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During the past decade educational researchers have increasingly turned to Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) as a set of approaches to answer questions about relationships between language and society. In this article the authors review the findings from a comprehensive research review of CDA in education. The findings proceed in the following manner: the multiple ways in which CDA has been defined, the theories of language included in CDA frameworks, the relationships of CDA to other social theories, and the role of issues of power and issues of reflexivity. The findings illustrate that as educational researchers bring CDA frameworks into educational contexts, they are reshaping the boundaries of CDA.
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This year marks the 25th anniversary of the publication of two seminal books: Language and Control, by Roger Frowley, Robert Hodge, Gunther Kress, and Tony Tew, and Language as Ideology, by Robert Hodge and Gunther Kress. These two books have influenced the way in which scholars approach questions of language and society and have become cornerstones in what we now know as Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). Of course, the history of the critical study of discourse can be traced back much further to language philosophers and social theorists such as Bakhtin (1981), DeBono (1996), Pechaus (1973), and Wittgenstein (1973), among others. We might also think of the history of critical discourse studies in terms of the emergence or the evolution of the term Critical Discourse Analysis, which has been attributed to the publication of Fairclough’s Language and Power in 1989.

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

Critical discourse studies stem from three overlapping intellectual traditions, each emphasizing the linguistic turn in the social sciences. These traditions are: critical discourse studies (e.g., Bhabha, 1990; Foucault, 1980; Habermas, 1977, 1973; Pollock, 1975); feminist/post-structuralism (e.g., Butler, 1990; Davis, 1993); and critical linguistics (e.g., Fiske, Hodge, Kress & Trew, 1974; Halliday & Hasan, 1989; Hodge & Kress, 1997; Pollock, 1975; Pennycook, 1991; Willis, 1999). Critical Discourse Analysis focuses on how language as a cultural tool mediates relationships of power and privilege. It is a term "Critical Discourse Analysis" (which the abbreviation CDA represents) and "critical discourse analysis" in lower case letters, a distinction that is quite relevant to this review. He argues that CDA refers to the trend of analysis that has been informed by Foucault, Hodge, Kress, Wodak, van Dijk, van Leeuwen and others. Lower-case "critical discourse analysis" includes a wider array of approaches (p. 20)—Gee's own form of analysis (1992, 1994, 1995, 1997); (but of Galtung, 1975; for an exception). On the other hand, linguistic anthropologists and conversation analysts often do not turn to social theory or attempt to connect their micro-level analyses with broader social forces. Critical Discourse Analysis was an attempt to bring social theory and discourse analysis together to describe, interpret, and explain the ways in which discourse constructs, become constructed, and are replicated by (or social work).

During the past decade, education researchers increasingly have turned to Critical Discourse Analysis as an approach to answering questions about the relationships between language and society. This proliferation in scholarship, as well as our failure to demonstrate this review, poses a series of focused questions for education researchers interested in CDA.

Indeed, discourse analysis of all types comes from fields outside education, and much of its work is tied to linguistics in one way or another. As much work creates a boundary of education, interesting and substantive concerns arise about how it is applied to educational issues, how it affects other research and approaches in education, and how it might be reviewed in the non-education research traditions from which it came.

This article provides a critical, integrative review of CDA across five databases in the social sciences. We present a review of the literature and we interpret this theory, methods, and implications of the literature reviewed. We intend that this review of CDA in the field of education be viewed as the context of the original CDA founders. The following questions frame our review: What happens when Critical Discourse Analysis crosses the boundaries into educational research? In what ways do education researchers use CDA? How can the use of CDA in educational contexts inform us about method and theory?
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Thus the Frankfurt school and other neo-Marxist scholars of society and language (e.g., the Bakhtin Circle) opened the debate about whether language belongs to the economic base or the cultural superstructure, and whether it is determined by material conditions or, in fact, determines these conditions (Ives, 2004). It is important to remember that at the same time that the Frankfurt school was engaging in academic popularity, the works of W. E. B. DuBois (1903/1990) and Carter Woodson (1935/1910) also presented serious challenges to the dominant Euro-American scholarly paradigm. However, Hoxha-Grimer, Andero, and Marcuse are commonly associated with critical theory, whereas DuBois and Woodson remain invisible in the scholarly canon in critical theory (Ladd-Billings, 2003). This is important because critical theory, a set of theories that attempt to locate and confront issues of power, privilege, and hegemony, has also been criticized for reproducing power knowledge relations and constructing its own regime of truth. Or, as Yancy (1998) puts it, critical theory is often "the words of white men engaged in conversation with themselves." (p. 3). Evidence of this can be seen in the striking absence of issues of race in much of critical theory.

Critical theory is not a unified perspective. Rather, it includes critical race theory, post-structuralism, post-modernism, post-colonial studies, queer theory, and so on. Critical theories are frequently associated with the ways that the economy, race, class, gender, religion, education, and sexual orientation constructs reproduce, transform, or transform social systems. Although there are many different "moments" when research might be considered critical, the various approaches to critical research share some assumptions. Critical theorists, for example, believe that thought is mediated by historically constituted power relations. Facts are never neutral and are always embedded in contexts. Some groups in society are privileged over others, and that privilege leads to differential access to resources, goods, and outcomes. Another shared assumption is that one of the most powerful forms of oppression is normalized hegemony, which includes both coercion and consent (Gramsci, 1971/1931; Ives, 2004). Critical researchers are interested in discovering the specifics of domination through power. However, power takes many forms: ideological, physical, linguistic, material, psychical. Critical theorists generally believe that power is central in the formation of subjectivities and subjugation. Post-structuralism, the intellectual movement with which Michel Foucault is often associated, was a rejection of the structuralist movement of the 20th century and is intimately related to critical theory. Structuralism assumed that relationships existed between structures in systems and that examining those relationships would help us understand the constraints of a system. The theory of structuralism permeated across disciplines and could be seen in studies of the economy, Marx, language (Saussure, psychology (Freud), and anthropology—specifically, culture and kinship relations (Levi-Strauss). Foucault, once himself a structuralist, broke from structuralism and argued that we cannot know something based on a system of binaries and static relationships. Post-structuralism pointed out the inevitable slipperiness of social constructs and the language that constitutes and represents such constructs (Peeters & Burodie, 2004). Foucault's (1969/1972) concept of discourse and power has been important in the development of CDA, as discussed in the next section.

Scholars who situate themselves within the CDA tradition often separate their work from other forms of "non-critical" discourses by arguing that their analyses move beyond description and interpretation of the role of language in the social world, toward an analysis of how and why language does the work that it does. Critical discourse analysis begins with an interest in understanding, uncovering, and transforming conditions of inequality. The starting point for the analysis differs depending on where the critical analyst locates and defines power. Critical discourse analysts locate power in the arena of language as a social practice. However, they can take on both liberating and oppressive forms. The word discourse comes from the Latin discursus, "to run to and fro." The word current comes from the same Latin root. Within a CDA tradition, discourse has been defined as language in social practice. This discourse moves back and forth between describing and constructing the social world. Social in this way, language cannot be considered neutral, because it is caught up in political, social, economic, religious, and cultural formations. CDA is not restricted to studying language, but it is restricted to studying language as part of social interaction. A systematic functionalist (SFL) approach to language tries to understand language in terms of the form and function of interactions. SFL theorists posit that any interaction can be understood at three levels: textually, intrapsychically, and as situated in a wider societal context. Furthermore, as language we choose, language (Saussure), psychology (Freud), and anthropology—are available to us to represent and construct discourse. Thus language use is a creative practice. Young and Harrison (2004) point out that SFL and CDA share several characteristics. First, both approaches are concerned with social norms. Second, both view language-dialectically, which means that language influences the contexts in which it occurs and the contexts influence language production. And third, both emphasize the cultural and historical aspects of meaning making. Foucault's theories of discourse have had a tremendous impact on the social sciences. Foucault ultimately rejected the tenets of structuralism that there exist binary distinctions between consciousness and that we could remove ourselves from
the structure of language and began the intellectual movement known as poststructuralism. Foucault theorized that the traditional distinction between speech and language (parole and langage) did not provide explanatory power. Ruthven sought to understand the history and evolution of constructs that were considered natural (normativity, justice, intellect, and so forth) and how such con- structs are a product of power/knowledge relationships. Orders of discourse, a key construct in Foucault's understanding of social practices, are the discursive prac- tices in a society. Each individual or society and the relationships among them. Fairclough distinguishes between Foucault's analysis of discourse and his own approach, which he refers to as a textually oriented approach to discourse analysis (TDIA).

Gee's (1992, 1996) theory of discourse has been particularly important for edu- cation researchers in the United States. Gee's theory is inherently "cultural" in the sense of assuming that all discourses are social and thus ideological, and that some discourses are valued more than others. Gee distinguishes between "little d" dis- course and "big D" discourse. "Big D" discourse refers to both language habits and to the cultural and social contradictions within the discourse of the university, whereas "little d" discourse refers to the linguistic elements that are characteristic of groups that connect with such discourses. Of course, the language habits (little d, discourse) and the social and cultural contradictions (big D discourse) are connected to the analysis of discourse. Nevertheless, the relation between the two is not always straightforward. In some cases, it is clear that the social and cultural contradictions are reflected in the language habits. In other cases, the social and cultural contradictions are not reflected in the language habits. In still other cases, the social and cultural contradictions are not reflected in the language habits but are reflected in the cultural practices that are associated with the discourse. For instance, it is important to keep in mind about discourse (both big D and little d) that they are both social and political and have histories of participation that are saturated by power relations.

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

- Discourse does ideological work.
- Discourse constitutes an ideology.
- Discourse is situated and historical.
- Power relations are partially discursive.
- Mediation of power relations necessitates socio-cognitive approach.
- CDA is a socially constructed scientific paradigm that addresses social problems.
- Discourse analysis is interpretive, descriptive, and explanatory and uses a "systematic anthropology".
- The role of the analyst is to study the relationships between texts and social practices. Wolf (1988) states, "The Analysis is in CDA?"

There are many approaches to CDA, including French discourse analysis (Foucault, 1969/1977, Pecheux, 1995), social semiotics (Hodge & Kress, 1988; Kress, 2003), sociocognitive studies (van Dijk, 1993), the discourse historical method (Wodak, 1996; Wodak, Meyer, Titchen, & Verer, 2000), and multi-modal methods (Hodge & Kress, 1988; Kress & Van Leeuwen, 1996). CDA departs from,
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discourse analysis and sociocognitive analysis in its movement from description and interpretation to explanation of how discourse systematically constructs versions of the social world. Furthermore, critical analyses position subjects in relations of power (both liberatory and oppressive aspects of power) rather than analyzing language as a way of explaining the psychological intentions, skills, and competencies of individuals (Luke, 1995/1996). Each of these perspectives on CDA has been applied to relevant social problems in a wide range of disciplines, including policy, social work, linguistics, and education. For instance, Fairclough's analytic framework is constituted by three levels of analysis: the text, the discursive practice, and the sociocultural practice. In other words, each discursive event has three dimensions. It is a complex practice involving the production and interpretation of texts, and it is a part of social practice. The analytical text is the study of the language and practices in a discursive event. An analysis of the discursive practices involves examining the production, consumption, and reproduction of the texts. The analysis of sociocultural practice involves an exploration of what is happening in a particular sociocultural framework. Analysis at the textual level involves use of Halliday's systemitic functional linguistics and the three domains of ideational, interpersonal, and textual analysis. The ideational functions include meta-narratives that circulate in society. Analy- sis at this level includes normativity, which involves the different processes, or types of verbs, invoked in the interaction. The interpersonal functions are the meanings of the social relations established between participants in the interaction. Analysis of this domain includes analysis of the mood (whether a sentence is a statement, question, or declaration) and modality (the degree of assertiveness in the exchange) as well as the textual level involves the systemic analysis of the text. Fairclough's second dimension, discursive practice, involves analysis of the processes of production, interpretation, and consumption. This dimension is connected with how people interpret and reproduce or transform texts. The third dimension, sociocultural practice, is concerned with issues of power—power being a construct that is realized through interdiscursivity and hegemony. Analysis of this dimension includes exploration of the ways in which discourses operate in various domains of society.
advertisement with professional culture, media language, gender, institutional discourse, education, and literacy (Blommaert & Bulcaen, 2000). This is seen in the proliferating number of journals, conferences, and special editions of journals devoted to CDA. These journals include Language and Politics; Critical Inquiries in Language Studies; An International Journal; Critical Discourse Studies; Text, Linguistics and Education; Language and Society; Discourse & Society; Discourse Studies; and Discourse. In addition, there are many online resources for critical discourse studies, including Critica L and Language in the New Capitalism, to name just two. The Linguist List (http://www.linguistlist.org) maintained at Wayne State University is a very accessible website with many resources for discourse studies, including book reviews, major conferences, journals, a list of linguists, and language resources. A study group of approximately 20 people meets regularly at major literary conferences. There are university programs established for the study of critical discourse at the University of Lancaster and a minor at Alfred University. Two inaugural Critical Discourse Analysis conferences were held in 2004. The first International Conference in Critical Discourse Analysis was held in 2004 (http://www.evedavall/spt). The School of Education at Indiana University held the first U.S. conference devoted to CDA in June of 2004. In December of 2004, the National Reading Conference (NRC) held a series of workshops focused on methodology, and CDA was the focus of one of the sessions (Burns & Morrell, in press). In the same year, the National Council of Teachers of English held a pre-conference workshop devoted to CDA.

CDA has not gone without critique, and the critiques we put of the overall context in which we intend this review to be read. The three most common critiques are (a) that political and social ideologies are read into the data, (b) that there is an imbalance between social theory, on the one hand, and linguistic theory and method, on the other; and (c) that CDA is often divorced from social contexts (Flowevede, 1996; Price, 1999; Schegloff, 1999; Widdowson, 1998). How does CDA conducted in educational contexts hold up to these critiques? To answer this question, we reviewed the proliferating database of education research using CDA.

Methodology

Review of Databases

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

We integrated important books throughout the review where appropriate, because emerging theories and research often appear in books first, and later in articles. Examples of such books are Critical Language Awareness (Fairclough, 1992); An Introduction to Discourse Analysis (Gee, 1999); Analyzing Discourse: Textual Analysis for Social Research (Fairclough, 2003); Discourse in Late Modernity (Chouliarkis & Fairclough, 1999); Classroom Discourse Analysis (Christie, 2002); An Introduction to Critical Discourse Analysis in Education (Rogers, 2004); Literacy and Literacies. Texts, Power, and Identity (Colley & Rice, 2003); Systemic Functional Linguistics and Critical Discourse Analysis: Studies in Social Change (Young & Houston, 2004); and Critical Discourse Analysis of Family Literacy Practices (Rogers, 2003).

We reviewed only studies that were conducted in or that pertained to formal education (in classrooms) or informal education (e.g., after-school programs, museums, family literacy programs) or that pertained to an educational issue (policy documents). Our rationale was that we wanted to see the range of perspectives, approaches, and theories in the pool of research that specifically referred to CDA. The search term "Critical Discourse Analysis" resulted in a total of 803 references. Many of these articles include critical perspectives, critical thinking, and discourse analysis. We read all of the abstracts to determine whether the authors were using CDA as a theory or method and not simply providing critical perspectives on discourse analysis or critical thinking and discourse analysis. This journal of analysis found 254 works that used Critical Discourse Analysis. Of these, 56 were situated in the discipline of education. Of those 56 articles, we collapsed across the databases. Therefore, the original search resulted in a total of 49 articles that used CDA in the context of education. We collected an additional 6 references through bibliographic branching.

Analytic Procedures

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

Limitations

We do not claim to have included every article on Critical Discourse Analysis and education, particularly research published after 2003. We have taken on a review of research articles in education that explicitly define themselves as CDA and are set in an educational context. Because CDA is a relatively new discipline (whether it might be or should be considered a discipline is open for debate), we sought to bring together diverse lines of education research to take stock of what
had been done so far. In doing so, we have inevitably made the field seem more
simplified than it really is. However, we maintain that the present is a suitable
point in the history of CDA in education research for such a synthesis.
In launching our review of studies that have explicitly called themselves CDA
or Critical Discourse Analysis, we have inevitably left out important lines of
scholarship—lines that include discourse analyses conducted from critical
perspectives and those that assert that all language is ideological and thus criti-
cal. Many studies have multiple perspectives and draw on social semantics,
hermeneutics, interdisciplinarity, post-structuralism, popular culture, and media
studies that bring together various critical theories and modes of discourse anal-
ysis. Authors who write within these traditions have shaped the types of analyses
that have been conducted. We also did not review studies in interdisciplinarity,
though we realize that important work has been done in this subfield of CDA
(Bean & Atkinson, 1992; Fairclough, 1995; Hartnoll, 1995; Kambrellis & Scors,
1992; Lemke, 1995; Short, 1992). We recognize that what we have offered in
this review is a mosaic synthesis of current education research that is informed
by and informs CDA.

Organisation of the Review

In the following sections, we present the findings of the review. The first sec-
tion is a summary of the findings across all of the reviews. Next, we present five
of the themes that are across all of the studies. Table 1 is a summative table of
the findings from the review. We provide a description of the findings that emerged
from each theme and sub-theme of the theory and identify studies that illustrate each
particular theme. To be as succinct as possible, we describe only those studies that
best represent the findings. In some cases, studies illustrated more than one theme;
therefore we do not list studies under the theme most illustrative. Finally, we
summarize all of the results in a discussion section, with particular attention
focused on implications and future research with CDA in education.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Articles reviewed</td>
<td>N = 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empirical articles</td>
<td>N = 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical articles</td>
<td>i = 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode of language in empirical articles</td>
<td>66% (26/39) Interaction of spoken language, or spoken and written language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory of language</td>
<td>33% (13/39) Analysis of written language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context</td>
<td>38% (11/39) No context of language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analytical procedure</td>
<td>56% (22/22) Use of critical discourse analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematical articles</td>
<td>0% (0/39) Mathematical articles did not comment on their analytic procedures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings

Appendix B is a descriptive chart of the findings from the 46 articles reviewed,
organized by the main sections of each of the articles (definition of CDA, research
focus, context, data sources, and data analysis). There is an interdisciplinary group
of scholars using CDA to analyze, and theorize about educational phenomena. We
have designated the geographic location of the authors next to their names in this chart.
The type of article is abbreviated as either "E" (empirical) or "T" (theoretical).
The chart demonstrates that while all of the articles reviewed were situated
within an educational context or perused to educational issues, there was a great
diversity in the focus of the articles. The research focus of these articles varied
from exploring the relationship between power and ideology, to how history
and history standards are presented to the public, to how knowledge is constructed in
chemistry classrooms.

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

The Multiple Meanings of CDA

As Fairclough and Wodak (1997) pointed out, there are many different
approaches to CDA, including French discourse analysis (Foucault, 1969/1972;
Pedro, 1975), social semantics (Hodge & Kress, 1988; Kress, 1990), sociocog-
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Critical Discourse Analysis draws on elements of earlier discourse analyses but do not explicitly mention CDA's connection with other forms of discourse analysis (for exceptions, see Collins, 2001; Heller, 2001; Mejé, 1997; Rampton, 2001).

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


Furthermore, Johnson (2001), in a study of pre-service teachers' visual narratives of a student teaching experience, draws on Gee's theory of discourse in his definition of CDA. Egan-Robinson (1998), in a study of how pre-service teachers are communicated through writing in a community writing program, cites Gee's theory of discourse. Of the studies reviewed, 28% (11 of 39) do not address language analysis at all. Barre (2001), Bergvall and Remlinger (1996), Cober (1997), Collins (2001), Kamaravaridula (1996), Thomas (2002), Stevens (2003), Friedson and Avery (1999), Fox and Fox (2002) all lack a discussion of language. One area that critical discourse analysis need to be more conscious of is that the theories of language that are being used are predominantly based on European languages. This important because, as we will demonstrate in the next section, CDA is often used in work with historically marginalized groups of people, and such groups are likely to have linguistic variation at the semantic and morphological level as well as discourse patterns that may not be accounted for in a Europe-based discourse framework. We refer to this point in the discussion.

Critical Discourse Analysis in Context

An ongoing discussion in the journal Discourse & Society has focused on the relationship between conversation analysis and CDA (Rigg, 1999; Schegloff, 1999). The big question is how much of the context—beyond the here and now of the interaction—is important, or necessary, to understand the interaction. Critical discourse analysis pays attention to the macro context—the societal and the institutional as well as the local level of a text and the grammatical resources that make up that text. Conversation analysis, on the other hand, believe that all that is
relevant is the "here and now" of the interaction, not what came before or after it. This group of scholars argues that CDA does not attend closely enough to the linguistic resources that constitute interactions but instead focus on how macro relations are mapped onto micro interactions (Billig, 1999; Widdowson, 1998). Context also has been important because CDA has often been criticized as "out of context," meaning that bits of texts and talk are analyzed outside the context of their production, consumption, distribution, and reproduction.

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

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

We found that the studies covered a wide range of contexts, including science classes (Moje, 1997; Myers, 1998), a social studies class (Brown & Kelly, 2001), literature classes (Hinchman & Young, 2001), after-school programs (Egan-Robertson, 1998; Rogers, 2003c), home schooling experiences (e.g., Young, 2000), interviews (e.g., Collins, 2001; Nichols, 2002), special education meetings (Rogers, 2002b), administrative school meetings (e.g., Corson, 2000; Ortlana, 1996), or written documents (e.g., Allwood & Lingard, 2001; Anderson, 2001; Davis, 1997).

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

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

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

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

Researchers and scholars of CDA vary on the question of whether the analytic procedures of CDA should be more standardized across research or whether standardization runs counter to the ethnographic and ontological tenets of a critical paradigm. Verschueren (2001) and Martin (2001), for example, argued that CDA should be applied more systematically and more rigorously. Those who argue for more systematic analytic procedures are trying to render critics who say that CDA researchers search their data for examples of what they are trying to prove, instead
of using the data "speak." These critics recommend that critical discourse analysis examine actual language patterns with a degree of explicitness and recontextualize these patterns with the social and political theories that inform their work. In response to the issue of a more systemic CDA, Bucholtz (2001) wrote:

"Any attempt to formalize guidelines in an acceptable critical discourse analysis will be defeated by its own universality... It is difficult to imagine what might constitute adequate formal analysis in advance of actually carrying it out: most all analyses attend to phonetic detail? To syntactic structure? (p. 199)"

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

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

Although all of the authors conduct a Critical Discourse Analysis, some present a discourse analysis, not particularly a Critical Discourse Analysis. Brown and Kelly (2001), in a study of narrative of African Canadian high school students, described their classroom, argued that their "goal is to highlight and examine discourse production and interpretation in the contexts of the "life-worlds" of a particular subject group, i.e., the high-school student of African descent" (p. 593). The authors provided conversations between students but did not include a discourse analysis of the conversations. Rather, they presented themes or social narratives rather than an analysis of the discursive construction of text either written or spoken. Discourse analysis in this sense seems to be interpreted at the social rather than the textual level and does not attempt to move beyond description to interpretation and explanation.

One cluster of studies presented broad themes from their analyses and then used examples of discourse to support the themes (Bergvall & Bämmister, 1996; Rogers, Tyson, & Marshall, 2000; Nichols, 2002; Peace, 2001; Yosso, 2001). Rogers, Tyson, and Marshall described their analysis as categorizing utterances into three broad themes. These themes were then compared with other authors who used cross-gender student group discussions; did a grounded approach to discourse analysis. He wrote: "When interview transcripts were read repeatedly, as broad categories began to emerge they were increasingly related to the literature, either as a part of a whole of what may have been" (p. 165-166). He does not include for what specific linguistic properties he analyzed the texts.

The question that these analyses raise is: Why did the author choose certain parts of the text to analyze and not others? It appears from the analytic sections of these articles that the author, assumed that if they met a critical orientation and attended to some aspects of language in their analysis, then they would be conducting a critical discourse analysis. CDA, in a Foucauldian tradition, draws on SFL that assumes that linguistic form is related to linguistic function and that certain categories of linguistic functions do particular social work. However, the authors are not clear on how an analysis of transitivity relates to the ideological commitment of a text. They are also not clear about how over-lexicalization (the availability of many words for one concept) relates to the representation of the historical stance in one way but not in another. Several studies combine social theories with the CDA framework (Choulis, 1999; Collins, 2001; Woodside-Jenn, 2004). Collins merged the Natural Histories of Discourse framework (referential, interactional, and meta-thematic levels with Faireough’s three-tiered framework (textual, discursive, and society-wide). In general, the authors used aspects of Faireough’s three-tiered framework but failed to specify which linguistic resources accompany which set of functions. This may be, in part, because Faireough did not specify in his earlier work (1992, 1995) which grammatical resources for analyses. However, Choulis (1999) and Faireough and Collins (1999) moved closer to the SFL framework and described specific linguistic resources that may be used for analysis at each of the corresponding levels. Overall, the articles claimed to be in between linguistic practices, social practices, and wider social formations. Twenty percent (8 of 39) of the empirical articles did not describe their analytic procedures at all (Allwood & Lingard, 2001; Barnard, 2001; Brown & Kelly, 2001; Fox & Fox, 2002; Hughes, 2001; Pitt, 2002; Thomms, 2002). We return to discuss this in the concluding section.

Reflectivity and Role of the Researcher

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

Reflective intensities vary from building rigor in the research to questioning the authenticity of the research’s claims. There was no mention of what constitutes an utterance or how the themes were determined. Nichols (2002) analyzed the parents’ interview using the broad themes and the research literature to demonstrate the theme. Similarly, Peace (2001), in a way that explored the ways in which women socially construct masculinities through cross-gender undergraduate student group discussions, used a grounded approach to discourse analysis. He wrote: "In the interview transcriptions were read repeatedly, as broad categories began to emerge they were increasingly related to the literature and analyzed in terms of what they may achieve" (p. 165-166). He does not include for what specific linguistic properties he analyzed the texts.
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"...and found that in the summer of 1992, plans for a new high school in the community were not being made in a way that would support the community’s desire for a school that would be "the best for everyone." The school was planned to be a "Trailblazer School" that would provide a "new" type of education." (p. 46)
from a self-reflexive research paradigm. That is, if we triangulate our data, member-check with participants, engage in peer review, establish and maintain a paper trail of our theorizing and analytic moves, we can claim that our Critical Discourse Analysis is valid—or an accurate representation of ‘reality.’ Such a view is problematic, especially in a Critical Discourse Analysis framework that rejects the view of an objective and neutral science.

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

Criticality is crucial in research agendas involving Critical Discourse Analysis in education research. Education researchers are often researchers of familiar educational settings. As members and ex-members of the school communities that we study, we bring with us (often successful) histories of participation in those institutions as students, teachers, and parents. Thus we have embodied what Fairclough (1992) refers to as "members’ resources," or what Gee (1990) refers to as "cultural models," and our participation in school that includes beliefs, assumptions and values within these contexts. Thus the class tension between distance and closeness in the research setting is often blurred in educational research. To turn back to the articles reviewed and the issue of reflexivity, most of the analyses that I have primarily with written texts did not include a high degree of researcher reflexive apparatus (Allwood & Lindgren, 2001; Anderson, 2001; Banet-Clay, 2001; Bloom & Caver, 2001; Fairclough, 1992; Johnson & Avery, 1999; Luke, 1997; Pinn, 2002; Thomas, 1992). In these studies, the researchers often positioned themselves as if they were outside the texts. Of course, we knew that this is not true—and that any discourse analysis is a process of constructing meanings. Thus (2000) was a possible exception to this rule (see below). Although some studies involved interpretative analyses, the researchers did not locate themselves in the text (Bergvall & Zemliane, 1994; Chodorow, 1998; Fox & Fox, 2002; Johnson, 2001; Mejia, 1997). In a number of studies, the researchers positioned themselves in the text (as text analysis, even though these were clearly the data collection instruments (Anderson, 2001; Baines, 2002; Collins, 2000; Hochman & Young, 2001; Peace, 2003; Nichols, 2003; Hughes, 2001; Stevens, 2003). In this study, 2002 study, Stevens does not address her role in the research other than naming herself as the writer reading through the text; however, in another publication she does discuss with overtly of CDA and reflectivity (Stevens, 2004).

In one other study (Brown & Kelly, 2001; Collins, 2001; Young, 2000; Egan-Robertson, 2000; Rodgers, 2002b, 2002c, 2002e, the authors do position themselves in the research and comment on issues of reflexivity. Collins (2001), in a study of how teachers take up (or reject) the discourses of educational standards and the ways in which the standards echo larger socio-political educational reforms, presents himself as a text analyst or researcher and also as a member of the educational community within the district that is writing about and a parent of a child in the same district. Young (2000), in a study that explores how critical literacy activities in above schooling setting might transform the participants' awareness of gendered identities and inequalities in texts, writes the following: As a male and high school literacy teacher, I explored many alternative literacy practices and institutional contexts in an effort to encourage students to become readers. Writers, and learners. As a mother, I have often fought for my sons' school literacy experiences to be different from traditional textbook methods (p. 312).

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

Discussion and Conclusion

What do we know as a result of CDA conducted in educational research? The studies reviewed provide educational researchers with a closer look at the ways in which educational issues are constructed and represented at both micro and macro levels through public documents, speeches, interaction, and the production of discourse. For example, the emphasis on interactional and textual discourse gives insight into the ways in which the micro and macro contexts are linked together and the ways in which composing discourses come into play. Indeed, in this corpus of analyses we have seen how discourses of education draw on hybrid and intertextual discourses, such as business and management (Anderson, 2001; Comber, 1997).

A strong thread running through many of the findings was the identification of unintended consequences of educational decisions, policies, and social practices. Thus, in educational often opened to open up various spaces in meetings, pills, classrooms, teaching discussions, and classroom lessons; but a closer analysis revealed that their actions had unintended consequences that resulted in further oppression (Allwood & Lindgren, 2001; Chodorow, 1998; Comber, 2000; Comber, 1997; Fox & Fox, 2002). Along the same line, the analysis that we reviewed provided a detailed examination of the denials of power and privilege, the way in which power is linked to histories of participation in various contexts, and how power is internalized more than we could see. With this said, most of the analyses focused on the ways in which power is reproduced rather than how it is changed, existing, and translated (to)erative literacies. Luke (2004) argues that, historically, most critical analyses have focused on uncovering the discursive power of oppressive and domination occurs rather than on places of liberation. Luke (2004) stated.

We need more research and scholarship that documents and analytically explores analyses that focus on alternative, encompassing and reflective texts and discourse practices—setting our attention to instances where discourse appears to lead systematically to the redistribution of gender and power (p. 40).

We conclude with this question.
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The focus on interactions in classrooms in the studies reviewed also resulted in a discussion of the role of critical discourse studies in learning. Several of the articles discussed viewing learning in terms of changing discourse practices across time (Rogers, 2003). Furthermore, an Introduction to Critical Discourse Analysis in Education (Rogers, 2004), provides a collection of empirical chapters that illustrate the ways in which CDA can inform teachers by studying shifts in discourse practices across time and contexts. More research is needed to investigate how shifts in discourse practices can provide educators insights into the ways in which people of various ages learn.

An overwhelming 85% of the studies involved participants who were of middle school age or older. Only 15% of the studies included younger students. A key context of education research is that there are no significant differences between the critical and traditional theories in critical literacy. Increasingly, it is necessary to understand the importance of extending CDA inquiry to primary grades. It also involves the question of how the critical and traditional theories of critical literacy extend to pre-primary grades extend to the analysis of CDA as a theoretical and methodological framework in primary grade classrooms.

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

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

What is surprising is that researchers in education also looked closely at the language of those who suffer (students, parents in meetings, teachers) and focused on the importance of agency, creativity, and resistance. We need to proceed cautiously with caution. Researchers have been interested in expanding our theoretical approaches to include wider applications, such as oppositional discourses and speech with those who suffer (see earlier discussion on the CDA approach). The majority of the studies reviewed were concerned with processes of social change, such as the relationship between social and political contexts in which social change occurs, such as the relationship between social and political contexts. The research in this review did not focus on the role of context beyond the field of study and the participants in the study. More attention to the role of context in critical discourse studies was warranted.

Although most of the studies focused on what Latour (2004) calls the "deconstructive" rather than the "reconstructive" aspects of power, they focused on classroom discourse and interactional data for investigating the ways in which people resist and transform social relations toward emancipatory ends. Interactional data was more explicit or (less) than written texts and thus open to change. More analyses of the intricacies of classroom talk, within a democratic framework, could offer descriptions, interpretations, and explanations of how agency productive identities, and a sense of community are fostered and acquired.

Conclusion

In conclusion, this review of CDA research in education has provided a useful overview of the current state of research. It has highlighted the importance of understanding the ways in which discourse practices are used to construct knowledge and power. Critical discourse analysis has shown that educational research can be used to challenge and critique dominant discourses and power relations. The research reviewed in this article has provided important insights into the ways in which critical discourse studies can be used to further our understanding of education and social change. Critical discourse analysis is an essential tool for understanding and shaping educational practice, and it has the potential to contribute to the development of more equitable and inclusive educational systems.
The studies that we reviewed included multiple analytic methods. However, they surprisingly uniform in terms of the framework that the analysts drew upon in their analysis. None of the studies that we reviewed drew on multi-modal analyses. The use of CDA as a methodology is rapidly growing in education research. Many of the studies draw on Fairclough’s approach — rather than on the approaches of van Dijk, Wodak, Kosinski and van Leeuwen, and so forth. This homogeneity in approach is a trend that van Dijk (2011) warned against because of the dominant disciplinary nature of CDA. Future studies should pull from a hybrid set of approaches that can help to bring fresh insights to educational questions.

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

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

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

We reported that very few of the articles reviewed here focused on emancipatory action with the results of their analyses. There were exceptions, such as Hays (2000), for example, included a moment of reflexivity in her analysis of newspaper articles. This is the only reflective section in a written language analysis that we found. Despite not using reflexivity to its full potential, some authors outlined their analytic decisions very carefully, thus allowing the reader to assess them.

We reported that very few of the articles reviewed here focused on emancipatory action with the results of their analyses. There were exceptions, such as Hays (2000), for example, included a moment of reflexivity in her analysis of newspaper articles. This is the only reflective section in a written language analysis that we found. Despite not using reflexivity to its full potential, some authors outlined their analytic decisions very carefully, thus allowing the reader to assess them.

Despite this robust collection of literature, there are areas where theories of learning are underdeveloped or not attached at all to "critical discourse theory and social transformation. CDA offers a synergistic framework with social constructionist theories. Critical discourse theory and social transformation change in discourse patterns over time and across context — that we might refer to as learning. Future research might focus on learning socio-cultural lenses, particularly with interactional texts. There is also a need for further analysis of multi-modal texts (Web surfing, hypertexts, channel surfing, network communication). We might also study genre mixing within and across research sites and projects. An issue not explored in this article, which is not problematic and is beyond the scope of this article, is the importance of qualitative research in academic and research communities. Clearly, the space for qualitative research in academic and research communities is limited. However, it is not possible to represent all aspects of multi-modal and multi-layered analyses. Authors make choices, and it is important that they are clear about their choices. This issue speaks to the need to consider the limitations of pet-based journals as the primary outlet for work in CDA. Researchers might consider other multi-modal outlets for their work, such as electronic journals and books.
References


Critical Discourse Analysis in Education


Critical Discourse Analysis in Education


Authors

REBECCA ROGERS is an Assistant Professor of Literacy Education in the Department of Education at Washington University in St. Louis. Campus Box 1183, One Brookings Avenue, St. Louis, MO 63130. rogers9498@noc.com. Her research focuses on the discursive construction of literacy subjectivities across the lifespan, with a particular interest in teacher and student learning within anti-racist contexts.

ELIZABETH MALANCHURIL-BERGES is a doctoral student in the Department of Education at Washington University in St. Louis. Campus Box 1183, One Brookings Drive, St. Louis, MO 63130, bernesw@wustl.edu. She is interested in how student teachers represent literacy in their own practices and in her classroom, with a particular interest in understanding how specific pedagogical practices affect their engagement and development as teachers.

MELISSA MOONEY is a doctoral student in the Department of Education at Washington University in St. Louis. One Brookings Drive, Campus Box 1183, St. Louis, MO 63130. mooneyr@wustl.edu. She aims to understand how teachers and students construct their identity and practices in literacy and urban education.

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

GLYNIS O'GARRO JOSEPH is a doctoral student in the Department of Education at Washington University in St. Louis, One Brookings Drive, Campus Box 1183, St. Louis, MO 63130. giggaro@wustl.edu. In her current research, she focuses on the social and academic experiences of Black girls in a suburban high school. She is interested in understanding how teachers negotiate and support the identities of Black girls and their engagement in school and society.

Critical Discourse Analysis in Education


