

# A General Critical Discourse Analysis Framework for Educational Research

Journal of Advanced Academics  
2018, Vol. 29(2) 116–142  
© The Author(s) 2018  
Reprints and permissions:  
sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav  
DOI: 10.1177/1932202X18758260  
journals.sagepub.com/home/joaa



Dianna R. Mullet<sup>1</sup> 

## Abstract

Critical discourse analysis (CDA) is a qualitative analytical approach for critically describing, interpreting, and explaining the ways in which discourses construct, maintain, and legitimize social inequalities. CDA rests on the notion that the way we use language is purposeful, regardless of whether discursive choices are conscious or unconscious. CDA takes a number of different approaches and incorporates a variety of methods that depend on research goals and theoretical perspectives. This methodological guide presents a general CDA analytic framework and illustrates the application of that framework to a systematic literature review of CDA studies in education. CDA research studies are no less likely than other forms of scholarly research to reproduce ideological assumptions; qualitative rigor and trustworthiness are discussed.

## Keywords

critical discourse analysis, education research, social inequality, qualitative research, analytical framework

Critical discourse analysis (CDA) is a qualitative analytical approach for critically describing, interpreting, and explaining the ways in which discourses construct, maintain, and legitimize social inequalities (Wodak & Meyer, 2009). CDA, like discourse analysis (DA), examines the ways in which language produces and moderates social and psychological phenomena; however, CDA emphasizes the role of language as a power resource (Willig, 2014).

---

<sup>1</sup>University of North Texas, Denton, TX, USA

## Corresponding Author:

Dianna R. Mullet, Department of Educational Psychology, University of North Texas, 1155 Union Circle #311335, Denton, TX 76203, USA.

Email: dianna.mullet@gmail.com

CDA deals primarily with discourses of power abuse, injustice, and inequality and attempts to uncover implicit or concealed power relations (Van Dijk, 1993; Wodak & Meyer, 2009). For instance, prejudices and oppression are reproduced in daily life through political and media discourses controlled by elite groups, and those discourses contribute to the cultural reproduction of racism (Van Dijk, 2007). CDA operates under the assumption that institutions act as gatekeepers to discursive resources; power and resource imbalances between “speakers” and “listeners” are linked to their unequal access to those resources. Pressing social issues motivate the CDA analyst, and the analyst’s goal is to bring about change through critical understanding (Van Dijk, 1993).

CDA is a useful approach for educational researchers who explore connections between educational practices and social contexts; for example, CDA has been used to examine relationships between teaching, learning and curricula, students’ identities across time and context (Tamatea, Hardy, & Ninnes, 2008), cultural representations in textbooks (de los Heros, 2009), and the influence of teachers’ ideological perspectives on their teaching practice (Llewellyn, 2009). CDA is, however, an emerging research approach with few resources to guide its application. The objectives of this guide are to present a general analytical framework for CDA and to illustrate an application of the framework. The first part of the guide describes a general analytical framework for CDA, suitable for application to a wide range of disciplines and research problems. The framework incorporates characteristics and principles shared across the major CDA approaches. The second part of the guide illustrates a step-by-step application of the general CDA analytical framework to a systematic literature review of educational research studies that employ CDA.

## **Overview of CDA**

Although there are similarities among CDA approaches, CDA has no unitary theory or set of methods (Van Dijk, 1993). The following section reviews key principles, concepts, and terminology common to major CDA approaches.

### *Methodological Characteristics*

CDA relies on a collection of techniques for the study of language use as a social and cultural practice (Fairclough, 2001). CDA focuses on social problems and not on scholarly paradigms (Van Dijk, 2007); as a result, CDA can be used to understand and solve problems with any theory or method that may be relevant. Procedures, techniques, and processes are all selected based on their relevance to the research purpose (Van Dijk, 1993). CDA emphasizes transdisciplinary work (Wodak & Meyer, 2009). According to Fairclough (2001), CDA is an approach “which is in a dialogical relationship with other social theories and methods, which should engage with them in a transdisciplinary rather than just interdisciplinary way” (p. 121). Because studies that examine interrelationships between power, ideology, and discourse are complex and multifaceted, CDA must remain open to transdisciplinary research (Lazar, 2007). In

transdisciplinary research approaches, distinctions between theory, description, and application become less relevant (Van Dijk, 1993).

CDA takes an inductive approach (Wodak & Meyer, 2009), but can also proceed through abductive or transductive inference in the sense that analysis oscillates between a focus on structure and a focus on action (Fairclough, 2001). Analysis procedures used in CDA are generally hermeneutic or interpretive (Wodak & Meyer, 2009) and produce meaning. In general, most approaches to CDA are characterized by (a) problem-oriented focus; (b) analysis of semiotic data; (c) the view that power relations are discursive to some extent; (d) the view that discourses are situated in time and place; (e) the idea that expressions of language are never neutral; (f) analysis that is systematic, interpretive, descriptive, and explanatory; and (g) interdisciplinary and eclectic methodologies (Van Dijk, 1993; Wodak & Meyer, 2009).

### *Theoretical and Philosophical Underpinnings*

CDA derives from a number of overlapping theoretical perspectives, all of which emphasize the use of linguistics (Wodak & Meyer, 2009). These perspectives include the poststructuralist discourse theories of Foucault, poststructural feminism, the Critical Theory of the pre-World War II Frankfurt School, neo-Marxist cultural theory, critical linguistics, and the “social representation theory” of Moscovici (Luke, 1997; Rogers, Malancharuvil-Berkes, Mosley, Hui, & Joseph, 2005; Wodak & Meyer, 2009).

CDA scholars classify CDA into several different research strategies or approaches. Some leading approaches used in social science research include the Dialectical-Relational Approach (DRA) of Fairclough, the Sociocognitive Approach (SCA) of Van Dijk, and Feminist CDA (FCDA) of Lazar. DRA focuses on social conflict and seeks to detect manifestations of conflict in discourse, including dominance, resistance, and differences (Wodak & Meyer, 2009). SCA emphasizes context and a focal triad of interrelationships between discourse, society, and cognition (Wodak & Meyer, 2009). FCDA aims to produce rich, nuanced analyses of the complex workings of power and ideology in discourses that sustain gendered social orders (Lazar, 2007). Despite differences in focus and product, these approaches to CDA share a set of core assumptions. Those assumptions include an interest in uncovering and transforming conditions of inequality; analyses that transcend the interpretation of language and, instead, aim to explain the work that language performs in society; and the view that standpoints, including the researcher’s, are embedded in context and are never neutral.

### *Key Principles and Concepts*

*The critical in CDA.* CDA and other critical approaches aim to convey knowledge that enables people to emancipate themselves from domination through reflection and self-awareness (Wodak & Meyer, 2009). Key to CDA is the concept of *power*, or the chance that a person in a social relationship can achieve his or her own will against the resistance of others (Wallimann, Tatisis, & Zito, 1977). Power is usually institutionalized

and organized hierarchically; small groups of power elites have special roles in the enactment of power (Van Dijk, 1993). Dominance, or the abuse of power, involves control of one group by another (Van Dijk, 1993). Dominance may include control of action (e.g., limiting the freedom of others) or cognition (e.g., influencing others' ideological stance; Wodak & Meyer, 2009).

CDA is particularly interested in linguistic manifestations of power (Wodak & Meyer, 2009). The exercise of power influences knowledge, beliefs, understandings, ideologies, norms, attitudes, values, and plans, and CDA seeks to uncover, reveal, and disclose implicit or hidden power relations in discourse (Van Dijk, 1993). Power can be exercised indirectly through the control of discourse; for example, through properties of syntax, rhetoric, or turn-taking. Power can also be exercised through linguistic surface structures such as tone, hesitation, pauses, laughter, or forms of address, or by controlling context; for example, physicians control context when they see patients by appointment only (Van Dijk, 1993). Van Dijk (2007) noted that although individual characteristics are included as variables in social research, many important aspects of context are omitted; omissions include time, place, social roles and relationships, and the role of knowledge in discourse production.

*The meaning of discourse.* Discourse has been defined as the creative use of language as a social practice. According to Weedon (1987), discourse refers to

ways of constituting knowledge, together with the social practices, forms of subjectivity and power relations which inhere in such knowledges and relations between them. Discourses are more than ways of thinking and producing meaning. They constitute the "nature" of the body, unconscious and conscious mind and emotional life of the subjects they seek to govern. (p. 108)

Discourse consists of talk, text, and media that express ways of knowing, experiencing, and valuing the world (McGregor, 2004). Discourse can take many forms or genres, not limited to policies, narratives, written texts such as letters or textbooks, conversations, speeches, meetings or classroom lessons, nonverbal communication, visual images, multimedia, and film (Wodak & Meyer, 2009).

In CDA, discourse is an integral component of social processes (Fairclough, 2001). CDA sees discourse as *constitutive*, in other words, discourse sustains and reproduces the status quo (Wodak & Meyer, 2009). Discursive practices have ideological effects in that they produce and maintain unequal power relations between groups of people (Wodak & Meyer, 2009). The relationship between discourse and dominance falls along two major dimensions: the direct exercise of dominance in text and talk in specific contexts, and the indirect use of discourse to influence others' minds (Van Dijk, 1993). Discourses are also used to justify inequality through paired complementary strategies: positive representations of one's own group, and negative representations of "others" (Van Dijk, 1993). These strategies are expressed in discourse as persuasive structures; for example, through structural emphasis (headlines in a newspaper), hyperbolic enhancement of "their" negative actions and "our" positive actions, or through choice of words that imply negative or positive evaluation (Van Dijk, 1993).

*Analysis.* Analysis in CDA is not limited to particular methods provided that the methods align with the critical paradigm; for instance, the critical perspective of CDA eliminates the use of narrow conversation analytic approaches (Van Dijk, 2007). CDA uses analytical tools from the fields of pragmatics, speech act theory, systemic functional linguistics, and other fields (Luke, 1997). Such tools allow discovery of latent or hidden beliefs that appear in language disguised as analogies, metaphors, or other conceptual expressions (Wodak & Meyer, 2009). There exists no complete list of linguistic devices: selection of devices depends on the specific research goals and data sources. However, CDA often targets common linguistic concepts such as time, tense, modality, actors, and argumentation (Wodak & Meyer, 2009); word order, coherence, intonation, topic choice, turn-taking, hesitations, pauses, and laughter (Van Dijk, 1993); and voice (active or passive) and choice of words (Luke, 1997).

*Trustworthiness.* There is little discussion of specific criteria that define qualitative rigor in the field of CDA. Two quality criteria are agreed upon in most CDA approaches: *completeness* (new data reveal no new findings) and *accessibility* (the work is readable by the social groups under investigation; Wodak & Meyer, 2009). Trustworthiness can be demonstrated through methodical triangulation, theoretical triangulation, data source triangulation, and (possibly) participant checking (Wodak & Meyer, 2009). Theoretical triangulation employs four levels of context: (a) immediate language, (b) interdiscursive relations between discourses and texts, (c) social level or context of situation, and (d) the broader societal or historical context. Table 1 summarizes and describes a set of guidelines for evaluating qualitative rigor in CDA research.

*Subjectivity.* CDA analysts and other critical researchers reject a neutral, objective stance in research. From the critical perspective, scientific neutrality places unequal power in the hands of the researcher and represents the failure to recognize that all knowledge is socially constructed and based on values (Lazar, 2007). CDA researchers must remain aware of the social, political, and economic motives that drive their own work and acknowledge that they do not occupy a superior position (Wodak & Meyer, 2009). Moreover, trustworthiness of CDA research depends on transparent articulation of the researcher's standpoint, both within their field and larger social contexts (Van Dijk, 1993).

## **Generic Analytical Framework for CDA**

The framework described in this section incorporates characteristics and processes shared common to approaches described by the network of CDA scholars founded in the 1990s, including Fairclough, Kress, Van Leuwen, Van Dijk, and Wodak. Those characteristics include a problem-oriented focus, an emphasis on language, the view that power relations are discursive, the belief that discourses are situated in contexts, the idea that expressions of language are never neutral, and an analysis process that is systematic, interpretive, descriptive, and explanatory (Fairclough, 2001; Kress, 1990;

**Table 1.** Guidelines for Evaluating Qualitative Rigor in Critical Discourse Analysis Research.

Criterion	Objective	Evidence of rigor
Reflexivity (Morrow, 2005)	Transparent view of whose reality is represented in the research	Self-reflective journal, peer debriefing, asking for clarification, member checking, focus groups.
Subjectivity (Morrow, 2005)	Transparent view of researcher bias	Researcher’s articulation of own positionality, monitoring of self, and rigorous subjectivity.
Adequacy of data (Lincoln & Guba, 1985)	Adequate evidence (completeness)	Data gathered to the point of redundancy; new data reveal no new findings.
	Adequate sample Adequate variety of data	Purposeful sampling strategy. Use of multiple data sources.
Adequacy of interpretation (Morrow, 2005)	Analytical framework	Clearly articulated analytical framework.
	Immersion in the data	Repeated forays into the data (e.g., repeated readings of transcripts).
Deviant case (Miles & Huberman, 1994)	Disconfirming evidence	Deliberate search for potentially disconfirming instances; comparisons of disconfirming with confirming instances.
Authenticity (Guba & Lincoln, 1994; Seale, 1999)	Educative authenticity	Participant’s understandings of others’ constructions expand.
	Catalytic authenticity	Action or change that redistributes power from the dominant to the disempowered.
	Fairness	Different constructions are represented.
Consequential validity (Patton, 2002)	Social or political change	Increased consciousness; perspectives of those who are silenced or disempowered are amplified.
Accessibility (Wodak & Meyer, 2009)	Audience for the research includes the participants	Findings are readable and comprehensible by the social groups under investigation.
Theoretical triangulation (Wodak & Meyer, 2009)	Four levels of context: Immediate language; Interdiscursive relations; Immediate social context; Broad social context	All four levels of context are represented and discussed in the analytical framework and the analysis.

Van Dijk, 1993; Wodak, 2001). The framework, summarized in Table 2 and described here, takes place in seven stages.

The framework, designed for flexibility and simplicity, condenses many CDA approaches into a set of easily conceptualized levels of analysis without sacrificing the

**Table 2.** General Analytical Framework for CDA.

Stage of analysis	Description	Example	
1	Select the discourse	Select a discourse related to injustice or inequality in society.	Experiences of women who work in male-dominated workplaces; portrayal of LGBTQ individuals in the media.
2	Locate and prepare data sources	Select data sources (texts) and prepare the data for analysis.	Newspaper articles, textbooks, interview transcriptions, advertisements, song lyrics, visual media.
3	Explore the background of each text	Examine the social and historical context and producers of the texts.	Characteristics of the genre, historical context, production process, overall slant or style, intended audience, intended purpose of the text, publisher characteristics, and writer characteristics.
4	Code texts and identify overarching themes	Identify the major themes and subthemes using choice of qualitative coding methods.	Thematic analysis, open or inductive coding, axial or deductive coding.
5	Analyze the external relations in the texts (interdiscursivity)	Examine social relations that control the production of the text; in addition, examine the reciprocal relations (how the texts affect social practices and structures). How do social practices inform the arguments in the text? How does the text in turn influence social practices?	Dominant social practices and norms (e.g., women in caregiver roles), social structures (e.g., social class or caste system, governments and legal systems, institutions such as schools).
6	Analyze the internal relations in the texts	Examine the language for indications of the aims of the texts (what the texts set out to accomplish), representations (e.g., representations of social context, events, and actors), and the speaker's positionality.	Headlines and leading statements, structural organization or layout of the text, use of quoted material, vocabulary (e.g., high frequency or sensitizing words), grammar, voice, and linguistic devices such as turn-taking, metaphor, or rule-of-three.
7	Interpret the data	Interpret the meanings of the major themes, external relations, and internal relations identified in stages 4, 5, and 6.	Revisit the structural features and individual fragments, pacing them into the broader context and themes established in the earlier stages.

Note. CDA = critical discourse analysis; LGBTQ = lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer.

core principles of CDA. This makes possible use of the framework for a variety of research problems across disciplines including, but not limited to education, psychology, journalism, information technology, and science. The framework outlines a set of objectives in broad terms, giving the analyst space to select methods (provided that said tools align with the critical perspective) that best fit the scope and goals of the research problem. In addition, there is no fixed procedure for the production of material (Jørgensen & Phillips, 2002), leaving the choice of products open to the researcher. Finally, although the framework is defined in stages, the stages represent an “ideal” (Jørgensen & Phillips, 2002): in practice, the analyst may move back and forth between stages in a manner reminiscent of constant comparative analysis (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). Such movement enhances trustworthiness by encouraging immersion in the data.

Flexibility and simplicity, however, come with limitations. The framework relies solely on the analyst’s interpretation of the data, and the degree of systematicity of textual analysis is also left to the analyst. These limitations leave open potential for the research to further the researcher’s own ideological agenda, rather than the agenda of the disempowered. Furthermore, although the framework calls for reflexivity (Stage 7), the framework offers no formal method by which to evaluate outcomes (emancipation, empowerment) of the research. Reflexivity is a subjective process and to be useful as a means of evaluating the outcomes of the analysis, reflexive accounts must be richly and comprehensively described. Finally, Stage Five (interdiscursivity) recommends a selection of texts that cross genres and disciplines, which can make CDA an intensive and time-consuming endeavor.

### *Stage 1: Select the Discourse*

Stage 1 involves identifying a discourse related to injustice or inequality in society; for example, discourses of gender in higher education in the physical sciences, inequity in public school funding, or the role of ethnicity in gifted and talented education referrals.

### *Stage 2: Locate and Prepare Data Sources (Texts)*

In Stage 2, data sources (texts) are selected and prepared for analysis. There is no single way of gathering data in CDA, but most CDA approaches analyze existing texts (Wodak & Meyer, 2009). The unit analysis is usually a whole text, but CDA sometimes focuses on smaller units such as sections or paragraphs (Luke, 1997). Data are often theoretically sampled; for example, the analyst might single out a text, find indicators of key concepts, categorize concepts, then collect additional texts relevant to those concepts (Wodak & Meyer, 2009).

### *Stage 3: Explore the Background of the Texts*

Stage 3 involves examination of the social and historical context and producers of the texts. Factors considered in this stage may include characteristics of the genre, historical context, production context, overall slant or style, intended audience, intended purpose of the text, publisher characteristics, and author characteristics.



#### ***Stage 4: Identify Overarching Themes***

In Stage 4, major themes and subthemes in the texts are identified through established qualitative coding methods such as open or inductive coding, axial or deductive coding, or thematic analysis. Themes are presented along with a meaningful description and representative quotations from the texts.

#### ***Stage 5: Analyze External Relations in the Texts (Interdiscursivity)***

Interdiscursivity is concerned with identification of interactions among different discourses within specific texts or talks. For instance, Lazar (2007) described a government advertisement campaign where she analyzed two competing discourses of gender relations, one based on traditional values and the other on modern values. To locate discourses within texts, the analyst can begin by finding fragments that infer ideological positions. To facilitate interpretation, each fragment, its location in the text, and the researcher's reflections on the ideology expressed in the fragment should be recorded in a table or journal. Ideological position often appears in a speaker's affiliation with his or her statements; for example, the statements "I am feminist," "I think I am feminist," and "I can identify with feminists" represent different levels of a speaker's commitment to the feminist ideology. If possible, texts should be compared with other texts in the genre or with similar texts from other disciplines, and similarities and differences in the discourses in each of those sources noted (Jørgensen & Phillips, 2002). Finally, attention should be given to social relations that control the production of the text, for example, reciprocal relations: How do the texts affect social practices and structures, and how do social practices in turn inform the arguments made in the texts?

#### ***Stage 6: Analyze the Internal Relations in the Texts***

In Stage 6, the texts are examined for internal relations, or patterns, words, and linguistic devices that represent power relations, social context (e.g., events, actors, or locations), or speakers' positionalities. Of interest are headlines and leading statements, highlighted phrases or images, structural organization or layout of the text, use of quoted material, high frequency or sensitizing words, grammar, voice, and linguistic devices such as turn-taking, metaphor, or rule-of-three (e.g., "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness"). Other important features include contrasts (e.g., "the field is growing, yet empirical research is still sparse"), omitted details, and language that implies a unitary truth (e.g., "Drugs kill people" is absolute, whereas "Drug abuse can lead to death" is less certain). Also of note is how the text is structured (e.g., "the research article is structured into sections: Introduction, Method, Results, Conclusions, and Implications"). To facilitate interpretation and enhance credibility, linguistic features identified throughout Stage 6 should be recorded in a table or journal along with their locations in the text, several lines of surrounding text (to provide context), and the analyst's initial reflections on the meaning.

## Stage 7: Interpret the Data

Stage 7 involves interpreting the meanings of the major themes, external relations, and internal relations identified in Stages 4, 5, and 6. In this stage, the analyst revisits structural features and individual fragments, placing them into the broader context and themes established in the earlier stages.

Throughout the interpretation, the analyst records memos describing gaps, questions, and insights discovered during the analysis process, and reflections on personal perspectives that may have influenced the analysis.

## Application of CDA to a Systematic Literature Review

This section describes an application of the CDA analytical framework to a systematic literature review, walking the reader through the analysis step-by-step. The analytical framework is summarized in Table 2, and guidelines for trustworthiness presented in Table 1 help guide the evaluation of qualitative rigor in the texts.

### Stage 1

The discourses of interest were *researcher positionality CDA research practice* and *trustworthiness in CDA research*. The analysis focused on CDA researchers' ideological perspectives evident in the method descriptions of their studies. The overall analysis was guided by the following questions:

**Research Question 1:** How are CDA researchers' ideological perspectives apparent in their use of CDA in education research?

**Research Question 2:** How do CDA researchers demonstrate qualitative rigor (trustworthiness) specific to CDA, particularly with regard to their ideological perspectives?

### Stage 2

In Stage 2, data sources were identified through an electronic literature search of three education-focused electronic databases (Education Source, ERIC, and Academic Search Complete). The search sought qualitative, empirical studies that employed CDA. The databases were queried for the phrase "critical discourse analysis," with the search restricted to peer-reviewed journal articles published after 2005 to focus on recent applications of CDA. The search initially returned 26 articles; of those, 10 were purposively retained based on relevance to educational research and inclusion in Cabells International Whitelist directory (Cabells International, n.d.). Topics in the retained articles included perceptions of economic disadvantage in professional development, women's professional relationships in the academy, teachers' constructions of race and disability, representations of gender in media, gendered instructional materials in higher education, legitimization of sex-based public policy, and student resistance to diversity (Table 3). The unit of analysis comprised the methods descriptions of CDA

**Table 3.** Summary of Key Information in the Data Items (Texts).

Text	Discourse	Examples from texts	Topic	Approach
Dworin and Bomer (2008)	Perceptions of poverty	<i>Assumptions</i> <i>Claims and positions</i> <i>Constructs</i> <i>Privilege and power</i> <i>Relations of power</i> <i>Oppression and silencing</i> <i>Themes in the culture</i>	Key passages in fiction literature invoke ready-made assumptions about the poor.	Combination of many
Ermann, Ponsford, Spence, and Wright (2014)	Parenting practices	<i>Cultural norms</i> <i>Maintenance</i> <i>Politically neutral</i> <i>Power structures</i> <i>Praxis</i> <i>Reinforce norms</i> <i>Social context</i> <i>Status quo</i>	The language of parenting practices contributes to the status quo.	Fairclough
Irving and English (2008)	Coerced partnership	<i>Agendas</i> <i>Co-creates</i> <i>Contextualized</i> <i>Dominant Partner</i> <i>Positioned</i>	Each partner in a coerced partnership is positioned with different agendas and mandates.	Fairclough Mills Treleven
Lim (2012)	Power and ideology in curricula	<i>Ideology</i> <i>Subjectivity</i> <i>Power</i> <i>Constructions of language</i> <i>figures centrally</i> <i>Struggles for power</i> <i>Social practice</i>	Language is a site of power struggles.	Fairclough
Marling (2010)	Feminism in print media	<i>Challenge and interact</i> <i>Normative frames</i> <i>Personal agency</i> <i>Practices</i> <i>Resistance</i> <i>We cannot escape</i>	Examination of norm-maintaining, mainstream discourse.	Fairclough Lazar
Prins and Toso (2008)	Parental support for literacy development	<i>Assumptions</i> <i>Ideological effects</i> <i>Implicit meanings</i> <i>Embedded</i> <i>Tacit meanings</i> <i>Link these to wider ideologies</i> <i>Power and privilege</i>	Practices associated with a dominant discourse become the norm.	Fairclough
Rizwan (2011)	Gender ideology in song	<i>Assign meaning</i> <i>Groups</i> <i>Social practices</i> <i>Social conditions</i> <i>Ideological representation</i> <i>Gender</i> <i>Expression</i> <i>Opposing realities</i>	Masculinity vs. femininity.	Fairclough

(continued)

**Table 3. (continued)**

Text	Discourse	Examples from texts	Topic	Approach
Schieble (2012)	Heteronormativity as a natural phenomenon	<i>Examine Maintenance, maintain Constructs, constructed Decisions Privilege Reflection Consequences Participants</i>	Participants' language acts as a discursive strategy for maintaining heteronormativity as natural.	Fairclough
Subtirelu (2015)	Instructors who speak English as a second language	<i>Careful analyst Ideology Reproduced Constrained Relying Accepting Patterns Shaping or resisting</i>	Discourse is constrained by and reflects underlying ideology.	Fairclough
Uzuner-Smith and Englander (2015)	Faculty hiring and promotion	<i>Their powerlessness Resist and challenge CDA agenda Disadvantaged by Ideological commonsense Make proposals for change Legitimize Normalize</i>	Empowerment of the oppressed.	Fairclough

Note. CDA = critical discourse analysis.

extracted from each article; the average unit of analysis constituted two paragraphs, or about 500 words.

### Stage 3

Stage 3 examined social contexts and producers of the texts (Table 4). Each producer's gender and analyst's estimation of the producer's ethnicity (based on name and photograph) and geographical and academic contexts were determined through review of the biographical profiles published with their articles. If profiles were not included with the article, the researcher collected secondary information from publicly available university or publisher webpages.

### Stage 4

Stage 4 involved identifying overarching themes in the texts and contexts surrounding the discourse. To gain familiarity with the data corpus, all texts were read and re-read in their entirety. During these initial readings, keywords, phrases, themes, and other potential indicators of themes were recorded (Table 3).

Themes relevant to the guiding questions were discovered through an inductive coding procedure. Inductive coding produces a small number of summary categories that capture

**Table 4.** Contexts and Backgrounds of Text Producers.

Article	Social context	Characteristics
Dworin and Bomer (2008)	Southwestern United States; large, state university teacher education program; pre-service methods courses in English and Language Arts.	Professors of curriculum and instruction; White males.
Ermann, Ponsford, Spence, and Wright (2014)	Northwestern United States; clinical context.	Applied psychologists; three White females and one White male.
Irving and English (2008)	Canada; small Catholic undergraduate university.	Library coordinator and faculty in adult education; White females.
Lim (2012)	Singapore; top teacher education institute.	Professor of curriculum and instruction; Asian male.
Marling (2010)	Estonia; prestigious national classical university.	English professor; White female.
Prins and Toso (2008)	Eastern United States; large public research university.	Professor of adult education; White female.
Rizwan (2011)	Pakistan; large public research university	Lecturer and PhD candidate in English; Asian female.
Schieble (2012)	Northeastern United States; large urban public university.	Professor of English education; White female.
Subtirelu (2015)	Eastern United States; private research university.	Professor of applied linguistics; White male.
Uzuner-Smith and Englander (2015)	Southwestern United States; public research university.	Professor of English as a second language; White female.

important themes in the data (Thomas, 2006). Working from a hard copy of the text, color pens were used to mark text segments (words or phrases) relevant to the research questions. Each segment was labeled with a unique identification code. Over several iterations, text segments and their labels were recorded in a codebook and assigned a category label. The codebook (see Appendix Table A1) included approximately 350 text segments assigned to 17 preliminary categories (Appendix Table A2). The 17 preliminary categories were refined through a constant comparative process that involved revisiting the texts and combining or dividing categories and eliminating categories that lacked relevance, resulting in four final categories (themes). The four themes are listed in Table 5 along with a summary description of each theme and a representative quotation from the text.

### Stage 5

Preliminary reflections on the two discourses were documented in Stage 5. Each text was examined for language that communicated the CDA researchers' positionalities and evidence of qualitative rigor in CDA. To facilitate later analysis and

**Table 5.** Key Themes Across the Texts.

Theme	Subthemes	Summary description	Examples
<i>Balance between researcher’s and others’ perspectives</i>	<i>Fairness Imbalance favoring participants Imbalance favoring researcher</i>	Language positions different perspectives equally in relation to one another; for example, the relationship between the researcher’s perspective and perspectives of participants.	<i>Fairness:</i> “I invoked the tools of critical discourse analysis to examine the discussion thread as a social practice that both constructs and is constructed by participants’ social, historical, and political contexts” (Schieble, 2012, p. 211).
<i>Power</i>	<i>Identification of a dominant group and inequality “Genres” (ways of interacting) Culture shapes our perspectives Ideologies are culturally reproduced</i>	Language identifies a dominant ideology and differentiates between dominant ideological perspective and the perspectives of others.	<i>Culture shapes our perspectives:</i> “What one ‘sees’ in a text, what one regards as worth describing, and what one chooses to emphasize in a description, are all dependent on one’s interpretation and understanding of the text vis-à-vis its larger social and political environment” (Lim, 2012, p. 63). <i>Ideologies are culturally reproduced:</i> “For example, teachers’ decisions to avoid discussions about sexuality in the classroom, while a discursive exchange in the moment, continue the maintenance of heteronormativity as normal and natural” (Schieble, 2012, p. 211).
<i>General qualitative rigor</i>	<i>Authenticity Subjectivity Reflexivity Adequacy Clear analytical framework</i>	Language expresses concepts and constructs related to broad conceptions of qualitative rigor.	<i>Adequacy of data/immersion in data:</i> “Our selections of passages are grounded in a sentence-by-sentence reading of the text” (Dworin & Bomer, 2008). <i>Subjectivity:</i> “Two of us are parents with experience in using attachment parenting practices and two are not parents and had little previous exposure to parenting literature” (Ermann, Ponsford, Spence, & Wright, 2014).

(continued)

**Table 5. (continued)**

Theme	Subthemes	Summary description	Examples
Qualitative rigor specific to CDA	<i>Theoretical triangulation</i>	Language in the text that supports qualitative rigor specific to critical research and CDA in particular; for example, language that describes theoretical triangulation.	<i>Theoretical triangulation</i> : “They contained features of language, either grammatical choices or rhetorical ones which seemed to point to larger discursive themes in the culture” (Dworin & Bomer, 2008, p.106).
	<i>Intention to elicit change (consequential validity and catalytic authenticity)</i>	Language in the text identifies sources of inequality and intentions to bring about social or political change that empowers silenced or marginalized groups.	<i>Catalytic authenticity</i> : “The analysis hopes to elucidate how the print media as a gatekeeper participate in the creation of a hegemonic social ideal that rejects feminism as a viable social programme” (Marling, 2010, p. 10).

Note. CDA = critical discourse analysis.

interpretation, these initial reflections on the discourses were documented in a memo (Table 6).

### Stage 6

In Stage 6, the analysis focused on linguistic devices and word usage in the texts. The text segments were examined for grammar, word choice, tone, and constructions connected with the four key themes. Relevant fragments were listed and described in Table 7. The use of active and passive voice gave insight into the researcher’s perspective; researchers tended to use active voice when expressing their own perspective (e.g., “we chose,” “we examined”), and passive voice (e.g., “passages are”) when expressing others’ perspectives. Additionally, text structures, rhetorical moves, metaphors, and patterns relating to the themes were found. For instance, the CDA process in one text was described as a sequential, ordered, step-by-step process. In another example, the authors repeatedly used the metaphor “toolkit” to refer to their CDA process.

### Stage 7

In Stage 7, findings from the earlier stages were brought together and analyzed. The interpretation is organized around the four key themes (Table 5).

**Table 6.** Memo: Initial Reflections on Two Discourses.

Text	Researcher positionality	Qualitative rigor in CDA
Dworin and Bomer (2008)	Excluded a description of positionality and relationships of researchers to the inquiry.	Vague articulation of CDA analytical framework; omitted details (e.g., data collection); described methods in general terms (e.g., “toolkit”); lacked discussion of trustworthiness.
Ermann, Ponsford, Spence, and Wright (2014)	Transparent account of researchers’ positions and their relationships to the project.	Clear articulation of analytical framework. Methods were identified (e.g., qualitative analysis software, memoing) and decisions supported or explained.
Irving and English (2008)	Researchers’ backgrounds, relevant experiences in the topic area, and interest in the project were described in rich detail.	No articulation of an analytical framework.
Lim (2012)	Acknowledged the researcher’s subjectivity, but maintained a neutral, passive tone (e.g., “what <i>one</i> regards as worth describing”). Excluded discussions of positionality or personal connection to the project.	Minimal articulation of analytical framework; explained what would be done at a high level without providing details as to how it would be done. Trustworthiness inferred, but not discussed explicitly.
Marling (2010)	Excluded discussion of researcher positionality and relationship to the project.	Detailed articulation of analytical framework (stagewise approach); included description of data collection, limitations of the analysis, and discussed how authenticity would be demonstrated.
Prins and Toso (2008)	Researchers spoke in a neutral, detached tone; vocabulary reflected a post-positivist perspective; excluded discussion of positionality and connection to the work.	Clearly articulated analytical framework; described specific methods; decisions were supported or explained; trustworthiness was discussed.
Rizwan (2011)	Researcher perspective was muddled. Excluded discussion of researcher positionality and personal relationship to the work.	Minimal articulation of analytical framework; methods were described, but lacked alignment with the claimed feminist theoretical perspective; no discussion of trustworthiness.
Schieble (2012)	Discusses the researcher’s positionality, background, and connections to the topic.	Clear, complete articulation of analytical framework; described contexts, data sources, methods, and analytical procedures. No discussion of trustworthiness.
Subtirelu, 2015	Researcher appeared to adopt post-positivist and interpretive perspectives.	No articulation of CDA analytical framework.
Uzuner-Smith and Englander (2015)	Excluded discussion of researchers’ positionalities and relationships to the project.	Clearly articulated, stagewise analytical framework; evidence of catalytic authenticity and theoretical triangulation.

Note. CDA = critical discourse analysis.



**Table 7.** Language Use Related to Perspectives and Ideologies.

		Vocabulary		
Text	Words	Example and purpose	Grammar	Perspectives
Dworin and Bomer (2008)	We Our Seemed	Emphasizes the authors' perspective over others, e.g., "We chose the passages we will include" Communicates uncertainty and justification, e.g., "they seemed to represent claims and positions"	Use of active voice to communicate authors' actions; passive voice was used to communicate otherwise. This highlights authors' perspective as powerful agents in the discourse. For example, "we chose," "we examined," "we analyzed," but "passages are grounded," "passages are short."	Authors are dominant.
Ermann, Ponsford, Spence, and Wright (2014)	Understand Hopes Implications	Alignment with critical theories. Communicates the authors' intentions to effect change. For example, "The project grew out of a desire to understand . . ."	Use of active voice and passive voice did not position the authors as powerful, e.g., "we conducted," and "CDA explores."	Authors share power with others equitably.
Irving and English (2008)	Contextualized Partner Partnership Co-create Uniquely	Acceptance of others' perspectives. For example, "co-creates the dominant discourses of partnerships uniquely."	Authors' actions were expressed in active voice at all times. Others' actions were expressed in both active and passive voices, e.g., "each partner is positioned," and "each responds to and co-creates." The authors share power with others.	Authors share power with others. Everyone is an active agent.
Lim (2012)	Proceeds Engages Draws	Things are happening beyond the author's control. For example, "syllabus draws from," "text engages in."	Use of disconnected, passive voice communicates neutrality. For example, "textual level focuses on showing how the text's language feature provides ideological structures."	Author as a passive participant in research. Author fails to adopt a critical stance.

*(continued)*

**Table 7. (continued)**

Vocabulary			
Text	Words	Example and purpose	Perspectives
Marling (2010)	Agency Challenge Resistances Personal Normative Privileges Promulgate	Emphasis on humans as agents of change. For example, “over-privileging resistances can leave the underlying norm understudied and hence also more intact.”	The author shares the perspective of his audience.
Prins and Toso (2008)	Privileges Promulgate	For example, “Language privileges certain values,” “people use texts to promulgate.”	Attribution of action to inanimate objects. For example, “It allowed us to . . .” “because language privileges certain values.”
Rizwan (2011)	Dual Classification Expectations Ideologies Opposing Actions Active Purposeful Capable Constrained Shaping Assume Analyst	Views masculine and feminine genders as dichotomous. For example, “masculinities vs. femininities.”	For Things, not people, are responsible for actions in society. The author is passive and anti-masculine.
Schieble (2012)	Actions Active Purposeful Capable Constrained Shaping Assume Analyst	For example, “certain actions are taken or not because of how social problems are framed.”	Humans are agents of change.
Subtirelu (2015)	Capable Constrained Shaping Assume Analyst	For example, “Patterns in discourse observed by the careful analyst.”	The researcher is superior relative to actors in the discourse.
Uzuner-Smith and Englander (2015)	Reciprocal Analyst	For example, “This reciprocal analysis serves . . .”	Author works from more than one perspective.

Note. CDA = critical discourse analysis.

**Theme: Balance between the researcher's and other's perspectives.** CDA is specifically interested in power abuse or breaches of the principles of democracy, equality, and justice by those who hold power (Van Dijk, 1993) and seeks to illuminate taken-for-granted hegemonic power relations that are reproduced through discourse (Lazar, 2007). An important responsibility of the CDA researcher is to recognize and articulate multiple perspectives. A researcher unaware of her imposed control over participants brings into question her ability to recognize power abuse. Therefore, language in CDA research that expresses the researcher's control or dominance of others threatens the trustworthiness of the findings. Language in CDA studies should position perspectives of different groups equally in relation to one another.

Several reviewed studies used language that either focused on a specific perspective for stated theoretical reasons, or gave equal consideration to multiple perspectives. For example, Marling (2010) focused on the norm-maintaining mainstream media discourse: "In order to appreciate [*acts of resistance*], we first need to understand the norm they have to challenge and interact with. Over-privileging resistances can leave the underlying norm understudied and hence also more intact" (p. 9). Similarly, Ermann, Ponsford, Spence, and Wright (2014) demonstrated multiple perspectives in their analysis: "The major themes identified emerged through an equitable consensus process, with our diverse perspectives reflected in the discussion of those themes" (p. 544).

Linguistic features of the texts (Table 7) also supported this theme. Some authors used language that communicated dominance of the researcher. For example, Dworin and Bomer (2008) combined heavy use of the words "we" and "our" with active voice to express their own perspectives, but used passive voice when expressing others' perspectives. Language structures in the other studies indicated a balance of power between researcher and others. For example, Irving and English (2008) frequently used the words "co-create," "partner," and "partnership." In addition, they used an equal balance of active and passive voice when expressing different perspectives, for example "we conducted," "CDA explores." Similarly, Marling (2010) used the collective "we" to represent himself, his participants, and his audience as a single group. Furthermore, Marling (2010) used words such as "agency," "challenge," "personal," and "resistances," words that invoke notions of human agency and empowerment. Some authors' language, however, cast them as passive participants in their own research. Rizwan (2011) used passive voice almost exclusively throughout her text, for example, in phrases such as "can be exhibited," and "analysis has been carried out." The second phrase, "analysis has been carried out" is not only passive, but also temporally disconnected—instead of using the simple past tense of the verb that would have indicated an action completed, Rizwan (2011) used the present perfect continuous tense that creates confusion about when exactly the analysis was performed.

**Theme: Power.** CDA addresses social problems and assumes that power relations are discursive (Wodak & Meyer, 2009); consequently, CDA must identify discourses of power and avoid language that accepts discourses of power as normative. Several subthemes were identified within the main theme, including *identification of a*

*dominant group or inequality, genres (ways of interacting), influence of culture on our perspectives, and cultural reproduction of ideologies.* For instance, Lim (2012) used a linguistic rule-of-three to communicate the idea that culture shapes our perspectives: “What one sees in a text, what one regards as worth describing, and what one chooses to emphasize in a description, all are dependent on one’s interpretation and understanding of the text vis-à-vis its larger social and political environment” (p. 63). Schieble (2012) explained how teachers’ decisions in the classroom contribute to the cultural reproduction of heteronormativity as “natural”: “For example, teachers’ decisions to avoid discussions about sexuality in the classroom, while a discursive exchange in the moment, continue the maintenance of heteronormativity as normal and natural” (p. 211).

**Theme: General qualitative rigor.** Language can implicitly indicate qualitative rigor even when qualitative rigor is not explicitly described. Subthemes of general qualitative rigor found in the reviewed articles included *authenticity, subjectivity, reflexivity, adequacy, and articulation of a clear analytical framework.* For instance, Ermann et al. (2014) expressed subjectivity: “Two of us are parents with experience in using attachment parenting practices and two are not parents and had little previous exposure to parenting literature” (p. 544). Dworin and Bomer (2008) communicated the adequacy of data (immersion in the data) criterion when they wrote, “Our selections of passages are grounded in a sentence-by-sentence reading of the text” (p. 106).

There were also counterexamples in the texts that lacked qualitative rigor. For example, Irving and English (2008) failed to clearly articulate an analytical framework; their brief, 100-word methodical description mentioned only that their analysis was “Informed by the use of CDA by Treleaven, Fairclough, and Mills” (p. 111). Another counterexample is Subtirelu (2015) who not only omitted an analytical framework, but also seemed conceptually confused regarding the tenets of CDA and critical theories. Subtirelu’s (2015) theoretical perspectives were muddled; for example, positivist vocabulary (e.g., “quantitative patterns,” “assumptions,” and “formulaic”) were intermingled with critical vocabulary (e.g., “ideology,” “privilege,” and “hegemonic”) (p. 46). In another counterexample, Rizwan (2011) initially claimed an FCDA approach (“drawing upon Lazar’s framework of feminist critical discourse analysis”), but then followed with a weak description of a CDA framework informed by Fairclough’s model (“drawing upon Fairclough’s model of CDA”) (p. 75).

**Theme: Expressions of qualitative rigor in CDA.** Authors used language that expressed concepts and constructs that supported qualitative rigor specific to CDA. Two subthemes of CDA qualitative rigor included *theoretical triangulation and intention to elicit change.* One author (Prins & Toso, 2008) explicitly described rigor:

To enhance the rigor and quality of data analysis, we used several strategies common to the CDA literature, namely explicating our methodological choices, theoretical position and analytical procedures; providing text-based examples to support claims; and connecting textual analysis to scholarly literature. (p. 570)

Other authors implicitly expressed CDA rigor. For instance, Uzuner-Smith and Englander (2015) suggested catalytic authenticity: “we can focus on the language aspect of a social practice to uncover the wider ideologies, and by so doing, we can better focus on empowering those who are disadvantaged by those ideologies” (p. 65). Schieble (2012) demonstrated rigor by offering a concrete illustration of the CDA concept of genre:

If a student is emailing a professor for a course, she may stick to standard conventions for writing a letter to convey formality as a way of reflecting and recreating institutional power relationships among students and professors. If the same student is writing an email to a friend, he or she may use all lowercase letters or run-on sentences. (p. 212)

Counterexamples of CDA rigor were also found. For example, Prins and Toso (2008) frequently used the word “hypotheses” (p. 568), a word associated with post-positivism: “hypothesis” contradicts the ideals of critical qualitative research by imposing the researcher’s a priori assumptions on the inquiry. Another counterexample is found in Rizwan (2011); there, the research questions contradict the consequential validity criterion: The goal of critical research is to empower or bring about change, yet Rizwan’s (2011) questions seek only to describe. For example, the question “How do the songs represent men and women, their actions and social expectations associated with their behavior” (p. 75) could be answered by means of interpretive or constructionist DA.

## **Discussion**

This study presented a general CDA analytical framework and applied the framework to a systematic literature review focused on identifying educational researchers’ ideologies and articulations of trustworthiness and qualitative rigor in the CDA literature.

### ***Researchers’ Ideological Positions***

The first research question addressed the idea that scholarly literature is not free of ideological hegemony. As shown in Table 7, the authors’ language in the reviewed studies expressed different ideologies and perspectives. CDA researchers must balance many perspectives, minimally those of the dominant group, the oppressed group, and the author’s own perspective. Imposition of the researcher’s ideologies or perspectives on research runs contrary to the aim of CDA: to disclose implicit or hidden power relations in discourse (Van Dijk, 1993). Power can be enacted implicitly through control of discourse, for example, in syntax or choice of words (Van Dijk, 1993). Because the research controls the research discourse, imposition of the researcher’s perspective on the research is a form of power abuse.

In five of the 10 studies (Ermann et al., 2014; Irving & English, 2008; Marling, 2010; Schieble, 2012; Uzuner-Smith & Englander, 2015), the authors’ language indicated that they negotiated multiple perspectives or shared power with others. Words

such as “partner” and “co-create” (Irving & English, 2008) suggested that the authors considered others’ perspectives and shared power. For example, “co-creates the dominant discourses” and “each responds to and co-creates” (Prins & Toso, 2008), and “the project grew out of a desire to understand” implicitly communicate ideals of power sharing.

Three authors (Lim, 2012; Prins & Toso, 2008; Rizwan, 2011) used language that either communicated passive or neutral involvement in their research or that positioned “others” as passive. From a critical perspective, scientific neutrality represents the failure to recognize that all knowledge is socially constructed and based on values (Lazar, 2007). For example, Prins and Toso (2008) attributed action to inanimate objects, for example, “It allowed us to,” or “texts promulgate,” or “language privileges certain people.” Those phrases suggest that things, not people, are responsible for actions in society.

Two authors (Dworin & Bomer, 2008; Subtirelu, 2015) used language that indicated they saw themselves as superior actors in the discourse. For example, repeated use of words such as “we,” “our” (Dworin & Bomer, 2008) and “assume,” “shaping,” and “analyst” (Subtirelu, 2015) implicate the researcher’s perspective of self as the powerful agent in the research discourse. Similarly, “patterns in discourse observed by the careful analyst” (Subtirelu, 2015) indicate that the author’s perspective is dominant.

These findings suggest that CDA authors must exercise great care in their use of language. Journal editors may or may not understand the complexities of language in CDA; editors who do will select appropriate peer reviewers, but those who do not may select reviewers who might miss a subtly expressed lack of balance among perspectives. One way to proactively address author bias is through subjectivity, that is, a transparent view of researcher bias in the form of a self-as-researcher statement. Another is by exercising reflexivity (e.g., through peer debriefing and reflective memos). Transparency, reflexivity, and peer debriefing were absent from most of the reviewed studies; CDA researchers could avoid departures from the critical paradigm by formulating positionality statements, keeping memos throughout the inquiry, and offering their work to other critical researchers for feedback before seeking publication.

### *Qualitative Rigor in the Reviewed Works*

Koro-Ljungberg, Yendol-Hoppey, Smith, and Hayes (2009) wrote,

An articulation of how one’s research design can be viewed as an interconnected unit of research questions, knowledges, methods, and methodologies that contribute to achieving the study’s aims avoids a characterization of the study as random, unintentionally intuitive or nonsystematic. (p. 696)

In CDA, arguably the most important aspect of qualitative rigor is a clearly articulated analytical framework. However, only three of the reviewed studies offered clearly

articulated analytical frameworks. CDA is not limited to any particular method of analysis (Van Dijk, 2007), and that may contribute to the weak articulation of analytical frameworks in CDA studies. Despite lack of constraints, however, analysts are ultimately responsible for the quality of the analysis and should be fully aware of the intensive planning and decision-making involved in CDA before undertaking CDA projects. Features that set clear CDA frameworks apart from the others included division of the analysis into discrete levels or stages, explanations of both *what* was done and *how* it was done in the analysis, and concrete examples that illustrated important actions within the analytical process. To ensure adequacy of interpretation, authors of CDA research should clearly instantiate and describe the particular methods used within their frameworks and illustrate the use of the methods with concrete examples.

## Implications

Research is not free of ideologies that influence critical thought. When a researcher's ideological perspectives dominate the research endeavor, hegemonies emerge. This study showed how a CDA framework could reveal hegemonies in critical research across a variety of disciplines and research goals. An important and compelling take-away of the study is that critical researchers are no less immune to control of power in the research setting than those who work in other paradigms. Methodological briefs such as this article can help raise researcher awareness of discourses of power and the researcher's potential influence on the research process. Further reviews that challenge hegemony in research are warranted.

CDA is a complex and time-consuming process. Methodologists who perform or write about CDA should be forthcoming about the time investment required for this type of analysis; for instance, an example timeline that breaks down CDA of a text of certain length would be enormously helpful to novice CDA researchers.

There exist no comprehensive "guides" for frameworks for conducting CDA. The generic analytical framework offered in this article is this author's first step toward a guide with wide applicability. This author hopes to, over time, refine and improve the generic CDA framework, demonstrate its applicability in authentic CDA studies, and disseminate the generic framework in the scholarly literature to make CDA more simple and efficient for those who are new or intermittent CDA researchers. In some disciplines (e.g., research on Gifted Education, Talent Development, or Creativity), CDA research is all but nonexistent in the literature. The simplicity and generality of the Generic CDA Analytical Framework developed in this study will foster the use of CDA in disciplines where it has been used rarely.

## Conclusion

CDA provides a multidisciplinary, flexible analytical framework for the critical analysis of texts and discourse. However, CDA is a difficult, complex, and time-consuming approach. Before attempting CDA, authors must become well versed in the principles of CDA.

Furthermore, because of the complexity and ill-defined nature of CDA, authors must recognize that to ensure trustworthiness, transparency (e.g., in the form of a clearly articulated analytical framework) is crucial. This study presented a generic CDA analytical framework applicable to a wide range of disciplines and research goals. This framework, which incorporates the core principles of CDA in seven levels of analysis, is intended to guide the design of more specific analytical frameworks tailored to the researcher's goals.

## Appendix

### Critical Discourse Analysis Coding Example

**Table A1.** Codebook Excerpt.

Code	Segment text	Category	Category label
S1	Our selections	C1	Author's perspective is dominant
S2	we	C1	
S3	we chose	C1	Active voice used when expressing author's perspective
S4	we will include	C15	
S5	seemed	C1, C15	
S6	seemed to represent claims	C2	Uncertainty or defensive stance
S7	Seemed to point	C3	Subjugation of others' perspectives
S8	we	C2	
S9	Our analysis	C1	Author is the owner of the research process
S10	We undertook	C16	
S11	We also explored	C1, C15	
S12	we	C1, C15	
S13	We examined	C1	
S14	We chose the passages we will include because	C4	Clear articulation of CDA analytical framework (C4)
S15	They seemed to represent claims and positions that occurred many times in the text	C10	Adequacy of data (C10)
S16	They contained features of language	C8	Theoretical triangulation (immediate social context) (C8)
S17	We examined them using several of the approaches from the loose toolkit available in the critical discourse analysis literature	C4, C10	
S18	Loose toolkit available in the critical discourse analysis literature	C4	
S19	Our analysis took several forms	C5	Weak articulation of CDA analytical framework
		C4	

(continued)



**Table A1. (continued)**

Code	Segment text	Category	Category label
S20	Analysis of the lexico-grammatical patterns	C4 C6 C12	Structural analysis (C6) Theoretical triangulation— immediate language (C12)
S21	Text structures such as rhetorical moves	C4, C6, C12	
S22	Analyzed the ways that the text positions the teacher/reader	C4, C8	
S23	Examined the patterns of the representation	C4	

Note. CDA = critical discourse analysis.

**Table A2. Preliminary Categories.**

Category	Category label
C1	Author's perspective is dominant
C2	Author's expression of uncertainty or defensiveness
C3	Author subjugates others' perspectives
C4	Clear articulation of analytical framework
C5	Poor articulation of analytical framework
C6	Structural analysis
C7	Theoretical triangulation—Interdiscursive analysis
C8	Theoretical triangulation—Immediate social context
C9	Analysis of word usage
C10	Adequacy of data
C11	Immersion in the data
C12	Theoretical triangulation—Immediate language
C13	Theoretical triangulation—Broad social context
C14	Consequential validity
C15	Active voice used when expressing author's perspective
C16	Author is the sole owner of the research process
C17	Passive voice when used with others' perspectives


### **Declaration of Conflicting Interests**

The author declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

### **Funding**

The author received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

## ORCID iD

Dianna R. Mullet  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2046-289X>

## References

References marked with an asterisk indicate studies included in the meta-analysis.

- Cabells International. (n.d.). *The journal whitelist*. Available from <http://www.cabells.com/>
- de los Heros, S. (2009). Linguistic pluralism or prescriptivism? A CDA of language ideologies in Talento, Peru's official textbook for the first-year of high school. *Linguistics and Education, 20*, 172-199. doi:10.1016/j.linged.2009.01.007
- \*Dworin, J. E., & Bomer, R. (2008). What we all (supposedly) know about the poor: A critical discourse analysis of Ruby Payne's "Framework." *English Education, 40*, 101-121.
- \*Ermann, K., Ponsford, M., Spence, H., & Wright, S. (2014). The discourse of benevolent paternalism in the introduction to The Baby Book. *Feminism & Psychology, 24*, 542-549. doi:10.1177/0959353514552022
- Fairclough, N. (2001). Critical discourse analysis as a method in social scientific research. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (pp. 122-136). London, England: Sage.
- Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. London, England: Aldine Transaction.
- Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1994). Competing paradigms in qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 105-117). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- \*Irving, C. J., & English, L. M. (2008). Partnering for research: A critical discourse analysis. *Studies in Continuing Education, 30*, 107-118. doi:10.1080/01580370802097702
- Jørgensen, M. W., & Phillips, L. J. (2002). *Discourse analysis as theory and method*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Koro-Ljungberg, M., Yendol-Hoppey, D., Smith, J. J., & Hayes, S. B. (2009). (E)pistemological awareness, instantiation of methods, and uninformed methodological ambiguity in qualitative research projects. *Educational Researcher, 38*, 687-699. doi:10.3102/0013189x09351980
- Kress, G. (1990). Critical discourse analysis. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 11*, 84-99. doi:10.1017/S0267190500001975
- Lazar, M. M. (2007). Feminist critical discourse analysis: Articulating a feminist discourse praxis 1. *Critical Discourse Studies, 4*, 141-164. doi:10.1080/17405900701464816
- \*Lim, L. (2012). Ideology, rationality and reproduction in education: A critical discourse analysis. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 35*, 61-76. doi:10.1080/01596306.2012.739467
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Llewellyn, A. (2009). "Gender games": A post-structural exploration of the prospective teacher, mathematics and identity. *Journal of Mathematics Teacher Education, 12*, 411-426. doi:10.1007/s10857-009-9109-0
- Luke, A. (1997). Introduction: Theory and practice in critical discourse analysis. In L. J. Saha (Ed.), *International encyclopedia of the sociology of education* (pp. 50-57). Oxford, NY: Pergamon.
- \*Marling, R. (2010). The intimidating other: Feminist critical discourse analysis of the representation of feminism in Estonian print media. *NORA—Nordic Journal of Feminist and Gender Research, 18*, 7-19. doi:10.1080/08038741003626767
- McGregor, S. L. (2004). *Critical discourse analysis: A primer*. Kappa Omicron Nu FORUM, 15(1). Retrieved from [http://www.kon.org/archives/forum/forum\\_archives.html](http://www.kon.org/archives/forum/forum_archives.html)

- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Morrow, S. L. (2005). Quality and trustworthiness in qualitative research in counseling psychology. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 52*, 250-260. doi:10.1037/0022-0167.52.2.250
- Patton, M. Q. (2002). Two decades of developments in qualitative inquiry. *Qualitative Social Work: Research and Practice, 1*, 261-283. doi:10.1177/1473325002001003636
- \*Prins, E., & Toso, B. W. (2008). Defining and measuring parenting for educational success: A critical discourse analysis of the parent education profile. *American Educational Research Journal, 45*, 555-596. doi:10.3102/0002831208316205
- \*Rizwan, S. (2011). Femininities and masculinities: A feminist critical discourse analysis of Hindi film songs. *Pakistan Journal of Women's Studies, 18*, 73-82.
- Rogers, R., Malancharuvil-Berkes, E., Mosley, M., Hui, D., & Joseph, G. O. G. (2005). Critical discourse analysis in education: A review of the literature. *Review of Educational Research, 75*, 365-416. doi:10.3102/00346543075003365
- \*Schieble, M. (2012). A critical discourse analysis of teachers' views on LGBT literature. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 33*, 207-222. doi:10.1080/01596306.2011.620758
- Seale, C. (1999). Quality in qualitative research. *Qualitative Inquiry, 5*, 465-478. doi:10.1177/107780049900500402
- \*Subtirelu, N. C. (2015). "She does have an accent but . . .": Race and language ideology in students' evaluations of mathematics instructors on RateMyProfessors.com. *Language in Society, 44*, 35-62. doi:10.1017/s0047404514000736
- Tamatea, L., Hardy, J., & Ninnes, P. (2008). Paradoxical inscriptions of global subjects: Critical discourse analysis of international schools' websites in the Asia-Pacific Region. *Critical Studies in Education, 49*, 157-170. doi:10.1080/17508480802040241
- Thomas, D. R. (2006). A general inductive approach for analyzing qualitative evaluation data. *American Journal of Evaluation, 27*, 237-246. doi:10.1177/1098214005283748
- \*Uzuner-Smith, S., & Englander, K. (2015). Exposing ideology within university policies: A critical discourse analysis of faculty hiring, promotion and remuneration practices. *Journal of Education Policy, 30*, 62-85. doi:10.1080/02680939.2014.895853
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1993). Principles of critical discourse analysis. *Discourse & Society, 4*, 249-283. doi:10.1177/0957926593004002006
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2007). The study of discourse: An introduction. In T. A. Van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse studies* (pp. xix-xlii). London, England: Sage.
- Wallimann, I., Tassis, N. C., & Zito, G. V. (1977). On Max Weber's definition of power. *Journal of Sociology, 13*, 231-235. doi:10.1177/144078337701300308
- Weedon, C. (1987). *Feminist practice and poststructuralist theory*. London, England: Basil Blackwell.
- Willig, C. (2014). Discourses and discourse analysis. In U. Flick (Ed.), *The SAGE handbook of qualitative data analysis* (pp. 341-351). London, England: Sage.
- Wodak, R. (2001). What CDA is about: A summary of its history, important concepts and its developments. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (pp. 1-12). London, England: Sage. doi:10.4135/9780857028020.n1
- Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (2009). *Methods for critical discourse analysis*. London, England: Sage.

### About the Author

**Dianna R. Mullet** received her PhD in educational psychology from the University of North Texas. Her research focuses on feminist conceptions of talent development in the sciences.