



The Uses of Discourse Analysis in the Study of Gender and Migration

**Gabriele Griffin
University of York**

April 2007

The uses of discourse analysis in the study of gender and migration

Gabriele Griffin, University of York

This chapter is concerned with the uses to which discourse analysis might be put in the study of gender and migration. It has two sub-sections: the first provides an introduction to discourse analysis and its use as a research tool. In the second I shall then look at concrete applications of discourse analysis to specific instances of studies of migration and gender with the aim of indicating a) the very different ways in which discourse analysis might be used to study these areas, and b) the very different ways in which migration and gender research might be conducted. For the specific instances of using discourse analysis I draw on discourse analytical research in the field of migration studies published in the journal *Discourse and Society*, mainly because this will enable readers to consult the original articles on which my discussions will be based and to read my discussion against the texts that inform it. As such the chapter will indicate the very different ways in which

discourse analysis may be utilized to investigate the complexities of migration experiences, revealing the ideologies/discourses at work that shape the identities of migrating and non-migrating subjects since those identities are structured through our interactions with these discursive frameworks.

Discourse analysis as a research tool

Discourse analysis is concerned with the investigation of language as it is actually used as opposed to an abstract system or structure of language (see Mills 1997 for a historicized account of the term ‘discourse’). Although I refer to ‘language’ here, it is possible to view discourse analysis as a method for examining all sorts of sign systems such as visual and behavioural ones, and not only verbal ones (Mills 1997) since its concern is with the detail of how something is expressed, and what its patterns and hence meanings are. However, for the purposes of this chapter I shall concentrate on verbal ones. I use the phrase ‘language as it is *actually used*’ without reference to the degree of formality or informality that pertains to the language use

under investigation, since discourse analysis, as is evident in the examples below, may be mobilized as readily to investigate formal language as utilized, for example, in a wedding ceremony or on equal opportunity forms, as to analyse less formal uses of language such as ‘naturally occurring speech’ or conversation (Heritage 2004). Whilst ‘formal’ is not the same as ‘formulaic’ (repetition of a fixed pattern), since it pertains to the standardization of language as well as the social decorum attending the use of language, formal language nonetheless denotes a style and use of discourse that relates to a more overtly circumscribed, indeed prescribed use of language than informal language use does. However, the latter, too, has its rules, for instance in lexical and grammatical terms, not least because it too constitutes a ‘communicative event’ and as such must be understandable to others.

The word ‘discourse’, then, in the sense of certain kinds of actual language use, has a variety of meanings (see Mills 1997, esp. pp. 1-26), not least in its relation to formal and informal language use. Thus ‘discourse’ may refer to the spoken word only, or all utterances written and verbal, or a particular way of talking delineating a specific domain with its own particular vocabularies and sets of meaning such as

legal discourse, medical discourse, scientific discourse; in other words, a 'regulated practice which accounts for a number of statements' (Foucault 1972: 80). In such a regulated practice, for instance in interaction with a call centre operator in the case of telephone banking, the interactional steps between operator and customer may be highly, indeed fully, prescribed, with definable characteristics and features established and maintained through the regulations that govern what you can and cannot utter as part of these interactions (see Cameron 2000). Such is the case also in questionnaire surveys, especially where they involve multiple-choice tick boxes and the respondent can answer only in a prescribed manner. The same is true of balloting papers in elections where only a specific set and way of answering (ticking one box) is allowed or the response becomes invalid. Discourses thus simultaneously make certain utterances possible while suppressing others, and part of an individual's cultural capital or competence resides in her grasp of the ways in which different discourses operate and when which kind of discourse is appropriate or not. This is one of the challenges migrants as well as their 'host communities' face in their interactions. Feminist linguist Deborah Cameron (1995) talks of 'verbal hygiene' to indicate the ways in which

discourses are ‘sanitized’ to structure particular circumstances.

As Michel Foucault, one of the cultural theorists associated with the theorization of the nature and the operations of discourse, has argued, different discourses produce different kinds of truth claims or effects (1970, 1978, 1979, 1981) and have specific relations to authority and power. Discourse, in Foucault’s writings, emerged not as a neutral mode of signifying but as a means for structuring social relations, knowledge, and power. That structuration is complex and does not follow a simple logic of either power or knowledge. Competing and, indeed, contradictory discourses circulate as my second example below will show, with different discourses achieving different degrees of hold among individuals and society at large at different times. For instance, immigrants may simultaneously by the same or different interest groups be defined as much-needed sources of labour, and as usurpers of indigenous people’s jobs. Or, to take a historicizing example, people from the former colonies of Great Britain at one time had the status of ‘British subjects’ but then, as a consequence of legislative and political changes, lost that status and the rights it entailed (Solomos 1983). A doctor’s note may be accorded

more authority than an individual's informal claim to be sick. Legal documents such as passports, for instance, or identity cards, wills, marriage, divorce, death certificates have to be presented in particular linguistic formats. Hence across a range of linguistic utterances, formulae are in place that indicate to their users and consumers the domains in which they are operating, their attendant truth claims, and the authority they have.

We use formulae such as 'and they lived happily ever after' to denote certain kinds of discourses such as romances and fairy-tales. Thus we understand fairy tales both as 'made-up' stories or fictions, and as myths, and the opening 'Once upon a time. . .' signals the commencement of a certain kind of story that we do not expect to be literally true but which – as fairy tale – delivers, *inter alia*, a particular sort of moral message. If a witness in a court of law were to start giving evidence with 'Once upon a time. . .' this would create interdiscursivity between the verbal requirements of the legal context which focus on the narration of 'fact'/evidence and those of the fairy-tale format, and it would also either be regarded as a form of gimmick to draw attention to what is being said by virtue of its being inappropriate in the context, or it would be simply viewed as inappropriate.

Language enables the expression of values and attitudes. Thus how we talk of immigrants, the kinds of words we use, indicate our view of their status within the context in which we operate. That expression of values and attitudes is complicated by context since different contexts enable the articulation of different sets of values and attitudes and the suppression of others. How ‘immigrants’ are designated in public discourses may therefore be quite different from how they are talked about in private contexts. Legislation on immigrants will utilize a different terminology from the informal talk used by members of right-wing parties, for example. Discourse analysis thus assumes from the outset that language is *invested*, meaning that language is not a neutral tool for transmitting a message but rather, that all ‘communicative events’ (van Dijk 2001: 98), whether these be annual reports of companies, an interview, or an argument constitute ‘a particular way of talking about and understanding the world (or an aspect of the world)’ (Phillips and Jørgensen 2002: 1) both on the part of the producer (the writer, the speaker) and on the part of the consumer (the reader, the audience). As such, discourse analysis references both a theory of language use - language use as not neutral but invested - and a method for analysing language in use.

That analysis of language in use has two aspects: the first relates to the language itself that is used, and the second to the process of using language, for example, the amount of verbal space a speaker occupies, or the pauses or inflections she utilizes. Much discourse analysis-based research deals with both, although in my three examples below, only the last one indicates this in the way her interview extracts are transcribed. Whilst it is possible to produce a discourse analysis that amounts simply to describing language use, for instance, how frequently particular words and phrases such as adjectives or metaphors are uttered, in *critical discourse analysis*, which is the focus of this chapter and which is strongly associated with the work of Norman Fairclough (1989, 1992, 2000) and Teun A. van Dijk, critique and therefore an invested stance to the material examined is at the heart of the research. Critical discourse analysis centres on the premise that discourse is *invested*, and operates to actualize the agendas of both speakers and listeners. This recognition has led to the notion of critical discourse analysis whose aim is to produce an analysis or ‘explanatory critique’ (Fairclough 2001: 235-6) of how and to what purpose language use is invested through the deployment of specific textual features (lexical, grammatical, semantic), in order to facilitate understanding of its effects and the possibility of

resistance to that investment. It thus explores ‘the links between language use and [socio-cultural] practice’ (Phillips and Jørgensen 69), and thus *what* values and attitudes, and *how* these are expressed. As such, and given its assumption of the investedness of language, it is ideally suited to migration studies since the socio-cultural investigation of migration involves the analysis of the investments expressed through discursive formations. Jonathan Charteris-Black (2006), for instance, states that the ‘Crime and Disorder Act 1998 defines an offence as “racially aggravated” if the offender demonstrates hostility based on the victim’s membership of a racial group’ (2006: 568-9). Hence, according to Charteris-Black, the Conservative Party in Britain tends to speak of ‘immigration’ – the noun denoting an activity – as opposed to ‘immigrants’, the noun denoting individuals because the latter, favoured by the British National Party, for instance, refers to people and is thus liable to being interpreted as a racially aggravated form of speech.

From a feminist perspective which assumes that gender is a central organizing principle of both knowledge and experience and that this principle expresses vested interests of diverse kinds, critical discourse analysis which shares that

assumption of ‘investedness’ is an ideal research tool since it reveals the articulation and operation of that investment (Cameron 2006; Cameron and Kulick 2003). Critical discourse analysis as a research method thus centres on understanding the ideological machinations of discourse, and aims to produce a critique of how discourse operates to effect certain agendas. In this respect, critical discourse analysis as a method has much in common with both gender studies and migration studies in that their objectives, too, involve the laying bare of ideological agendas which emerge from the discourses produced in formal and informal exchanges. All the examples I shall draw on therefore are informed by a critical discourse analysis stance which attempts to understand the investments that various discursive formations have and make, socially, culturally, politically.

Discourse analysis as a research tool in the study of migration and gender

In discussing the use of discourse analysis as a research tool in the study of migration and gender, I have decided to utilize three articles published in the journal *Discourse and*

Society since these may be readily accessed by readers. This journal, with its subtitle ‘An International Journal for the Study of Discourse and Communication in Their Social, Political and Cultural Contexts’, explicitly centres on critical discourse analysis. Its contents reveal the very different ways in which critical discourse analysis (CDA) may be conducted, both in terms of the materials on which it draws, and the ways in which these are analyzed. This will become evident in my discussion of the articles below. *Discourse and Society* has a long history of publishing articles that deal with topics directly relevant to both gender studies and to migration studies, together and separately. Since feminism operates from the assumption that all knowledge and experiences are gendered (Linkova and Cervinkova 2004), this includes migration, and, indeed, one can observe the confluence of ‘gender’ and ‘migration’ in current debates about Muslim community members; in discussions about the wearing of the veil, an almost entirely female-centred activity; in questions about the different treatments of women and men in diverse ethnic communities; about the different ways in which women and men migrate (Espinoza 2003); the different employment sectors migrant women and men inhabit (e.g. Ehrenreich and Hochschild 2003), etc.

The first of my examples of how discourse analysis might be used to focus on issues of migration and gender is Jonathan Charteris-Black's (2006) account of 'how metaphor contribute[d] to the formation of legitimacy in right-wing political communication on immigration policy in the 2005 British election campaign.' (563) Like all discourse analysts, Charteris-Black worked with a *corpus* or body of data he constructed, in this instance 'spoken and written sources of right-wing political communication and media reporting.' (567) The spoken sources were 'transcriptions of 13 speeches given by members of the Conservative Party'; the written sources were party-political manifestos and press articles. Charteris-Black gives no indication that he transcribed the speeches but discusses supplementing his material with searchable electronic versions of right-wing newspapers and party website sources. Overall, his research is an example of a primarily, possibly exclusively, desk-based study which is one quite common way of utilizing discourse analysis, namely to provide a detailed examination of particular bodies of written texts to which, ultimately, all transcriptions of verbal material of course also belong.

Charteris-Black's analysis reveals the ways in which the British right mobilized certain metaphors during the 2005

election campaign to stake a claim in the political debates about immigrants. He focuses his research on very specific linguistic aspects of the texts he analysed, in particular metaphors. Such metaphors are just one particular linguistic pattern to which, as a critical discourse analyst, one might pay attention. Others could include other words categories, for instance combinations of nouns and adjectives, verbs, etc. Charteris-Black shows (568) that the far right talked of immigration as process well as talking of ‘immigrants’, that is people, whilst the centre-right talked only of ‘immigration’, that is the abstract noun and process, and did not use the word ‘immigrants’. Charteris-Black attributes this difference to a legal ruling which stated that ‘using “immigrant” can justify treating an assault as “racially aggravated”’ (568), and effectively argues that a party seeking to stay within the confines of the law in Britain cannot afford to trespass against it by utilizing inflammatory speech of a kind that might expose that party to claims of committing race hatred crimes. Charteris-Black also shows how metaphors of Britain as a ‘container’, that is an island seeking to defend its borders against the ‘(natural) disaster’ of incoming ‘tides’, ‘waves’ or ‘flows’ immigrants, permeated the right-wing discourses dealing with

immigration during the 2005 election campaign, equating immigration with a ‘natural disaster’.

Part of the process of arriving at this conclusion involves a quantitative dimension in that Charteris-Black counts how often certain words and phrases occur in his primary material. He then examines the contexts in which they are used, thus bringing a qualitative dimension to his analysis. Discourse analysis thus emerges as a compound method involving more than one type of research process and analysis. It is this quality, which will also be evident in the other examples I shall discuss below, that makes discourse analysis a paradigmatic example of an integrated research method, drawing not only on a range of sources (here: speeches, manifestos, newspaper articles, website content) but also on a range, quantitative and qualitative, of ways of analysing those sources.

When Charteris-Black considers the metaphors used by the right-wing parties to refer to immigration such as ‘flood’, ‘wave’, and ‘tide’, he relates these back to their ‘source domain’, the meta-discursive category that unites these metaphors and he finds that they belong to the realm of ‘the natural disaster’. Charteris-Black shows that the far right represented immigration as a natural disaster whilst the

centre right focussed on the immigration system and its much documented lack of control over immigration as a disaster (579). This creates a distinction between what Britain can control (its systems) and what it may not be able to control so readily (the immigrants wishing to enter its territory), with the centre right attempting to suggest control from within that it is in Britain's power to do something about, and the far right projecting Britain as the victim of uncontrolled immigration from without. Charteris-Black argues that the latter is potentially racist whereas the former avoids this stance, not least because 'racist discourse highlights the individual racial characteristics of immigrants' (579) which the systems-based metaphors do not engage with.

One of the effects of the discursive representation of immigrants and immigration in the 2005 British election campaign, and one not directly commented on by Charteris-Black, is that the use of metaphors which suggest an undifferentiated mass ('flood', 'wave' etc.), and indeed the use of abstract nouns such as immigration, lead to a de-personalization, one might argue a de-humanization of those involved which deflects from the fact that we are discussing people, and people who are classed, gendered, raced,

endowed with a whole range of traits that constitute them as complex entities, both individually and as groups. One effect of the non-recognition of that specificity is that gender as an organizing category vanishes, and indeed in Charteris-Black's as in much other research that uses discourse analysis as a method, including migration studies based research, gender as an explicit reference point of enquiry is not mentioned. The 'silencing' of women and of the category 'gender' as significant has been one of the sustained objects of critique of much feminist research (for early examples see Olsen 1980 or hooks 1989). As gender researchers we might therefore enquire into the circumstances in which gender as a category ceases to be mobilized, and what impact this has since, for instance and in contrast, in other discourses about disasters, natural and man-made – to which the metaphors identified by Charteris-Black as informing certain public discourses on migrants belong - such as the December 2004 tsunami or the famine in Ethiopia, or the civil war in Darfur, women (and children) were constantly referenced as victims. The listing of the war in Darfur together with famine in Ethiopia and the tsunami is deliberate: it points to the fact that disasters are not, in my view, 'natural' but occur for specific reasons and with specific licenses. Disasters occurring in nature, for instance, are not unrelated to global

warming which is a man-made disaster. In other words, in my own mini discursive analysis here, I break down the distinction between ‘natural’ and other disasters because in all instances human beings’ contributions to these, and the discursive suppression of that contribution if that is what occurs, are part of what critical discourse analysis needs to and sometimes does engage with. One way of doing this is to consider how discursive formations such as unqualified pluralization and abstraction (‘immigrants’ and ‘immigration’) suppress the specificity of the persons and processes concerned, thus effacing the particularities and differences among these.

My second example of how critical discourse analysis might be used in the analysis of issues of migration and gender is Aleksandra Galasinska’s (2006) account of ‘Border Ethnography and Post-Communist Discourses of Nationality in Poland’. This article is based on fieldwork in terms of the collection of interview data rather than being entirely desk-based as the previous example was. Here critical discourse analysis is applied to the spoken word as recorded by the author during interviews and then transcribed. This two-stage research process – interviewing, followed by the

analysis of transcribed material – not only integrates fieldwork and desk-based work but also indicates the way in which critical discourse analysis relies on multiple simultaneous and successive methods to achieve its end. The is important for understanding that critical discourse analysis is achieved through a serial process of interpretive steps based on the selection of what to ask, whom to ask, how to record the data, what to focus on in their analysis and how to articulate that analysis. This refuses the notion of this research method as a unitary fixed grid to be imposed on a given text but rather frames it as a dynamic, situated, dialogic, flexible and provisional process.

Galasinska’s piece centres on the relationship between language and identity (see also Barker and Galasinski 2001). She explores the ‘discursive constructions of ethnicity, and in particular notions of “Polishness”, among members of three-generation families living in the Polish town of Zgorzelec, on the border with Germany.’ (609) This town has variously been part of Germany and part of Poland, living with significantly different political regimes, and in the 20th century experiencing the shift from Nazism, to Communism, to free-market capitalism and democracy. Importantly, in 1945 when Zgorzelec became part of Poland

– having been under German rule during the Nazi period – it was resettled with Poles from the more eastern regions of Poland whilst its German inhabitants had to move to the new Germany (Galasinska 610): ‘As a result, there are virtually no people in Zgorzelec who [or whose families] lived there before 1945. Even the oldest of [Galasinska’s] informants had not experienced the pre-war town.’ (610) In other words, this is a settler community made up entirely of migrants, who initially moved, or were moved, internally in a newly configured - both geographically and ideologically - nation state.

Following Billig (1995), Galasinska in her research is concerned to show how ‘lived ideologies are usually associated with ideological dilemmas’ (611), in this case manifested as the contradiction between a proud assertion of being Polish on the one hand, and a denigration of Poles compared to Germans, on the other. Galasinska undertook 21 interviews with members from 7 families. She gave the interview content an initial focus by utilizing photographs of the town of Zgorzelec, later asking direct questions about the interviewees’ sense of identity. In her analysis of her informants’ comments she then, like Charteris-Black in analysing his texts, looked for categories under which to

summarize her interviewees' expressed values and attitudes, and thus writes:

According to people from Zgorzelec, Poles:

- do not work properly;**
- live in messy and dirty conditions;**
- drink heavily and excessively;**
- steal and take bribes;**
- live beyond their means;**
- are not like Germans. (2006: 613)**

Despite this view of Poles, her interviewees, themselves Poles, proudly identified as such, and did so by utilizing various verbal strategies designed to distance themselves from their 'less worthy' compatriots, thus using a multiplicity of linguistic forms to create diverse versions of 'being/doing Polish' which allowed them to maintain their identity as 'Polish' whilst criticizing 'other' Poles.

Galasinska's article focuses less on contemporary migration issues than on histories of migration and settlement, and their impact on individual identity. In this context she

addresses the gender dimension of that identity in very particular ways: in the description of her research and in her reflections on her research she manifests tenets of feminist research praxis which are not necessarily exclusive to that practice but are central to it. The first of these is that she identifies her informants by gender which allows the reader of her article to draw a conclusion she herself also articulates, namely that both her female and male informants, irrespective of sex and age, share the same contradictory views regarding Polish identity. As she puts it: 'Interestingly, these constructions were evenly read across the sample, regardless of age, gender or class of the informants.' (612) Thus both old women and middle-aged men in her sample for example agree that Poles lack discipline (617-18). Since the article presents a particular set of excerpts from the interviews, it is not possible to know what, if any, role gender plays in the interviewees' views of Polish and German identity. The article leads one to believe that it plays no role.

Secondly, in line with a long history of demand from feminists that researchers situate themselves explicitly in their work (eg Harding 1987; Pinnick et al 2003), Galasinska discusses the impact of herself as both 'insider' and

‘outsider’ – given that she is a Polish woman - on her work. In particular, Galasinska links the impact of herself on how her interviewees expressed themselves, to the way in which she conducted the interviews. These effectively had two parts: in the first she asked her interviewees to comments on photographs of the town of Zgorzelec; in the second she asked questions about how her interviewees self-labelled. Whilst the first part was largely non-directed, inviting narrative in a fairly unstructured manner, the second part was directed, and conducted very much in question-and-answer terms. The effect of this, according to Galasinska, was that her informants perceived the first part of the interview to be informal and therefore used informal language, and the second part as formal requiring the use of formal language. Galasinska here demonstrates how the interview method which positions her differently, informally at one point, formally at another, impacts on the linguistic register her informants use to negotiate these two different scenarios, with results – since her research is concerned with discourse analysis – that are directly affected by her stance as interviewer.

Galasinska does not reflect on her *gendered* position as a researcher as such, suggesting that she does not perceive her

own gender to be significant in the research she conducts. However, in a highly gendered culture such as the Polish one, where genderedness is strongly marked by the dominant religious discourse – Catholicism – one has to assume that her gender had an impact on her research, though it is not possible to say from her data in what ways. Gender, in any event, was not the focus of this particular article by Galasinska but it emerges in the classification of her interview sample, and in its absence when Galasinska discussed her situatedness as researcher.

Ann-Carita Evaldsson's (2005) article on 'Staging Insults and Mobilizing Categorizations in a Multi-ethnic Peer Group', my third example, centres on 'how pre-adolescent boys of immigrant and working-class backgrounds stage insults and, as part of this process, mobilize categorizations.' (763) For her data Evaldsson drew on 'ethnographic research combined with video recordings of pre-adolescent children's everyday interaction in a multiethnic and low-income school setting in Sweden.' (764) She suggests that the fact that insulting was 'routinely organized *by* boys and *directed at* boys' shows that this practice is 'important in the production. . . in a local masculine order.' (764) Evaldsson thus directly engages with questions of gender and of

migration in her choice of sample, and in the content of her research. One might argue that she conducts a type of critical masculinity studies (Hearn 2004) within the broad context of migration studies, a critical discourse analysis which reveals the intersectionality of ethnicity, gender and indeed class.

Evaldsson's research, as the outline above indicates, draws on a variety of methods for data collection which include ethnography (presumably, though this is not explicitly stated, some kind of observation and fieldnote writing) and video-recording which she then analyses. In her article she reproduces verbatim some of the exchanges from her video recordings as evidence for her argument that these pre-adolescent boys in their insults refer to linguistic competences (the ability to speak a given language, in this instance Swedish), social standards (knowledge of how to interact), and economic status (material dis/advantage; owning objects) which 'collude[] with and transgress[] local norms of conduct and institutional discourse' in ways that demonstrate both the political character of these children's everyday talk and the ways in which it orients itself towards 'dominant language ideologies' (763) Thus boys from immigrant backgrounds mock each other, for instance, for

their inability to pronounce Swedish words correctly (776), thereby highlighting their immigrant status and using that factor as a means of derogating each other. Evaldsson analyses this as follows:

The insults are constructed as a serious racist offence. However, the fact that insults referring to ‘limited language proficiency in Swedish’ are used among friends and non-indigenous Swedes cast the exchanges as a fair contest and align it with ritual insults. (777)

She argues that ‘insulting is not primarily an adversary act but appears to be used by the boys to organize participation and negotiate the features of what constitutes acceptable peer behaviours.’ (777) My sense is that Evaldsson’s notion of ‘peer’ entails a particular view of equality that does not allow for the notion that the routine insults traded by these boys involve the negotiation of pecking orders that have hierarchies and rely on adversary, that is hostile, acts to maintain hierarchies of interaction akin to the social hierarchies these boys encounter in the everyday, where migrants, for instance, are treated as inferior to indigenous populations.

One of the points Evaldsson makes in her discussion of her findings is that ‘insulting is not a separate or well-structured isolated speech activity’ but rather ‘a parasitic activity that

takes its shape from a sequential context' (782) in which linguistic dexterity in the form of knowing how to counter racial slurs with return insults is part of what establishes and maintains the pecking order among these boys. Towards the end of her article she argues that some boys can talk themselves up by insulting others, thus 'improving' their own status as boys 'with low-income and immigrant background' (784). She also suggests that from the categorization analysis of the insults used, 'it became evident that possessions, clothing, language proficiency in Swedish and minority languages, gender, ethnicity and sexuality are relevant categories for the boys involved in the insult talk.' (783) To analyse all these in terms of their significance is clearly beyond the scope of Evaldsson's article which, however, does establish, through a detailed linguistic analysis, how gender and migration are imbricated in her specific sample.

The three texts I have discussed use discourse analysis in the discussion of migration and gender in very different ways. This is partly a function of the very different sets of data and approaches they base their work on, and partly evident in the very different ways in which they present their data.

Charteris-Black produced a desk-based piece of research in which he offered summaries of findings, partly through the quantitative analysis of his material (frequency counting), and partly through summarizing the material via the analytical categories he used. By contrast both Galasinska and Evaldsson relied on the spoken word as their primary material, with the latter offering extracts from her data as part of her article. These were the most detailed of the three examples in terms of their analytic transcription. Thus her evidence included indications of emphases, ellipses, pauses, and non-verbal behaviours that were largely un-presented and unaddressed in the former's work.

Conclusions

Critical discourse analysis, as a research tool which assumes that all utterances are invested, and that it is the researcher's job to analyse those investments, is a compound research method for analysing signifying systems of which language, both written and spoken, is but one. Since critical discourse analysis may rely on both quantitative and qualitative data, generated through a range of research processes, from desk-based textual analysis to interviews

and videoing of interactions, it is an integrated research method which mobilizes diverse sources and multiple analytical methods to achieve its ends. As such it is not knowledge-domain specific, ie it can be utilized within the social sciences and the humanities, and indeed, act as an integrating cross-over research method. It also, and by virtue of its characteristics, has a significant role to play in migration and gender studies since both domains recognize the investedness of data, at the points of collection, analyses, and dissemination of the data (based on the questions why and how are we collecting certain data, what do we hope to find out through their analysis, and to what uses will those findings be put). Secondly, the flexibility of critical discourse analysis regarding what method is used to collect the data (from written texts, to interviewing, for example) makes critical discourse analysis a useful tool in migration research where evidence may be collected in oral and informal ways, as much as through formal means. This is useful not least when one is dealing with people for whom the language of the researcher may constitute their second language.

This brings me on to an issue in critical discourse analysis that one needs to consider, in particular in relation to migration studies, although it is actually an issue that affects

all research. This is the issue that when one conducts migration research, especially where it centres directly on migrant communities themselves, it may be cross-cultural and involve migration across languages, too. Here the question arises as to the meaning of what is uttered, and how this is understood in one culture compared to another. To give a concrete example: whilst it is not unusual in German to say 'shit' informally as a swear word and its impact level is relatively low, using this swear word in English is considered much more gross and unacceptable. Similarly, to insult someone's mother as a way of aggravating another person is both more common and more insulting in some cultures than in others. Such cultural differences are not immediately obvious when one deals with discursive material, whether spoken or written, and grappling with the ways in which diverse socio-cultural dispositions and stances are inflected in the use of sign systems is one of the difficult tasks a researcher faces (Kuhn and Remøe 2005). Such issues which in some ways arise in all research need to be addressed by the researcher and this is sometimes best done by critical self-reflection and sustained engagement with and articulation of one's own position in relation to the material examined, as Galasinska to a certain extent does. It also requires a degree of familiarity with and immersion in the

migrant communities with whom one is dealing. This is where forms of ethnographic research and participant observation may be useful tools. However, even when such tools are employed, researchers ultimately return to the recordings of what they have participated in and observed and as such return to forms of discourse analysis in their final analysis.

References

Barker, C. and D. Galasinski (2001) *Cultural Studies and Discourse Analysis: A Dialogue on Language and Identity*. London: Sage.

Billig, M. (1995) *Banal Nationalism*. London: Sage.

Cameron, Deborah (1995) *Verbal Hygiene*. London: Routledge.

Cameron, Deborah (2000) *Good to Talk? Living and Working in a Communication Culture*. London: Sage.

Cameron, Deborah (2006) *On Language and Sexual Politics*. London: Routledge.

Cameron Deborah and Don Kulick (2003) *Language and Sexuality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Charteris-Black, Jonathan (2006) 'Britain as Container: Immigration Metaphors in the 2005 Election Campaign', *Discourse and Society* 17/5: 563-581.

Ehrenreich, Barbara and Arlie Russell Hochschild, eds. (2003) *Global Woman*. London: Granta Press.

Espinoza, Robert (2003) 'Migration Trends: Maps and Charts', in Barbara Ehrenreich and Arlie Russell Hochschild.

Evaldsson, Ann-Carita (2005) 'Staging Insults and Mobilizing Categorizations in a Multiethnic Peer Group', *Discourse and Society* 16/6: 763-786.

Fairclough, Norman (1989) *Language and Power*. London: Longman.

Fairclough, Norman (1992) *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Fairclough, Norman (1995) *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language*. London: Longman.

**Fairclough, Norman (2000) *New Labour, New Language?*
London: Routledge.**

**Foucault, Michel (1970) *The Order of Discourse: An
Archaeology of Knowledge*. London: Tavistock.**

**Foucault, Michel (1978 [1972]) *The History of Sexuality: An
Introduction*. Vol 1. Harmondsworth: Penguin.**

**Foucault, Michel (1979) *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of
the Prison*. New York: Random House.**

**Foucault, Michel (1981) 'The Order of Discourse', in Robert
Young, ed. *Untying the Text: A Poststructuralist Reader*.
London: Routledge, Kegan and Paul.**

**Galasinska, Aleksandra (2006) 'Border Ethnography and
Post-Communist Discourses of Nationality in Poland',
Discourse and Society 17/5: 609-626.**

**Hearn, Jeff (2004) 'From Hegemonic Masculinity to the
Hegemony of Men', *Feminist Theory* 5/1: 49-72.**

**Harding, Sandra (1987) *Feminism and Methodology*.
Bloomington: Indiana UP.**

**Heritage, John ([1997], 2004) 'Discourse analysis as a way of
analysing naturally occurring talk', in David Silverman, ed.,**

***Qualitative Research: Theory, Method and Practice*, London: Sage. 200-21.**

hooks, bell (1989) *Talking Back: Thinking Feminist – Thinking Black*. London: Sheba Feminist Publishers.

Kuhn, Michael and Svend Otto Remøe, eds. (2005) *Building the European Research Area*. New York: Peter Lang.

Linkova, Marcela and Alice Cervinkova, eds. (2004) *Thinking Borders: Gender Examinations of Rationality, Objectivity and the Knowing Subject*. Prague: Academy of Sciences.

Mills, Sara (1997) *Discourse*. London: Routledge.

Olsen, Tillie (1980) *Silences*. London: Virago.

Phillips, Louise and Marianne Jørgensen (2002) *Discourse Analysis as Theory and Method*. London: Sage.

Pinnick, Cassandra L., Koertge, Noretta and Robert F. Almeder, eds. (2003) *Scrutinizing Feminist Epistemology*. New Brunswick: Rutgers UP.

Polity Press (1994) *The Polity Reader in Cultural Theory*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Silverman, David, ed. ([1997], 2004) *Qualitative Research: Theory, Method and Practice*. London: Sage.

Solomos, John (1983) *Race and Racism in Britain*. 2nd ed. Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1993.

van Dijk, Teun (2001) 'Principles of Critical Discourse Analysis', in Margaret Wetherall, Stephanie Taylor, and Simeon J. Yates, eds. (2001) *Discourse Theory and Practice*. London: Sage.300-17.