

Critical Discourse Analysis Using Norman Fairclough Framework

Duong Thanh Hao*, Nguyen Hong Hanh**

* (Thai Nguyen University of Economics and Business Administration & Vietnam National University- University of Languages and International Studies, Vietnam)

** (Thai Nguyen University of Economics and Business Administration, Viet Nam)

ABSTRACT

Critical discourse analysis' (henceforth CDA) includes various approaches to social discourse analysis (Fairclough & Wodak 1997, Pecheux M 1982, Wodak & Meyer 2001) that differ in theory, methodology and type of research problem. They tend to stand out. My own work in this area has also changed to some extent between aspects of Language and Power publishing (Longman 1989) and discourse analysis: Text analysis for research society (2003). My current research is on social change processes in terms of their discourse (Fairclough 1992 is an original formula of the CDA version dedicated to this topic). More specifically, I am interested in recent and contemporary social transitions, defined differently by terms such as 'new liberalism', 'globalization', 'transformation', 'information society', 'knowledge-based economy' and 'social learning'. I will focus here on the CDA version that I have used in recent works (partly collaborative) (Chiapello & Fairclough 2002, Chouliaraki & Fairclough 1999, Fairclough 2000a, 2000b, 2003, 2004, Fairclough, Jessop & Sayer 2004).

Key words: *Critical discourse analysis, Norman Fairclough, Language and Power*

1. THEORETICAL ISSUES

The term 'discourse' is used in various ways in the field of discourse analysis. The two are especially relevant here. First, the "discourse" in the abstract sense is a category that specifies broad semi-dynamic elements (as opposed to and related to other elements, not selling images) of social life (language, but also the visual semantics, 'body language', etc.). I like to use the term 'semiosis' (Fairclough, Jessop & Sayer 2004) to avoid the common confusion of this 'discourse' meaning with the second word, which I retain: 'discourse' as a noun count, as a category to designate specific ways to represent specific aspects of social life (for example, often to distinguish different political discourse, representing issues). inequality, disadvantage, poverty, 'social exclusion', in different ways). This 'discourse' category in the second sense is determined through relation and difference with the other two categories, 'genre' and 'style' (see below).

The realist social ontology adopted here treats social structures as well as social events as parts of social reality. Like a number of social theoreticians such as Bourdieu and Bhaskar (Bourdieu & Wacquant 1992, Bhaskar 1996), I memorize coherent accounts on the relationship between social structures and social activities, based on mediation categories, for which I am using the term 'private practices.' Each each of these stages there is a semiotic dimension. Different examples of social organization are languages (and other semi-systems).

I use the term 'discourse order' (this term is Foucault, but it is reproduced in this CDA version in a special way, see Foucault 1984, Fairclough 1992, 2003) for the semifinal dimension of the articulated social networks (for example, the political sphere is partly constituted as a specific order of discourse, so are also specific government, educational or business organizations). The word 'letter' is not used in this sense, because its key association with written documents cannot be shook away but a more generic definition is difficult to locate. The interaction of different social components, including semiosis, is social activity and social activities, to some degree. For examples, social practices (though obviously there is scope for debate about what they are) include: social practices:

- Activities
- Social relations
- Objects and instruments
- Time and place
- Social subjects, with beliefs, knowledge, values etc
- Semiosis

Dialectically connected are these variables (Harvey 1996). In other words, they are different elements, but not secret, completely distinct entities. There is a way in which the others cannot be reduced to each introspect. There is also, for instance, a part of social relationships in organizations, but we do not theorize and research social ties just as we do. Languages theorization and analysis. We have special characteristics, and their research leads to other disciplines. In contrast, massively 'outdated' texts (Althusser & Balibar 1970, Fairclough, Jessop & Sayer 2004) by other social factors that analyzed the language of texts quickly found questions about relationships. social, social identity, institutions, etc. This does not mean that the linguistic analysis of documents can be reduced to other forms of social analysis. However, the dialectic character of the relationship between the factors emphasizes the value and importance of working across industries in a " transdisciplinary " way.

In social practice (and articulation of social areas, organizations and social events) semiosis has three components. Semiosis is an important element of this approach. Firstly, it is part of a social, action (and interaction) practice. Of example, part of the work (of instance a shop assistant) is to use the language in a particular way. Second, semiosis figures in the representation. Social actors operating in any field or organization create representations of other practices, as well as agents ('reflexes') for their own activities, in the process of their actions and the different social actors will represent them differently depending on how they are positioned within the field or organization. Third, semicircular figures exist, in the constitutional constitution - for example, the identity of a political leader like Tony Blair in England is part of the semi-structured way of existence (Fairclough 2000b).

Semiosis is part of the social activity that constitutes the ' genres '. Genres are the different ways (inter) act in their semi-special aspect. Examples include: meetings in organizational forms, politics and other forms of interviews, newspaper articles and book reviews. Semiosis in the representation and self-representation of social practice constitutes the 'discourse '. The speech reflects social life in a complex way. For example, the lives of the poor and the poor are reflected in different discourses in government social practice, politics, medicine and the social sciences, as well as in speeches. The differences in each of these practices correspond to the different part of the way of creating a 'style' - such as that of business managers, or political leaders. The semiotic aspect of a social or organizational or organizational field (that is, a specific way of social practice) is a "discourse order", a specific expression of genres and acts. language diversity. At a higher level of analysis, part of the relationship analysis between different social sectors, organizations and organizations (categories) is an analysis of the relationship between different orders (for example, the main and mass media). A discourse order is a semi-divergent social framework-a particular social order of ties between different means of generating meaning, i.e. expression, genre and style. Various forms. Another component of this order is dominance: some concepts in a given order of discourses are dominant or dominant, others are margins or opponents or substitutes. For example, appointments with doctors and patients in the UK may be common, but there are several alternative ways to use or grow more or less alongside or on the contrary. Towards superiority. The predominant way may still maintain the social distance between the doctor and the patient, and the physician's authority on how to conduct the interaction; But there are more "democratic" ways in which doctors play according to their authority. The political concept of "hegemony" can be usefully used in analyzing discourse orders (Butler et al 2000, Fairclough 1992, Laclau & Mouffe 1985). A specific social structure of semi-difference can become hegemony, becoming part of a common sense of legitimacy of maintaining dominant relations, although hegemony is always open to competition. The painting is bigger or less. A discourse order is not a closed or rigid system, but an open system, which can be changed by what happens in actual interactions.

Social activities are created by intersecting two causal forces (social behaviors (and, behind them, social structures) and social players in critically pragmatic terms (Fairclough, Jessop & Sayer 2004). Social actors, however, rely on the social structures and social practices they conduct-social structures and practices are mediating the causal power of the social players, and vice versa. The text in the expanded sense that I described earlier are semi-dynamic elements of social events and it helps to highlight the productive activity of social actors in the creation of texts if we think of them in terms of " texturing ": social actors based on social structures (including languages) and practices (including discourse commands) in creating text, but actively work with these "resources", creating (potentially novel) texts from them, rather than simply imitating them. Text analysis includes an " interdiscursive " analysis of how genres, speeches and styles are interconnected. These are categories that are distinguished and relevant at the level of social practice (as elements of the discourse order). At the level of social events - the text - they are drawn in such a way as to create hybrids or 'mix' genres, i.e. a text that can be mixed with genres, speeches and / or the style (for example, the 'marketization' of higher education is in part a matter of 'blending' genres and styles, as well as more clearly discourse, on education and market, Fairclough 1993). Text analysis also includes linguistic and semi-dynamic

analysis of visual images (for example modern texts are characteristic and growing, "multimodal" with radius systems) (Kress & van Leeuwen 2000). Interdisciplinary analysis is a central and special feature of this CDA version. It allows people to incorporate elements of 'context' into text analysis, to show the relationship between specific events and more durable social practices, to show innovation and changes in the text, and it has an intermediary role in allowing a person to link in detail the linguistic and semiotic characteristics of texts to social change processes on a wider scale.

Social change involves evolving social practices and across the social network, as the social practices of markets, institutions and organizations become interlinked in financial, institutional and organizational structure. That includes changing the order in the speech and the relation between the order of the discourse (and thereby changing the gender, discourse and style and the link between genres, speech and style). Moreover, the semantic changes (the order of discourse) are the premise for broader social change processes - for example, a network of genres built is the premise for 'globalization'. If one understands the latter as including strengthening the ability to 'act at distance' and the space to 'stretching power relations' (Giddens 1990). And in many cases, broader social change processes can be seen as starting from the change in discourse, as I argue below.

I have stated above, the relation between semiosis and other social practicing elements is a dialectical relationship-inner semiosis, and is localized by other factors without specific factors. Will reduce each other! Will reduce each other. They are distinct, but not unambiguous. When we think traditionally of the dialectic debate as a method of social transformation, then we are asking ourselves what the forms and conditions of the cycle of internalization are. Take the concept of a "knowledge-based economy". This suggests a qualitative change in economies so that economic processes that rely primarily on knowledge and change occur, at an increasingly rapid rate, through creation, circulation and operating (including materializing) knowledge in economic processes.

Naturally, the economic transition makes sense long ago (science, technology) (in truth, it may always be said), but it is suggested a substantial increase in importance compared to other factors (including financial resources and labor forces)—though this is not a trend slogan, but a real change in action. The relevance of the ideas here is 'knowledge-driven' equivalent to 'discourse-driven': knowledge is created and circulated in the form of discourse, and the process by which knowledge (such as discourse) operated in economies is precisely the dialectic of semantics.

The presentations included descriptions of how things were and were, as well as imagination — descriptions of how things might or could be. Knowledge 'of a knowledge-based economy includes imagination in this sense - a prediction of possible states, "possible world". With regard to the idea of social action, they conceive of potential social activities and social networks-possible combinations of activity, social topics, social ties, tools, entity, time space, meaning. Such dreams can be used as networks-creative events, topics, social relations etc. can become real things, subjects, social relations. They can become actual events. Meeting, etc. Activation involves concretizing discourses - economic discourses becoming a reality in economic production tools, including hardware ('factories, machines, etc.) and' software '. (management system, etc.). Speeches such as imagination are also issued in new ways to act and interact, and those rules are in the internal section: speeches are issued as genre. For example, consider the new management discourse, which envisions management systems based on 'teamwork', a relatively decentralized, networked way, of organizations. They can be visually issued as new categories (in new category networks), such as categories for group meetings. Such special enactments are incorporated into their more general enactments as new ways to act and interact in production processes.

Speeches like imagination can also be imprinted as new ways, new identities. It is common that new economic and social formation depends on new entities - for example, "Taylorism" as a production and management system dependent on changes in the way, identity, of workers (Gramsci 1971). The process of 'changing the subject' can be thought of as inculcating new discourses - Taylorism will be an example. Inclusion is the problem of people who come to their own discourses, to locate within them, act and think and talk and see themselves about new discourses. The use of rhetoric is a stage of inculcation: people may learn new teachings and use them for certain purposes (for example, procurement of grants for projects or work in regional development, academically) and then separate themselves from them. One of the intricacies of the dialectical dialectic is the process that begins when the self-consciousness rhetoric becomes "ownership" - how people become self-consciously 'in a discourse. The combination also has its material aspects: dialectically engraved discourses not only about style, how to use the language, they are also materialized in the body, posture, gestures, how to move, etc. (they themselves are semi-automatic at many different levels, but none can reduce to semiosis).

The dialectic of semiosis (dialectical dialectic, Harvey 1996) as I defined, is nothing inevitable. A new speech may go through a non-issued or inculcated organization. It can be applied, but not fully engraved. In English Universities (as in other countries), for example, management presentations have been published very widely. (e.g. staff appraisal procedures, including a new category of 'appraisal interview'), but may argue that the level of remedy is limited - many argue that not all scholars do not 'own' these management lectures. We must consider the conditions of the capacity and the constraints on the dialectic of the discourse in specific cases. This is related to the theory of socialist ism '(Sayer 2000). A common thing in contemporary social science is that social entities (organizations, organizations, social agents, etc.) are created or 'built' through social processes, and understanding A general understanding of these processes highlights the effectiveness of discourses, as I have done above: social entities in some of the meaningful effects of discourse. The case of social constructionism becomes problematic is that it disregards the relative firmness and long-termness of social entities (their 'internal' reality in critically realistic terms), Sayer 2000), maybe more or less acceptable or resistant to changes of particular types. When using a dialectical theory of discourse in social research, one needs to take into account the circumstances and circumstances and factors that facilitate the allowances and resistance of social entities. for changes due to specific discourse.

In addition, one can argue that dialectical processes (actuate, inculcate, concretize) often rely on productive strategies. Different groups of social actors create diverse strategies for change during the time of social turmoil or uncertainty, including creative speeches on different ways of social life, stories tell the less-or less connection between what occurred in the past and what might occur in future. The performance, hegemony and practice of what strategy (and discussion) is based on a number of conditions (Jessop 2002, Fairclough coming b).

2. METHODOLOGY

The example I will mention when discussing methodology are aspects of a specific research project (about 'knowledge-based economy' and 'information society') in a research program. Larger studies: investigating semiosis as a 'transition' factor in central and eastern Europe (CEE). I see methodology as a process, starting with a research topic, as in this case 'transition', and more specifically 'knowledge-based economy' and 'information society' is the goal in 'transition', one of the objects of research '(Bourdieu & Wacquant 1992). The selection of appropriate methods (selection, collection and analysis of data) depends on the subject of the study. More precisely, certain aspects of the methodology demonstrate such a CDA, while other aspects depend on the research project and the object of the study.

A thorough Text Analysis is important for CDA. In particular, this involves a mixture of intertextual study of texts (which consists of the articulation of different forms, speeches and styles) and a semi-analytical language and form. Many, many. Other. Depending on the project and the object, which data to use, how to collect. The same applies to the nature of language and other aspects of semi analysis, which are especially linked to functional systemically linguistics (Halliday, 1978, 1994), if one focuses on discourse, narratives, procedures, transliterations, names and voices (in particular), but that represent only some characteristic biography in this area. Each language analysis approach can be taken in principle. To order to make coherent research subjects, we do not think research is straightforward or how people in the field define problems and concerns that transparently put research subjects together. In this case, it is widely recognized that both 'transitions' or 'information societies' or 'knowledge-based economies' are concepts, representations of actual reality or It is expected that it can be done at face value (Eg Pickles & Smith 1998, Stark & Bruszt 1998, Jessop 2004, Garnham 2001, Godin 2003). These are discourse elements in conjunction with concrete methods of change, and epistemological meaning and practice are difficult to explain their rhetorical importance (and maybe the meaning of their ideology) to legislators and imaginations, who are especially concerned with change. For example, 'transitions' change in CEE and elsewhere as a path from a well-defined departure point to a single and well-defined destination, which seems difficult to reconcile with complexity. The complexity and diversity of processes are actually taking place. For example, Stark & Bruszt (1998) reject the 'transition' process for such reasons in favor of 'transformation'.

The process of building 'objects of research' from research topics involves selecting theoretical frameworks, views and categories to be included in the research topic. Based only on such theories on the subject of research and identification of research subjects' that one can solve according to appropriate methods of selecting, collecting and analyzing data. A critical disk analyst would naturally approach research subjects with theoretical inclination to highlight the semicircular, but since this is certainly the initial problem that links semiosis to poor Other facilities, so the theory of the research topic is an interdisciplinary problem, in the sense that I have provided that the interdisciplinary mechanism The CDA is part of the theory. In certain cases, this will be the work of a research team, in other cases (such as the current article) that may be

the problem of a critical discourse analyst based on word documents. other disciplines and theories (although in this case I have also collaborated with the main theorist in the "cultural political economy" (see below) that I have drawn, that is, Jessop). Needless to say, one has to be selective, that is to make a judgment about the "mixture" of available resources that provide the most effective theory on the topic of research including the most effective view of the relationship. Us between semiosis and non-sale factors.

I will approach the "information society" and "knowledge-based economy" as research topics by recent developments in the political economy (Pickles & Smith 1998, Jessop 2002, 2004, Stark & Bruszt 1998, Ray & Sayer 1999, Sayer 1995). Specifically, I will follow Jessop (2004) as a strategy to achieve and stabilize a new 'fix' between capital accumulation and political regulatory regimes following the 'fix' collapse. 'is often referred to as "Fordism". This formula derives from a 'regulation theory', which has a political-economic view rather than a narrow and purely economic view of economic change, assuming an economic order ('capital accumulation regime ') depends on the political order (regime' of regulation ') that can produce and maintain the prerequisites for its sustained activity.

The more general requirement is to have non-economic prerequisites (including we will see social and cultural as well as political conditions) to establish and reproduce economies. The international political-economic order that has dominated since the fall of Fordism has been widely identified as "post-Ford", which shows uncertainty of what follows, or should, obey. The importance of a "knowledge-based economy" (this is Jessop's focus, although the same can be said with the "information society", and for the regular combination of the two. characteristic of the document I will consider) is that it appears to be emerging as a change strategy that can be effectively operated in real change.

They are strategies, but, like any strategy, are specific discourses, specific expressions, or more imaginative (because they are certainly predictive as much as described). new political and economic order. And they are speeches of a special kind, which we can call 'nodding' speeches, in the sense that they are inclusive and expressed speeches in a very special way. many other speeches - technical presentations (such as ICT presentations) on "intellectual property", presentations on governance and government (for example, " e-government " death "), presentations on" social exclusion "and" social inclusion, "etc. In discussion, they form selective, 'simplified' representatives (Jessop 2002), 'condensation' (Harvey 1996) on very complex economic, political, social and cultural realities. includes certain aspects of these facts and excludes certain aspects and excludes certain aspects and other foundations. No speech would be like a strategic debate in which a new political economy can be conceived and worked, concretized, corrected. A speech can only function as long as it is extremely pleased with, simplifies and condenses truth as much as possible (as much as that is possible). Can be used to represent / visualized reality in a number of ways in the different abstract levels, in various areas of social life (economics, policy, education, health, regional and social inequalities, etc.). Only when it is a rational imagination, it will attract investment. the time and money to prepare for the imagined future it envisages, the material elements that are critical to turning imagination into reality (Cameron & Palan 2004). In this sense, "knowledge-based economy" and "information society" have a dispersed and partially materialistic characteristic. They are discourses, but not just discourses, they are materially strengthened discourses and materially motivated. The theoretical framework we need to conceptualize is that it needs not just a political economy (rather than a narrow economy), but what Jessop calls the "cultural political economy", a political economy, among other things, incorporates a theory of discourse and of dialectic of discourse, of how the interpretation of the world can come to build and restructure the world, without losing the physical reality of the world, or the conditions that the physical reality of the world sets (as I briefly pointed out) about the (re) construction of the world.

This strategic view provides the basis for forming research objects for this 'transitional' aspect as a research topic and the 'cultural' orientation of the political-economic approach means that Research subjects can be built to include or highlight questions about semicircles. Subjects of study may include the emergence and the constitution, hegemony, dissemination and redeployment, and operation of strategies of "knowledge-based economy" and "information society". These research objects can be specifically constructed as subjects for CDA research projects in the following ways:

The emergence of discourses on 'knowledge-based economies' and 'information societies' such as nodding discourses related to the emergence of their strategies and constitutions through relations between other discourses, including 'available' discourse before the last note. • The competitive relationship between the speakers within the framework of the competitive relationship between the emerging hegemony strategies and hegemony of these nodal speakers. • Dissemination of 'knowledge-based economies' and 'information societies' on structures (for example, between economic markets, government, public services and society such as

education and health) and scale (between 'global' or international, macroeconomic regions (e.g. EU or NAFTA), social and national life scales), and their rediscovering in new social areas, institutions, organizations, countries and localities.

This shift of nodes from 'structure' to 'constructions' (Sayer 2000), from mere representation and imagination to having a transformative impact on social reality, is transformed. - are issued as new ways (actions), introduced new ways (identities), specified in new production tools and techniques or ways of organizing space.

The discovery, compilation and analysis of data involves different methods for these various research topics. A genealogy method is required to research the presence and nature of these speeches, which recognizes these speeches before the debate in the field and involves the compilation of historical texts and selection. Such note addresses are the primary documents of this collection, discussing the constitution of these speeches, presenting elements in the field of previous discourses and defining the linkages between the different discourses. To examine the supremacy of these speeches, these speeches need to be put in their competitive relationship with other discursive, concentrating among other things on dialog between and inside documents in important organizations, such as the OECD (Godin 2003). Dissemination and rediscovery include the comparison of texts on various social sectors and at different social levels (in specific cultures or populations for example), as well as a study of how they are coupled with those present in these new contexts if those discourses are repeated. Research requires ethnographic methods for data collection, in which only by accessing insiders' perspectives at localities, companies, etc. I will only discuss aspects of disseminating and reproducing these pitches.

The main form of criticism related to the CDA and important social research is, in general, ideological criticism. But we can distinguish three forms of criticism related to the CDA: ideological criticism, rhetoric and strategy (forthcoming b). Meanwhile, ideological criticism focuses on the effects of semiosis on the social relationships of power, and rhetorical criticism of persuasion (including 'manipulation') in texts. or talk individually, what we might call 'strategic criticism' focusing on how strategies pursue strategies social actor groups to change society in specific directions.

The study objects (appearance, hegemony, reappearance and functioning) that I have identified can be regarded as strategic critique. Strategic critiques can be seen when we consider a certain predominance as strong as we are in the time of social reform and restructuring. This is not to imply that all critique and rhetoric are no longer relevant; in a critical review it is a matter of their relative salinity.

3. RECONTEXTUALIZATION OF NODAL DISCOURSES IN ROMANIA

The dissemination and re-enactment of strategies and discourse of the "knowledge-based economy" and "information society" in CEE are closely linked to the EU's expansion process. The EU Lisbon Council in 2000 adopted these strategies as part of the "Electronic Europe" initiative. The EU's "strategic goal" is "to become the most dynamic and competitive knowledge-based economy in the world, capable of sustained economic growth with more and better jobs and engagement. bigger society". The "European Action Plan 2002" was agreed upon in Feira in 2000 and the EU member states in CEE are relevant to the EU's strategic goals in applying "European Action Plan". Europe + "in 2001, one reason is said to be avoiding a" digital divide "in the EU. According to the Romanian government's "National Strategy for Promoting New Economy and Information Society Implementation" (2002), it was clarified at a conference of the ministers of the candidate countries and representatives of EU in Warsaw (May 2000) that 'the European electronic initiative will become a fundamental element of the integration process'.

The "e-Europe+ Action Plan" agreed by the candidate states has been clearly modeled after the EU "e-Europe 2002 Action Plan", and most of the "National Strategy" documents The Romanian government is modeled after them. This part is part of an "action plan" but it is also part of a strategic document that is comparable to a level with the Lisbon Summit Statement. The node in the Lisbon Declaration is "knowledge-based economy", while the node in Romanian document is "information society" (the "new economy" discourse can be considered as a secondary but not discourse).

There does not appear to be a clear and stable relationship between the two pitched speeches in 'eEurope' and 'eEurope +' projects, they are joined together in different ways in different policy documents. In the Romanian article on the knowledge-based economy for the World Bank's knowledge economy for EU countries, held in Paris at the same time the publication of the 'National Strategy' "of Romania" (February 2002), the discourse is a "knowledge-based economy", although it refers to almost the same set of strategies and policies. In the Lisbon Declaration, "information society" is one of the three elements of one of the three "strategies" to

achieve "strategic goals" to become the most dynamic and competitive knowledge-based economy. in the world ". Although "knowledge-based economy" is not an imaginary entity or objective in Romania's "National Strategy", the "new economy" is partially defined in an understandable way. 'knowledge-based economy' is 'intensifying the integration of knowledge in new products and services'

As these comments imply, what makes sense regarding the reengineering is both the presence or absence of specific discourses in particular texts and the relationships in which the discourse varies. are hinged, "textured", together. One can identify the difference between texts that are on this issue by analyzing the relationship between discourses and genre characteristics, in the sense that genres can be considered closed devices. framework "to organize the relationship between discourses (Chouliaraki & Fairclough 1999). Relevant characteristics of the genre include the rhetorical structure and the argument structure of the text (Fairclough 2003). I will concentrate on these subjects in my study. The core selection for the review can be found to rely on the particular topic of the study (research) but there are several other methodological questions (such as procedures and department presentation) which are responsible for the re-emergence. In the preamble to the Lisbon Declaration the main features of the rhetorical structure are arguments from problems to solutions. and from head to vehicle. The two paragraphs of the first appendage ('New challenge') are both arguments from the problem to the solution, from what 'is' going on to what 'must' be done in response (from the 'test' challenges, 'changes that are happening, for the necessary feedback, what the Union' must 'do,' need 'to do,' urgently 'let it do, these changes' love'. bridge'). The second part ('The Union's strengths and weaknesses') is also a version of a debate on solution issues, arguing for the proposed solution as a response to weaknesses', promptly. according to the 'strong points'. Paragraphs 5 and 6 in the third section ('The way forward') are both the ending word arguments ('strategic goal') meaning ('strategy') and paragraph 7 is the ending word argument. ('strategy') for means of governance to achieve them.

This rhetorical structure forms a framework in which diverse discourses are interconnected in a specific way in which the relationships are structured (textual) between these discourses. For example, in paragraph 5, establishing 'strategic goals' establishes an equivalent relationship (Fairclough 2003) between 'sustainable economic growth', 'better and better employment' and 'coherence'. bigger society '(more precisely: there is a humorous structure that establishes an equivalent relationship between the first two phrases and the remaining two phrases and a coordinate structure that establishes an equivalent relationship between the two terms from this), all as attributes of 'knowledge-based economy'. Each of these equivalent terms represents an intrinsic EU policy area associated with an established discourse (discourse of growth, (un) employment, social and regional cohesion). The development of an 'overall strategy' is a means to achieve a 'strategic goal' establishing an equivalent relationship between the three listed elements of the strategy and including 'better policy for society'. information and R & D '(and within this, between' information society 'and' R & D '), 'accelerate the structural reform process to compete and innovate '(and in that, between 'competitiveness' and 'innovation') and 'improvement of the internal market'; between modernizing European social models, 'investing in people' and 'combating social exclusion'; and from then onwards. Again, diverse policy areas and related discourses (e.g. "information society", "competitiveness", "social exclusion") are interlinked in specific relationships in the nod of the "knowledge-based economy". An important overall feature of speaking the discourse in the document is that in developing issues, strategic goals and strategies to achieve it, the discourse represents the economy ('increasing Sustainable economic growth 'in the strategic goal' is linked to keynote addresses for social issues and policies ('getting better at work' and 'social cohesion' in the section).

One major difference between the Treaty of Lisbon and the Romanian document 'National Strategy,' which makes argument from problems to solutions with arguments from scratch to medium. It has a rhetoric structure comparable. More broadly, Romanian littoral claims that Romania faces strategic targets (and methods for resolving them) from particular issues. It is a startling failure in a national strategy article, but I argued later not to shock Romania's international reputation. This does not automatically mean that issues are not defined or goals, approaches and policies not stated in the text. It is, but the organized relation between them is important. Rather of approving priorities and plans for their suitability and timeliness in meeting diagnostic problems, for example, the relationship between targets and strategic concerns is commonly reverted. The problem facing the country, the problems are understood as weaknesses and difficulties to achieve the strategic goal of "information society". This is indicated by the wider rhetorical structure of the document: the strategic goal is formulated (as I will describe below) in chapters 1 and 2 on the basis of a statement of common interests (not benefits). benefits to Romania) of 'information society' and Romania's international commitments (especially 'eEurope') and Romanian specific issues (poverty, migration of good labor occupations, etc.) are identified only in chapter 3 of the assessment of the country's current position in the 'information society'.

The arguments for "information society" as the strategic goal are largely implied. The Lisbon Declaration is based on arguments from problems to material solutions in which the literature begins with these arguments. In contrast, the Romanian document begins with a general chapter on "information society" and "new economy" that completely ignores Romania, and only indirectly refers to Romania in the last few paragraphs. In terms of rhetorical structure, this chapter is an extended description of the "information society", followed by rules about what must be done to build such a society. The first part, describes, describes "the information society" as it really exists, rather than a strategic goal, representing it in an idealized way (and to some degree unimaginable.), in the universal sense, what is often said to be its potential effects and benefits as if they were actual effects and benefits. The example here is a translation of the second paragraph:

Information society is a new phase in human culture, a new way of living and a higher standard involving the use of in-depth knowledge in all aspects of human life and development. People with significant economic and social implications. The knowledge society provides its members with easy access to information, a new way of working and learning, improved opportunities for economic development and enhanced social cohesion. In just nine-thirteen sections of it, a strategic vision of building a new model of society appeared. The following paragraphs highlight the role of government, business, academic communities and civil society in this process. At this stage, one might argue that Romania in particular is implied without being clearly named - this is implicit in the statement that 'prioritizes national development for the long-term medium-term' and 'section Pepper's attachment to Atlantic structures' (often built in this way in the context of Romanian policy) needs to be taken into account. "Information society" as a strategic goal is established by chance on the basis of idealized statements about "information society" as a universal reality.

The second chapter reviews international and EU trends and policies, including a summary of 'e-Europe' and 'eEurope +' initiatives. Romania is a participant in 'eEurope + '. The "information society" as a "development target" has been declared "an essential condition for entry into the single European market". It is implied, without explicitly stated, that this applies to Romania, and its "information society" is therefore its "development goal" (strategic goal). The third chapter is a STEEP analysis (social, technological, economic and political factors) of the current situation related to the international and "information society" in Romania, including an assessment of issues. and capacity and policy in Romania - it is here, as I said earlier, that specific Romanian issues are raised.

Therefore, the "information society" is entirely set up as Romania's strategic goal on an exotic basis: the common benefits it brings as an existing reality and commitment to the strategic goal. This is part of our commitment to the 'e-Europe +' initiative. Only in chapter 4 (Direction Direction and Strategic Selection '), that strategy option' for Romania is clearly addressed. I will comment on the rhetorical structure and reasoning of the first part and how it constructs the discourse. The rhetorical structure of this section is characterized by arguments from the general factual statement about their economic changes and social consequences in the "information society," with respect to capabilities, policies and strategy (by implication, by specific countries). Although these arguments are formulated in general terms without specific references to Romania (Romania is only explicitly mentioned in the last sentence), they can be considered implicit implications for Romania - the list. The four policies include Romanian specific policies (especially the fourth part, very similar to those that are explicitly supported for the economic applications of IT in Romania in the next section of the chapter). The first sentence makes a general practical statement about the consequences of large-scale IT use ('profound implications for socio-economic life, fundamental changes in the way goods and services are produced, etc. and in human behavior '). The second sentence is a conditional formula of opened possibilities: greater use of information technologies 'that can ensure the socioeconomic progress of information societies', provided that 'the goals and directions of the strategic nature are adopted through policies that are appropriate to the real society in which we live.' The four policies are then listed ('strengthening democracy and rule of law', 'developing a market economy and moving towards a new economy', 'improving the quality of life' (and, through policies to achieve this, 'integration into Euro-Atlantic structures and the Global Information Association'), 'strengthening and developing the national economic framework, securing goods production and competitive services in internal and external markets'). The first three elements of this list are structured as arguments from start to finish.

In the following two paragraphs, two sentences make general practical statements about 'information society', which makes a more specific statement (v.3) on knowledge development as 'the determinant'. and economic growth and the standard of living ', which implies making it possible (v. 4) to 'divide numbers' into, with 'appropriate strategies', digital opportunities. The model of argument from actual economic claims to the possibility of strategy is repeated in the following two paragraphs. The last sentence is a recommendation, 'taking the examples of the countries mentioned above and presented in the appendix' (Ireland, Israel, Finland),

that Romania 'should make a basic choice to developing a branch of the economy producing goods and services required by an IT-based, information society.

The first section of the Lisbon Declaration has a rhetorical framework that creates ties between the problems identified, the strategic objectives of solving them and strategy of achieving them (with means of achieving this strategy's end). Alternatively, instead of being focused on medical issues (no such diagnosis), it is a strategic goal that is set and the emphasis is on the opportunity emerging from the joint economic change declaration culture and strategies to realize them. Therefore, at one point in the document there are special 'strategic options' for Romania, there is no attempt to set strategic goals that adapt to specific Romanian issues and are strategic choices. The only approach suggested is clearly and strictly related to the economic applications of ICT in this final sentence (only one question is directly stated in Romania). This is addressed in depth in the rest of the chapter.

I pointed out above that speeches reflecting economic interests are associated with social issues and policies in the Lisbon Declaration. Everything similar is included in the list of four policy areas in Romanian literature, but it differs significantly. First, this articulation lies only in the strategies to achieve the hypothetical strategic goal of the "information society", while in the Lisbon Declaration, the introduction of economic and social discourses is present. In building issues, strategic goals, and strategies to achieve it. Second, and connected, those are just social policies that are represented, not social issues. Third, the representative social policies relate to political issues and 'quality of life', but not to the standard of living (or the main problem of poverty), employment (or unemployment), or the main division between urban and rural areas and population. This suggests that there are significant social problems that you might find as not addressed, such as those focusing on the Lisbon Declaration, (zero) housing, social stability and sector. I will make a few comments about delivering speeches in the listed policies. First, an equally structured relationship between 'democracy' and the '(institutions) of the rule of law', that one may find meaningful in terms of reproducing the 'main' discourse e-government '(as a constituent discourse of both nodding speeches): the purpose of establishing a "law" was one of the important ways in which Romanian society after 1989 distinguished and distance from the time. Great Ceausescu. Equivalent relationships in the development of means for achieving policy (between 'citizen participation in public life', 'facilitating non-discriminatory access to public information', 'improving public service quality', modernizing public administration ') form a statement of speeches one can find in members' 'e-government' policies. EU. In part three, the policy of "improving the quality of life" is presented as a means to "integrate into Atlantic structures and the Global Information Association". This again makes sense for the re-creation.

'Integration into Atlantic structures', including integration into the EU, is often considered a Romanian policy goal, which is understood to be merging with each other in a mistaken way as EU members and NATO members (Repere 2004). Policies to improve the quality of life are a means for this purpose in the sense that they are among the conditions that Romania must meet (in view of the 'buying community' and 'initiative'. Europe ') upon joining the EU.

If we consider the arguments and explanations given in the literature as a whole about Romania adopting the "information society" as a strategic goal, it can clarify issues that it is understood. Incidentally is a solution. IT is "considered an important engine for boosting the national economy and promoting national interests". Romania has adhered to the goals of the 'eEurope' program, considering them to be a beneficial framework for the urgent integration process in the EU '. If Romania is not quickly integrated into 'Euro' Atlantic architecture' (the strategy of "information society" is expressed as a prerequisite for this), "the economic gap between our country and other countries development will increase ". It is worth noting that factors related to the economy, "national interests" and EU integration are included, but - in contrast to the Lisbon Declaration - social factors (unemployment, poverty, social exclusion, social and regional cohesion) are not. These are the cases in which Romania is mentioned specifically and clearly. There is a much larger number of people in which the arguments for the "information society" are made generally, without regard to specific countries, which can be considered implicitly applied to Romania. In addition to the first chapter, these are mainly economic arguments (for example, developing countries can gain certain economic advantages from quickly taking advantage of the opportunities provided by ICT and especially is ecommerce '). In the first chapter, there are some general statements about the "information society" that can be considered implicit arguments to support its use as a strategic goal, and they include solutions for social issues (see previous quotation). Yet these reasons, of course, do not address the particular issue of Romania and do not address it in a certain way (e.g. about 40% of the workers still work in agriculture). In Chouliaraki & Fairclough (1999), we have argued that reappearance is a dialectic of colonial possession. There is an 'external' discourse process that focuses on reimagining practices (countries, sectors, organizations, etc.) and an 'external' discourse process used in re-practice practices.

materialization. In principle, one can claim that no colonization without appropriation - rediscovering is always a positive process on the part of 'internal' social actors in bringing an 'external' factor into a new context, putting it into a new set of relationships with its existing elements, and doing so to transform it. This is often manifested in a hybrid of texts, a mix of 'outside' and inside scattering elements. Moreover, strategically, one might argue that the strategic relationships between 'external' and 'internal' social actors will always be influenced by the strategic relationships between the internal social 'agents'.

In general, room for autonomous authorities and initiatives in contemporary Romania for the main stream of economic and social policies and activities is quite limited. Romania is strongly committed to integration into the European Union and the 'Euro Atlantic structures' and maintains good relations with the support and assistance of the EU, the United States, EU nations, and national bodies. (UNO, World Bank, IMF, etc.), and these are accompanied by conditions that leave Romania with little room to maneuver. I pointed out in the analysis of the 'National Strategy' document, rather than being explicitly legalized as a solution to specific Romanian problems, the strategic goals are implicitly legalized through idealized statements about 'information society' is understood as a common practice, and by referring to Romania's international commitments. Any country faces the problem of legalizing its goals, strategies and policies, and these can be considered as legalization strategies adopted by the Romanian government (although a Such discourse will require further analysis of policy documents and other government documents). Given its international status, one might argue that Romania has no choice in formulating its goals, strategies and policies on the basis of its analysis of specific problems and needs. Although Boia (1997), in distinguishing the 'defensive' and 'offensive' Romanian reactions to integrate with the 'west' in the modern Romanian history, suggests that it is a feature of 'positive' (integration) responses to proceed with little regard for the consequences of profound domestic divisions and inequalities in the country.

The data I tested related to the reengineering of the 'information society' and 'knowledge-based economy' in Romania including policy documents co-operated by the EU, member states, EU with candidate countries, Romania's government and other candidate states, individual government ministries, as well as interviews with government ministers. I have chosen the Lisbon Declaration and the Romanian National Strategy document for the purpose of illustration here to compare strategy documents and formulate strategic goals (although the Romanian document is also an "action plan") and can only be compared to a limited extent according to the Lisbon Declaration, because the foundation, justification and legitimacy of strategic goals are an important aspect of the restructuring of 'nodding speeches' at the national level.

Such information represents just a proportion of the type of data relating to recreational activities as a research purpose; people would also require documented information, including written and spoken content, from particular organizations (such as education), businesses, societies, political parties, etc. To study the re-enactment of those nodding speeches more thoroughly. Such data expansion may also provide evidence of more active appropriation of these discourses, the hybrid relationship between these and other discourses, and the strategic differences in the process re-enactment of them, which I was able to cover in this article.

CONCLUSION

Within this paper, I introduced a certain variant of the CDA, defined by theory of functional and dialectical discourse, a system aimed at constructing study structures by means of theorems. The study's theory of research interacting with other social theory and research fields and choosing methods inherent to this CDA version which are partially subject to a particular study topic. I have referred to specific research topics of the "information society" and "knowledge-based economy" as elements of "transition" in Romania that relate only to re-enactment such as a study object, and then only part.

Let me add one last note to the politics of the "transition" in Romania, which has its own characteristics. Romania is slower than other "transitional" countries in implementing transition programs, although this rate has rapidly increased significantly over the past few years. There is a general and widespread skepticism about government and politics, and about how much the Romanian government's commitment on paper means in practice. A common feature in the commentary is that they, in the heavily used expression of nineteenth-century Romanian literary critic Maiorescu 'formless content' - because of modernization and westernization in Romania, more people will add.

The language of modernization is easily imitated from the West, but not much has changed in social reality. Governments since 1989 have been accused of repeating the language of new liberalism, of the Washington Consensus, about joining the EU, to perfect a "rhetoric" for external consumption, while the economy,

Romanian government and society remain unchanged. Assessing such allegations makes it particularly important to go beyond public policy documents and to study the functioning of discourses such as 'information society' and 'knowledge economy'. Only by examining government initiatives like the 'e-government' website but also, primarily, through ethnographic research can provide insight into the relationship between actors. Speech, rhetoric and reality.

REFERENCES

- [1] Althusser (L.) & Balibar (E.). 1970. *Reading Capital*. London: New Left Books.
- [2] Bernstein (B.). 1990. *The Structuring of Pedagogic Discourse*. London: Routledge.
- [3] Bhaskar (R.). 1986. *Scientific Realism and Human Emancipation*. London: Verso.
- [4] Boia (L.). 1997 *History and Myth in Romanian Consciousness*. Budapest: Central European University Press.
- [5] Bourdieu (P.) and Wacquant (L.). 1992 *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- [6] Butler (J.), Laclau (E.) & Zizek (S.). 2000 *Contingency, Hegemony, Universality*. London: Verso.
- [7] Cameron (A.) & Palan (R.). 2004 *The Imagined Economies of Globalization*. London: Sage.
- [8] Chiapello (E.) & Fairclough (N.). 2002. Understanding the new management ideology: a transdisciplinary contribution from critical discourse analysis and the new sociology of capitalism. In: *Discourse & Society* 13 (2) 185-208.
- [9] Chouliaraki (L.) & Fairclough (N.). 1999 *Discourse in Late Modernity: Re-Thinking Critical Discourse Analysis*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- [10] Fairclough, N. (1992) *Discourse and Social Change* Cambridge: Polity Press.
- [11] Fairclough (N.) 1993 Critical discourse analysis and the commodification of public discourse. In: *Discourse and Society* 4.2: 133-68.
- [12] Fairclough (N.). 2000a Discourse, social theory and social research: the discourse of welfare reform. In: *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 4.2.
- [13] Fairclough (N.) 2000b *New Labour, New Language?* London: Routledge.
- [14] Fairclough (N.). 2003 *Analyzing Discourse and Text: Textual Analysis for Social Research*. London: Routledge.
- [15] Fairclough (N.). 2004. Critical Discourse Analysis in Researching Language in the New [16] Capitalism: Overdetermination, Transdisciplinarity and Textual Analysis. In: Harrison (C.) & Young (L.) eds. *Systemic Linguistics and Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Continuum.
- [17] Fairclough (N.). forthcoming a. Critical discourse analysis in transdisciplinary research. To appear in Chilton (P.) & Wodak (R.). *New Directions in Critical Discourse Analysis*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- [18] Fairclough (N.). forthcoming b. Critical discourse analysis and change in management discourse and ideology: a transdisciplinary approach to strategic critique. To appear in Ramallo (F.). ed , *Studies in Organisational Discourse*.
- [19] Fairclough (N.) Jessop (R.) & Sayer (A.). 2004 Critical realism and semiosis. In: Joseph (J.) & Roberts (J.). eds. *Realism discourse and Deconstruction*. London: Routledge.
- [20] Fairclough (N.) & Wodak (R.). 1997 Critical discourse analysis. In: van Dijk (T.). *Discourse as Social Interaction*. London: Sage.
- [21] Foucault (M.). 1984. The order of discourse. In: Shapiro (M.). ed. *The Politics of Language*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- [22] Fowler (R.), Kress (G.), Hodge (B.) & Trew (T.). 1979 *Language and Control*. London: Routledge.
- [23] Garnham (N.). 2001 The information society: myth or reality? Bugs, Globalism and Pluralism conference, Montreal.
- [24] Giddens (A.). 1990 *Modernity and Self-Identity*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- [25] Godin (B.). 2004 The knowledge-based economy: conceptual framework or buzzword? Project on the History and Sociology of S & T Statistics, Working Paper 24.
- [26] Gramsci (A.). 1971. *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*. London: Lawrence & Wishart.
- [27] Halliday (M.A.K.). 1978. *Language as Social Semiotic*. London: Edward Arnold.
- [28] Halliday (M.A.K.). 1994. *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. 2nd edition. London: Edward Arnold.
- [29] Harvey (D.). 1996. *Justice, Nature and the Geography of Difference*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- [30] Jessop (B.). 2002. *The Future of the Capitalist State*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- [31] Jessop (B.). 2004 Cultural political economy, the knowledge-based economy, and the state.
- [32] MS. Kress (G.) & van Leeuwen (T.). 2000. *Multimodal Discourse*. London: Arnold.
- [33] Laclau (E.) and Mouffe (C.). 1985 *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy*., London: Verso.
- [34] Pêcheux (M.). 1982. *Language, Semantics and Ideology*. London: Macmillan.
- [35] Pickles (J.) & Smith (A.). 1998. *The Political Economy of Transition*. London: Routledge.
- [36] Ray (L.) & Sayer (A.). 1999. *Culture and Economy after the Cultural Turn*. London: Sage.

- [37] Repere 2.1. 2004. *România în lumea contemporană* (contributions to a Colloquium at the New Europe College, Bucharest).
- [38] Sayer (A.). 1995. *Radical Political Economy*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- [39] Sayer (A.). 2000. *Realism and Social Science*. London: Sage.
- [40] Stark (D.) & Bruszt (L.) 1998. *Postsocialist Pathways: Transforming Politics and Property in East Central Europe*. Cambridge: CUP.
- [41] Sum (N-L.) & Jessop (B.) 2001. On pre- and post-disciplinarity in (cultural) political economy *New Political Economy* 6 89-101
- [42] Wodak (R.) & Meyer (M.) 2001. *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Sage.

