

YZ

**THE DISCURSIVE CONSTRUCTION OF
IDENTITY AND DIFFERENCE - TURKEY AS
EUROPE'S OTHER?**

Rainer Hülsse

Center on Transatlantic Foreign and Security Policy Studies

Free University Berlin

Innestr. 22

14195 Berlin

Germany

e-mail: huelsse@zedat.fu-berlin.de

*Discussion paper presented at the ECPR Joint Sessions of Workshops, Mannheim, 26-31 March, 1999
(Workshop: The Political Uses of Narrative)*

1. Identity, again

“Proposals are invited which address the significance of the use of narrative for the study of politics. Papers should show the way in which narrative as a representation of reality (...) contributes to the construction of social and political order, collective memory, and identity (...)” (ECPR- Workshop-summary 1998).

This paper will be discussing the use of narrative for the study of politics only in the epilogue. Nonetheless, I claim that it fits perfectly well into this workshop, if only one replaces narrative by discourse in the workshop description. Hence, this paper investigates the way discourse constitutes identities. To this end a framework will be developed, with which to analyse identity constituting discourses. The aim of this paper is to show how fairly abstract reasoning about discourse and identity can be translated into a method of research. However, no actual discourse analysis is being carried out.

The starting point of my argument is to be found in the theoretical debate on identity. Here a broad consensus seems to develop around an anti-essentialist or constructivist understanding of identity, which sees identity not as a set of pre-social, invariable characteristics of individuals or groups, but rather as imaginations. Collective identities thus result from an ongoing process of construction and reproduction of shared understandings about a group's self. Moreover, this strand of identity-theory acknowledges the crucial importance of the 'other' for constructing the identity of the 'self': "Identities are forged out of shared experiences, memories and myths, in relation to those of other collective identities. They are in fact often forged through the opposition to the identities of significant others, as the history of paired conflict so often demonstrates" (Smith 1992: 75). Thus 'othering' and identity-construction go hand in hand.

I argue that constructivists in International Relations (IR)¹, though recognising this theoretically, have done little to show empirically how exactly people construct identities by way of 'othering'.

In order to avoid this mistake, I will take a little detour to look at the constitution of identities through discourse. This detour involves an analysis of the constitution of difference in the first place. It will be looked at discourses on the 'other', in order to examine the link between the 'other' and the 'self'. It is my working assumption that the discourse on the 'other' always contains elements of 'self-understanding'. Thus, one only needs to look close enough at the

¹ IR is my disciplinary background. In the past few years interest in identity surged in IR, as always later than in other social sciences or cultural studies. By now, however it has become a very fashionable topic, particularly among constructivists and postmodernists.

discourse on the 'other' in order to find traces of the 'self'. This necessity of 'close reading' partly explains why most students of IR neglect the 'self/other'-nexus on the empirical ground - text and discourse analysis is simply not yet very widespread in the discipline, not even among constructivists. The application of discourse analytical methods in IR is still very much in its infant stage (Zehfuß 1998).² Therefore this paper attempts to show how to better understand the discursive construction of identity and difference by way of discourse analysis.

In chapter 2 I will introduce Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), a method which I take to be particularly suited for my purposes. It will serve as the background to the framework of analysis, which will be described in chapter 3. In chapter 4 I strive to illustrate the framework's potential by linking it to an empirical case: the EU-discourse about possible EU-membership of Turkey. Finally, in chapter 5, I want to return to the relationship between the terms discourse and narrative.

2. Discourse Analysis, Critical this time

In this chapter the discourse analytical approach this paper is based on, will be introduced: Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). Before, a few general remarks on the term 'discourse' and the different concepts of discourse analysis will be made.

Understandings and definitions of the term 'discourse' are numerous and often vague (van Dijk 1997: 1).³ Partly this may be due to the postmodernists' lack of interest in definitional questions, partly to the spreading of the term into everyday language.

Usually Foucault is taken to be the point of reference as far as discourse is concerned. To him discourse is a specific form of the production of knowledge, especially the knowledge systems that constitute the various sciences - thus he talks about the medical discourse for example (Fairclough/Wodak 1997: 261) Stuart Hall's definition of discourse may be taken as an example for this tradition: "A discourse is a group of statements which provide a language for talking about - i.e. a way of representing - a particular kind of knowledge about the topic. When statements about a topic are made within a particular discourse, the discourse makes it possible to construct the topic in a certain way. It also limits the other ways in which the topic can be constructed" (Hall 1992: 291). This emphasis on the production of knowledge makes

² Examples of discourse analytical approaches to IR are Larsen 1997, Diez 1998, Waever 1998.

³ Foucault himself admits his own share to this confusion (Foucault 1990: 116).

for a clear connection to the sociology of knowledge⁴, which studies the construction of societal knowledge - a point that is often overlooked in IR theory. This connection is important since the sociology of knowledge in many respects is the theoretical foundation of social constructivism. Accordingly I claim the study of discourse to be the most obvious way to understand social constructions, which should make for a natural alliance between discourse analysts and social constructivists.⁵

Although I do not take their understandings of discourse as fundamentally different from the one described above, it can be said that political scientists generally use the term in a more concrete way. The micro-level of language is absolutely central, in contrast to most postmodernist approaches which analyse discourse as a macro-phenomenon (van Dijk 1993: 251). To political scientists, discourse is basically the public discourse about a certain topic or theme (Keller 1997: 311, 316). Thus discourse analysts write on political debates about specific issues, for example the discourse on nuclear power (Gamson/Modigliani 1989), on acid rain (Hajer 1995) or racism (Jäger 1993; Wodak/Matouschek 1993). what is because?

It comes of no surprise that the term's fuzziness hardly makes for a unified understanding of what discourse analysis is supposed to be and how discourse analysts are to go about it. One may find all sorts of approaches labelled as discourse analysis, ranging from fairly standardised and quantitative approaches⁶ via hermeneutics to complex historical 'tours de horizons' à la Foucault (Brand 1988: 87; Keller 1997: 325). Due to this heterogeneity Keller (1997: 327) contends that discourse analysis may well be a research program, but certainly not a single method. Van Dijk sees it as a new cross-discipline and his two handbook-series (1985; 1997b,c) have certainly contributed to the development of this cross-discipline, which cuts across traditional disciplines such as sociology, political science, anthropology, social psychology, communication studies and linguistics. Hence, discussing the differences between the various currents of discourse analysis would be beyond the scope of this paper. However, I will elaborate on CDA, since this is the current of discourse analysis my research draws upon.

⁴ Its most important protagonists being Mannheim (1936), Schütz (1967), and Berger/Luckmann (1966).

⁵ This latter remark is principally addressed to my colleagues in IR, which do not seem to be aware of this point in their debate about the legitimacy of various constructivists strands.

⁶ Nevertheless it seems inappropriate to subsume quantitative content analysis under discourse analysis. Whereas the former takes an interest in the mere frequency of the use of a word or phrase (and normally does not hesitate to draw conclusions about the speaker's attitudes for example), the latter tries - in one way or another - to re-construct argumentative structures (Donati 1992: 152).

As far as the theoretical origin of CDA is concerned, one may distinguish between its philosophical and linguistic roots:⁷ On the philosophical side, CDA is influenced by Neo-Marxism, especially by Gramsci's and the Frankfurt School's emphasis on the cultural underpinnings of hegemony (Fairclough/Wodak 1997: 260). It is from their sympathy for critical theory that CDA-scholars take their emancipatory research goals. On the linguistic side CDA draws upon Bernstein's sociolinguistics (1971), Halliday's systemic linguistic theory (1978), but also borrows from Bakhtin's concept of intertextuality (1981). Most obvious, however, is its strong affinity with pragmatics, from which CDA takes many of its central assumptions. Although CDA is very much a product of the 1990's, it does have a predecessor, namely 'critical linguistics', developed in the late 1970's by British linguists such as Fowler et al. (1979) and Kress/Hodge (1979) (Titscher et al. 1998: 179).

Its critical impetus is not the only feature of CDA that distinguishes it from other discourse analytical approaches. The other central features will be explained in the following. This overview is based on similar efforts by key representatives of CDA (Wodak 1996: 7-20; Fairclough/Wodak 1997: 271-280; Titscher et al. 1998: 180-181), but I chose a different order, starting from a definition of discourse which alludes to CDA's principal points and working my way down to the approach's more technical features. The definition, quoted below, appears to have achieved the status of CDA's standard-definition of discourse, since it is referred to by Fairclough and Wodak in all their research since 1992:

"CDA sees discourse - language use in speech and writing - as a form of 'social practice'. Describing discourse as social practice implies a dialectical relationship between a particular discursive event and the situation(s), institution(s) and social structure(s) which frame it. A dialectical relationship is a two-way relationship: the discursive event is shaped by situations, institutions and social structures, but it also shapes them. To put the same point in a different way, discourse is socially *constitutive* as well as socially shaped: it constitutes situations, objective knowledge, and the social identities of and relationships between people and groups of people" (Fairclough/Wodak 1997: 259).

⁷ For a more thorough overview readers are advised to consult either Titscher et al. (1998: 178.181), Wodak (1996), Fairclough/Wodak (1997: 260-268), or van Dijk (1993: 251).

Discourse is action

One important feature of CDA is the conceptualisation of discourse as action - here one can clearly see the pragmatic imprint. Discourse is not merely a form of language use, but does have a behavioural dimension, too - it is a 'form of social practice' (see Wodak 1996: 14, 16). By talking or writing people act, because what they do has consequences: They verbally create situations (and institutions and social structures), which are the basis of further verbal and non-verbal action. Thus the relationship between discourse and situations is one of mutual constitution, or as Fairclough and Wodak would have it: dialectical (Wodak 1996: 16).⁸ This leads to the next characteristic.

Mutual constitution of discourse and society

Situations, institutions, social structures, knowledge, and identities - the terms referred to in the definition quoted above - may be subsumed under the terms society and culture. It then follows that society and culture are constituted by discourse, but at the same time, they constitute discourse. Every single instance of language use has its impact on society and culture, no language use is possible without a social/cultural background (Titschler et al. 1998: 180). It follows from this logic, that CDA does not only analyse discourse, but has to take into account the cultural and societal context as well; again pragmatics' influence on CDA is obvious. The difficult question, however, is how to relate the two. It is widely acknowledged that this relation is fairly complex and has to be understood as indirect (Fairclough/Wodak 1997: 277-278; Wodak 1996: 19). But there is much less agreement on the precise nature of this indirect link. Whereas some see 'orders of discourse' as mediating between discourse and society, others take cognition to be the crucial connection, a point that will be discussed in the next chapter.

Discourse = \sum texts (in context)

What has been said above about the conceptual and definitional confusion about the term 'discourse' holds true for the differentiation between 'discourse' and 'text' as well. A clear-cut distinction is easiest when working with a Foucaultian concept of discourse as societal formation (Titscher et al. 1998: 37, Fn. 25). Discourse then is the overall term, texts being one component of discourse. In principle the logic of this distinction applies to CDA as well: Discourse is made up of talk and text, situated within context (van Dijk 1997a: 3).

As Wodak (1996: 3) notes, the difference between discourse and text is definitely not that the former is oral whereas the latter is written - a difference which is correct for talk/text. Since

⁸ Which I take to be a rather peculiar understanding of dialectical.

oral products, i.e. talk, frequently are accessible to research only in the form of texts, I do not distinguish between talk and text, but rather take text to be the tag for all forms of verbal products.

Despite the fact that text linguistics is increasingly taking account of context as well and is thus approaching discourse analysis (Titscher et al. 1998: 37, Fn. 26), one important difference between text analysis and discourse analysis remains. In text analysis texts are the principal object of interest, whereas discourse analysis examines single texts only to better understand the overall discourse.

Importance of context

Discourse does not take place in a vacuum, it is embedded in a specific context. Therefore a discourse cannot be understood without taking into consideration its context. This point is central in pragmatics and, again, has originally been made by Wittgenstein. He argued that utterances are meaningful only in their situational, cultural, ideological and historical context (Wodak 1996: 19). Based on this reasoning, CDA allocates the analysis of context a central place. Of course, other discourses - past and present - are an important part of the context, therefore intertextuality also figures prominently in CDA (Titscher et al. 1998: 45, 181).

Discourse does ideological work

Discourse has the potential of reproducing ideology. In order to find out whether a particular discursive event is ideological, textual analysis is not enough. Therefore a text's interpretations by the recipients and its social effects are also being studied by CDA.

A brief discussion of the concept of ideology should show why I consider CDA to be particularly well-suited for my research. "Ideologies are particular ways of representing and constructing society which reproduce unequal relations of power, relations of domination and exploitation." (Fairclough/Wodak 1997: 275).⁹ Originally - due to its Marxists background - only unequal class relations were being considered in theories of ideology, but today unequal relations of gender and ethnicity, too, are being reflected in terms of ideology. Since sexist and racist discourse are among the most frequently studied discourse types in CDA the link to ideology is obvious. With reference to Althusser Fairclough/Wodak (1997: 276) argue that ideology does not only construct a certain social reality, but also a specific identity. Although I do not agree on the implicit distinction between social reality and identity - holding that identity is

⁹ Note the social constructivist core of the definition. This affinity between social constructivism and theories of ideology does not surprise, if one remembers that one of the most renowned theorists of ideology - Karl Mannheim - is also considered to be one of the founding fathers of the sociology of knowledge.

part of social reality - I nonetheless share the view that identity-constructions can be ideological.

CDA addresses social problems

Language is not per se the object of study, but the linguistic aspects of social processes and structures. Of main interest for CDA is the question as to how power is exercised in discourse. This, of course, requires interdisciplinary research, especially social scientists and historians are asked to cooperate with linguists.¹⁰

CDA is a socially committed scientific paradigm

As indicated above CDA tries to go one step further than 'normal' discourse analysis by adding some 'critical spice'. This means first of all, to make explicit the researcher's own (political) interests. CDA's interest is not only to uncover ideological language use, but also to contribute to a change of discourse. The ultimate goal - although not mentioned in the various works-of-reference - would thus be a Habermasian 'ideal speech situation'.

3. Working the methodological frame

The methodological framework of my research is derived from CDA. However, CDA does not provide a single method (Wodak et al. 1998: 41f, Fn. 37). Rather one may distinguish two different strands (Titscher et al. 1998: 178) which differ in three important respects: First, in their conceptualisation of the connection between discourse and society. Secondly, in the way they understand the actual analysis of discourses. Thirdly, in their fields of application.

Norman Fairclough - whose name stands for one of the strands - links discourse to society by a concept taken from Foucault: 'orders of discourse', defined as "(...) the totality of discursive practices within an institution or society, and the relationships between them" (Fairclough 1992: 43). The specific order of discourse, that is the structure of the various discourses within this order of discourse, allows for conclusions about the social conflicts and social change. To him any discursive event is text, discursive practice (the production and interpretation of texts) and social practice at the same time. Discourse analysis is then carried out along these three dimensions (Titscher 1998: 184). His research interest is clearly directed towards the connec-

¹⁰ The present protagonists of CDA all share a similar, linguistic background. Their call for interdisciplinarity thus awaits an answer by social scientists. However, this presupposes a certain willingness on behalf of the social scientists to get acquainted with the basics of linguistics. Considering the ubiquity of language in modern social theory, one would expect this willingness to be there. Time will tell, how many of them will take the chance and how successful they are.

tion between social and discursive *change* (Fairclough/Wodak 1997: 264).

The other strand, Ruth Wodak and Teun van Dijk being its chief representatives, takes social cognition to be the link between discourse and society (Fairclough/Wodak 1997: 266). As far as the conceptualisation of discourses is concerned, they pay more attention to argumentation strategies, besides offering a - in my view - more practical guide to text analysis. Moreover they emphasise the importance of context and pay particular attention to the historical setting of a particular discourse, the reason for which they sometimes call their approach 'discourse-historical'. Their research interest rests not so much in change but more in the constitution of stereotyped images in racist, anti-Semitic or nationalist discourses (Fairclough/Wodak 1997: 266; Titscher et al. 1998: 199; Wodak/Matouschek 1993: 233).

My own framework borrows from both directions of CDA, combining some of Fairclough's theoretical considerations with Wodak's guide as to how to analyse texts. All in all it does have a certain leaning towards the 'discourse-historical' approach. However, before developing my framework three more general remarks need to be made.

First, in contrast to many other strands of discourse analysis CDA does provide for a relatively clear methodological tool kit. It may thus be seen as a research method within the research programme of discourse analysis.

Second, as mentioned above, CDA does have a 'critical' impetus. In my study, however, the intervention into social practices is only analytical: it shows how inequality and difference are being (re-)produced through discourse, but it does not intervene practically, i.e. it does not attempt to change discourse (Wodak et al. 1998: 44).

A third remark touches upon the question as to how discourse and society are linked. I do share the view of their mutual constitution and CDA's interest in exactly how language is socially constitutive and constituted (Titscher et al. 1998: 183). However, I have the impression that CDA implicitly focuses on the constitutive role of language anyway while neglecting the impact of society on discourse.¹¹ Furthermore I do agree that there is no direct impact of society on discourse and vice versa, but that the connection is mediated (Fairclough/Wodak 1997: 277). But, I neither find the Fairclough- nor the van Dijk/Wodak-concept very convincing. The former, because it is too abstract and complex to be of much value on the empirical ground, the latter because - without denying that cognition may play a significant role - I hold that discourse analysis should foremost deal with texts, not with supposed cognition. For the

substantiated and finally how this is being done linguistically.

Lastly, language is also supposed to constitute social relations between those participating at the discourse. This may be done explicitly, as in the case when the discourse is about the relations between the participants, but also implicitly, for example if one participant constitutes his/her dominance by interrupting other participants. As far as my study is concerned I face the problem that I am interested in the constitution of social relationships between two groups, however I will be looking only at the language use of one group. Though not quite in line with Halliday and Fairclough I claim that this does not prevent the study of the relational function. For once, because the other group still makes part of the discourse, the fact that it is not included in my discourse analysis does not exclude it from the actual discourse. Second, because I will often be dealing with instances of language use where the relationship to the other is the explicit topic.

Having discussed the three functions of language use that will be analysed in my research I now want to introduce Wodak's suggestion to look at three dimensions of language use. However, as stated above, the two approaches are not mutually exclusively, but can be combined to one framework. Although I hold that the specific combination that will be outlined below is my original contribution, there is good reason to believe that Fairclough and Wodak do not see their approaches as irreconcilable: Wodak adopts the principle logic of Fairclough's multifunctional approach quite explicitly in a recent publication (Wodak et al. 1998: 43), and in an article Fairclough and Wodak have published together they write: "A useful working assumption is that any part of any language text, spoken or written, is simultaneously constituting representations, relations, and identities" (Fairclough/Wodak 1997: 275).

For the following overview of the 'discourse-historical' approach by Wodak and her fellow researchers at the University of Vienna I mainly draw upon Wodak et al. (1998) and Titscher et al. (1998).

Wodak distinguishes three dimensions of text analysis: In a first dimension, a text may be examined as to its content. In other words, the manifest level of a text is of interest here, asking for what is apparently said or written. In her empirical research Wodak develops clusters, according to which she organises the various content-elements of a text. These clusters, however, do depend on the respective discourse topics and cannot be generalised.

The second dimension is called 'strategies of argumentation': " We understand strategies as some sort of more or less conscious, more or less elaborated plans of action, situated on diffe-

rent levels of mental organisation" (Wodak et al. 1998: 75; my translation¹³). In simple terms, strategies denote what the actors want. Any discursive action has an underlying strategy, be it conscious or unconscious. However, these strategies are not seen as purely finalistic and instrumental (Wodak et al. 1990: 34, Fn. 3). The understanding of strategies is weaker than this: they are seen as goal-oriented, but not as a completely rational and instrumental realisations of the goals.¹⁴ Since strategies are inside the author's head, we are dealing with mental models and thus have to be aware of the affinity to concepts such as frame, script or scheme.¹⁵ It is obvious that strategies cannot be observed directly by the researcher and therefore have to be inferred from the actual language use.

Unlike the content-dimension the analysis of the strategy-dimension is less discourse-specific, or to put it differently: The repertoire of strategies in the discourses typically analysed (racism, anti-Semitism, nationalism) is limited. One may thus borrow strategies identified by previous studies, when doing research. In a study on Austrian identity, for instance, Wodak identifies strategies such as assimilation which emphasise sameness and thus construct an image of a homogenous Austrian population. Dissimilation is a related strategy where the difference between Austrian and Non-Austrians is emphasised (Wodak et al. 1998: 77).

Discourse analysis according to Wodak has to be complemented by a third perspective, namely the analysis of a text's linguistic realisations. Here one searches for linguistic characteristics on the level of single words, of sentences and of the text as a whole. This is home turf for linguists, but social scientists do not need to worry too much, since what has been said about the transferability of strategies holds true for the linguistic realisations, too. Notwithstanding the fact that linguistic variations are numerous and linguistic analysis may focus on very different aspects of language - phonetics or morphology for example - linguistic analysis for our purposes is not quite as complex, because it may be build upon the work done by the specialists. For instance, when analysing a discourse on national identity, one may well take a look at the various means of language ('sprachliche Mittel'), Wodak et al. (1998) found to be important in the discourse on Austrian identity. For instance, they show that the tropes of metonymy, synecdoche and personification are crucial means for the linguistic realisation of arguing the sameness of people.

¹³ In the German original 'plans of action' reads as 'Handlungspläne'.

¹⁴ This is close to Pierre Bourdieu's understanding of strategy (Wodak et al. 1998: 74).

¹⁵ Discourse analysis in the cognitive psychology tradition seems particularly popular among political scientists (for example: Donati 1992; Gamson/Modigliani 1987, 1989).

Taken together, these three dimensions of language use make for what Wodak et al. (1990: 33) call their framework of analysis ('Analyseinstrumentarium').

To this point the two principle 'schools' of CDA have been discussed. I have elaborated on their respective systematisation of language use, showing that Fairclough looks at functions, whereas Wodak's concept points at the different 'layers' of language use. However, in neither of the models we are dealing with categories that are mutually exclusive: In fact, Fairclough explicitly states that every instance of language has got all three functions at the same time. In Wodak's model language use is always three-dimensional: A text does have a certain content, there is an underlying strategy to it, and, of course, a text does not exist without linguistic realisations.

Building on both Fairclough and Wodak I will now develop my own framework. It is meant to guide the empirical research along the preceding theoretical and methodological reflections. Or, to put it differently, it is a means to ensure that the empirical 'data' will be looked at in a systematic way. Moreover, a clear framework should enhance the research's intersubjectivity. The principle idea behind my framework is a simple combination of Fairclough's and Wodak's approach. Every instance of language use will then be analysed in two dimensions, describing its functions as well as its realisations on different levels/layers. In principle this makes for a fairly thorough analysis, since every text will be looked at with nine different lenses. Normally the analysis starts with the content level. First, one will have to ask what sort of representations of the world (ideational function) are being purveyed on the content level (cell a in the table below). Then, one looks at the kind of social relations, the content puts forward (b). In a third step we look at the social identities (normally of the author or the author's group) as being indicated by the content of the text (c). Subsequently the same three functions are examined on the level of linguistic realisations (d-f) and on the level of strategy (g-i). In the end, we should ideally be able to summarise the findings for every single text (or instance of language use) in a table of the following type. However, this is an ideal-type framework, which does not claim to cover every instance of language use. It is meant as a way to structure texts, but should not be used as a straight-jacket. It is unlikely that every text can be broken down to all nine cells. Blanks will most likely remain.

function	ideational	relational	identity
level			
content	a	b	c
linguistic realisation	d	e	f
strategy	g	h	i

Without 'empirical life' this framework remains fairly abstract. Therefore a further elaboration on the methodological framework is necessary, but is deferred to the next chapter where I will try to sketch the usage of this framework in my empirical case. For the moment, a few more abstract remarks on the research-process need to be made, showing that textual analysis according to the table above is not yet enough, since the table covers only the analysis of texts, however we aim at analysing discourse. Therefore it is necessary to see texts in their context, because - as stated in the previous chapter - I understand discourse as the sum of texts in their context.

In fact, discourses may only be described, understood and interpreted within their specific context - as I have already indicated in the previous chapter (Titscher et al. 1998: 194; Wodak et al. 1990: 52). This makes a detailed analysis of context necessary. It is exactly this context-specificity which distinguishes CDA from the ethnomethodological conversation analysis, which analyses communication processes out of context (Wodak et al. 1990: 53). It is against the background of this emphasis on context that CDA takes multi-disciplinarity to be so important, since the context usually has a variety of dimensions: sociological, political, institutional, psychological, historical etc.

Broadly speaking, three levels of context may be distinguished (Wodak et al. 1998: 45f)¹⁶: On the lowest level this is the so-called co-text, which is the immediate, language-internal, or, in linguistic terms, syn-semantic surrounding of a particular instance of language use. On a higher level, an utterance is made in a specific, language-external setting. Setting in this understanding comprises the characteristics of the institutional setting - it makes a difference whether one speaks in parliament or at home -, but also the characteristics of the discourse participants, for instance the nationality and sex of the speaker. And, of particular importance in an approach named 'discourse-historical' is of course the historical setting within which

¹⁶ Matouschek/Wodak (1995: 226) do also give a very similar overview of 'steps of research' ('Arbeitsschritte').

texts are being produced.

The third level of context does not fit into the high-and low categorisation. It is the intertextual references of a specific utterance. Here one looks for traces of other texts in the text under examination. References to other texts may take a variety of forms, from explicit quotes to subtle allusions.

In sum, we thus understand textual analysis as closely connected to the analysis of context. However, the actual research is not organised as a two-step of context analysis followed by text analysis. Rather, contexts and texts are looked at as interconnected and it is the parallel and blended analysis of both that makes for a discourse analysis.

5. Framing the Case: Turkey as the ma(r)ker of European Identity?

So far this paper has been quite abstract. This is due to the main purpose of this paper, namely to introduce a general and clear-cut discourse analytical framework for the study of identity-construction. Now this framework will be illustrated with reference to an empirical discourse, which I am analysing in the context of a larger research project.

I will start out by giving some context information on the discourse under study. Next, I will show how the usage of my framework enables me to generate research questions and hypotheses. A more detailed explanation and discussion of my research questions and hypotheses will then be given, hoping that this will serve the illustration and thus better comprehension of my approach. What readers will wait for in vain, however, is empirical results, simply because at this stage of research only exploratory analyses of the discourse have been carried out.

At its summit in Luxembourg in December 1997 the European Council decided about the candidates for EU-membership. It was decided to commence accession-negotiations with the Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland, Slovenia, Estonia, and Cyprus. A second group of Central- and Eastern European countries were to follow once they would have met certain criteria proving their progress towards democratic and economic consolidation. Turkey, on the other hand, was not included, neither in the first nor in the second group, causing considerable disappointment and fury in Turkey.

The question of Turkish accession to the EU had been high on the political agenda throughout the year 1997 and it is exactly this discourse about Turkey's possible EU-membership which I will be analysing. My research intentions, which will be explained below, allow me to look only

at the EU-side of the discourse, i.e. at discursive events from within the EU or its member states, but not on Turkish or other (e.g. US-American) contributions to the discourse. A further restriction is the focus on the discourse in 1997 and the first half of 1998, which, of course, is not to deny that the discourse had started long before and continued thereafter.¹⁷ Apart from these restrictions I attempt to give a fairly 'thick' description and analysis of the discourse: I will take into account official documents from the European Council and the Commission, debates in the European Parliament and statements from members of these organisations, on the other hand the discourse within selected EU-member states. Here again, official documents and statements by politicians (for instance speeches) will be examined, but considerable attention will also be paid to the media discourse.

The EU-discourse on Turkey's possible EU-membership may be the object of research, but it is not the research interest per se. Rather, I want to find out how much this discourse tells us about the EU itself and what function it had for the EU. This research interest is derived from the debate about identity, according to which identity is constructed by way of 'othering' (e.g. Neumann 1998). One cannot think of one's identity without the non-identical, i.e. the 'other' is crucial for the construction and representation of the 'self'. Or, to connect it with Halliday/Fairclough, the discourse about the self is a discourse about the other at the same time, just as 'talking' about the other always involves the self.

Since the discourse on Turkey's suitability for EU-membership may certainly be seen as a discourse that contains elements of 'othering' (for the simple reason that for the time being Turkey is - at least formally - the EU's other), one should - according to theory - be able to show how this discourse contributed to the constitution of European identity. This is exactly what my research project is trying to do.

Halliday and Fairclough teach us that any instance of language use has got three functions. In terms of our empirical case, 'talking' about Turkey's EU-eligibility reflects and constructs knowledge about Turkey and about the criteria for membership (ideational function). It also serves to manifest the relationship between Turkey and the EU (relational function) as well as contributing to the construction of a European identity (identity function). Of course, these functions are analytical and will hardly be easy to separate in the texts. This multifunctional

¹⁷ However, it might be clear from the preceding chapter that Turkish or other discourses may trickle into the EU-one by way of intertextuality and the very same mechanism links the discourse before 1997 to the one under study here.

approach to language points to the fact that 'talking' about a certain topic is always more than just the representation and construction of this topic. It is also about the speaker's identity.

Both, the multifunctional theory of language and the constructivist, anti-essentialist theories of identity emphasise the intertwinedness of self and other, of subject and object. And it is precisely this intertwinedness which I am interested in. It will be my first goal to test whether this intertwinedness can be shown in the discourse under examination. My motivation for this stems from a strong dissatisfaction with the literature on identity, which rambles about the importance of the 'other' without bothering much about showing empirically if and how self and other hang together. Thus, the first proposition under scrutiny is the following:

The discourse on Turkey's suitability for EU-membership simultaneously is a discourse on European identity.

If one takes Halliday's concept of *multifunctionality* more literally, one could reformulate this proposition in a somewhat stronger - and thus more provocative - fashion:

For the EU the discourse on Turkey's suitability for EU-membership functions as a means to (re-)construct its own identity.

In order to come to terms with the self/other nexus in my empirical case I will work my way along the three Fairclough- functions, asking three research questions:

- 1) *How is knowledge about Turkey's suitability for EU-membership represented/constructed in the discourse?*¹⁸
- 2) *How are the relations between Turkey and the EU represented/constructed?*
- 3) *How is the identity of the EU represented/constructed?*

For all three questions I will search for representations/constructions on the three linguistic levels of content, strategy and realisation, as I have shown with the help of the table in chapter 3. This detailed categorisation will allow to reflect upon another aspect of discourse, namely the connection between the two dimensions of my table: function and level/layer. It will be looked at 'correlations' - to (mis)use a term probably not very popular among this audience - between the different functions of language use and the levels of realisations. The underlying idea is that different functions may draw upon different levels of realisations, because one level may be better suited to fulfil a particular function than another. Or, to put it

differently, certain levels may be 'natural' partners of certain functions. Thus I will try to answer a fourth research question:

4) Is there any indication for a systematic relation between specific functions and the application of specific linguistic levels?

Of course, research may show that the relation is arbitrary. But, from a theoretical point of view one could argue that the ideational function may tend to be realised mainly on the level of content. The communication of a certain understanding of reality needs to be fairly explicit, in order to contribute to the shared knowledge, it does carry a certain content. Needless to say that the other two linguistic levels would still be involved. In my empirical case, the discourse participants do verbalise their respective knowledge about Turkey and an assessment of Turkey's suitability for EU-membership. It is easy to see that this involves a great deal of language use on the level of content. Views on Turkey are exchanged - one points at recent human rights violations while another points to the strategic role of Turkey in the Middle East and yet another refers to cultural differences - which serve to argue for or against Turkish EU-membership.

Moreover, it appears to be plausible to expect the following systematic relation between the identity-function and the level of linguistic realisation (=style): Since the identity-function is less 'visible' than the ideational function of language use, it is being realised on a less visible level of linguistic realisation, too, namely on the level of style. The construction of a European identity by way of the Turkey-discourse would thus mainly be realised on the level of style. Without a detailed linguistic analysis one would not detect these deeper levels of discourse, the discourse on Turkey's EU-suitability would be understood as nothing other than it shows to be on the level of content. Only by analysing its style one would discover the underlying discourse, namely the one on European identity.

These presumptions are summarised in the following proposition:

Whereas the discourse on Turkey's suitability is mainly being realised on the level of content, the parallel discourse on European identity mainly takes place on the level of style.

In the preceding paragraphs the focus has been on language/discourse, whereas structure, action, and society have temporarily been put aside. As mentioned above, the discourse-society connection is a very important issue in CDA and will also be considered in my research. But I

¹⁸ The terms representation and construction are being used both in order to indicate the mutual constitution of discourse and structure/action. The describing role of language is referred to by the term 'representation', whereas the defining role is indicated with the term 'construction'.

want to emphasise that I do not claim to explain policy decisions with reference to discourse. Attempting to use discourse as an independent variable with which to explain outcome as dependent variable would be quite naive when considering the complex relationship between discourse and action/structure.

With regard to the empirical case I thus do not try to come up with an explanation of the Luxembourg summit in December 1997. Discourse did neither cause nor can it explain why the European Council decided not to include Turkey in the second group of candidates. What discourse analysis can do, however, is to research the discursive environment of a particular policy decision and thus find out whether a decision is in tune with the discourse or not. It is a working assumption of discourse analysis, however, that decisions will hardly ever be out of tune. Discourse analysis does not only provide for an overview of what is being said and what apparently cannot be said, but may also delineate the margins of decision. The discourse on Turkey prior to the Luxembourg summit may thus be expected to represent the various 'images' of Turkey as well as constructing certain images. And, of course, these images do influence the interests of the decision-makers and thus the decisions. On the other hand it is quite obvious that these images of Turkey are also shaped by context, e.g. the prosecution of Kurds in the south-east of Turkey has certainly had considerable impact of the EU's picture of Turkey. The context's impact on discourse may also be witnessed in the discourse after the Luxembourg summit, which saw a fierce reaction of Turkey, which again provoked an angry counterreaction from the EU.

The mutual constitution of discourse and society/context will be paid tribute to by constantly relating discourse to context and vice versa. The study of discourse will thus be complemented by a study of non-discursive events in the period of research.

5. Epilogue: narrative discourse or discursive narrative?

In the introduction to this paper I justified my participation in this workshop by simply asserting that discourse and narrative are equivalent terms. Of course, this is a crude simplification, but it may also be understood as a warning, namely to strive for definitional clarity when talking about 'narrative' in order to prevent narrative to become a new buzzword - following the lead of discourse - but also to prevent people like me to intrude the field of narrativists. This final chapter is intended to explore the relation between the two terms in question, which may then serve as a starting point for the discussion in the workshop.

For the purposes of this paper discourse has been defined as the ensemble of texts about a specific topic embedded in various and changing contexts. As for a specification of the term narrative I will start with a brief look at linguistic/literary-theory understandings of narrative and then present two non-linguistic applications and discuss their relation to discourse, abstractly but also with reference to my empirical case.

Linguists/literary theorists agree that all narratives "(...) depict a temporal transition from one state of affairs to another" (Ochs 1997: 189). The object of depiction need not be fictitious, the reason for which the historian Hayden V. White (1978; 1987) claimed that historiography, too, is narrative (Antor 1998: 133; Nünning 1998: 391). As to the categorisation of narrative it is usually referred to as 'genre' besides non-narrative genres (Nünning 1998: 391), or as genre of discourse respectively (Ochs 1997: 199). Apart from this, Ochs (1997: 189f) contends that narrative does not necessarily concern past alone, but may also be about present or future chains of events. Just how consensual this last point is, I could not find out.

The use of narrative in sociology and philosophy appears to be particularly relevant for my study, since it frequently deals with narrative in connection with identity. It will be presented by discussing two representatives.

The American sociologist Richard Harvey Brown, for instance, sees society as a network of narrative texts (Morel et al. 1997: 271). These texts create sense and identity: "Reciprocally, the sequential ordering of the past, a present, and a future enables the structuring of perpetual experience, the organization of memory, and the constructions of the events, identities, and lives that they express. This rhetorically constructed narrative unity provides models of identity for people in particular symbolic settings or lifeworlds" (Brown 1996: 22f). The core feature of narrative - the recounting of events - may be identified in this understanding of identity. Moreover he shares Ochs' view that not only past events but also present and future ones can be narrated. Considering Brown's understanding of society as a network of narrative texts, it is quite clear that he cannot exclude present and future. However, I argue that narrative thus becomes an overall-category, principally the synonym of text, which does not allow to distinguish narrative and non-narrative genres. This confirms my fears about the use of narrative to describe anything textual, much in the same way as discourse.

The second example for a broad understanding of narrative and a link with identity is Ricoeur's work on narrative identity. Narrative identity explains how individuals link the different stages of their changing identity. Narrative allows for constant re-counting and re-interpretation of

past events in a way that makes sense of one's biography and in order to design the present self (Wodak et al. 1998: 55f). In contrast to Brown narrative is only being used for the sequential ordering of past events, thus narrowing its meaning significantly and escaping the danger of narrative being too vague a term. At the same time this is the reason why Wodak et al. (1998: 65) claim that national identity is more than a narrated one, since narrative does not cover the present and future dimensions of national identity. In their understanding national identity is the product of discourses, of which narratives about the national culture are a major, but not the only part (Wodak et al. 1998: 61).

This demonstrates that CDA, too, may apply the term narrative, however as a subcategory of discourse. In the case of my research, there could be narratives being told about the other, namely Turkey's past (ideational function), about the Turco-European relations (relational function), and the self, that is about Europe (identity-function). My impression from the first exploratory look at the discourse is that narratives are quite frequent when it comes to the representation of the Turco-European relations. While some newspaper articles contain narratives on the Turco-EU-relationship - exemplary starting with the 1963 Ankara-treaty passing various events up to the Luxembourg summit in 1997 - others narrate the relationship from the antiquity to the Turco-Prussian co-operation in building the Baghdad-railway. Again, as stated in the previous chapters, narrating about the relationship towards Turkey is partly also to narrate about Turkey proper and the self.

If narrative was to be included in my research-framework it would make for a background category along with other genres of discourse. The important difference to the two dimensions of function and level/layer is that a text may well have three functions at the same time and may be realised on three levels simultaneously, however it would not be - at least not regularly - all genres at once.

References

- Antor, Heinz* 1998: Erzählung, in: Nünning, Ansgar (ed.): Metzler-Lexikon Literatur- und Kulturtheorie: Ansätze-Personen-Grundbegriffe, Stuttgart, 133-134.
- Bernstein, Basil* 1971: Class, Codes and Control, London.
- Brand, Karl-Werner* 1988: Diskursanalyse, in: Kriz, J./Nohlen, D./Schultze, R.-O. (eds.): Lexikon der Politik, Bd. 2, München, 85-87.
- Diez, Thomas* 1998: Discursive Nodal Points and the Analysis of European Integration Policy, Paper at the ECPR/ISA-Conference, Vienna, 16-19 September.
- Dijk, Teun A. van* (ed.) 1985: Handbook of Discourse Analysis, Vol. 1-4, London.
- Dijk, Teun A. van* 1993: Principles of Critical Discourse Analysis, in: Discourse & Society 4: 2, 249-283.
- Dijk, Teun A. van* 1997a: Discourse as Interaction in Society, in: Dijk, Teun A. van (ed.): Discourse as Social Interaction. Discourse Studies: A Multidisciplinary Introduction, Volume 2, London, 1-37.
- Dijk, Teun A. Van* (ed.) 1997b: Discourse as Social Interaction. Discourse Studies: A Multidisciplinary Introduction. Volume 2, London.
- Dijk, Teun A. van* (ed.) 1997c: Discourse as Structure and Process. Discourse Studies: A Multidisciplinary Introduction, Volume 1, London.
- Donati, Paolo R.* 1992: Political Discourse Analysis, in: Diani, Mario /Eyerman, Ron (eds.): Studying Collective Action, London, 136-167.
- Fairclough, Norman* 1992: Discourse and Social Change, Cambridge.
- Fairclough, Norman/Wodak, Ruth* 1997: Critical Discourse Analysis, in: Dijk, Teun Van (ed.): Discourse as Social Interaction. A Multidisciplinary Introduction. Volume 2, London, 258-284.
- Foucault, Michel* 1990: Archäologie des Wissens, Frankfurt/M.
- Fowler, R. et al.* (eds.) 1979: Language and Control, London.
- Gamson, William A./Modigliani, Andre* 1989: Media Discourse and Public Opinion on Nuclear Power: A Constructionist Approach, in: American Journal of Sociology 95: 1, 1-37.
- Hajer, M.A.* 1995: The Politics of Environmental Discourse. Ecological Modernization and the Policy Process, Oxford.
- Hall, Stuart* 1992: The West and the Rest: Discourse and Power, in: Hall, Stuart/ Gieben, Bram (eds.): Formations of Modernity, Oxford, 275-332.
- Halliday, Michael A.K.* 1973: Explorations in the Functions of Language, London.
- Halliday, Michael A.K.* 1978: Language as Social Semiotic, London.
- Jäger, Siegfried* 1993: Kritische Diskursanalyse. Eine Einführung, Duisburg.
- Keller, Reiner* 1997: Diskursanalyse, in: Hitzler, Ronald /Honer, Anne (eds.): Sozialwissenschaftliche Hermeneutik. Eine Einführung, Opladen, 309-333.
- Kress, G./Hodge, R.* 1979: Language as Ideology (ed.): London,
- Larsen, Henrik* 1997: Foreign Policy and Discourse Analysis. France, Britain and Europe, London.
- Mannheim, Karl* 1936: Ideology and Utopia, New York.
- Matouschek, Bernd/Wodak, Ruth* 1995: 'Rumänen, Roma ... und andere Fremde.' Historisch-kritische Diskursanalyse zur Rede von den 'Anderen', in: Heiss, Gernot /Rathkolb, Oliver (eds.): Asyl-land wider Willen. Flüchtlinge in Österreich im europäischen Kontext seit 1914. Veröffentli-

chungen des Ludwig-Boltzmann-Institutes für Geschichte und Gesellschaft. Band 25, Wien, 210-238.

Neumann, Iver B. 1996: Self and Other in International Relations, in: *European Journal of International Relations* 2: 2, 139-174.

Nünig, Ansgar 1998: Narrativität, in: Nünig, Ansgar (ed.): *Metzler-Lexikon Literatur- und Kulturtheorie: Ansätze-Personen-Grundbegriffe*, Stuttgart, 391.

Ochs, Elinor 1997: Narrative, in: Dijk, Teun A. van (ed.): *Discourse as Structure and Process. Discourse Structure and Process*, London, 185-207.

Schütz, Alfred 1967: *The Phenomenology of the Social World*, New York.

Smith, Anthony D. 1992: National identity and the idea of European unity, in: *International Affairs* 68: 1, 55-76.

Titscher, Stefan et al. 1998: *Methoden der Textanalyse. Leitfaden und Überblick*, Opladen.

Waever, Ole 1998: *Explaining Europe by Decoding Discourses*. Kopenhagen.

White, Hayden V. 1978: *Tropics of Discourse. Essays in Cultural Criticism*, Baltimore.

White, Hayden V. 1987: *The Content of the Form. Narrative Discourse and Historical Representation*, Baltimore.

Wodak, Ruth 1996: *Disorders in Discourse*, New York.

Wodak, Ruth et al. 1990: 'Wir sind alle unschuldige Täter', Frankfurt/M.

Wodak, Ruth et al. 1998: *Zur diskursiven Konstruktion nationaler Identität*, Frankfurt/M.

Wodak, Ruth/Matouschek, Bernd 1993: 'We are dealing with people whose origins one can clearly tell just by looking'. *Critical Discourse Analysis and the Study of Neo-Racism in Contemporary Austria*, in: *Discourse & Society* 4: 2, 225-248.

Zehfuß, Maja 1998: Sprachlosigkeit schränkt ein. Zur Bedeutung von Sprache in konstruktivistischen Theorien, in: *Zeitschrift für Internationale Beziehungen* 5: 1, 109-137.