SSOAR

Open Access Repository
www.ssoar.info

The field of Foucaultian discourse analysis: structures, developments and perspectives

Diaz-Bone, Rainer; Bührmann, Andrea D.; Rodriguez, Encarnacion Gutiérrez; Schneider, Werner; Kendall, Gavin; Tirado, Francisco

Veröffentlichungsversion / Published Version
Zeitschriftenartikel / journal article

Zur Verfügung gestellt in Kooperation mit / provided in cooperation with:

GESIS - Leibniz-Institut für Sozialwissenschaften

gesis
Leibniz-Institut
für Sozialwissenschaften

Mitglied der
Leibniz-Gemeinschaft

The Field of Foucaultian Discourse Analysis: Structures, Developments and Perspectives

Rainer Diaz-Bone, Andrea D. Bührmann,
Encarnación Gutiérrez Rodríguez, Werner Schneider,
Gavin Kendall & Francisco Tirado [*]

Abstract: *»Das Feld der Foucaultschen Diskursanalyse: Strukturen, Entwicklungen und Perspektiven«.* The article outlines the field of FOUCAULTian discourse analysis. The FOUCAULTian concept of discourse is introduced, and methodological positions and methodological developments are sketched. Compared to other qualitative social research approaches, the different researchers and research groups that have adopted the FOUCAULTian concept of discourse are not linked by a fully integrated common research paradigm. However, they share common methodological problems and areas of methodological research resulting from various references to FOUCAULTian positions. In the last decade, different research groups have become aware of these shared commonalities, so that one can speak of an emerging field of FOUCAULTian discourse analysis rather than an emerging paradigm. The article gives an insight into discourse analytic research in selected countries, discusses the internationalization of FOUCAULTian discourse analysis and highlights current trends and perspectives.

Keywords: Michel FOUCAULT, FOUCAULTian discourse analysis, discourse analysis, field, paradigm.

[*] Address all communications to: Rainer Diaz-Bone; Freie Universität Berlin; Institut für Soziologie, Garystraße 55, 14195 Berlin, Germany; e-mail: diazbone@zedat.fu-berlin.de; Andrea D. Bührmann, Institut für Soziologie, LMU München, Konradstr. 6, 80801 München, Germany; e-mail: andrea.buehrmann@soziologie.uni-muenchen.de; Encarnación Gutiérrez Rodriguez, Spanish, Portuguese and Latin American Studies, School of Languages, Linguistics and Cultures, University of Manchester, Manchester, M13 9PL, United Kingdom; e-mail: e.gutierrez@manchester.ac.uk; Werner Schneider, Philosophisch-Sozialwissenschaftliche Fakultät, Universität Augsburg, Universitätsstr. 10, 86135 Augsburg, Germany; e-mail: werner.schneider@phil.uni-augsburg.de; Gavin Kendall, School of Humanities and Human Services, Queensland University of Technology, Brisbane, QLD4034, Australia; e-mail: g.kendall@qut.edu.au; Francisco Tirado, Departament de Psicologia Social, Facultat de Psicologia, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, 08193 Bellaterra (Barcelona), Spain; e-mail: franciscojavier.tirado@uab.es.

1. Introduction

The debate on discourse analysis, originally influenced by Michel FOU-CAULT, has gained significance in various academic disciplines, in particular as a qualitative research method. However, we still need to develop a more accurate focus regarding the foundation of discourse analysis as a method and its application in social research. This is the aim of this special issue of HSR. The articles in this issue offer an insight into theoretical and methodological aspects of FOUCAULT's 'discourse', discussion on the problems we might encounter applying it as a method and its current development. The articles represent a selection of the on-line journal special issue of FQS – Forum: Qualitative Social Research 8(2): "From Michel Foucault's Discourse Theory to Empirical Discourse Research".[1]

The concept of discourse understood as a collective form of practice in the social field or in areas of society points to the creation of a collectively shared knowledge order, although FOUCAULT has emphasised that the individual as subject is created discursively. While the concept of discourse addresses the meso- and macro-level to discursively analyse the influences of discourses on interaction and agents, it also addresses the micro level of social relations. At the centre of the analysis lies the individual and her/his discursive production as well as the relationship between discursive practices or discursive forma-tions and processes of subjectification. In recent work both perspectives are brought together through, for example, FOUCAULT's concept of dispositif or Judith BUTLER's concept of performativity. Within this background new debates on methodological developments in discourse analysis are taking place. This will be discussed in the following articles in this issue.

Thus, discourse analysis is not perceived as "just" a theoretical "attitude" or as a different "perspective" in qualitative social research. Recently researchers have been attentive to the socio-historical studies of FOUCAULT and his methodological reflections with regard to archaeology and genealogy. On this basis a new and different form of self-reflexive empirical research has been produced. Therefore, there is a need to reflect upon the coherence and premises of FOUCAULT's discourse analysis. In this regard, some of the contributions here discuss specific research designs, explanations, methodological standards and quality criteria. Furthermore, these articles illustrate the relevance and significance of the following questions: Does discourse analysis imply or de-scribe a specific research method, research concepts and conceptualisations or instruments as well as their application in the research process? And: How could we combine other research perspectives or paradigms with discourse analysis? Finally, the selected articles illustrate different receptions of FOU-CAULT's discourse analysis and the impossibility of departing from a ho-

---

[1] Available through URL: <http://www.qualitative-research.net/fqs/fqs-d/inhalt2-07-d.htm>.

mogenous paradigm in social research. Nonetheless, the articles show that there is a field of discourse analysis in qualitative research methods.

This issue starts with an outline to the international field of FOUCAULT's discourse analysis.[2] We speak of "field", because discourse analysis which is informed by or oriented to the work of FOUCAULT is not an integrated paradigm in the sense made famous by KUHN (1962). After the FOUCAULTian notion of discourse and the conception of discourse analysis that "works with FOUCAULT" are presented, some of the different local/national scenes of discourse analysis will be sketched. This will be done mainly with reference to national approaches because so far there does not seem to be a strong transnational structure of the field—although there are some networks, such as in the "sub"-fields of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), that transcend national boundaries already. Then we will discuss some current strands and perspectives in FOUCAULTian discourse analysis. In short, we will look at how: (1) the collection of articles in this HSR-issue presents converging developments but also the heterogeneity of the field of FOUCAULTian discourse analysis and (2) the different groups and national scenes have started to connect themselves internationally. So the editors of this issue hope to give a fresh insight into the state of discourse analysis and to contribute with this special issue of HSR to the discussion and development of this field.

2. The FOUCAULTian Conception of Discourse and FOUCAULTian Discourse Analysis

Today the theoretical work of Michel FOUCAULT is widely regarded as being part of the theoretical body of social sciences like sociology, social history, political sciences and social psychology. But FOUCAULTian notions are also fundamental in other dynamic fields such as cultural studies, gender studies and postcolonial studies. Discourse theory concepts and arguments are no longer restricted to linguistics or other sciences of language use. Today they are part of the social sciences.[3] One of the reasons for this spread beyond the purely linguistic is that FOUCAULT conceived discourse as social structure and discursive practice as social practice. "Discourse" is not simply dialogue or philosophical monologue. The term "discourse" was first used to signify the

---

[2] This is a shorter version of the Introduction of the FQS-Issue Vol. 8(2): Diaz-Bone, Rainer; Bührmann, Andrea D.; Gutiérrez Rodríguez, Encarnación; Schneider, Werner; Kendall, Gavin & Tirado, Francisco (2007). The Field of Foucaultian Discourse Analysis: Structures, Developments and Perspectives [52 paragraphs]. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, *8*(2), Art. 30, URL: <http://www.qualitative-research.net/fqs-texte/2-07/07-2-30-e.htm>.

[3] See for the English-speaking world URL: <http://www.michel-foucault.com/> and the online-journal Foucault Studies.

grammatical structure of narratives (BARTHES, 1988). Here "discourse" was conceived as the order overarching the level of the sentence. For a long time the various purely linguistic approaches to discourse were dominant (VAN DIJK, 1985, 1997a, 1997b). In socio-linguistic approaches and conversation analysis (TEN HAVE, 1999) "discourse" means an interactional order which emerges in social situations, so here "discourse" is an interactionist concept (ANGERMÜLLER, 2001). In the different traditions of French structuralism and (so called) post-structuralism the term discourse seems to be omnipresent. In the structuralist era discourse was introduced as the underlying deep structure of the human mind (LÉVI-STRAUSS) or the human psyche (LACAN).

The FOUCAULTian use of this concept is the first that combines a structuralist view with a praxeological interpretation of discourse into an (at least) dualistic concept. FOUCAULTian discourse is conceived of as a super-individual reality; as a kind of practice that belongs to collectives rather than individuals; and as located in social areas or fields. However, as the later work of FOUCAULT (1988, 1990, 2005) and the work of Judith BUTLER (1990, 1993) have shown, discourses have an impact on individuals as they are discursively constructed and constituted. So some researchers in the field (JÄGER, 2004; KELLER, 2007; DIAZ-BONE, 2007) consider the FOUCAULTian concept of discourse to belong more to a meso- or macro-level than to a micro-level (as in conversation analysis or ethnomethodology) although it influences socialized individuals and interactions in social situations. However, others in the field see, from a post-structuralist angle, the subject as constructed and constituted on the basis of a discursive matrix: several articles in this special edition discuss the relationship between a discursive matrix and subjectivation/subjectification (TATE, 2007, and, in the context of dispositif, see also BÜHRMANN & SCHNEIDER, 2007). They focus on the subject and the discursive constitution of the subject: in this way, FOUCAULTian discourse analysis enters the micro-level.

FOUCAULT worked out his concept of discourse and discursive practice in *The Archaeology of Knowledge* (FOUCAULT, 1972a), which was announced as a methodological supplement to his epistemological magnum opus The Order of Things (FOUCAULT, 1970). FOUCAULT offers his principles of discourse theory in *the Archaeology of Knowledge*. Using this approach—located "beyond hermeneutics and structuralism" (DREYFUSS & RABINOW, 1983)—FOUCAULT wishes to distance himself from certain central hypotheses of the traditional treatment of history. For FOUCAULT, the goal of the *Archaeology of Knowledge* (1972a) is to engage in a pure description of discursive events, which treats the material in its original neutrality, serving as a horizon for the investigation of the unities constructed within it. In this context FOUCAULT first scrutinizes the concepts of "tradition", "discipline", "development" or "author" because he assumes these imply the illusion of historical continuity. Where representations of continuity are asserted FOUCAULT in-

10

troduces the category of discontinuity and the concepts of "rift", "threshold", "series," "rupture" and "transformation". Second, FOUCAULT problematizes the category of meaning. He wishes to scrutinize the discourse concerning the fact and conditions of a discourse's manifest appearance and not to dwell on the content that may be concealed therein, but rather on the transformations that the discourses have effected. Finally, FOUCAULT abandons the notion of a sovereign subject in so far as he conceives of discourses as a self-contained order, which is inaccessible with regard to the intentions of the individuals involved in them when one's attempt ignores the objects or contexts of the discourses.

Through this deconstructive operation, FOUCAULT (1972a) establishes the archaeological area of research that is constituted by the totality of all effective statements—whether written or spoken—in their dispersion and in the forcefulness that is proper to each one (as a "serious speech act" [DREYFUSS & RABINOW, 1983]). The starting point of the FOUCAULTian analysis of statements is thus the diversity of all statements whose positivity is in need of investigation. The point here is to analyse the historical conditions of the actual existence of statements. Beginning with the actual positive existence of statements, FOUCAULT (1972a) then proposes to include a large quantity of statements within a discourse insofar as they belong to the same discursive formation. In analysing discourses, he differentiates four complexes that are characterized by regularities in their discursive practices and correspond with the identified existence-functions of statements. Thus, discourses are structured and constituted by the formation rules of objects, enunciative modalities, concepts, and strategies. In conclusion, one can say that in FOUCAULT's descriptions of the process of discursive analysis he first asks which object or area of knowledge is discursively produced; second, he asks according to what logic the terminology is constructed; third, he asks who authorized it; and finally, he asks which strategic goals are being pursued in the discourse (see also BÜHRMANN 2004:27-39).

Yet in his *Archaeology of Knowledge* FOUCAULT still delivers theoretical work, within which discourse is presented as a system of statements ("enunciations"). It is this character of an "ordered system" which is constitutive of statements, rather than the intentionality of individuals in situations (although individuals still have to enact discourses and statements). These statements are produced (diachronically) in an ongoing discursive stream, whereby the preceding statements build the (virtual) context of previously-enacted statements. Ongoing statements have to respect the set of rules which is inherent in this context of preceding statements. If they fail to do this, they will not have an impact; they will not be accepted or even recognized in the social area or social field as "serious speech acts" (DREYFUSS & RABINOW, 1983). To identify and to analyse discourses is equivalent to identifying and analysing systems of statements as bearers of their *rules of formation* i.e. the rules that made the

statements possible and that simultaneously already reside in the (system of preceding) statements. They are not external to the statements themselves and they must be understood as the result of a socio-historic process in which the discourse as a field of knowledge and a system of rules emerges. These rules are said to be "responsible" for the organized—i.e. systematic and pre-structured—ways of using "concepts", of referring to "objects", of thinking in strategies and of formatting the ways of speaking. So one can speak of these ways of making statements as discursive practices.

These discursive practices are productive: they produce the specific semantics of the words in use, and they relate words to objects and to strategies of acting towards and thinking about things, persons etc. In this way, ontologizing categorizations and evaluations are integrated, and they appear as "natural" as opposed to "constructed" or as the contingent result of discursive practices. In this sense, discourses produce a perception and representation of social reality. This representation forms part of hegemonic strategies of establishing dominant interpretations of "reality" (see the contributions in LACLAU, HOWARTH, NORVEL & STAVRAKAKIS, 2000). It is this aspect of discourse as a mediator and tool of power through the production of knowledge that gender or queer (e.g. BUTLER) and postcolonial theorists (e.g. SAID and SPIVAK) have explored when engaging with FOUCAULT's concept of discourse. Discourses, as SAID (1978) and SPIVAK (1987) note are not innocent explanations of the world. They are, as SPIVAK emphasizes, a way of *worlding*, of appropriating the world through knowledge. The strands of knowledge with which we engage in our attempt to describe and understand the world are produced in complex power relations in which different actors and institutions work to establish a dominant interpretation of "reality". It is in regard to the understanding of discourse as an instance of hegemony that SAID and SPIVAK look at the question of what kind of *truth* has been produced within the context of European colonialism. Furthermore, they investigate what kind of descriptions of world, people and things have been discursively conveyed as the "Other" in the name of the "Orient" and the "gendered subalternized "Other". Discourses are understood in these approaches as instances of ideology, showing how ideology needs to be analysed beyond the MARXist paradigm of "false consciousness". Instead, FOUCAULT's concept of discourse brings us to the question of hegemony and the power of discourses in establishing a dominant or a counter-hegemonic representation (GUTIÉRREZ RODRÍGUEZ, 1999). Discourse does not only imply the semantic structure of individual utterances or political speeches, but, as HARAWAY (1991) notes, it delineates a material-semantic knot, in which subjective experiences and objects of knowledge are inscribed. Discursive practices are interwoven with non-discursive practices. This distinc-

tion leads to the concept of the "dispositif".[4] Here, institutional and technical forms of social practices are embedded in discourses and vice versa. The dispositif is the constitutive interface for power-knowledge relations which FOUCAULT has analysed in many of his socio-historical studies, in particular in his work on governmentality, which became extraordinarily famous in the last three decades (FOUCAULT, 1977, 1978; LEMKE, KRASMAN & BRÖCKLING, 2000; GUTIÉRREZ RODRÍGUEZ & PIEPER, 2003, BÜHRMANN, 2004; BÜHRMANN & SCHNEIDER, 2007).

Discourses are studied in their socio-historical development, which is not theorized as a continuous unfolding of an a priori existing "logic", but as a process that is characterized by discontinuities and ruptures. The early notion of discourse emphasizes the existence of a system of rules which is inherent in discursive practices, and stresses the coherent organization of discourse. Later, FOUCAULT (1972b) and especially his follower Michel PÊCHEUX (1975) "opened" this structural position by including inconsistencies and contradictions. The FOUCAULTian notion of discourse was first developed in the area of the historical epistemology of sciences and in applications in social history in France. Here in the 1960s discourse researchers started to reflect upon the methodology of discourse analysis. But this first strand of FOUCAULTian discourse analysis remained a Francophone research area with little international reception (HAK & HELSOOT, 1995; WILLIAMS, 1999; HELSLOOT & HAK, 2007; DIAZ-BONE, 2003, 2007).

Instead the *theoretical* concepts in the FOUCAULTian work received a wider international reception in various social sciences. These were adopted and combined with other theoretical traditions in sociology and linguistics. In short, in different disciplines researchers started to work with the FOUCAULTian concept of discourse as an empirical concept. The starting point for the development of discourse analysis outside of France, however, was an interdisciplinary heterogeneity of different syntheses.

Over the last twenty years, one can speak of an increasing interest in methodological positions and the methodological consequences of FOUCAULT's considerations about how to explore discourses, i.e. the empirical analysis of discursive structures and discursive practices. Some of the methodological debates have focussed the question on whether there is one methodology in FOUCAULTian work, and if there is just one, to ask questions like: What are its standpoints, its strategies etc. (DREYFUSS & RABINOW, 1983)? Some discourse researchers started exploring methodological strategies and collecting tools for empirical discourse analysis (KENDALL & WICKHAM, 1999; KELLER, 2004) or to present the results of their methodological experiences as

---

[4] However, some discourse analysts do not accept this distinction—they regard every social practice as discursive.

13

"schedules" for discourse analysis (e.g. MEYER & WODAK, 2001; JÄGER, 2004).

Since the 1990s different researchers and research groups that use the FOU-CAULTian notion of discourse started to become aware of each other and to influence each other. In Germany one can say that different conferences and workshops built the platform for discussions. First, discourse researchers compared theoretical uses of FOUCAULTian notions and different theoretical paradigms and disciplinary footings. Soon, handbooks, overviews (BUBLITZ, BÜHRMANN, HANKE & SEIER, 1999; KELLER, HIRSELAND, SCHNEI-DER & VIEHÖVER, 2001, 2003, 2005; KERCHNER & SCHNEIDER, 2006) and an increasing amount of monographs emerged. In France the situation was similar, but there linguists and historians kept a more prominent role in the development and continuity of FOUCAULTian discourse analysis (WIL-LIAMS, 1999; CHARAUDEAU & MAINGUENEAU, 2003; GUILHAU-MOU, 2005). Here, following the seminal works of PÊCHEUX, different groups started to develop methodological tools for discourse analysis. The influence of this FOUCAULTian discourse analytic perspective weakened in the 1980s, but is now experiencing a kind of renaissance.

All these national and international initiatives mobilized the recognition and acknowledgement of others, which supported the emergence of a field of FOUCAULTian discourse analysis. A field—in BOURDIEU's (1985, 1988) sense—differs from a paradigm by virtue of its widely recognized cleavages and differences (MARTIN, 2003; DIAZ-BONE, 2002). The groups and individuals that recognize each other as part of the field share common topics, methodological questions and interests.[5]

There are some older attempts to give an overview of the international area of discourse analysis (e.g. EHLICH, 1994). KELLER (2004) delivers a more recent portrayal of the international field. Recently, some more specific suggestions have been made about how to interpret the structure of national fields. ANGERMÜLLER (2001) suggested a differentiation between two central paradigms: a so-called "pragmatical discourse analysis" and a "post-structural discourse theory". The first paradigm is characterized by a more descriptive and specific micro-orientation. Sociologists and social psychologists in particular have used this approach to research everyday conversation and interaction. This paradigm includes approaches like symbolic interactionism, ethnomethodology and conversation analysis. Discourse means here—more or less—an emergent symbolic system. In contrast to this, the paradigm of post-structural discourse theory is more macro-oriented. Here ANGERMÜLLER points in particular to how linguistics attempts to find out more about (current and historical) political ideologies. This diagnosis may have been valid up until the

---

[5] The notion of field was first introduced as a social space with national boundaries. But BOURDIEU (2000) has extended this concept and discussed international fields.

beginning of this decade. However, today only a part of this diagnosis is correct. One can argue that the newer sociological strand of FOUCAULTian discourse analysis is meso- or macro-oriented (KELLER, 2007; DIAZ-BONE, 2002, 2006a) and the main problem with linguistic analysis in the so-called post-structural discourse analysis is with the use of small corpuses of data. But like many others in the field, ANGERMÜLLER (2001) points to surprising methodological and theoretical convergences, which have been discussed in many conferences and workshops. Perhaps the most interesting facet of this debate is that both paradigms can be understood as modifications and developments of FOUCAULTian discourse analysis. That does not mean that they totally align with such an approach, but that they all refer more or less to the methodological principles of FOUCAULTian discourse analysis.

3. Structures and Positions in the Field of FOUCAULTian Discourse Analysis

Today, the structure of the field of FOUCAULTian discourse analysis—or of forms of discourse analysis that are strongly influenced by the works of FOU-CAULT—is not an internationally integrated field. One can speak of different national histories of the reception of FOUCAULT and different national situations in which FOUCAULT-oriented approaches are embedded. So one can speak of a fragmented international field containing national "subfields", which are more or less self-oriented. Some of these have a rich tradition of their own and focus mainly on this tradition (as, for example, does French discourse research); some are more internationally oriented and in the last few years national traditions have started to intensify their relations. We as editors are an internationally recruited group and all of us have amassed experience in the field of discourse analysis for many years, but nonetheless our perspective may be biased. So if we present information about a national scene such as French discourse analysis or the British scene of discourse analysis, other countries—or even complete continents—may be neglected. This is the case especially for Latin America, where, for example, in Brazil there is a tradition of the influence of the work of Michel PÊCHEUX.[6] Another underrepresented area is the USA, where—as far as we can see—the impact of FOUCAULTian discourse *theory* is enormous and the methodological orientation toward discourse analysis is increasing, if we use the second and third editions of "The SAGE handbook of qualitative research" (DENZIN & LINCOLN 2000, 2005) as an indicator.[7]

---

[6]   But for Argentina see HAIDAR, 2007 and for Chile see ROMÁN BRUGNOLI, 2007.

[7]   In the USA, FOUCAULTian concepts are extensively referred to and one can find the taken-for-granted use of the concept of FOUCAULTian discourse analysis (with the chap-

In this FQS special issue, reports from different research groups—especially from Germany—are collected (see table of contents). However, we want to present some schematic remarks about the national scenes of discourse analysis as they integrate or are oriented by FOUCAULTian concepts. The relative length of the presentation of different nations is not correlated to the relative importance of the different national scenes (as if such a thing could ever be adjudicated upon). And of course we do not assert that our presentation is exhaustive.

3.1 France

The French situation is in some way paradigmatic, not only because FOUCAULT was a French philosopher, epistemologist and in a way historian, but also because here the groups in the Parisian region which promoted a FOUCAULTian form of discourse analysis as an empirical method were interdisciplinary from the beginning—as later in other countries—and have made inter- and sometimes transdisciplinary exchange possible since the late 1960s. In France, historians, linguists and social psychologists formed the first interdisciplinary research groups in the late 1960s. One important influence was the French tradition of the ANNALES School, another point is the work and the projects of Michel PÊCHEUX (HAK & HELSLOOT, 1995; HELSLOOT & HAK, 2007; see below Section 3.4). Both integrated linguistics foundations with the FOUCAULTian notion of discourse. As Glyn WILLIAMS (1999) has pointed out, the beginnings of "French discourse analysis"—although first focused around FOUCAULTian notions discourse—were in this era embedded in the wider context of post-structuralism and therefore not narrowly oriented only to the works of one author. The works of the French school of "epistemology" influenced the whole movement of structuralism and post-structuralism (WILLIAMS, 1999; DIAZ-BONE, 2002, 2007). The founder of this school was Gaston BACHELARD; his student, Georges CANGUILHEM, was a teacher not only of FOUCAULT but also of PÊCHEUX and other world-renowned social scientists (such as Pierre BOURDIEU and Louis AL-THUSSER). WILLIAMS (1999) traces the different formations, the works and projects of PÊCHEUX. Connected with PÊCHEUX are the French historians who combined the FOUCAULTian notion of discourse (as a materiality of its own, as PÊCHEUX [1975] formulated) with the so-called ANNALES tradition (the name stems from the historical journal ANNALES, which was founded by

ter "Foucauldian discourse analysis" in the articles in GUBRIUM & HOLSTEIN [2000, p.493ff.]; HOLSTEIN & GUBRIUM [2005, p.490]). In the third edition a new article is included which discusses the methodological foundations of FOUCAULTian discourse analysis (esp. archaeology and genealogy) and presents an enormous literature of works in the field of education, where the authors use FOUCAULTian theoretical notions or work with FOUCAULTian methodologies (SCHEURICH & MCKENZIE, 2005).

Lucien FEBVRE and Marc BLOCH [see DOSSE, 1994]). Here, the historical "archives" of discursive knowledge (especially in the era of the French revolution) were the main research topics. The works of Régine ROBIN (1973), Jacques GUILHAUMOU (2003, 2005; GUILHAUMOU, MALDIDIER & ROBIN, 1994) and Dominique MAINGUENEAU (1984) can be cited as landmarks (MAINGUENEAU & ANGERMÜLLER, 2007). In the 1970s the FOUCAULTian impact vanished because of the MARXist dominance of French discourse analysis. Today one cannot speak of a clearly marked French field of FOUCAULTian discourse analysis. But the FOUCAULTian influence has been in ascendency since the 1980s. Linguists and historians reoriented their work towards FOUCAULTian and more sociological topics.

The French field today is heterogeneous and gains in visibility by special issues of (mainly) linguistics journals (such as *Langages*, No. 17/1995 "Les analyse du discours en France"; *Marges Linguistiques*, No. 9/2005 "Analyse du discours. L'état de l'art et perspectives", available at) and conferences.[8] What is remarkable about the state of French FOUCAULTian discourse analysis is that sub-disciplines like Critical Discourse Analysis are not present, that sociology is not so influential as in Germany or England, and that the linguistic perspective integrates FOUCAULTian work. In France, discourse analysis (including FOUCAULTian perspectives) is mainly organized in research centres in the Parisian region.[9] There are a few exceptions, such as the publications by a group from Rennes, where political, linguistic and sociological perspectives are integrated, and techniques for computer-aided discourse analysis are presented (RINGOOT & ROBERT-DEMONTROND, 2004). The French scene of discourse analysis is mainly nationally oriented, but there have always been "go-betweens" and bridges, such as the discussions between Michel PÊCHEUX and Jürgen LINK (resulting in the elaboration of the—different— concepts of interdiscourse, DIAZ-BONE, 2006b), the exchange between Reiner KELLER and Jacques GUILHAUMOU (see GUILHAUMOU, 2003), and the work of Johannes ANGERMÜLLER (2007).[10]

3.2 Germany

The early reception of FOUCAULTian discourse theory—from about the 1970s on to the 1980s—was mainly done in women's studies, history, literary studies and criminology. Researchers referred chiefly to the genealogical studies of FOUCAULT (1977, 1978, 1988, 1990). But they also pursued the role of discourses especially in the process of the "humanization of punishment" or the

---

[8] See the conference report of FEIN & FLOREA (2007).
[9] ANGERMÜLLER (2007) discusses three such centres/perspectives.
[10] We thank Johannes ANGERMÜLLER for his copious help. He is preparing a special edition of the French journal *Langage et société*, which will present German approaches to discourse analysis.

"othering of women". Subsequently, the reception of FOUCAULT was more connected to implications of and possibilities for discourse analysis. Some researchers tried to combine FOUCAULTian discourse analysis with other socio-linguistic approaches and methods of conversation analysis. One of the first groups which started working systematically with FOUCAULTian discourse analysis was the so-called "*diskurswerkstatt* Bochum" (Bochum discourse workshop) which was founded by Jürgen LINK and which has published from the early 1980s the journal kultuRRevolution (see LINK & PARR, 2007). The second important group is housed at the Duisburger Institut für Sprach- und Sozialforschung (Duisburg Institute for Language and Social Research, DISS, see ZIMMERMANN, 2007). Both groups were very important for the further development in the German-speaking world of discourse analysis. Siegfried JÄGER, the main protagonist of DISS, published one of the most widely known methodological introductions to critical discourse analysis (JÄGER, 2004). Furthermore, DISS organized annual meetings for researchers interested in discourse analysis. At first, the discourse researchers at DISS and especially JÄGER focused research on everyday conversation or talk and the so-called media discourse in newspapers. Here they refer to LINK, who focused on different societal functions of discourses and distinguished between so-called special discourses ("Spezialdiskurs"), elementary discourse ("Elementardiskurs") and interdiscourse ("Interdiskurs"). At first the *diskurswerkstatt Bochum* concentrated its research on special discourses and questions of ideology. But more recently its focus moved from that issue to more and more sociological questions. So some researchers investigated, for example, the relationships between Niklas LUHMANN's ideas and FOUCAULTian discourse theory, while others worked on the relationship between the work of BOURDIEU and FOUCAULTian discourse analysis (BUBLITZ, 1999; DIAZ-BONE, 2002; SCHWAB-TRAPP, 2004).

This change indicates—we suggest—a new development in dealing with questions of discourse theory and discourse analysis in the German-speaking world. During this developing "sociologization", a research group at the University of Paderborn was established—which today is called the *Paderborn approach* (BUBLITZ, 2007). Here different researchers tried to make FOUCAULT's *Archaeology of Knowledge* (1972a) productive for analysing the discourses of the crisis of modernity since 1900 (see BUBLITZ, 2007). But they also questioned the methodological impact of discourse analysis (see BUBLITZ, BÜHRMANN, HANKE & SEIER, 1999).

Such questions were discussed at conferences at the University of Erlangen-Nuremberg (see ANGERMÜLLER, BUNZMANN & NONHOFF, 2001) Here one significant issue was the place of the work of LACLAU & MOUFFE (2001). Other important conferences and workshops have taken place since 1999 at the University of Augsburg organized by the Working group "Discourse Research in the Social Sciences" (Arbeitskreis "Sozialwissenschaftliche

18

Diskursforschung") from Augsburg/Munich (see KELLER & SCHNEIDER, 2007). Perspectives and limitations in discourse theory and discourse analysis were discussed at these workshops and conferences (see KELLER, HIRSE-LAND, SCHNEIDER & VIEHÖFER, 2001, 2003).[11] Since the end of the 1990s the relationship between the sociology of knowledge and discourse analysis has been targeted by these activities (see KELLER, HIRSELAND, SCHNEIDER & VIEHÖFER, 2005), while Reiner KELLER (2004, 2005) has published an approach for grounding discourse theory and empirical discourse research in the sociology of knowledge (see also SCHNEIDER 1999; SCHNEIDER & HIRSELAND, 2005; DIAZ-BONE, 2003).

A fruitful and productive exchange has been established among these different research groups mentioned here. One could say that there is a very lively discourse scene—both theoretically and analytically.[12] One can find research or working groups but also "solo" researchers spread all over the German-speaking world. As far as we can see the main research interests in this scene are the following issues: methodological work on (FOUCAULT's) discourse analysis and theory; the expansion of discourse analysis and theory towards interdiscourse theory; dispositif research; the analysis of everyday conversation, media discourses and (narrative) interviews; and, finally, the combination of discourse theory with other theories or concepts like Pierre BOURDIEU's praxeological theory or Niklas LUHMANN's theory of differentiation, Ernesto LACLAU and Chantal MOUFFE's concept of hegemony, and Judith BUTLER's idea of the heteronormative matrix.

3.3 Great Britain

In Britain there exists a strong tradition in the different strands of linguistic and socio-linguistic discourse research (KELLER, 2004). In the British context FOUCAULTian discourse analysis (or forms of discourse analysis which strongly refer to FOUCAULT) has been developed from at least three different

---

[11] There have been six workshops of the Arbeitskreis "Sozialwissenschaftliche Diskursfor-schung" (Augsburg/München): "1. Workshop: Perspektiven der Diskursanalyse", March 11-12, 1999 (Augsburg); "2. Workshop: Perspektiven der Diskursanalyse II", March 30-31, 2000 (Augsburg); "3. Workshop: Diskurs-Wissen-Kultur", September 25-26, 2003 (Augsburg); "Praxis-Workshop Diskursanalyse", June 17-18, 2004 (Augsburg); "2. Praxis-Workshop Diskursanalyse", June 14-15, 2005 (Augsburg); "Sprache – Macht – Wirklichkeit", October 10-12, 2007 (Augsburg) For programs, see URL: <http://www.diskursforschung.de/> [last access: 08.11.07].

[12] This liveliness can be seen in the workshops "Endlich Ordnung in der Werkzeugkiste. Zum Potential der Foucaultschen Diskursanalyse", April 29-30, 2005 (Berlin), program: URL: <http://www.polwiss.fu-berlin.de/aktuell/diskurswerkstatt/Programm_workshop.pdf> [last access: 09.11.2006]. See also the workshops at the Berliner Methodentreffen, June 24-25, 2005 and July 14-15, 2006, the programs can be accessed at URL: <http://www.berliner-methodentreffen.de/material/index.php> [last access: 08.11.2007].

perspectives: (a) critical linguistics and sociolinguistics; (b) social psychology; and (c) ideology and discourse analysis. Regarding the first perspective, the University of East Anglia (UEA) inaugurated Critical Linguistics with the publication of "Language and Control" in 1979. The "linguistic turn" in the Social Sciences and the "critical paradigm" within linguistics led not only to Critical Linguistics but also to Critical Discourse Analysis. In the 1970s the project of critique opened up the space to think about the relations of power and representation. In continuation of this tradition, the *School of Language, Linguistics and Translation Studies* organized an international conference on *Critical Approaches to Discourse Analysis Across Disciplines* (CADAAD) in June 2006, inaugurating the *Research Centre for Language and Communication*. CADAAD hosts an on-line journal, which published its first issue in February 2007. The on-line interdisciplinary journal engages in critical approaches to discourse analysis and with a variety of methodologies. Another hub for critical discourse analysis is based at the *Department of Linguistics and English Language* at Lancaster University, where Norman FAIRCLOUGH, since the early 1980s, has been working on critical discourse analysis, including the place of language in social relations of power and ideology, and how language figures in processes of social change. Ruth WODAK (see Section 3.5) is also based there as Chair in Discourse Studies. Under the guidance of Paul CHILTON and Ruth WODAK the project New Discourse in Contemporary China (NDCC) has been developed. [25]

The second strand is represented at Manchester Metropolitan University (MMU), where a Discourse Unit in social psychology was established. The Discourse Unit is a trans-institutional collaborative centre, which supports a variety of qualitative and theoretical research projects contributing to the development of radical theory and practice. The term "discourse" is used primarily in critical hermeneutic and structuralist senses to include inquiries influenced by feminism and psychoanalysis. The centre functions: (1) as a teaching resource base for qualitative and feminist work; (2) as a support unit for the (re)production of radical academic theory; (3) as a networking centre for the development of critical perspectives in action research.[13] The initiators of the MMU Discourse Unit are Ian PARKER and Erica BURMAN, both critical psychologists. The Discourse Unit has been established as a centre for qualitative and theoretical research on the reproduction and transformation of language, subjectivity and practice.[14]

The third strand on ideology and discourse analysis is hosted by the World Network in Ideology and Discourse Analysis based at the *Centre for Theoretical Studies in the Humanities and Social Sciences* and the *Department of Gov-*

---

[13] Within this context in March 2007 the sixth Conference of the *Discourse, Power, Resistance Series* was held at MMU.

[14] The centre runs short courses, including ones on critical psychology and discursive practice.

ernment at the University of Essex. The IDA World Network facilitates the exchange of ideas and information in Ideology and Discourse Analysis. In June 2007 IDA World held the 5th Annual IDA World workshop with Ernesto LACLAU.

3.4 Spain

In Spain, discourse analysis—strongly inherited through the French tradition, and particularly through Michel FOUCAULT's work—has been implemented as a working tool in some research groups that are located in geographically distant universities such as The Autonomous University of Barcelona, The Complutense University of Madrid or The University of Valencia. Furthermore, some individual researchers are working along similar lines in areas such as Euskadi, Andalucía or Galicia. Discourse analysis is present in disciplines such as sociology, social psychology or linguistics. Recently, some historians have also started to explore the possibilities offered by discourse analysis (see also TIRADO, 2007). The Autonomous University of Barcelona's Social Psychology PhD program is a good example of where FOUCAULT's theories have been developed. This institution has been contributing to academic discourse for more than ten years. Their program has produced teachers and researchers that understand the practice of Social Psychology using premises adopted from FOUCAULT; many of the researchers associated with this institution have utilized discourse analysis as a common tool of research and thought. Some of these researchers have formed or taken part in research groups such as ATIC (Research Group on Technology and Social Action) from *The Open University of Catalonia* and the *GESCIT* (Group of Social Studies on Science and Technology) of the Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona. All three universities share similar characteristics: (1) although located administratively in Departments and Faculties of Social Psychology, Humanities or Psychology, their members come from different disciplines, making the aforementioned academic groups totally interdisciplinary; (2) one of the tools they use is discourse analysis. Regardless of the adaptation or version of discourse analysis employed by these institutions, its very utilization reflects a strong connection to FOUCAULT's work; (3) the focus on control, social transformation and the technological dimension of our reality constitutes the core of their varied research projects. All three groups have adapted elements of FOUCAULTian discourse analysis to utilize it in the analysis of the practices that managing technology imply.

3.5 Further National Fields

There are two comparatively small countries, Austria and the Netherlands that are mentioned here because of their two leading researchers: Teun A. VAN DIJK, who originally hailed from Amsterdam (where he worked for many

years, although now he is based in Barcelona) and Ruth WODAK from Vienna (now based at Lancaster, see Section 3.3). VAN DIJK contributed two early interdisciplinary volumes that gathered contributions to the different forms of discourse analysis (VAN DIJK, 1985, 1997a, 1997b). He founded and edited discourse analytic journals such as *Discourse & Society*, and was one of the leading researchers in CDA (see his homepage). For the Netherlands, the work of Tony HAK and Niels HELSLOOT must be mentioned. Their contribution consists in research on the work of Michel PÊCHEUX and foundations of "post-FOUCAULTian discourse analysis" (HAK & HELSLOOT, 1995; HEL-SLOOT & HAK, 2007).

Ruth WODAK's work in the 1970s and 1980s founded the so-called Vienna school of critical discourse analysis. Here a small discourse analytic oriented network in Vienna developed (see KENDALL [2007] and REISIGL [2007]). Ruth WODAK and Teun A. VAN DIJK are also outstanding examples of the internationalization of discourse analysis. These two researchers are well connected with other prominent discourse researchers in CDA. CDA was initiated to work out theoretical and methodological first principles of a critical perspective in empirical discourse analysis which extended FOUCAULTian notions of discourse, power and society, and prominent in this endeavour were researchers such as Norman FAIRCLOUGH (UK), Siegfried JÄGER (Germany), Günter KRESS (UK), and Theo VAN LEEUWEN (the Netherlands) (MEYER & WODAK, 1991).

4. Conclusion: A Still-emerging Field in Qualitative Social Research

In Section 2 we pointed out that the theoretical work of FOUCAULT is in many social sciences an established part of their theoretical body (or is currently establishing itself, as in political science and history outside France). The international "sciences movements" such as gender studies, cultural studies, postcolonial studies and especially governmentality studies force the integration of FOUCAULT's works into the international and interdisciplinary landscapes of the social sciences. But we have to point out the difference between research in the area of FOUCAULTian discourse theory, research done with reference to the theory of FOUCAULT on one side and empirical FOUCAULTian discourse analysis on the other side. FOUCAULTian discourse analysis is not a theoretically informed "attitude" or just another "perspective" in the area of qualitative social research. Many researchers in the last few decades have become more and more aware that the socio-historical analyses of FOUCAULT and his methodological considerations about archaeology and genealogy have laid the groundwork for a new methodological area for empirical research that conceives itself as a form of scientific and self-reflexive practice:

FOUCAULTian discourse analysis as methodological discourse of social discourses and discursive practices.

It follows, then, that discourse research has to reflect on the coherence of the research practice and the degree of fit with the theoretical notions of FOUCAULTian discourse theory, its underlying assumptions and models. It follows also that there are (or have to be developed) specific forms of research design, modes of explanation, methodological standards and quality criteria for the evaluation of FOUCAULTian analysis—as the articles in this issue demonstrate. Yet these articles demonstrate also that discussions are still active about the questions: does FOUCAULTian discourse analysis include or prescribe certain methods, research tools and instruments, their design and use in the practice of discourse analysis? And how can other approaches and paradigms be combined with FOUCAULTian discourse research?

The collection of articles in this special issue of HSR demonstrates that there are different strands of FOUCAULTian discourse research and that FOUCAULTian discourse analysis is not integrated in the way that one could speak of a FOUCAULTian paradigm. But the different research groups have begun to recognize each other and to identify shared methodological problems and topics. And here new perspectives for FOUCAULTian methodology emerge, as concepts such as "interdiscourse", "dispositif", "materialities" (as techniques, bodies, visual materials, media), events, other forms of practices and performativity force questions about the consequences of adequate methodological adaptation. The authors in this anthology address many of these questions. We hope that this book gives some more insight into the state of the art in FOUCAULTian discourse research as an emerging field of qualitative social research that forges its international integration.

References

Angermüller, Johannes (2001). Diskursanalyse: Strömungen, Tendenzen, Perspektiven. Eine Einführung. In Johannes Angermüller, Katharina Bunzmann & Martin Nonhoff (Eds.), *Diskursanalyse: Theorien, Methoden, Anwendungen* (pp.7-22). Hamburg: Argument.

Angermüller, Johannes (2007). Research report: Major research centers in discourse analysis in France. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research, 8*(2), URL: <http://www.qualitative-research.net/fqs-texte/2-07/07-2-P4-e.htm> [last access: 28.05.07].

Angermüller, Johannes; Bunzmann, Katharina & Nonhoff, Martin (Eds.) (2001). *Diskursanalyse: Theorien, Methoden, Anwendungen*. Hamburg: Argument.

Barthes, Roland (1988). *The semiotic challenge*. New York: Hill and Wang.

Bourdieu, Pierre (1985). The genesis of the concepts of habitus and of field. *Sociocriticism*, 2, 11-24.

Bourdieu, Pierre (1988). *Homo academicus*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Bourdieu, Pierre (2000). *The social structures of the economy*. London: Polity Press.

Bublitz, Hannelore (1999). *Foucaults Archäologie des kulturellen Unbewußten*. Frankfurt/M.: Campus.

Bublitz, Hannelore (2007). Projektbericht: Paderborner Ansatz der Diskursanalyse: „Die Ordnung der Geschlechterverhältnisse. Archäologie und Genealogie der Geschlechterdifferenz im Diskurs über die Kulturkrise um 1900" (DFG-Projekt von 1995-1999). *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research, 8*(2), URL: <http://www.qualitative-research.net/fqs-texte/2-07/07-2-P6-d.htm> [last access: 31.05.07].

Bublitz, Hannelore; Bührmann, Andrea; Hanke, Christine & Seier, Andrea (Eds.) (1999). *Das Wuchern der Diskurse*. Frankfurt/M.: Campus.

Bührmann, Andrea D. (2004). *Der Kampf um weibliche Individualität. Zur Transformation moderner Subjektivierungsweisen in Deutschland um 1900*. Münster: Verlag westfälisches Dampfboot.

Bührmann, Andrea D. & Schneider, Werner (2007). Mehr als nur diskursive Praxis? – Konzeptionelle Grundlagen und methodische Aspekte der Dispositivanalyse [51 paragraphs]. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research, 8*(2), Art. 28, URL: <http://www.qualitative-research.net/fqs-texte/2-07/07-2-28-d.htm> [last access: 28.05.07].

Butler, Judith (1990). *Gender trouble*. New York: Routledge.

Butler, Judith (1993). *Bodies that matters*. New York: Routledge.

Charaudeau, Patrick & Maingueneau, Dominique (Eds.) (2002). *Dictionaire d'analyse du discours*. Paris: Édition du Seuil.

Denzin, Norman & Lincoln, Yvonna S. (Eds.) (2000). *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research* (2nd edition). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Denzin, Norman & Lincoln, Yvonna S. (Eds.) (2005). *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research* (3rd edition). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Diaz-Bone, Rainer (2002). *Kulturwelt, Diskurs und Lebensstil. Eine diskurstheoretische Erweiterung der bourdieuschen Distinktionstheorie*. Opladen: Leske + Budrich.

Diaz-Bone, Rainer (2003). Entwicklungen im Feld der foucaultschen Diskursanalyse. Collective Review: Glyn Williams (1999). French discourse analysis. The method of post-structuralism / Johannes Angermüller, Katharina Bunzmann & Martin Nonhoff (Eds.) (2001). Diskursanalyse. Theorien, Methoden, Anwendungen / Reiner Keller, Andreas Hirseland, Werner Schneider & Willy Viehöfer (Eds.) (2001). Handbuch Sozialwissenschaftliche Diskursanalyse. Band 1: Theorien und Methoden / Patrick Charaudeau & Dominique Maingueneau (Eds.) (2002). Dictionaire d'analyse du discours / Reiner Keller (2003). Diskursforschung. Eine Einführung für SozialwissenschaftlerInnen [66 paragraphs]. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research, 4*(3), Art. 1, URL: <http://www.qualitative-research.net/fqs-texte/3-03/3-03review-diazbone-d.htm> [last access: 08.11.07].

Diaz-Bone, Rainer (2006a). Zur Methodologisierung der Foucaultschen Diskursanalyse [48 paragraphs]. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research, 7*(1), Art. 6, URL: <http://www.qualitative-research.net/fqs-texte/1-06/06-1-6-d.htm> [last access: 08.11.07].

Diaz-Bone, Rainer (2006b). Operative Anschlüsse: Zur Entstehung der Foucault-schen Diskursanalyse in der Bundesrepublik. Jürgen Link im Gespräch mit Rainer Diaz-Bone [38 paragraphs]. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research, 7*(3), Art. 20, URL: <http://www.qualitative-research.net/fqs-texte/3-06/06-3-20-d.htm> [last access: 15.05.07].

Diaz-Bone, Rainer (2007). Die französische Epistemologie und ihre Revisionen. Zur Rekonstruktion des methodologischen Standortes der Foucaultschen Diskursanalyse [65 paragraphs]. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research, 8*(2), Art. 24, URL: <http://www.qualitative-research.net/fqs-texte/2-07/07-2-24-d.htm> [last access: 28.05.07].

Dosse, François (1994). *New history in France. The triumph of the Annales*. Urbana: University of Chicago Press.

Dreyfuss, Hubert & Rabinow, Paul (1983). *Michel Foucault. Beyond structuralism and hermeneutics* (2nd edition). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Ehlich, Konrad (Ed.) (1994). *Diskursanalyse in Europa*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.

Fein, Elke & Florea, Marie-laure (2007). Innen und Aussen in Wissenssoziologie und Diskursanalyse. Tagungsbericht: Diskursanalyse in Deutschland und Frankreich: Aktuelle Tendenzen in den Sprach- und Sozialwissenschaften [19 paragraphs]. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research, 8*(1), Art. 22, URL: <http://www.qualitative-research.net/fqs-texte/1-07/07-1-22-d.htm> [last access: 24.05.07].

Foucault, Michel (1970). *The order of things*. New York: Pantheon.

Foucault, Michel (1972a). *The archaeology of knowledge*. New York: Pantheon.

Foucault, Michel (1972b). Discourse on language. In Michel Foucault, *The archaeology of knowledge* (pp.215-238). Mew York: Pantheon.

Foucault, Michel (1977). *Discipline and punish*. New York: Pantheon.

Foucault, Michel (1978). *The history of sexuality*, Vol.1: *The will to knowledge*. New York: Pantheon.

Foucault, Michel (1988). *The history of sexuality*, Vol.3: *The care of the self*. Vancouver/WA: Vintage.

Foucault, Michel (1990). *The history of sexuality*, Vol. 2: *The use of the pleasure*. Vancouver/WA: Vintage.

Foucault, Michel (2005). *The hermeneutics of the subject*. Basingstoke: Palgrave/MacMillan.

Gubrium, Jaber & Holstein, James A. (2000). Analyzing interpretative practices. In Norman Denzin & Yvonna S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research* (2nd edition, pp.487-508). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Guilhaumou, Jacques (2003). Geschichte und Sprachwissenschaft – Wege und Stationen (in) der „analyse du discours". In Reiner Keller, Andreas Hirseland, Werner Schneider & Willy Viehöfer (Eds.), *Handbuch Sozialwissenschaftliche Diskursanalyse*. Band 2: *Forschungspraxis* (2nd edition, pp.19-65). Wiesbaden: VS-Verlag Budrich.

Guilhaumou, Jacques (2005). Où va l'analyse du discours? Autour de la notion de formation discursive. *Marges linguistiques*, 9, 95-114.

Guilhaumou, Jacques; Maldidier, Denis & Robin, Régine (1994). *Discours et archive*. Liège: Mardaga.

Gutiérrez Rodríguez, Encarnación (1999). *Intellektuelle Migrantinnen. Subjektivitäten im Zeitalter von Globalisierung*. Opladen: Leske & Budrich.

Gutiérrez Rodríguez, Encarnación & Pieper, Marianne (Eds.) (2003). *Gouverne-mentalität. Ein sozialwissenschaftliches Konzept in Anschluss an Foucault*. Frankfurt/M.: Campus.

Haidar, Victoria (2007). El análisis de discursos que hacen parte de un régimen de prácticas de gobierno: una aproximación desde la perspectiva de los estudios de la gubernamentalidad [57 paragraphs]. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research, 8*(2), Art. 8, URL: <http://www.qualitative-research.net/fqs-texte/2-07/07-2-8-s.htm> [last access: 28.05.07].

Hak, Tony & Helsloot, Niels (Eds.) (1995). *Michel Pêcheux. Automatic discourse analysis*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Haraway, Donna (1991). *Simians, cyborgs, and women. The reinvention of nature*. New York: Routledge.

Helsloot, Niels & Hak, Tony & (2007). Pêcheux's contribution to discourse analysis [47 paragraphs]. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research, 8*(2), Art. 1, URL: <http://www.qualitative-research.net/fqs-texte/2-07/07-2-1-e.htm> [last access: 28.05.07].

Holstein, James A. & Gubrium, Jaber (2005). Interpretative practice and social action. In Norman Denzin & Yvonna Lincoln, Yvonna (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research* (3rd edition, pp.483-505). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Jäger, Siegfried (2004). *Kritische Diskursanalyse* (4th edition). Marburg: Unrast-Verlag.

Keller, Reiner (2004). *Diskursforschung. Eine Einführung für SozialwissenschaftlerInnen*. Opladen: Leske + Budrich.

Keller, Reiner (2005). *Wissenssoziologische Diskursanalyse. Grundlegung eines Forschungsprogramms*. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.

Keller, Reiner (2007). Diskurse und Dispositive analysieren. Die Wissenssoziologische Diskursanalyse als Beitrag zu einer wissensanalytischen Profilierung der Diskursforschung [46 paragraphs]. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research, 8*(2), Art. 19, URL: <http://www.qualitative-research.net/fqs-texte/2-07/07-2-19-d.htm> [last access: 28.05.07].

Keller, Reiner & Schneider, Werner (2007). Research report: Arbeitskreis „Sozialwissenschaftliche Diskursforschung". *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research, 8*(2), URL: <http://www.qualitative-research.net/fqs-texte/2-07/07-2-P5-d.htm> [last access: 28.05.07].

Keller, Reiner; Hirseland, Andreas; Schneider, Werner & Viehöfer, Willy (Eds.) (2003). *Handbuch Sozialwissenschaftliche Diskursanalyse. Band 2: Forschungspraxis* (2nd edition). Wiesbaden: VS-Verlag Budrich.

Keller, Reiner; Hirseland, Andreas; Schneider, Werner & Viehöfer, Willy (Eds.) (2004). *Handbuch Sozialwissenschaftliche Diskursanalyse. Band 1: Theorien und Methoden* (2nd edition). Wiesbaden: VS-Verlag.

Keller, Reiner; Hirseland, Andreas; Schneider, Werner & Viehöfer, Willy (Eds.) (2005). *Die diskursive Konstruktion von Wirklichkeit*. Konstanz: UVK.

Kendall, Gavin (2007). What is critical discourse analysis? Ruth Wodak in conversation with Gavin Kendall [38 paragraphs]. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research, 8*(2), Art. 29, URL: <http://www.-qualitative-research.net/fqs-texte/2-07/07-2-29-e.htm> [last access: 28.05.07].

Kendall, Gavin & Wickham, Gary (1999). *Using Foucault's methods*. London: Sage.

Kerchner, Brigitte & Schneider, Silke (Eds.) (2006). *Foucault: Diskursanalyse der Politik*. Wiesbaden: VS-Verlag.

Kuhn, Thomas S. (1962). *The structure of scientific revolutions*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Laclau, Ernesto & Mouffe, Chantal (2001). *Hegemony and socialist strategy. Towards a radical democratic politics*. London: Verso.

Laclau, Ernesto; Howarth, David R.; Norvel, Aletta J. & Stavrakakis, Yannis (Eds.) (2000). Discourse theory and political analysis: Identities, hegemonies and social change. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Lemke, Thomas; Krasmann, Susanne & Bröckling, Ulrich (Eds.) (2000). *Gouvernementalität der Gegenwart. Studien zur Ökonomisierung des Sozialen*. Frankfurt/M.: Suhrkamp.

Link, Jürgen & Parr, Rolf (2007). Research report: diskurs-werkstatt und kultuR-Revolution. zeitschrift für angewandte diskurstheorie. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research, 8*(2), URL: <http://www.qualitative-research.net/fqs-texte/2-07/07-2-P1-d.htm> [last access: 28.05.07].

Maingueneau, Dominique (1984). *Genèses du discours*. Paris: Mardaga.

Maingueneau, Dominique (1994). Die „französische Schule" der Diskursanalyse. In Konrad Ehlich (Ed.), *Diskursanalyse in Europa* (pp.187-195). Frankfurt/M.: Peter Lang.

Maingueneau, Dominique & Angermüller, Johannes (2007). Discourse analysis in France. A conversation [48 paragraphs]. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research, 8*(2), Art. 21, URL: <http://www.qualitative-research.net/fqs-texte/2-07/07-2-21-e.htm> [last access: 28.05.07].

Martin, John Levi (2003). What is field theory? *American Journal of Sociology, 109*(1), 1-49.

Meyer, Michael & Wodak, Ruth (Eds.) (2001). *Methods of critical discourse analysis*. London: Sage.

Pêcheux, Michel (1975). *Language, ideology and sematics*. London: MacMillan.

Reisigl, Martin (2007). Research report: Der Wiener Ansatz der Kritischen Diskursanalyse. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research, 8*(2), URL: <http://www.qualitative-research.net/fqs-texte/2-07/07-2-P7-d.htm> [last access: 31.05.07].

Ringoot, Roselyne & Robert-Demontrond, Philippe (Eds.) (2004). *L'analyse de discours*. Rennes: Éditions Apogée.

Robin, Régine (1973). *Histoire et linguistique*. Paris: Armand Colin.

Román Brugnoli, José Antonio (2007). Lo que las metáforas obran furtivamente: discurso y sujeto [152 paragraphs]. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research, 8*(2), Art. 12, URL: <http://www.qualitative-research.net/fqs-texte/2-07/07-2-12-s.htm> [last access: 31.05.07].

Said, Edward (1978). Orientalism: *Western conceptions of the orient*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Scheurich, James Joseph & McKenzie, Kathryn Bell (2005). Foucault's methodologies: Archeology and genealogy. In Norman Denzin & Yvonna Lincoln, Yvonna (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research* (3rd edition, pp.841-868). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Schneider, Werner (1999). „*So tot wie nötig – so lebendig wie möglich!" Sterben und Tod in der fortgeschrittenen Moderne. Eine Diskursanalyse der öffentlichen Diskussion um den Hirntod in Deutschland*. Münster: Lit-Verlag.

Schneider, Werner & Hirseland, Andreas (2005). Macht – Wissen – gesellschaftliche Praxis. Dispositivanalyse und Wissenssoziologie. In Reiner Keller, Andreas Hirseland, Werner Schneider & Willy Viehöver (Eds.), *Die diskursive Konstruktion von Wirklichkeit. Zum Verhältnis von Wissenssoziologie und Diskursforschung* (pp.251-275). Konstanz: UVK.

Schwab-Trapp, Michael (2004). Diskurs als soziologisches Konzept. Bausteine für eine soziologisch orientierte Diskursanalyse. In Reiner Keller, Andreas Hirseland, Werner Schneider & Willy Viehöver (Eds.), *Handbuch Sozialwissenschaftliche Diskursanalyse. Band 1: Theorien und Methoden* (2nd edition, pp.263-285). Wiesbaden: VS-Verlag.

Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty (1987). *In other worlds: Essays in cultural politics*. New York: Routledge.

Tate, Shirley Anne (2007). Foucault, Bakhtin, Ethnomethodology: Accounting for hybridity in talk-in-interaction [44 paragraphs]. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research, 8*(2), Art. 10, URL: <http://www.qualitative-research.net/fqs-texte/2-07/07-2-10-e.htm> [last access: 28.05.07].

Ten Have, Paul (1999). *Doing conversational analysis*. London: Sage.

Tirado, Francisco (2007). Research report: El análisis del discurso de tradición foucaultiana en algunos grupos de investigación españoles. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research, 8*(1), URL: <http://www.qualitative-research.net/fqs-texte/2-07/07-2-P3-s.htm> [last access: 28.05.07].

Tirado, Francisco & Gálvez, Ana (2007). Positioning theory and discourse analysis: Some tools for social interaction analysis [88 paragraphs]. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research, 8*(2), Art. 31, URL: <http://www.qualitative-research.net/fqs-texte/2-07/07-2-31-e.htm> [last access: 31.05.07].

Van Dijk, Teun A. (Ed.) (1985). *Handbook of discourse analysis*. Vol. 1-4. London: Academic Press.

Van Dijk, Teun A. (Ed.) (1997a). *Discourse as structure and process. Discourse studies 1*. London: Sage.

Van Dijk, Teun A. (Ed.) (1997b). *Discourse as social interaction. Discourse studies 2*. London: Sage.

Williams, Glyn (1999). *French discourse analysis. The method of poststructuralism*. London: Routledge.

Zimmermann, Jens (2007). Research report: Gegen den Strich: Das Duisburger Institut für Sprach- und Sozialforschung (DISS). *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research, 8*(2), URL: <http://www.qualitative-research.net/fqs-texte/2-07/07-2-P2-d.htm> [last access: 28.05.07].