a Social Theory of Discourse', is a condensed theoretical account of critical discourse analysis. The second section, 'Analytical Framework', sets out a three-dimensional framework for analysing discursive events. Readers will find the view of the field sketched out in these sections more fully elaborated in Fairclough (1989, 1992a). The third section makes a transition between the rather abstract account of the first two sections and the illustrative example: it is a reflection on language and discursive practices in contemporary ('late capitalist') society, which it is claimed make a critical, social and historical orientation to language and discourse socially and morally imperative. The fourth section is a text-based examination of the marketization of discursive practices as a process which is pervasively transforming public discourse in contemporary Britain, with particular reference to higher education. The paper concludes with a discussion of the value of critical discourse analysis, as a method to be used alongside others

DISCOURSE & SOCIETY © 1993 SAGE (London, Newbury Park and New Delhi), VOL. 4(2): 133–168.

in social scientific research on social and cultural change, and as a resource in struggles against exploitation and domination.

TOWARDS A SOCIAL THEORY OF DISCOURSE

Recent social theory has produced important insights into the social nature of language and its functioning in contemporary societies which have not so far been extensively taken on board in language studies (and certainly not in mainstream linguistics). Social theorists themselves have generally articulated such insights abstractly, without analysis of specific language texts.¹ What is needed is a synthesis between these insights and text-analytical traditions within language studies. The approach developed in this section of the paper is aiming in that direction.

'Discourse' is a category used by both social theorists and analysts (e.g. Foucault, 1972; Fraser, 1989) and linguists (e.g. Stubbs, 1983; Van Dijk, 1985). Like many linguists, I shall use discourse to refer primarily to spoken or written language use, though I would also wish to extend it to include semiotic practice in other semiotic modalities such as photography and non-verbal (e.g. gestural) communication. But in referring to language use as discourse, I am signalling a wish to investigate it in a social-theoretically informed way, as a form of social practice.

Viewing language use as social practice implies, first, that it is a mode of action (Austin, 1962; Levinson, 1983) and, secondly, that it is always a socially and historically situated mode of action, in a dialectical relationship with other facets of 'the social' (its 'social context')—it is socially shaped, but it is also socially shaping, or *constitutive*. It is vital that critical discourse analysis explore the tension between these two sides of language use, the socially shaped and socially constitutive, rather than opting one-sidedly for a structuralist (as, for example, Pêcheux [1982] did) or 'actionalist' (as, for example, pragmatics tends to do) position. Language use is always simultaneously constitutive of (i) social identities, (ii) social relations and (iii) systems of knowledge and belief—though with different degrees of salience in different cases. We therefore need a theory of language, such as Halliday's (1978, 1985), which stresses its multifunctionality, which sees any text (in the sense of note 1) as simultaneously enacting what Halliday calls the 'ideational', 'interpersonal' and 'textual' functions of language. Language use is, moreover, constitutive in both conventional, socially reproductive ways, and creative, socially transformative ways, with the emphasis upon the one or the other in particular cases depending upon their social circumstances (e.g. whether they are generated within, broadly, stable and rigid, or flexible and open, power relations).

If language use is socially shaped, it is not shaped in monolithic or mechanical ways. On the one hand, societies and particular institutions and domains within them sustain a variety of coexisting, contrasting and often competing discursive practices ('discourses', in the terminology of many

social analysts). On the other hand, there is a complex relationship between particular discursive events (particular 'instances' of language use) and underlying conventions or norms of language use. Language may on occasion be used 'appropriately', with a straightforward application of and adherence to conventions, but it is not always or even generally so used as theories of appropriateness would suggest (see Fairclough, 1992b, for a critique of such theories).

It is important to conceptualize conventions which underlie discursive events in terms of *orders of discourse* (Fairclough, 1989, 1992a), what French discourse analysts call 'interdiscourse' (Pêcheux, 1982; Maingueneau, 1987). One reason for this is precisely the complexity of the relationship between discursive event and convention, where discursive events commonly combine two or more conventional types of discourse (for instance, 'chat' on television is part conversation and part performance: Tolson, 1991), and where texts are routinely heterogeneous in their forms and meanings. The order of discourse of some social domain is the totality of its discursive practices, and the relationships (of complementarity, inclusion/exclusion, opposition) between them—for instance in schools, the discursive practices of the classroom, of assessed written work, of the playground, and of the staff-room. And the order of discourse of a society is the set of these more 'local' orders of discourse, and relationships between them (e.g. the relationship between the order of discourse of the school and those of the home or neighbourhood). The boundaries and insulations between and within orders of discourse may be points of conflict and contestation (Bernstein, 1990), open to being weakened or strengthened, as a part of wider social conflicts and struggles (the boundary between the classroom and the home or neighbourhood would be an example). The categorization of types of discursive practice—the elements of orders of discourse—is difficult and controversial: for present purposes I shall simply distinguish between *discourses* (*discourse* as a count noun), ways of signifying areas of experience from a particular perspective (e.g. patriarchal versus feminist discourses of sexuality), and *genres*, uses of language associated with particular socially ratified activity types such as job interview or scientific papers (see, further, Kress, 1988, on the distinction between discourses and genres).

By 'critical' discourse analysis I mean discourse analysis which aims to systematically explore often opaque relationships of causality and determination between (a) discursive practices, events and texts, and (b) wider social and cultural structures, relations and processes; to investigate how such practices, events and texts arise out of and are ideologically shaped by relations of power and struggles over power; and to explore how the opacity of these relationships between discourse and society is itself a factor securing power and hegemony (see below). In referring to opacity, I am suggesting that such linkages between discourse, ideology and power may well be unclear to those involved, and more generally that our social practice is bound up with causes and effects which may not be at all apparent (Bourdieu, 1977).²

ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK

I use a three-dimensional framework of analysis for exploring such linkages in particular discursive events. Each discursive event has three dimensions or facets: it is a spoken or written language *text*, it is an instance of *discourse practice* involving the production and interpretation of text, and it is a piece of *social practice*. These are three perspectives one can take upon, three complementary ways of reading, a complex social event. In analysis within the social practice dimension, my focus is political, upon the discursive event within relations of power and domination. A feature of my framework of analysis is that it tries to combine a theory of power based upon Gramsci's concept of *hegemony* with a theory of discourse practice based upon the concept of intertextuality (more exactly, *interdiscursivity*—see further below). The connection between text and social practice is seen as being mediated by discourse practice: on the one hand, processes of text production and interpretation are shaped by (and help shape) the nature of the social practice, and on the other hand the production process shapes (and leaves 'traces' in) the text, and the interpretative process operates upon 'cues' in the text.

The analysis of text is form-and-meaning analysis—I formulate it in this way to stress their necessary interdependency. As I indicated above, any text can be regarded as interweaving 'ideational', 'interpersonal' and 'textual' meanings. Their domains are respectively the representation and signification of the world and experience, the constitution (establishment, reproduction, negotiation) of identities of participants and social and personal relationships between them, and the distribution of given versus new and foregrounded versus backgrounded information (in the widest sense). I find it helpful to distinguish two subfunctions of the interpersonal function: the 'identity' function—text in the constitution of personal and social identities—and the 'relational' function—text in the constitution of relationships. The analysis of these interwoven meanings in texts necessarily comes down to the analysis of the forms of texts, including their generic forms (the overall structure of, for instance, a narrative), their dialogic organization (in terms, for instance, of turn-taking), cohesive relations between sentences and relations between clauses in complex sentences, the grammar of the clause (including questions of transitivity, mood and modality), and vocabulary. Much of what goes under the name of pragmatic analysis (e.g. analysis of the force of utterances) lies on the borderline between text and discursive practice. (See Fairclough, 1992a, for a more detailed analytical framework, and see below for examples.)

The analysis of discourse practice is concerned with sociocognitive (Fairclough, 1985, 1989) aspects of text production and interpretation, as opposed to social-institutional aspects (discussed below). Analysis involves both the detailed moment-by-moment explication of how participants produce and interpret texts, which conversation analysis and pragmatics excel at, and analysis which focuses upon the relationship of the discursive event to the order of discourse, and upon the question of which discursive

practices are being drawn upon and in what combinations. My main interest, and main concern in this paper, is the latter.³ The concept of *interdiscursivity* highlights the normal heterogeneity of texts in being constituted by combinations of diverse genres and discourses. The concept of interdiscursivity is modelled upon and closely related to *intertextuality* (Kristeva, 1986), and like intertextuality it highlights a historical view of texts as transforming the past—existing conventions, or prior texts—into the present.

The analysis of the discursive event as social practice may refer to different levels of social organization—the context of situation, the institutional context, and the wider societal context or ‘context of culture’ (Malinowski, 1923; Halliday and Hasan, 1985). Questions of power and ideology (on ideology, see Thompson, 1990) may arise at each of the three levels. I find it useful to think about discourse and power in terms of hegemony (Gramsci, 1971; Fairclough, 1992a), both because control over discursive practices can helpfully be seen in terms of hegemonic struggle over orders of discourse, and because hegemony and hegemonic struggle in a broader sense may involve discourse to a substantial degree. For instance, the bid by Thatcher(ism) for political hegemony in Britain was conducted to a significant extent in discourse and over discursive practices (Hall, 1988; Fairclough, 1989). Hegemony is a more or less partial and temporary achievement, an ‘unstable equilibrium’ which is a focus of struggle, open to disarticulation and rearticulation. This seems to me to be also not an inappropriate description of an order of discourse, which can itself be seen as one domain of potential cultural hegemony. The seemingly limitless possibilities of creativity in discursive practice suggested by the concept of interdiscursivity—an endless combination and recombination of genres and discourses—are in practice limited and constrained by the state of hegemonic relations and hegemonic struggle. Where, for instance, there is a relatively stable hegemony, the possibilities for creativity are likely to be tightly constrained. For example, one might draw a rather gross contrast between dominance of cross-gender interaction by normative practices in the 1950s, and the creative explosion of discursive practices associated with the feminist contestation of male hegemony in the 1970s and 1980s.

This combination of hegemony and interdiscursivity in my framework for critical discourse analysis is concomitant with a strong orientation to historical change: to changing discursive practices and their place within wider processes of social and cultural change. Historical change ought, in my view, to be the primary focus and concern of critical discourse analysis if it is to be relevant to the great social issues of our day (see the next section). The concern with change has a dual orientation: on the one hand, towards the specificity of particular discursive events, as attempts to negotiate unstable and changing sociocultural circumstances in the medium of language, drawing upon and often transforming available discursive practices and orders of discourse; on the other hand, towards orders of discourse in the longer term, towards shifting discursive practices within and across social domains and institutions as one facet of social change. The

discussion below of marketization in public discourse, specifically in higher education, will provide an illustration.

It may be helpful to readers to have available a summary of some of the main terms introduced in the last two sections:

DISCOURSE (abstract noun)	language use conceived as social practice.
DISCURSIVE EVENT	instance of language use, analysed as text, discursive practice, social practice.
TEXT	the written or spoken language produced in a discursive event.
DISCOURSE PRACTICE	the production, distribution and consumption of a text.
INTERDISCURSIVITY	the constitution of a text from diverse discourses and genres.
DISCOURSE (count noun)	way of signifying experience from a particular perspective.
GENRE	use of language associated with a particular social activity.
ORDER OF DISCOURSE	totality of discursive practices of an institution, and relationships between them.

LANGUAGE AND DISCOURSE IN LATE CAPITALIST SOCIETY

Critical discourse analysis tends to be seen, certainly in many linguistics departments, as a marginal (and, for many, suspect) area of language study. Yet it ought, in my view, to be at the centre of a reconstructed discipline of linguistics, the properly social theory of language recently appealed for by Kress (1992). My first objective in this section is to suggest that strong support for this position comes from an analysis of the 'state' of language and discourse (i.e. of 'orders of discourse') in contemporary societies: if language studies are to connect with the actualities of contemporary language use, there must be a social, critical and historical turn. A second objective is to fill in the wider context of the processes of marketization of public discourse discussed in the next section.

My premise in this section is that the relationship between discourse and other facets of the social is not a transhistorical constant but a historical variable, so that there are qualitative differences between different historical epochs in the social functioning of discourse. There are also inevitably continuities: I am suggesting not radical disjuncture between, let us say, pre-modern, modern and 'postmodern' society, but qualitative shifts in the 'cultural dominant' (Williams, 1981)⁴ in respect of discursive practices, i.e. in the nature of the discursive practices which have most salience and impact in a particular epoch. I shall refer below particularly to Britain, but a *global* order of discourse is emerging, and many characteristics and changes have a quasi-international character.

Foucault's (1979) investigations into the qualitative shift in the nature and functioning of power between pre-modern and modern societies are

suggestive of some of the distinctive features of discourse and language in modern societies. Foucault has shown how modern 'biopower' rests upon technologies and techniques of power which are embedded within the mundane practices of social institutions (e.g. schools or prisons), and are productive of social subjects. The technique of 'examination', for example, is not exclusively linguistic but it is substantially defined by discursive practices—genres—such as those of medical consultation/examination and various other varieties of interview (Fairclough, 1992a). Certain key institutional genres, such as interview, but also more recently counselling, are among the most salient characteristics of modern societal orders of discourse. Discourse in modern as opposed to pre-modern societies is characterized by having the distinctive and more important role in the constitution and reproduction of power relations and social identities which this entails.

This Foucauldian account of power in modernity also makes sense of the emphasis in 20th-century social theory upon ideology as the key means through which social relations of power and domination are sustained (Gramsci, 1971; Althusser, 1971; Hall, 1982), the common-sense normalcy of mundane practices as the basis for the continuity and reproduction of relations of power. And Habermas (1984) gives a dynamic and historical twist to the analysis of the discourse of modernity through his postulation of a progressive colonization of the 'lifeworld' by the economy and the state, entailing a displacement of 'communicative' practices by 'strategic' practices, which embody a purely instrumental (modern) rationality. The process is well illustrated, for example, in the ways in which advertising and promotional discourse have colonized many new domains of life in contemporary societies (see further below and the next section).

I ought not to omit from this brief review of language and discourse in modernity phenomena of language standardization, which are closely tied in with modernization; one feature of the modern is the unification of the order of discourse, of the 'linguistic market' (Bourdieu, 1991), through the imposition of standard languages at the level of the nation-state.

Many of these characteristics of modern society are still evident in contemporary 'late capitalist' (Mandel, 1978) societies, but there are also certain significant changes affecting contemporary orders of discourse; they thus manifest a mixture of modernist and what some commentators (Jameson, 1984; Lash, 1990) characterize as 'postmodernist' features. The identification of 'postmodernist' features of culture is difficult and necessarily controversial in the sphere of discourse as in others. In what follows, I shall draw, very selectively, upon two recent accounts of contemporary culture, as 'late modernism' (see Giddens, 1991, and the related discussion of the 'risk society' in Beck, 1992) and as 'promotional culture' (see Wernick, 1991, and Featherstone, 1991, on 'consumer culture'), to tentatively identify three sets of interconnected developments in contemporary discursive practices.

1. *Contemporary society is 'post-traditional'* (Giddens, 1991). This means that traditions have to be justified against alternative possibilities rather

than being taken for granted; that relationships in public based automatically upon authority are in decline, as are personal relationships based upon the rights and duties of, for example, kinship; and that people's self-identity, rather than being a feature of given positions and roles, is reflexively built up through a process of negotiation (see also [3] below). Relationships and identities therefore increasingly need to be negotiated through dialogue, an openness which entails greater possibilities than the fixed relationships and identities of traditional society, but also greater risks.

A consequence of the increasingly negotiated nature of relationships is that contemporary social life demands highly developed dialogical capacities. This is so in work, where there has been a great increase in the demand for 'emotional labour' (Hochschild, 1983), and consequently communicative labour, as part of the expansion and transformation of the service sector. It is also true in contacts between professionals and publics ('clients'), and in relationships with partners, kin and friends. These demands can be a major source of difficulty, for not everyone can easily meet them; there is a notable new focus on training in the 'communicative skills' of face-to-face and group interaction in language education.

This provides a frame within which we can make sense of the process of 'informalization' (Wouters, 1986; Featherstone, 1991) which has taken place since the 1960s in its specifically discursive aspect, which I have called the 'conversationalization' of public discourse (Fairclough, 1992a, forthcoming).⁵ Conversationalization is a striking and pervasive feature of contemporary orders of discourse. On the one hand, it can be seen as a colonization of the public domain by the practices of the private domain, an opening up of public orders of discourse to discursive practices which we can all attain rather than the elite and exclusive traditional practices of the public domain, and thus a matter of more open access. On the other hand, it can be seen as an *appropriation* of private domain practices by the public domain: the infusion of practices which are needed in post-traditional public settings for the complex processes of negotiating relationships and identities alluded to above. The ambivalence of conversationalization goes further: it is often a 'synthetic personalization' associated with promotional objectives in discourse (see [3] below) and linked to a 'technologization' of discourse (see [2] below).

2. *Reflexivity, in the sense of the systematic use of knowledge about social life for organizing and transforming it, is a fundamental feature of contemporary society* (Giddens). In its distinctive contemporary form, reflexivity is tied to what Giddens calls *expert systems*: systems constituted by experts (such as doctors, therapists, lawyers, scientists and technicians) with highly specialized technical knowledge which we are all increasingly dependent upon. Reflexivity and expert systems even 'extend into the core of the self' (Giddens, 1991: 32): with the demise of the given roles and positions laid down within traditional practices, the construction of self-identity is a reflexive project, involving recourse to expert systems (e.g. therapy or counselling).

Discursive practices themselves are a domain of expertise and reflexivity. I have written elsewhere (Fairclough, 1992a) of the contemporary 'technologization of discourse', which can be understood in Giddens' terms as the constitution of expert systems whose domain is the discursive practices of, particularly, public institutions. The technologization of discourse combines research into existing discursive practices, redesign of those practices according to criteria of institutional effectivity, and training in the new practices. Examples would be the work of social psychologists in 'skills training', focusing, for instance, upon the conduct of job interviews (Argyle, 1978), or of management experts and consultants (e.g. Margerison, 1987). Technologization of discourse is, I suspect, most widely experienced in the form of top-down imposition of new discursive practices by organizations upon their members. For example, many workers in service industries whose labour has an 'emotional' character have experienced such institutional attempts to dictate how they should interact with members of the public. Two recent books by Tannen (1986, 1991) on cross-gender interaction between partners in personal relationships illustrate the emergence of expertise in this area in a form which is directly available to individuals in the building of personal identities.

3. *Contemporary culture has been characterized as 'promotional' or 'consumer' culture* (Wernick, 1991; Featherstone, 1991).⁶ These designations point to the cultural consequences of marketization and commodification—the incorporation of new domains into the commodity market (e.g. the 'culture industries') and the general reconstruction of social life on a market basis—and of a relative shift in emphasis within the economy from production to consumption. The concept of promotional culture can be understood in discursive terms as the generalization of promotion as a communicative function (Wernick, 1991: 181)—discourse as a vehicle for 'selling' goods, services, organizations, ideas or people—across orders of discourse.

The consequences of the generalization of promotion for contemporary orders of discourse are quite radical. First, there is an extensive restructuring of boundaries between orders of discourse and between discursive practices; for example, the genre of consumer advertising has been colonizing professional and public service orders of discourse on a massive scale, generating many new hybrid partly promotional genres (such as the genre of contemporary university prospectuses discussed in the next section). Second, there is a widespread instrumentalization of discursive practices, involving the subordination of meaning to, and the manipulation of meaning for, instrumental effect. In Fairclough (1989), for instance, I discussed 'synthetic personalization', the simulation in institutional settings of the person-to-person communication of ordinary conversation (recall the discussion of conversationalization in [1] above). This is a case of the manipulation of interpersonal meaning for strategic, instrumental effect.

Thirdly, and most profoundly, and also most contentiously, there is a change in what Lash (1990) calls the 'mode of signification', the relationship between signifier, signified and referent. One aspect of this is a shift in the relative salience of different semiotic modalities: advertising, for

example, had undergone a well-documented shift towards greater dependence upon visual images at the relative expense of verbal semiosis. But there is also, I suggest, a significant shift from what one might call signification-with-reference to signification-without-reference: in the former, there is a three-way relation between the two 'sides' of the sign (signifier, signified) and a real object (event, property, etc.) in the world; in the latter there is no real object, only the constitution of an 'object' (signified) in discourse. Of course, the possibility of both forms of signification is inherent in language, but one can nevertheless trace their comparative relative salience in different times and places.

The colonization of discourse by promotion may also have major pathological effects upon subjects, and major ethical implications. We are, of course, all constantly subjected to promotional discourse, to the point that there is a serious problem of trust: given that much of our discursive environment is characterized by more or less overt promotional intent, how can we be sure what's authentic? How, for example, do we know when friendly conversational talk is not just simulated for instrumental effect?⁷ This problem of trust is compounded by the significance for reflexive building of self-identity of choices made among the 'lifestyles' projected in association with the promotion of goods. But the pathological consequences go deeper; it is increasingly difficult not to be involved oneself in promoting, because many people have to as part of their jobs, but also because self-promotion is becoming part-and-parcel of self-identity (see [1] above) in contemporary societies. The colonizing spread of promotional discourse thus throws up major problems for what we might reasonably call the ethics of language and discourse.

This is, let me repeat, a tentative identification of changes in discursive practices and their relationship to wider social and cultural changes. Nevertheless, this sketch does, I hope, give some sense of aspects of 'the language question' as it is experienced in contemporary society. If this account carries conviction, then it would seem to be vital that people should become more aware and more self-aware about language and discourse. Yet levels of awareness are actually very low. Few people have even an elementary metalanguage for talking about and thinking about such issues. A critical awareness of language and discursive practices is, I suggest, becoming a prerequisite for democratic citizenship, and an urgent priority for language education in that the majority of the population (certainly of Britain) are so far from having achieved it (see Clark et al. 1990, 1991; Fairclough, 1992b). There is a major role and opportunity here for applied language studies, yet it will not be capable of undertaking it unless there is the critical, social and historical turn I am calling for.

MARKETIZATION OF PUBLIC DISCOURSE: THE UNIVERSITIES

In this section I refer to a particular case and specific texts in order to illustrate the theoretical position and analytical framework set out in the

first two sections, at the same time making more concrete the rather abstract account of contemporary discursive practices in the previous section. The case I shall focus upon is the marketization of discursive practices in contemporary British universities,⁸ by which I mean the restructuring of the order of discourse on the model of more central market organizations. It may on the face of it appear to be unduly introspective for an academic to analyse universities as an example of marketization, but I do not believe it is; recent changes affecting higher education are a typical case and rather a good example of processes of marketization and commodification in the public sector more generally.

The marketization of the discursive practices of universities is one dimension of the marketization of higher education in a more general sense. Institutions of higher education come increasingly to operate (under government pressure) as if they were ordinary businesses competing to sell their products to consumers.⁹ This is not just a simulation. For example, universities are required to raise an increasing proportion of their funds from private sources, and increasingly to put in competitive tenders for funding (e.g. for taking on additional groups of students in particular subject areas). But there are many ways in which universities are unlike real businesses—much of their income, for instance, is still derived from government grants. Nevertheless, institutions are making major organizational changes which accord with a market mode of operation, such as introducing an ‘internal’ market by making departments more financially autonomous, using ‘managerial’ approaches in, for example, staff appraisal and training, introducing institutional planning, and giving much more attention to marketing. There has also been pressure for academics to see students as ‘customers’ and to devote more of their energies to teaching and to developing learner-centred methods of teaching. These changes have been seen as requiring new qualities and skills from academics and indeed a transformation in their sense of professional identity. They are instantiated in and constituted through changed practices and behaviour at various levels, including changed discursive practices, though these have very much been ‘top-down’ changes imposed upon academic staff and students and the extent to which they have actually taken effect is open to question (see further below).

In what follows I wish to take up the discussion of ‘promotional’ culture in (3) in the last section. I suggest that the discursive practices (order of discourse) of higher education are in the process of being transformed through the increasing salience within higher education of promotion as a communicative function. This development is closely intertwined with the emergence of post-traditional features (see [1] in the last section), and I investigate in particular, focusing upon discursive practices, the following two interconnected questions: (a) What is happening to the authority of academic institutions and academics and to authority relations between academics and students, academic institutions and the public, etc? (b) What is happening to the professional identities of academics and to the collective identities of institutions?¹⁰ This entails an emphasis on interper-

SCHOOL OF ENGINEERING

With our reputation as one of the UK's leading centres of teaching excellence and research innovation, we're making a lasting impact on the next generation of innovators and business leaders in the field of Engineering — and you can help.

With your ambition, energy and expertise, you will be committed to teaching at both undergraduate and post-graduate level, while enjoying the advantage of our close links with industry and applied research initiatives to add to both your own reputation and ours.

SENIOR ACADEMIC POST

VEHICLE EMISSION TECHNOLOGY

Up to £31,500 p.a. plus substantial enhancement available by negotiation.

The School of Engineering is renowned for its innovative work in the area of Vehicle Emission Technology and is a leader in the field of Automotive Research. A team leader is now required to join this active team to help build on our success.

This leading post requires an outstanding Engineer who can bring expertise in at least one of the following:- Vehicle Pollution, Hybrid Vehicles, Air Quality Systems. You'll also need to be dedicated to progressing research and consultancy whilst lecturing to undergraduate and postgraduate students.

Along with appropriate qualifications, technological expertise and industrial experience, you will need to have energy, enthusiasm and communication skills to motivate your team.

We offer an excellent salary and benefits package, but more importantly the ideal environment and opportunity to really make a contribution to the future of automotive engineering.

You may be awarded the title of Professor if the relevant criteria are met.

For an informal discussion about the post please ring Professor David Tidmarsh, Director of School of Engineering on (0742) 533389.

Application forms and further details are available from the address below. Ref. 40/92.

**LECTURERS/SENIOR LECTURERS/
PRINCIPAL LECTURERS**

£10,949 — £28,851 p.a.

COMPUTER AIDED ENGINEERING

With expertise in one or more of the following: CAD, CAM, FEA, Expert Systems, AMT. Ref. 41/92.

QUALITY SYSTEMS

Applications to both Design and Manufacturing Engineering, offering expertise in one or more of the following areas; TQM, SPC, BS5750, BS7000, Taguchi Methods. A capability to contribute to the teaching of operations management will be an advantage. Ref. 42/92.

MANUFACTURING TECHNOLOGY

With expertise in one or more of the following: Metal and Polymer Forming, Non-conventional Manufacturing, AMT, Environmental Impact of Manufacturing. Ref. 43/92.

OPERATIONS MANAGEMENT

With expertise in one or more of the following: Expert Systems, Database Systems, Simulation, Manufacturing Planning and Control, CIM, CAPP, MRP. Ref. 44/92.

ENVIRONMENTAL ENGINEERING

(Two Posts)

Post 1: With expertise in one or more of the following: The chemistry of air/water pollution, the impact of geology, hydrology and ecology on environmental issues, impact of transport on the environment. Ref. 45/92.

Post 2: With expertise in Electro-hydraulic Control Systems, Automation, PLCs, Environmental Noise, Noise Control, Acoustics, Vibrations. Ref. 46/92.

MATERIALS ENGINEERING : MATERIALS RESEARCH INSTITUTE

An experienced graduate Materials Scientist or Metallurgist, ideally with an appropriate higher degree, to undertake research and development work in the Metals and Ceramics Research Group. The research work will involve the use of extensive SEM/STEM/XRD and surface analysis facilities applied to a range of metallurgical problems with a particular emphasis on surface engineering. Ref. 47/92.

For all the above posts you will ideally have industry-related experience to add to your degree and a record of achievement in research and/or consultancy activities. You will be committed to teaching excellence at both undergraduate and postgraduate levels and also have the enthusiasm and ability to be part of an active group and to initiate and supervise research, consultancy and short course programmes.

If you feel you have the ideas and expertise to make an impact in a dynamic, forward-looking environment, then please send for an application form and further details to the Personnel Department, Floor 3, 5 Storey Block, Pond Street, Sheffield S1 1WB. Telephone (0742) 533950. Closing date 8th June 1992.

We are actively implementing equality of opportunity policies and seek people who share our commitment. Job share applicants welcome. Women are under represented in this area and applications from this group are particularly welcomed.

The University working in partnership with industry and the professions.

**MAKE AN
IMPACT ON
THE NEXT
GENERATION**



**Sheffield
City Polytechnic**

**Promising
Futures**

EXAMPLE 1: Sample 1

**University of
Newcastle upon
Tyne**

Department of English
Literature

LECTURER

Applications are invited for a Lectureship in the Department of English Literature from candidates who have expertise in any Post-Medieval field. The post is available to be filled from 1st October, 1992, or as soon as possible thereafter.

Salary will be at an appropriate point on the Lecturer Grade A scale: £12,860 - £17,627 p.a. according to qualifications and experience.

Further particulars may be obtained from the Director of Personnel, Registrar's Office, University of Newcastle upon Tyne, 6 Kensington Terrace, Newcastle upon Tyne NE1 7RU, with whom applications (3 copies), together with the names and addresses of three referees, should be lodged not later than 29th May, 1992.

Please quote ref:
0726/THES.
(18704) B9905

EXAMPLE 1: Sample 2

**University of
Nottingham**

**LECTURESHIP
IN LAW**

The Department of Law is a thriving department committed to excellence in teaching and research across a broad range of legal disciplines. The successful applicant will share this commitment. Applications are invited from candidates with an interest in any field of Law, but the Department has a particular need in the area of Property Law.

The appointment will be made at the appropriate point on the Lecturer A and B scales according to age, qualifications and experience. Professor M.G. Bridge, the Head of the Law Department, is happy to answer any enquiries (Ext. 3376).

Further details and application forms, returnable not later than 26th May, from the Personnel Office, University of Nottingham, University Park, Nottingham NG7 2RD (Tel: 0602 484848, Ext. 2696), Ref. No. 1529. (18699) B9905

EXAMPLE 1: Sample 3

sonal dimensions of textual form/meaning (recall the discussion of the multifunctionality of language and discourse in the first section), and I refer in particular to four examples that are partially and of course highly selectively representative of the order of discourse of the contemporary university: press advertisements for academic posts (*Example 1*), programme materials for an academic conference (*Example 2*), an academic curriculum vitae (*Example 3*), and entries in undergraduate prospectuses (*Example 4*). I shall draw upon the analytical framework sketched out earlier.

Example 1: Advertisements

My first example consists of three advertisements for academic posts which appeared in the *Times Higher Education Supplement* on 22 May 1992. Advertisements by the newer universities (until the summer of 1992, polytechnics) and the older universities in general follow sharply different patterns at the time of writing. Sample 1 is a typical newer-university advertisement; Sample 2 a typical older university advertisement, though, as Sample 3 shows, there are intermediate types and incursions of the newer-university model into the more traditional one. (It will be interesting to see how practices evolve during the first few years of the post-binary system.) The analysis focuses upon Sample 1 and to a lesser extent Sample

2. I present my analysis here in accordance with the three-dimensional framework introduced earlier, but (for reasons of space) I am less systematic in discussing my other examples.

Discourse practice. Sample 1 is interdiscursively complex, articulating together a variety of genres and discourses, including elements of advertising and other promotional genres. It is an illustration of one of the features of promotionalized discursive practices I identified in the previous section—the generation of new hybrid, partly promotional genres. An obvious promotional element is the presence of features of commodity advertising genre, realized textually for instance in the ‘catchy’ headline (*Make an Impact on the Next Generation*) and in personalization of the reader (*you*) and the institution (*we*). In the latter respect, advertising simulates conversational genre, which is also therefore a part of the interdiscursive ‘mix’. In addition to general commodity advertising elements, there are elements from the genre of prestige or corporate advertising, including the self-promotional claims at the beginning (*With our reputation . . .*) and the logo. Some of the self-promotional material draws upon narrative genre; the section under the heading *School of Engineering*, for example, can be construed as a (simple) story about the institution’s impact on the next generation. A discourse of personal qualities is also an element of the interdiscursive mix (e.g. *with your ambition, energy*), as is a discourse of (educational) management, realized textually most notably in nominalizations such as *teaching excellence, expertise, a dynamic, forward-looking environment*. There are also, of course, elements of the more traditional genre and discourse of university job advertisements (e.g. *Application forms and further details are available from the address below. Ref. 40/92*).

Text. I begin with more general comments on contrasting interpersonal meanings in Samples 1 and 2, then move on to a more detailed discussion of their textual realizations.

The institutional identity projected in Sample 2 is impersonal, distant, settled (in a sense I explain below) and conservative. The institutional voice is that of a traditional university. The institution claims authority only with respect to the post and its conditions and procedures of application. There is no attempt to project a specific professional identity for the potential applicant. Very similar interpersonal meanings are present in those parts of Sample 1 which draw upon the traditional genre and discourse of academic advertisements (e.g. *Application forms and further details are available from the address below*), but the sample is characterized by contradictory interpersonal meanings in accordance with its complex interdiscursive mix, and its most salient interpersonal meanings are drawn from the dominant, promotional and self-promotional elements in that mix. The predominant institutional identity projected is personalized and assertive (self-promotional). While the identity of the institution in Sample 2 is taken as settled and given, there is an obvious sense in which Sample 1 is actively constructing an institutional identity. Again, not only

is a professional identity for the potential application set up in the text in contrast with Sample 2, but also it is actively constructed in parts of the text which are about the qualities of a successful applicant (e.g. *With your ambition, energy and expertise, you will be committed to teaching . . .*). In these sections, the institution is claiming authority over the identity of applicants (including in terms of what are traditionally seen as personal qualities), as well as elsewhere (like Sample 2) over the post, its conditions and application procedures. The personalization of both institution (*we*) and addressees (*you*), and the individualized address of potential applicants (it is a singular not a plural *you*), simulate a conversational and therefore relatively personal, informal, solidary and equal relationship between institution and potential applicant, and other features (see below) reinforce this.

Realization of these interpersonal meanings involves analysis of the text in several dimensions. The *generic structure* of Sample 2 follows traditional advertising for academic posts: a heading identifying the institution, then the main heading giving the title of the post, then details of the post and salary, then procedure for applying. Sample 1 is hybrid, showing evidence of three elements in its interdiscursive mix: commodity advertising, and prestige advertising, as well as traditional advertising for academic posts. The traditional headings are missing, and there is a catchy advertising-style headline (though not actually at the head of the advertisement) and a signature line which identifies the institution with a logo and slogan as well as its title. The body of the advertisement begins with a promotional characterization of the institution, and a characterization of the suitable applicant for the posts advertised. These advertising and promotional elements foreground the predominant interpersonal meanings identified above.

Parts of Sample 1 are generically structured as narratives—the section beneath the heading *School of Engineering* is an example. The rather simple story is of the reader as a possible future employee working within the institution. Such narrative is not a feature of traditional university job advertisements (nor of Sample 2), and its presence here is linked to the shift identified above towards a more active discursive construction of professional identity. Notice in this connection an otherwise rather odd feature of modality and tense, exemplified here in *you will be committed to teaching*, which occurs several times in the sample; this is a potentially face-threatening prediction about the professional ethics as well as behaviour of the potential employee, with the modal verb (*will*) marking a high-level of commitment to the proposition, which, however, loses its face-threatening character in the imaginary scenario portrayed in the narrative. Although the story is, as I have said, a rather simple one, it is more elaborate than its meagre two sentences would suggest. These narrative sentences have a form of complexity which one does not find in traditional academic advertisements. Both sentences contain a number of subordinate clauses and both have prepositional phrases introduced by *with* which contain presupposed propositions. In all, there are seven propositions in this narrative (in

abbreviated form; we have a reputation, we are making an impact, you can help, you have ambition, etc., you will be committed to teaching, you will enjoy the advantage of our links, you will add to your reputation and ours). Notice that the paratactic clause linked with a dash to sentence 1 (*—and you can help*) evokes a conversational style which gives a touch of informality to the personalized relationship between institution and potential applicant.

Turning to the *grammar* of the *clause*, I want to comment in turn on features of *modality*, *mood* and *transitivity* (Halliday, 1985). The authority of the institution with respect to the post, its conditions and the procedure of application in Sample 2 is partly realized in mood and modality features. Clauses are, of course, declarative, with high-affinity epistemic (or ‘probability’) modalities such as *the post is available* or *salary will be . . .* There is also one instance of deontic (‘obligational’) modality (*applications . . . should be lodged*), and one case (*further particulars may be obtained*) with an ambivalence between epistemic and deontic modality (mixing ‘possibility’ with ‘permission’) which is characteristic for this discourse. Sample 1 has several instances of imperative mood (*make an impact on the next generation, please send for an application form*) which accord with the personalized institution–audience relationship noted above. As in Sample 2, the authority of the institution is marked through high-affinity epistemic modalities. However, explicit obligational modalities are absent. I noted above the frequency of clauses with modal auxiliary *will* marking futurity plus high-affinity epistemic modality. These are, in some cases, set within developed if simple narratives, as I have indicated, but this is not always so: the advertisement seems generally to cast the potential applicant in the imaginary role of future employee. But notice that these clauses (e.g. *for all the above posts you will ideally have industry-related experience*) provide *alternatives* to obligational clauses (such as *you should have industry-related experience*), in which obligational meanings can be backgrounded. This accords with the personalized, solidary and equal relationship claimed between institution and potential applicant which I described above. So also does the foregrounding of the activity of the potential applicant in these clauses (and also, for instance, in *you can help*, with a modal verb ambivalent between ‘possibility’ and ‘ability’). Although it takes us beyond mood to pragmatics and speech acts, let me also note here the frequency of clauses which make claims about the institution (e.g. *The School of Engineering is renowned for its innovative work . . .*), which realize the self-constructive and self-promotional institutional identity I have referred to.

In terms of transitivity, there are two features of Sample 2 which contribute to its qualities of impersonality: passives and nominalizations. Both are illustrated in its opening sentence: *Applications are invited for a Lectureship*. The passive verb is agentless, so that the institution is not present in the surface grammar, and the nominalization (*applications*) also lacks an agent, so that the potential applicant is also absent. There are elements of this impersonal style in Sample 1 (e.g. *applications from this group are particularly welcomed*) but they are not salient.

There are a number of points which might be made about the vocabulary of these samples, but I shall make just two. First, the formal-sounding and slightly archaic vocabulary of Sample 2 (such as *thereafter*, *particulars*, *lodged*) accords with the impersonality and distance of the institutional identity set up. Vocabulary of this sort is not present in Sample 1. By contrast (and this is the second point), Sample 1 uses a vocabulary and collocations of educational management (*teaching excellence*, *expertise*, *a dynamic, forward-looking environment*, *progressing research*, *research and consultancy*), as well as a vocabulary of personal qualities and skills. From the perspective of discursive practice, these vocabularies belong to separate discourses which I identified earlier as belonging to the interdiscursive mix. The appropriation of these discourses is, I think, part of the process of constructing a new corporate identity for the higher education institution.

Social practice. The observations on marketization of universities at the beginning of this section are part of the wider social practice within which these discourse samples are located. It is also relevant that these samples appeared in a period of transition between announcement of the abolition of the binary divide between polytechnics (referred to as the 'newer' universities above) and (older) universities, and its full implementation. There are many relevant historical factors here. For example, there have been particularly strong links between the newer universities and business, and polytechnics were in conception more vocationally oriented than universities, though they have also evolved many courses which are like traditional university courses. Sample 1 illustrates a type of job advertisement found widely for posts in business. For instance, a rapid survey of the *Guardian* at the time of writing shows that the great majority of advertisements for posts in marketing resemble Sample 1 rather than Sample 2 in terms of the sorts of features discussed above. One development that is at issue here, therefore, seems to be the fracturing of the boundary between the orders of discourse of higher education and business as regards advertising, and a colonization of the former by the latter. This can be construed as one rather particular discursive manifestation of the processes of marketization of higher education referred to above. As Sample 3 shows, this colonization of academic discourse affects older universities as well, though there is generally at the time of writing a rather clear correlation between the two types of advertisement and the older and newer universities. This case is, I think, an interesting one in terms of struggles to restructure hegemony within the order of discourse of higher education. At present, there are in this specific area of discursive practice two orders of discourse which have not yet been unified. I would predict that, with the breakdown of divisions between institutional types, that situation is highly unlikely to persist. It will be interesting to see whether and how the two orders of discourse begin to unify, and whether and how a struggle develops around the traditional advertising practice illustrated by Sample 2 and the new, interdiscursively complex practice illustrated by Sample 1. A significant issue in monitoring developments will be to monitor changes in

processes and routines of drafting and production of advertisements, and it will also be interesting to monitor the responses of potential applicants to different advertising styles.

Example 2: Programme materials; Example 3: Curriculum vitae

I want to refer rather more briefly, and without systematically using the three-dimensional framework of analysis, to two of my other examples, as further instances of the incursion of promotion and self-promotion into the order of discourse of higher education, and of the reconstruction of, respectively, corporate and individual professional identities.

Example 2. The first is the 'pack' given to participants in a one-day academic conference held recently at Lancaster University.¹¹ The conference was a highly prestigious event with two of the foremost sociologists in Europe as its main speakers. The 'pack' consisted of

- (a) a brief account of the topic of, participation in and organization of the conference;
- (b) a programme;
- (c) a page of notes on 'platform participants', their academic positions, publications and other distinctions;
- (d) a page on the research centre which co-organized the conference, its history, personnel, research activities, relationships with other organizations;
- (e) a rather spaciouly laid-out seven-page list of participants with their institutions, divided into external participants and Lancaster participants;
- (f) an evaluation form for the conference.

Conferences of this sort are increasingly used as a means of promoting academic organizations, as well as being motivated for more conventional academic reasons, and this example is, I think, fairly typical of the tendency. While (a) and (d) are the most obviously promotional elements, one could argue that even (e) has a promotional function in using a rather spacious layout to underline the distinguished array of participants in the conference. Here is (a):

This one-day conference links the growing body of sociological thought on Risk in Society (as in recent studies by social theorists such as Giddens, Beck, Baumann and others), with the phenomenon of world-wide environmental concern and cultural change. It is timed to relate to the imminent first publication in English of Ulrich Beck's celebrated book *Risikogesellschaft* (*The Risk Society*), one of the most influential and best-selling works of post-war European sociology.

The conference will bring together sociologists from the UK and continental Europe on these questions for the first time. It is organised jointly by Lancaster's Centre for the Study of Environmental Change (CSEC) and Sociology Department, with the support of the Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC).

It is quite a good example of a widespread contemporary ambivalence; is

this information, or is it promotion? The promotional function seems to have become more salient in ('colonized') a whole range of types of informative discourse. Does meaning (here, the giving of background information relevant to the conference) have primacy, or is it subordinated to effect (constructing the conference as a highly significant event in the minds of its participants)? For example, the information in sentence 2 is on one level certainly accurate (Beck's book has had a rapturous reception and has just been published in English). Yet why *imminent* (with its portentous associative meaning) rather than *forthcoming*? Why *first* publication (implying, but only on the basis of a guess, that there will be more)? Why *Ulrich* Beck (it was simply *Beck* in sentence 1? Why not stop at *celebrated book* (which gives the information about the book's reception), why add the reduced relative clause (*one of the . . . European sociology*), especially since the addressees are those who have elected to attend the conference, who are mostly 'in the know'? Is this sentence on balance *referring* to the book and its imminent publication, or rather *constructing* the book and the event? In short, is this sentence mainly informative or mainly to do with promoting the book (notice the vague—one might even say euphemistic—verb *relate to*) and thereby implicitly the conference (if the book is that significant, so by implication is a conference where the author is talking about the topic of the book)? As so often in contemporary society, the giving of information is taking place in a context where there is a premium on winning people to see things in a particular way. Notice the closed nature of this promotional work; the conference is being promoted amongst its own participants, who constitute a significant section of the constituency empowered to give the institution the recognition it is seeking. I should perhaps add that I suspect that these promotional objectives would be no mystery to most of those who participated; people who attend such conferences seem generally prepared to live with promotional objectives, limiting themselves to ironic, distancing comments in private which suggest that for some academics at least such apparently necessary work on institutional identity does not sit easily with their sense of their own professional self-identity.

Example 3. The next example I want to look at specifically in terms of promotion—and more exactly self-promotion—is an extract from a curriculum vitae (CV). Such data are sensitive for obvious reasons, and I have therefore used an extract from a CV I prepared myself in 1991 for an academic promotions committee. The form of submissions to this committee is controlled by procedural rules which specify the maximum length of a CV and the categories of information it should contain, and require a 'supporting statement' of no more than 'two sides of A4 paper'. The extract I have chosen is a paragraph from the supporting statement. Unlike the CV proper, the content of the supporting statement is not specified in the procedural rules. I had to make informal enquiries to find out what was expected. I was able to look at previous submissions by colleagues, and I received advice from a colleague with experience of the committee. From

these sources, I gathered that the supporting statement had to be a compelling account of one's contribution to, if possible, all of the categories of activity in two overlapping schemes of categorization: to research, teaching and administration; and to the department, the university, and the wider community (these categorization schemes are actually spelt out in the procedural rules, though not specifically with reference to the supporting statement). The advice I received was that one had to 'sell' oneself to stand any chance of success. The following extract from an internal memorandum, produced shortly after I had prepared the submission, gives a sense of the prevailing wisdom at the time:

To succeed, departments have to 'sell' their candidates. One cannot expect merit to gleam with its own halo; the halo has been assiduously polished up! Put differently, this means that one has to hone one's application to give an impression of all-round excellence, preferably over a period of time, with feedback from others.

This easily extends to an emphasis on the need for extended preparation for the well-honed application—for instance, it is helpful to have favourable student feedback on one's courses, ideally over several years. One's future promotability may become a significant factor in the planning of one's current activities. Here is the extract:

Contributions to the Department

I have I believe played a significant role in the academic and administrative leadership of the Department over the past eight years or so. I was Head of Department from 1984 to 1987 and again for one term in 1990, and I have carried a range of other responsibilities including MA and undergraduate programme coordination and admissions. I helped to set up and now help to run the Centre for Language in Social Life. Through my coordination of the Language, Ideology and Power research group and in other activities, I have stimulated research (e.g. on critical language awareness) among colleagues and postgraduate students, and helped form what is now being recognized nationally and internationally as a distinctive Lancaster position on and contribution to study of language and language problems in contemporary British society. I am currently helping to edit a collection of Centre for Language in Social Life papers for publication.

Some of the self-promotional properties of the extract are obvious enough. There is a series of claims realized as clauses with past tense, present perfective and present continuous verbs and *I* as subject and theme. These are mainly claims which are categorical in their modality, positive assertions without explicit modalizing elements, though there is a subjective modality marker in the first clause (*I believe*) which (a) foregrounds the subjective basis of judgement in the whole paragraph in that the first clause is a summary/formulation of the paragraph, but also (b) foregrounds (one might say rather brazenly) the self-promotional nature of the activity. (For the analytical terminology used here see Halliday, 1985, and Fairclough, 1992a.) Except for one relational process (*I was Head of Department*), all clauses in the extract contain action processes. It would seem that material actional process verbs are consistently being selected

even where other process types would be just as congruent with or more congruent with the happenings and relationships reported—for instance, although I am indeed one of the five co-directors of the Centre for Language in Social Life, it receives practically no ‘running’ from anyone, and I might well (indeed better) have worded this *am now an active member of*. Similarly *played a significant role in* might have been *been a significant part of*, *carried a range of other responsibilities* might have been *had a range of other responsibilities*, *helped to set up* might have been *was a founding member of*, and so forth. These changes would, I think, reduce the sense of dynamic activity conveyed in the extract. A noteworthy lexical choice is *leadership* in the first sentence. The wording of academic relationships in terms of *leadership* belongs, in my view, to a managerial discourse which has come to colonize the academic order of discourse recently, and which I actually find deeply antipathetic. In terms of the characteristics of promotional discourse discussed earlier, the extract is very much a signification/construction of its subject/object rather than just referentially based description, and meaning would seem to be subordinated to effect.

I suppose I saw the preparation of the submission as a rhetorical exercise. By which I mean that I was consciously using language in a way I dislike, playing with and parodying an alien discourse, in order to ‘play the game’ and convince the committee of my merits. That is rather a comforting account of events, and a common enough one; the self stands outside or behind at least some forms of discursive practice, simply assuming them for strategic effects. I felt embarrassed about the submission, but that is, I think, compatible with the rhetorical account. There are, however, problems with this account. In the first place, it assumes a greater consciousness of and control over one’s practice than is actually likely to be the case. For instance, while I was quite conscious of what was at stake in using *leadership*, I was not aware at the time of how systematically I was ‘converting’ all processes to actions, although I *could* have been (and perhaps I ought to have been)—unlike most people I have the analytical apparatus. More seriously, the rhetorical account underestimates the incorporative capacity of institutional logics and procedures. Whereas the average academic rarely has contact with promotions committees, contact with other organizational forms whose procedures are based upon the same logics are necessary and constant. Doing one’s job entails ‘playing the game’ (or various connected games), and what may feel like a mere rhetoric to get things done quickly and easily becomes a part of one’s professional identity. Self-promotion is perhaps becoming a routine, naturalized strand of various academic activities, and of academic identities.

Example 4: Prospectuses

My final example consists of extracts from Lancaster University’s undergraduate prospectuses for the years 1967–8 (Extract 1), 1986–7 (Extract 2), and 1993 (Extract 3). I have used part of the English entry from the first, and part of the Linguistics entries from the second and third (Linguis-

tics was taught within English in 1967–8)—see Appendix. I focus upon differences between the 1993 and 1967–8 samples, the 1986–7 sample being included to show an intermediate stage in the development of the prospectus genre. A first observation is that the earliest and most recent entries are sharply different in their content. The 1967–8 entry (Extract 1) consists of: (a) approximately half a page on the English BA degree, specifically on the view of the study of English it embodies; (b) an itemized list of the ‘special interests’ of the department; (c) approximately one page on the detailed content of the English BA degree. The 1993 entry (Extract 3) consists of (a) a box detailing entry policy and requirements; (b) three paragraphs on the department—its staff, courses, academic links, academic achievements, and ethos; (c) a headed section on assessment; (d) a headed section on graduate careers; (e) a one-page diagrammatic summary of the undergraduate Linguistics degree; (f) a colour photograph showing students learning to use a spectograph. I shall focus my comments again on aspects of authority and identity.

I shall begin with textual analysis, considering specifically meanings of requirement and obligation and their formal realizations. Sections (a), (c) and (e) of the 1993 entry (entry requirements, assessment, and the undergraduate degree structure) involve requirements placed by the institution upon students or applicants. Most of the 1967–8 entry deals with degree structure, with entry requirements and assessment being dealt with elsewhere in the prospectus. Meanings of obligation and permission are extensively and overtly present in the 1967–8 entry. There are quite a few obligational and permissive modal auxiliary verbs (e.g. *subjects may be offered, each undergraduate will choose, third-year undergraduates must choose, any one course . . . may be offered*) and other modal expressions (*second-year undergraduates . . . are required to take; compare must take*). Obligation is expressed lexically as well as modally (in *no specialization . . . is permitted, a very limited concentration . . . is allowed*). By contrast, although meanings of requirement and obligation are implicit in the 1993 entry, they are not explicitly worded. This is facilitated by the use of tabular and diagrammatic layout for the entry requirements and the degree structure, which allow requirements to be left implicit. For instance, while **A/AS-level grades: BCC or equivalent** implies that applicants are required to achieve these grades, explicit obligational meanings are conspicuously absent. The degree structure section consists mainly of phrases (or ‘minor clauses’—see Halliday, 1985), but where a full clause is used the wording again backgrounds requirement (e.g. *You take at least three*, rather than, for example, *You must take at least three*). The assessment section again uses minor clauses and lacks overt obligational meanings.

A related contrast is between the impersonal style of the 1967–8 entry and the personalized style of the 1993 entry. Notice, for example, that the three passive verbs in the 1967–8 entry referred to above as instances of obligational meaning (*are required to take, is permitted, is allowed*) are ‘agentless’, that is, they lack an explicit agent, though in each case the institution is the implicit agent (it is the department, or the university, that

requires, permits and allows). There are also other agentless passives in the entry where the institution is implicit agent (e.g. *the Language course is so constructed as to be*). The opening sentence uses a different syntactic–semantic means to maintain impersonality; selecting *the undergraduate courses* as subject and agent of *treat*. This is, in Halliday’s terms, a ‘grammatical metaphor’ for a ‘congruent’ (non-metaphorical) grammaticization with, for example, *we* as subject/agent of *treat* and *undergraduate courses* within an adjunct (*we treat English as a whole subject in our undergraduate courses*). Another impersonalizing device is nominalization; *the special interests of the Department include the following*, with the nominalization (*the special interests of the Department*) as clause subject, avoids more personalized alternatives like *members of the Department* (or *we*) *are particularly interested in*. . . . It is also worth noting that what appear to be merely descriptive statements about the course could be reworded and regrammaticized in personalized ways: compare (the actual) *the course consists of three parts* with *the department/we organize(s) the course in three parts*.

Actually, there are two issues involved here. First, there is the issue of to what extent participants (here the institution and the potential applicant/student) in the processes referred to are made explicit or left implicit. Secondly, there is the issue of the grammatical person of these participants when they *are* explicit: third person, or first (*we*) and second person (*you*). (A further question is whether first and second person are singular or plural—in fact, where they are used, the institutional first person is plural [*we*] whereas the second person is singular—addressees are addressed individually.) With regard to the institution as participant, the 1967–8 entry is impersonal in both senses—not only is the institution referred to in the third person where it is explicit, it is often not explicit at all—whereas the 1993 entry is personalized in both senses as far as the institution is concerned—it is frequently explicit in the text, and it is first person.

But the picture is somewhat more complex for the addressees. There is some second-person direct address in the 1993 entry (*Linguistics does not commit you to any one career, you take at least three of*). But applicants are referred to in the third person in the opening entry requirements section (e.g. *all accepted candidates are invited to open days*—notice also the passive verb and missing institutional agent), and applicants/students are not referred to in the next section until its third paragraph (beginning *We are a friendly* . . .), and then in the third person (e.g. *the people we teach, students*). On the other hand, the 1967–8 entry is again impersonal in both senses with respect to addressees. For example:

. . . no specialization in either language or literature separately is permitted until the third year of study when a very limited concentration on either is allowed.

While the agentless passives avoid personalization of the institution as noted above, the nominalizations acting as their subjects (*no specialization, a very limited concentration*) avoid personalization of addressees

(compare *you cannot specialize until the third year of study*). An agentless passive is used to the same effect: *in Part II, various periods are studied*. Where the student participants are explicitly textualized, in the third person, it is generally particular groups of students who need to be explicitly identified (e.g. second-year undergraduates), though notice cases of individualized third person reference with *each* (*each undergraduate will choose*) and generic reference with the indefinite article (*may be offered by an undergraduate*).

Turning to some broader issues of social practice, these contrasting textual features mark a major historical shift in the nature and objectives of university prospectuses, in line with the wider changes in higher education I discussed earlier. The 1967–8 entry gives information about what is provided on a take-it-or-leave-it basis. In the 1993 prospectus, by contrast, the promotional function is primary; it is designed to ‘sell’ the university and its courses to potential applicants, in the context of a competitive market where the capacity of a university to attract good applicants is seen as one indicator of its success, and a factor which can affect how well it is funded. A revision of the prospectus can lead to a dramatic increase in applications; for instance, when Lancaster University revised its prospectus in the late 1980s, the number of applicants went up by 15 percent for two successive years. The content and form of the contemporary prospectuses are informed by market research—evidence of what applicants most want to know (hence the prominence of careers information in the 1993 entry), an understanding of the literacy culture of young people (e.g. the salience within it of ‘glossy’ printed material of various sorts), an understanding of the conditions of reading documents of this sort (they are likely to be flicked through rather than carefully read), and so forth.

These changes entail a shift in discourse practice, and specifically in the processes of prospectus production, of which the textual features noted above are realizations. The primacy of the promotional function in contemporary prospectuses entails drawing upon genres associated with advertising and other forms of promotional activity as well as the more traditional informationally oriented genre of university prospectuses, so that the 1993 entry, for example, is an interdiscursively hybrid quasi-advertising genre. The two entries are strikingly different in physical appearance: the earlier entry is based upon the conventional printed page, whereas the 1993 entry uses a brochure-style page size and layout with three print-columns per page, colour (the first page of the entry uses five colours), tabular layout and a photograph. The document is drawing upon visual and design features widely used in advertising and promotional material. As to the features noted earlier, promotional considerations are certainly behind the marked change in content between 1967–8 and 1993, especially the introduction of the three paragraphs about the department, which bring in a genre of prestige or corporate promotion. The personalization of the institution (as *we*), which occurs heavily in this part of the entry, is a part of this. Like individualized direct address with *you*, it is widely used in advertising. The avoidance of explicit obligational meanings

is also in line with the elevation of the promotional function. The avoidance of explicit obligational meanings marks a significant shift in authority relations. Promotional material addresses readerships as consumers or clients, and when someone is selling to a client, the client is positioned as having authority. This is generally true in advertising. It is in contradiction with the traditional authority of the university over applicants/students, and it places the institution in something of a dilemma, for it will obviously still wish to impose requirements and conditions upon entry, course structure and assessment. This dilemma over authority is given a textual resolution (though not necessarily a very satisfactory one): these requirements *are* included in the text, but *not* in overtly obligational forms. The text effects a compromise between the demands of two different situations and the conventions of two different genres (see Fairclough, 1988, for a further example). The text also effects a compromise as regards self-identity. The series of claims about the department which make up the first three paragraphs point to a promotional genre, but the claims are quite restrained (in comparison with, for example, Sample 1 of the job advertisements). A final note is that the interdiscursive mix I have suggested here appears to be achieving a hegemonic status in higher education publicity, as part of a more general dominance of a marketing ethos in this area of higher educational activity.

Summary

The four examples I have used above can hardly be said to be properly representative of the complex order of discourse of a modern university, but they do provide four contrasting 'takes' on the discursive practices of such institutions. They have, I hope, suggested how analysis of the discourse of organizations such as universities (in the terms of analytical framework introduced earlier) in their 'text' and 'discourse practice' dimensions can illuminate such matters as shifting authority relations and shifts in self-identity within organizations. The particular shifts I have identified can be summed up as (i) the decline of stable institutional identities which could be taken for granted, and a much greater investment of effort into the construction of more entrepreneurial institutional identities, (ii) a corresponding decline in the implicit (unspoken) authority of the institution over its applicants, potential students and potential staff, (iii) a reconstruction of professional identities of academics on a more entrepreneurial (self-promotional) basis, with the foregrounding of personal qualities.

The discursive instantiation of these shifts illustrates, I think, all three of the sets of developments in contemporary discursive practices identified in the previous section. I have already sufficiently highlighted the third of these, the elevation and generalization of the promotional function in discursive practices, and its consequences in terms of the hybridization of discourse practice, the subordination of meaning to effect, and the mode of signification. But the shifts I have identified can also be read (with respect

to the first of my sets of developments) in terms of Giddens' account of the post-traditional nature of contemporary society, and the corresponding informalization of society which is partly constituted through a conversationalization of discursive practices, which is also evident in my examples. The second set of developments, associated with the increased reflexivity of contemporary life and my concept of technologization of discourse, is also relevant here: one dimension of the much increased emphasis on staff development and training in higher education is the training of staff in the discursive practices of, for instance, marketing or preparation of research proposals for research councils (itself a heavily promotional form of discourse these days).

It would be premature to draw sweeping conclusions with respect to the 'social practice' dimension of my analytical framework on the basis of such a limited range of illustrative examples. But as I indicated in note 9, this paper is linked to a longer-term study of change in higher education. One of the questions which that study will address is whether developments in higher education amount to the emergence of a new, reconstituted hegemony, and whether one can talk of a restructured hegemony in the domain of the order of discourse in particular. It would be unwise to leap too quickly to such a conclusion before there has been some investigation of the reception of and response to the sort of changes I have illustrated amongst various categories of members of higher educational institutions. It may well be, for example, that largely 'top-down' changes in discursive practices are widely marginalized, ignored or resisted by certain categories of staff and/or students in a significant range of their activities.

CONCLUSION

I conclude this paper with some brief reflections upon the social use and utility of a critical discourse analysis. I have tried to indicate how critical discourse analysis might contribute to more broadly conceived social research into processes of social and cultural change affecting contemporary organizations. Discourse analysis is, I believe, an important though hitherto relatively neglected resource for such research. It has the capacity to put other sorts of social analysis into connection with the fine detail of particular instances of institutional practice in a way which is simultaneously oriented to textual detail, the production, distribution and interpretation/consumption of texts, and wider social and cultural contexts.

However, discourse analysis also has the capacity to be a resource for those engaged in struggle within institutions. For many members of higher educational institutions, for example, the dramatic changes of the last decade or so have been profoundly alienating, yet their capacity to resist them has been weakened by their reluctance to fall back upon traditional practices and structures which have been widely criticized from the Left and the Right and which have been the target for change. Many have experienced a sense of helplessness, which critical discourse analysis can, I

believe, help to illuminate. Part of the difficulty, which emerges from an investigation of discursive practices, is a polarization between unacceptable traditional practices and equally distasteful, highly promotional, marketized new practices. Advertisements for academic posts are a very small but interesting case in point: they do appear to be rather starkly polarized, as I showed earlier, with no real alternative to the two main types. The situation can be conceived of in terms of an *absence* within the order of discourse: the absence of a language—of discursive practices—through which authority relations and institutional and professional identities different from either traditional or marketized forms can be constituted. Critical discourse analysis cannot solve this problem, but it can perhaps point to the need for a struggle to develop such a new ‘language’ as a key element in building resistance to marketization without simply falling back on tradition, and perhaps give a better understanding of what might be involved in doing so.

NORMAN FAIRCLOUGH is Senior Lecturer in Linguistics at Lancaster University, UK. His main research interests are in critical discourse analysis and interdisciplinary study of discursive aspects of social and cultural change. He has published *Language and Power* (Longman, 1991), *Discourse and Social Change* (Polity Press, 1992), and edited *Critical Language Awareness* (Longman, 1992). He is writing a book on media discourse.

English

The undergraduate courses treat English as a whole subject and not as two divergent specializations. Accordingly, when English is taken as a major subject for the degree of B.A., no specialization in either language or literature separately is permitted until the third year of study when a very limited concentration on either is allowed. For higher degrees, specialization in either language or literature may be complete or subjects may be offered which connect these two branches of study.

In the study of *language* for the B.A. degree, modern English is central and is combined with some general linguistics and phonetics, and in Part II with history of the language. Language specializations in the third year include optional courses on older forms of English, and also on various aspects of the modern language and of linguistics. The study of English language throughout the first degree course will include fieldwork, special studies of varieties of modern English and the use of language laboratory techniques. The Language course is so constructed as to be of value to those who wish to specialize in English as a second or as a foreign language. As much as possible of the material used for literary study is also used for the study of language.

In the study of *literature* the syllabus is divided into periods, each taught with emphasis on a different aspect of literary study. The first-year course, based mainly on modern literature, deals with problems of reading and with the forms and functions of literature in contemporary society. In Part II, various periods are studied, two in two-year courses and the remainder in one-year courses.

The special interests of the Department include the following:

1. Project work in the drama courses using the facilities which will be available in the Theatre Workshop, at present being designed.
2. Special studies of the relationship between language and literature, including work on literary structures from a linguistic point of view.
3. Poetry as a performed art and its links with song.
4. Relations between the study of literature and of philosophy.
5. Relations between literature and scientific thought.
6. Relations between literary and historical study.

Undergraduate studies

PART I (FIRST YEAR) COURSE

The course consists of three parts:

- (a) Language: a general introduction, including some elementary phonetics and linguistics.
- (b) Literature: a course on problems of reading, and the forms and functions of literature, based on modern English poetry and prose fiction and on texts from three different types of drama (Classical, Renaissance, Modern).
- (c) Special courses: each undergraduate will choose one of the special courses referred to below, the choice being determined by his other first-year subjects:

- (i) For those taking groups involving History or Economics or Politics or French Studies or Classical Background, a study of certain historical aspects of literature in the seventeenth century.
- (ii) For those taking groups involving Economics or Politics or Philosophy, a study of some of the relationships of literature and philosophy, centred on the works of William Blake.
- (iii) For those taking groups involving Environmental Studies, Mathematics or Philosophy, a study of certain scientific texts from a literary and linguistic point of view.

The Part I course, or selected parts of it, will also (timetable permitting) be available as a one-year minor course for certain second-year undergraduates majoring in Boards of Studies A, B and C who did not take English in their first year.

PART II (SECOND AND THIRD YEAR) COURSES

Major course

Second-year undergraduates majoring in English are required to take four lecture courses – two in literature and two in language, from the following:

- (a) Literature 1780-1860
Literature 1660-1780
Elizabethan Drama, including some project work in the theatre
- (b) Varieties of Modern English I (study of the varieties of modern English outside the United Kingdom)
History of the English Language I
Principles and Techniques of General Linguistics, with special reference to English

Third-year undergraduates must choose four courses: *either* three language and one literature, *or* three literature and one language, *or* two of each. *Any one* course in language or literature may be offered by an undergraduate as a special option to be examined as such in the Final Examination. Third-year courses listed for 1966-67 (subject to the availability of staff) are as follows:

- (a) Literature 1850-1966, Literature 1550-1660, Mediaeval Literature, Jacobean Drama.
- (b) Old English, Middle English, Old Norse, Writing Systems, Linguistic Study of Style, Varieties of Modern English II, History of the Language II, Principles and Techniques of General Linguistics II.

Combined major course in English and French Studies – see page 118

Combined major course in English and Philosophy – see page 118

Combined major course in Latin and English – see page 118

LINGUISTICS

Linguistics (BA) Q100 Ling
Human Communication (BA) P300 Hum
Comm
Classical Studies and Linguistics (BA) QQ98
Class/Ling
Computer Science and Linguistics (BA) GQ51
Comp/Ling
English and Linguistics (BA) QQ13 Eng/Ling
French Studies and Linguistics (BA) QR11
Fr/Ling
German Studies and Linguistics (BA) RR32
Germ/Ling
Italian Studies and Linguistics (BA) QR13
Ital/Ling
Language and Education (BA) Y656
Lang/Educ
Linguistics and Philosophy (BA) QV17
Ling/Phil
Linguistics and Psychology (BA) LQ71
Ling/Psy
Modern English Language (BA) Q312 MEL

Lancaster is a major centre in the United Kingdom for study in Linguistics, the science of human language. There are about five thousand languages, and their enormous diversity and complexity supply the raw data for Linguistics. Language is Man's most remarkable achievement, and its systematic study provides insights into Man's psychological and social nature. The study of language tells us something about the nature of the human mind, since languages are abstract systems of peculiar and labyrinthine structure and yet men are capable of communication in them very easily and speedily. Language is of interest sociologically, since it is the stuff that binds complex societies together: without language no sophisticated social organisation is possible. The Department of Linguistics and Modern English Language, which has a staff of 13, is unique among departments of Linguistics in the country in the way its degree schemes offer students *three* alternative but complementary perspectives: on the structure and functions of human language; on the use

of symbols by humans as a means of understanding themselves and their place in society; on English, as one of the world's most important means of communication and the language of one of its most significant literatures. Degree schemes in Linguistics, Human Communication, English and Linguistics and Modern English Language, as well as combined schemes with other departments, provide the perspectives.

The department makes use of a variety of modes of teaching in its undergraduate programme. Typically, teaching is by lecture and small group seminars of up to 12 students, where the seminars are used to discuss readings related to the lecture topic. Many courses, especially those concerned with the collection of language data, concentrate on seminars and workshops and often involve more than one member of staff.

Linguistics and Human Communication offer useful training and expertise that are of special professional relevance to many working in education, public services and administration, industry and management, the mass media and creative arts, for example as language teachers, as speech therapists, as social workers, as counsellors and as translators. Indeed an understanding of how language works and the structure and purposes of human communication is available in a whole range of careers in which there is a need for clear communication, sensitive to people's interests and needs.

A detailed departmental prospectus can be obtained from the Departmental Secretary.

Admission requirements and policy
 Linguistics is not a subject taught at school, and prospective applicants should try to get some idea of the subject before committing themselves to it. (They may read, for example, one or more of the following introductory books: *The Articulate Mammal* and *Language*

Change: Progress and Decay by Jean Aitchison, *Linguistics* by D Crystal, *Phonetics* by D J O'Connor, *Grammar and Semantics* by F R Palmer.) The Department usually makes conditional offers on the basis of the UCCA form. We look for evidence of a keen interest in the structure of language *per se* and a willingness to analyse it objectively. When such evidence cannot be found in the UCCA form, we interview candidates. GCE attainments in Languages and Mathematics are taken as indications of likely talent in Linguistics, but there are no specific formal prerequisites. (For the general requirement see page 178.) *We welcome applications from mature candidates.*

About 25 candidates gain admission each year to the degree scheme in Human Communication and to single and combined major degree schemes in Linguistics.

Part I course in Linguistics

The purpose of this course is to provide a foundation for the Part II studies of students who intend to major in Linguistics or in Human Communication and to provide a balanced and self-contained introduction for those undergraduates who go on to major in another subject.

Part I Linguistics comprises Introduction to General Linguistics (151) which is compulsory and which introduces students to core areas of the subject (Phonetics, Phonology, Syntax, Semantics, Pragmatics and Sociolinguistics), together with a set of options (152) in which students choose two of a range of more specialised topics each studied for half the year. The available options vary from year to year: they currently include Structure of a non-Indo-European Language (e.g. Chinese, Arabic or Hebrew), Writing Systems, History of Modern Linguistic Thought, Field Methods, the Linguistics of Literacy.

Linguistics (3-year scheme)

Part I

Students are free to choose any two courses from the list on page 175 in addition to

Linguistics at Part I, subject to timetable restrictions and departmental advice; but it is wise to select courses that will permit at least one alternative choice of Part II degree scheme (since you might wish to change your mind). Subjects that combine well with Linguistics include English and the other language subjects, Computer Studies, Educational Studies, Philosophy, Psychology, and Sociology, and the Department of Linguistics has close links with those departments.

Part II courses

(Six units in Linguistics, two units in a minor and a free ninth unit course: see page 18.)

Students take six units in Linguistics from a wide range of courses on various aspects of the subject. A unit can comprise either two half-unit courses or one full course. They cover the core areas studied in Part I and specialisms that include Sociolinguistics, Psycholinguistics, Stylistics, and Anthropological, Computational, Philosophical and Applied Linguistics. Some of the courses are designed specifically for the needs of the students combining Linguistics with a particular subject, while others are appropriate for all students of Linguistics. For detailed information on the courses available see the departmental prospectus.

Students also take two courses in a minor, chosen freely (subject to departmental advice and prerequisites: see page 175, and a free ninth unit course.

Human Communication (3-year scheme)

The degree scheme in Human Communication, jointly offered by the departments of Linguistics, Psychology and Sociology, places language in a broader context; it investigates human communication as a unified field of academic enquiry through the interrelated perspectives of the three subjects. Its aim is to bring the student to an awareness of the centrality of communication in human behaviour and consciousness. The only specific entry requirement is that undergraduates who take Psychology in Part I must have a pass in Mathematics at Ordinary level.



Places available: 30
Admissions tutors: Jenny Thomas (Linguistics courses); Greg Myers (Human Communication)

A/AS-level grades: BCC or equivalent; AS-levels accepted
GCSE: Maths and normally a language for Linguistics courses
Scottish Highers: BBBB
International Baccalaureate: 30 pts
BTEC: at least merits in BTEC National
Mature students: we are keen to recruit mature students.

All accepted candidates are invited to open days; interviews in special cases.

The Department of Linguistics and Modern English Language is one of the largest in the UK with a teaching staff of fourteen. We offer a series of flexible degrees with a wide range of courses in 'core' areas like phonetics, grammar and discourse analysis; areas which connect strongly with other disciplines, like sociolinguistics and psycholinguistics; and more 'applied' areas like adult literacy, language teaching and the linguistic study of literature. We have strong links through collaborative degrees with English, Computer

Science, the social sciences (especially Psychology and Sociology) and Modern Languages.

We received a grade 4 (national excellence in most areas of Linguistics and international excellence in some) in the 1989 research ratings carried out by the Universities Funding Council. We are especially well known for our research work in Linguistics in relation to language teaching, for the study of language in social settings (e.g. school classrooms and interaction between cancer patients and their carers), for the automatic analysis of texts by computer, and for the linguistic study of literature.

We are a friendly and flexible group of teachers who like to have social contact with the people we teach. Every year, students are invited to join staff for a walking weekend in the nearby Lake District. There are also opportunities for students to spend part of their second year in Copenhagen as part of an ERASMUS student exchange arrangement. We are currently exploring similar links with universities in other European countries.

Assessment

For Linguistics and Human Communication courses: coursework (at least 60%) and exams

For courses run by the English Department: coursework (50% in the first year, usually 40% in later years) and exams.

What our graduates do

Linguistics and Human Communication offer useful training and expertise that are of special professional relevance to many working in education, language teaching, speech therapy, translation, industry and commerce, management, the mass media, creative arts, social work and counselling.

Recent graduates have gone to work or train as teachers of English overseas, teachers of English as a mother tongue, computer programmers and consultants, bankers, chartered accountants, O & M analysts, air traffic planners, managers in the retail industry, personnel managers, journalists, social workers, nurses, and so on. A sizeable proportion of our Linguistics graduates take up employment overseas.

A degree in Human Communication or Linguistics does not commit you to any one career, but can open many doors.



EXAMPLE 4.3a

BA Hons Linguistics Q100

See also Culture and Communication	page 119
Human Communication	135
English Language	136
English Language and Literature	137
Education and English Language	123
Linguistics with Japanese studies and combined degrees in Linguistics and Computer Science	56
English	164
Modern Language (French or German or Italian)	194
Philosophy	139
Psychology	139

First year

Linguistics

A second subject: see page 40	A third subject: see page 40
----------------------------------	---------------------------------

Registration requirement: none

Core course in general linguistics, plus options such as pragmatics, historical linguistics, literacy.

Average weekly workload: lectures 2 hrs, seminar/workshop 2 hrs (plus private study time)

Assessment: coursework 60%, exam 40%

Second and third years

Linguistics units consist of full courses or two half-courses (marked h)
You take at least three of:

- Phonetics (h)
- Phonology (h)
- Syntax (h)
- Semantics (h)

and your choice of the following, to make at least six units in total:

- Morphology in the extended standard theory (h)
- Pragmatics (h)
- Language acquisition
- Literacy and cognition (h)
- Computational linguistics (h)
- Language processing
- Interpreting language in use (h)
- Language in society
- Grammar, genre and social context (h)
- Discourse analysis (h)
- Language, ideology and power (h)
- Language and gender (h)
- Language learning and teaching (h)
- Language and education
- Second language acquisition and language pedagogy (h)
- The teaching of language and literature (h)
- Present-day English language
- Stylistics of poetry (h)
- Stylistics of prose and prose fiction (h)
- Stylistics of drama (h)
- Bilingualism (h)
- Independent study

Up to three courses in another subject



EXAMPLE 4.3b

NOTES

I am grateful to Teun van Dijk, Theo van Leeuwen and Ruth Wodak for their helpful comments on an earlier version of this paper.

1. I use the term 'text' for both written texts and transcripts of spoken interaction.
2. The pendulum of academic fashion seems to be swinging against such an 'ideological' view and in favour of a greater stress on self-consciousness and reflexivity (see Giddens, 1991). While accepting the need for some correction in this direction (see further on reflexivity below), I believe it is wrongheaded to abandon the ideological view.
3. The two are not, of course, independent. The nature of detailed production and interpretation processes in particular cases depends upon how the order of discourse is being drawn upon. See Fairclough (1992a: 18–19) for a critical discussion of conversation analysis in these terms.
4. I am using this term rather more loosely than Williams, for whom dominant, emergent and oppositional culture were tied to dominant, emergent and oppositional classes. See Wernick (1991: 183–4) for discussion.
5. Wouters (1986), however, sees informalization and formalization as cyclical phenomena, and suggests a new wave of formalization since the 1970s.
6. The discussion here draws heavily upon Wernick (1991) as well as Fairclough (1989).
7. Another question is whether practices which are widely simulated are not thereby devalued in a general way.
8. At the time of writing, the binary divide between universities and polytechnics is being dissolved. I shall refer below to the ex-polytechnics as the 'newer universities' and to the 'older universities'.
9. The account in this paragraph is drawn from collaborative work with Susan Condor, Oliver Fulton and Celia Lury. This paper is part of our longer term interdisciplinary study of changing organizational forms, discursive practices and social and professional identities in higher education.
10. The threefold focus upon changes in the market, in authority, and in self-identity broadly characterizes much of the work of the Lancaster Centre for the Study of Cultural Values, of which I am a member. I draw here particularly upon a recent formulation by Russell Keat.
11. Conference on 'The Risk Society: Modernity and the Environment', 29 May 1992. Lancaster University.

REFERENCES

- Althusser, L. (1971) 'Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses', in *Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays*. London: New Left Books.
- Argyle, M. (1978) *The Psychology of Interpersonal Behaviour*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Austin, J. (1962) *How to Do Things with Words*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Beck, U. (1992) *The Risk Society: Towards a Different Modernity*. London: Sage.
- Bernstein, B. (1990) *The Structuring of Pedagogic Discourse*. London: Routledge.
- Bourdieu, P. (1977) *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1991) *Language and Symbolic Power*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Clark, R., Fairclough, N., Ivanič, R. and Martin-Jones, M. (1990) 'Critical Lan-

- guage Awareness Part I: A Critical Review of Three Current Approaches to Language Awareness', *Language and Education* 4: 249–60.
- Clark, R., Fairclough, N., Ivanič, R. and Martin-Jones, M. (1991) 'Critical Language Awareness Part II: Towards Critical Alternatives', *Language and Education* 5: 41–54.
- Fairclough, N. (1985) 'Critical and Descriptive Goals in Discourse Analysis', *Journal of Pragmatics* 9: 739–63.
- Fairclough, N. (1988) 'Register, Power and Sociosemantic Change', in D. Birch and M. O'Toole (eds) *Functions of Style*. London: Pinter.
- Fairclough, N. (1989) *Language and Power*. London: Longman.
- Fairclough, N. (1992a) *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Fairclough, N. (1992b) 'The Appropriacy of "Appropriateness"', in N. Fairclough (ed.) *Critical Language Awareness*. London: Longman.
- Fairclough, N., ed. (1992c) *Critical Language Awareness*. London: Longman.
- Fairclough, N. (forthcoming) 'Conversationalization of Public Discourses and the Authority of the Consumer', in N. Abercrombie, R. Keat and N. Whiteley (eds) *The Authority of the Consumer*. London: Routledge.
- Featherstone, M. (1991) *Consumer Culture and Postmodernism*. London: Sage.
- Foucault, M. (1972) *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. London: Tavistock.
- Foucault, M. (1979) *Discipline and Punish*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Fowler, R., Hodge, B., Kress, G. and Trew, T. (1979) *Language and Control*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Fraser, N. (1989) *Unruly Practices*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Giddens, A. (1991) *Modernity and Self-identity*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Gramsci, A. (1971) *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*. London: Lawrence & Wishart.
- Habermas, J. (1984) *The Theory of Communicative Action, Vol. 1*. London: Heinemann.
- Hall, S. (1982) 'The Rediscovery of "Ideology": Return of the Repressed in Media Studies', in M. Gurevitch et al. (eds) *Culture, Society and the Media*. London: Methuen.
- Hall, S. (1988) 'The Toad in the Garden: Thatcherism among the Theorists', in C. Nelson and L. Grossberg (eds) *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*. London: Macmillan.
- Halliday, M. (1978) *Language as Social Semiotic*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Halliday, M. (1985) *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Halliday, M. and Hasan, R. (1985) *Language, Context and Text*. Geelong, Victoria: Deakin University Press.
- Hochschild, A.R. (1983) *The Managed Heart*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Jameson, F. (1984) 'Postmodernism, or the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism', *New Left Review* 146: 53–92.
- Kress, G. (1988) *Linguistic Processes in Sociocultural Practice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kress, G. (1992) 'Cultural Considerations in Linguistic Description'. First Pit Corder lecture, British Association of Applied Linguistics (unpublished manuscript).
- Kristeva, J. (1986) 'Word, Dialogue and the Novel', in T. Moi (ed.) *The Kristeva Reader*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Lash, S. (1990) *The Sociology of Postmodernism*. London: Routledge.
- Levinson, S. (1983) *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Maingueneau, D. (1987) *Nouvelles tendances en analyse du discours*. Paris: Hachette.

- Malinowski, B. (1923) 'The Problem of Meaning in Primitive Languages', Supplement 1 in C. Ogden and I.A. Richards, *The Meaning of Meaning*. New York: Harcourt Brace.
- Mandel, E. (1978) *Late Capitalism*. London: New Left Books.
- Margerison, C. (1987) *Conversation Control Skills for Managers*. London: Mercury Books.
- Pêcheux, M. (1982) *Language, Semantics and Ideology*. London: Macmillan.
- Stubbs, M. (1983) *Discourse Analysis*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Tannen, D. (1986) *That's Not What I Meant!: How Conversational Style Makes or Breaks Your Relationship with Others*. New York: William Morrow.
- Tannen, D. (1991) *You Just Don't Understand: Women and Men in Conversation*. London: Virago.
- Thompson, J.B. (1990) *Ideology and Modern Culture*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Tolson, A. (1991) 'Televised Chat and the Synthetic Personality', in P. Scannell (ed.) *Broadcast Talk*. London: Sage.
- Van Dijk, T. (1985) *Handbook of Discourse Analysis* (4 vols). London: Academic Press.
- Wernick, A. (1991) *Promotional Culture*. London: Sage.
- Williams, R. (1981) *Culture*. London: Fontana.
- Wouters, C. (1986) 'Formalization and Informalization: Changing Tension Balances in Civilizing Processes', *Theory, Culture & Society* 3(2): 1–18.