

Habitus as the principle for social practice: A proposal for critical discourse analysis

JANN SCHEUER

*Institute of Danish Dialectology
University of Copenhagen
Njalsgade 80
2300 Copenhagen S, Denmark
jann.scheuer@hum.ku.dk*

ABSTRACT

Critical discourse analysts are often criticized for interpreting linguistic data in political contexts, placing the data in an artificial environment motivated by political agendas rather than scientific inquiry, and thereby disregarding findings that would follow from a data-internal and more empirically grounded analysis. This article argues that critical discourse analysis may gain proficiency for social analysis by adopting concepts suitable for cultural and historical analysis of socialization, as found in Bourdieu. Application is demonstrated in a study of a job interview, with close linguistic analysis; close attention is given to the applicant by drawing on evaluations after the interview and on a retrospective interview with the applicant. It is proposed that a method combining linguistic and socio-historical analysis may offer advantages to critical discourse analysis, including a more systematic approach to text-external contexts and qualified, balanced perception of the social agent as a creative yet socially determined individual. (Critical discourse analysis, recontextualization, organizational communication, job interview, socialization, habitus, masculinity.)*

INTRODUCTION

Critical discourse analysis (CDA) is a wide-ranging approach taking discourse in any form as its object of study. Its scope, in principle, extends from grammatical and micro-sociological analyses to studies of wider social contexts on a macro-sociological level, often with reference to global political movements, ideologies, and market tendencies, and often with an overt political agenda (Fairclough 1992, Wodak 1996, Chouliaraki & Fairclough 1999). It is hardly surprising, then, that CDA is confronted with various critiques. One way of framing these is in terms of contexts. According to Schegloff 1997, analysts prematurely place linguistic data in political and macro-sociological contexts. A strictly data-based and comprehensively text-internal analysis, he argues, is a precondition for considering contexts external to the text itself.

In my opinion, Schegloff has a point. The methodology devised by Fairclough (among others) insists on relating the text to SOCIAL PRACTICE in order to address political and societal issues (Fairclough 1992:86ff). Fairclough does not, however, sufficiently explicate what social theory lies behind the concept of social practice, or how text-external data should be incorporated in the analysis. It seems, then, that CDA is in danger of insisting on political agendas without simultaneously offering methods that adequately justify the analysis, independent of its political agenda.

This essay suggests some guidelines for strengthening the analysis of social practice in CDA. Taking a spoken interaction – a job interview – as its object of study, it seeks to demonstrate that close analyses of text may go hand in hand with analyses of social practice in such a way that the latter will not appear as an irrelevant and arbitrary context, but rather as offering much toward explaining what is going on.

FRAMEWORK

Job interviews may be approached from different angles. They are spoken interactions, and consequently some form of interaction analysis may be applied. However, since an aim of this article is to address wider social contexts, the analyses presented will not focus primarily on interactional aspects, although such aspects will inevitably be touched upon. In order to carry out a comprehensible analysis within a reasonable space, I shall focus predominantly on the language use and social practice of the applicant, playing down the interactional aspects.

Special attention will be given to RECONTEXTUALIZATION, the process by which speakers draw on existing discourses and discursive practices when facing new contexts. Following Linell (1998a: 154ff, 1998b), recontextualization may be defined broadly as the dynamic transfer and transformation of something from one interaction to another. Recontextualizations may be INTERTEXTUAL and INTERDISCURSIVE, drawing on texts, discourses, and discursive practices found in different interactions and at different points in time and space (Fairclough 1992; Linell 1998a: 156). Recontextualizations may also be INTRATEXTUAL, drawing on texts found within the ongoing interaction. The cases considered here are of the former kind. Since the analyses concern a wider social context, the focus is on recontextualizations ACROSS interactions – on participants' recycling of texts, discourses, and discursive practices learned outside the present interviews (cf. Bernstein 1990). An important aspect of the recontextualizations is their stylistic effects, in terms of constructing and modulating the relationship between participants and in terms of type-casting the interaction according to familiar social practices (Fairclough 1992:127). By drawing on different discursive practices, participants may engage with different levels of formality, intimacy, equality, etc., and they may endow the interaction with resonances of academia, casual conversation, pedagogic lecturing, and so forth.

Since the job interview focuses broadly on such matters as applicants' careers, qualifications, education, and family background, analysis of applicants' social history may be applied. The socio-historical analysis here draws on Pierre Bourdieu's work (1977, 1984, 1991, 1993), especially the concepts of FIELD, the various forms of CAPITAL, TRAJECTORY, HABITUS and TASTE. A field may be understood as a structured network of social practices and positions related to a trade or an area of production. Bourdieu 1993 is concerned with the field of cultural production, the net of social practices by which art is produced, consumed, evaluated, appreciated, and enjoyed, as well as the positions of agents in the field in terms of power, prestige, and influence – their capital – and the overall structure of positions in the field. A person's trajectory may be understood as the sequence of positions held by that person in one or more fields. A person's habitus may be understood as the dispositions inscribed by the trajectory. Habitus is a structured principle, working predominantly through the body rather than through some sort of creative intellect; it has been accumulated over the past, but it addresses the future in terms of generating the individual's preferences, choices, perspectives, reasoning, and so on. An important output of habitus is the person's taste, or attraction to certain practices and objects. Since it is a product of the habitus, taste has a double nature: On the one hand, it is immediate and emotional, beyond strategic calculation; on the other, it is structured by and fundamentally linked to power and social position.

Bourdieu's concepts incorporate socio-history into this analysis. On the macro level, we consider changes and developments in Danish society in such fields as semiconductor technology, production industry, management, and education; and on the micro level, a particular applicant's individual history, his trajectory and habitus, and also his social background and gender-related practices (Connell 1995). Consequently, the framework presented is sociolinguistic in that it relates social background to language. Social background, however, is conceived not just as a set of static variables, but also as an ongoing social process with local and global aspects. The overall aim is to present a linguistically informed version of the concept of habitus (Bourdieu 1977; cf. Hasan 1998, Chouliaraki & Fairclough 2000, Fairclough 2000).

Since habitus is a product of individual life history, socialization, and career trajectory, the case presented concerns an applicant with a specific habitus which enables and inspires him to follow certain strategies in the job interview. As will be demonstrated, these strategies are diverse. At one end of the spectrum, the applicant engages in informal, personal talk about his life story, thus interacting with the committee in a climate of intimacy and equality. At the other end, he gives speeches of a formal and academic kind; especially when the talk concerns academic capital, he also employs practices such as arguing and negotiating – even to the point of being considered a bluffer by committee members – thus interacting in a climate of distance and hostility.

I will investigate the creation of this habitus, arguing that it is a result of the applicant's career trajectory, as it is manifested in the various professional posi-

tions obtained by him in such fields as electronics manufacturing, sales, and management. The strategies produced by the habitus reflect experiences he has had in these positions. I shall also argue that this habitus is a result of social struggle: The applicant's movement through social strata, from the working class to and beyond the middle class, predisposes him for the practices of social struggle. And I shall argue, finally, that a habitus of this sort is also propelled by the ongoing project of enacting masculinity. All these motivations and sources are reflected in the strategies arising out of habitus in the job interview.

The outcome of the interview is, of course, an interactive achievement, and here we can see the shortcomings of habitus. The strategies produced prove ill-suited in terms of interactively realizing the applicant's presumed aims. Mainly, the interview is not felicitous; the applicant does not make a favorable impression. His style of interaction is identified by committee members as a cunning salesman's style. His use of negotiating techniques during talk on hard facts – e.g., regarding academic capital and professional experiences – is perceived as misleading. His verbal skills are certainly acknowledged by committee members in the discussions after the interview, but they are also perceived as deceptive and overly dominant. During the interview, the applicant's talk more than once leads to trouble in the form of harsh reactions from the committee.

The fact that an experienced professional, such as this applicant, let things go this far may be explained with reference to the embodiment of practices of social struggle. His career trajectory, primarily one of transition through positions of increasing power and prestige, is based on practical experience; coming from a working-class background, he possesses no academic credentials. His professional experience is symbolic capital, growing with each new position obtained. However, it is also capital that is gradually losing its value as academic training, rather than practical experience, becomes a key qualification in the Danish business sector. Consequently, in his professional life, the applicant is constantly threatened by his lack of academic capital, and from this perspective, the radical strategies he employs in the interview are intelligible as acts of compensation and struggle. Furthermore, they are intelligible as acts of the body – as embodied forms of talk – because they are reproduced in a context to which they are clearly not well adapted. Struggling with the interviewers predictably will not lead to success in job interviews.

FIELDWORK AND DATA

The interview analyzed is drawn from a corpus of 41 job interviews recorded in four major Danish companies (5,000+ employees) in 1994 and 1995 (Scheuer 1998, 2001). During the fieldwork, several types of data were collected. The following events were tape-recorded: the committee's talk before each job interview; the job interviews; the committee's discussions after each job interview; the committee's final evaluation of the interviews, including the choice of can-

didate; and a retrospective interview with each applicant. I was present throughout all situations except the final evaluation.

In the present case, the retrospective interview took place about two months after the job interview. The applicant, Niels, had listened to the recording of the original interview the day before we met. Our session lasted more than two hours. This interview provided research data on Niels's social background, in terms of background variables such as class and educational level, and also in terms of life history, private as well as professional. My analyses of his socialization, trajectory, habitus, and other characteristics draw on these data.

SETTING

The vacant position was that of manager of a purchasing department, responsible for about 20 employees and a rapidly growing yearly budget of DEK 300 million, corresponding to U.S. \$40 million. The company made extensive use of advanced electronic equipment, and many of the purchased articles were of a technical nature.

The committee had six members, five men and one woman, between 40 and 65 years old. Some ranked below the vacant position in the hierarchy, others above it. The committee spokesman, the chief of the section, was seated opposite Niels, as was the director of the division, the hierarchically highest-ranked company representative. The person who was soon to retire from the position was also present.

Before the interview, the committee members had discussed Niels's written application, which had given rise to ambivalent feelings. The application had given an impression of professional mastery and was considered very well formulated and persuasive – but perhaps too much so. Committee members had reflected upon whether the style of the application resulted from consultation, and thus the application had not given an impression of authenticity.

Niels, a male in his early forties, wore a dark lilac suit and a tie, short hair, no beard, and rather small steel-framed glasses. He was a short man, solid but not fat, and physically fast-moving and agile. He entered the room in a dynamic way, energetically insisting on shaking hands with everyone, which was a bit awkward because of the physical arrangements.

During the handshaking, Niels remarked that he recognized the director; he was positive that the two of them had met before. The director had no parallel recollection. This incident may have reinforced mistrust of Niels among the committee members; it was rather obvious from manner of dress and physical position who were the influential members of the committee, and whom one might benefit from being acquainted with.

STRIVING FOR CO-MEMBERSHIP

The six recorded job interviews at this company all followed a standard procedure, as described by Adelswärd (1988:35ff; cf. Akinaso & Seabrook Ajitrotutu 1982, Scheuer 2001). The committee spokesman briefly introduced the members

(as well as me) and gave a five-minute speech about the formal structure of the organization. The next step was to invite the applicant to present herself or himself by giving an introductory speech. Extracts (1), (2), and (3) below are consecutive passages from the beginning of Niels's introductory speech.¹

(1) 8.2–8.8

- 1 A – eh jeg kan godt sige lidt mere jeg kan sige at
 2 at jeg har jo osse på >familiesiden en indgangsvinkel til {hosting
 3 company}< på den måde at min eh: ↑morfar, (0.5) han var
 4 i:eh: tolv år – restauratør for::: restauranten – i: {name} al↑LÉ!
 5 (0.7) og [det] var jo i sin tid ikke en kantine >men en egentlig<
 6 C1 [hm]
 7 restaurant. (0.4) og den drev han i mange år. (0.8) og da han så, (0.4)
 8 eh holdt op med det, (0.4) så overtog min mormor: den lille
 9 choko↑ladekiosk inde: i den store sal man kommer ind i, (0.3) og hænger
 10 sit tøj oppe og den har hun haft – indtil den faktisk blev nedlagt,
 11 (0.4) jeg tror ikke den er der mere. (0.5) eller osse så er den,
 12 C2 nej den er [lukket.]
 13 A [nej] den har hun – eh [hun] – hun er jo på
 14 () [()]
 15 A plejehjem nu ik [men]
 16 C1 [ja] okay
 17 A jeg har sådan haft familiemæssige [relationer] og er faktisk
 18 () [(cough)]
 19 A kommet en del der inde osse.=
 20 C1 =aha ((spoken silently))
 21 (0.7)

- 1 A I can tell a bit more, I can tell that
 2 I have also got a family related perspective on {hosting
 3 company} in the respect that my grandfather, he was
 4 for twelve years the keeper of the restaurant in <name> street.
 5 And back in those days it wasn't a canteen but a proper
 6 C1 Ah.
 7 restaurant. And he kept it for many years. And when he
 8 stopped, then my grandmother took over the little
 9 kiosk in the large hall you enter through, and hang
 10 up your clothes, and she kept it until it was actually closed down.
 11 I don't think it exists any more. Or perhaps it does.
 12 C2 No, it has been closed.
 13 A No, she has, she is in
 15 a home now, right, but
 16 C1 Yes. Okay.
 17 A I have had sort of family relations and have actually
 19 been in there often too. (i.e. in the hosting company)
 20 C1 Ah.

In (1), Niels introduces into the professional setting of the job interview a discourse of personal family history; by means of recontextualization, he produces a personalized account of peripheral qualifications. The family history is adjusted to his present audience and purposes. Historical details of rooms and departments are foregrounded: the nature of the grandfather's restaurant and the scenery surrounding the grandmother's kiosk is described in some detail in lines

4–7 and 8–10, whereas the grandparents’ doings are not given much attention. The definite form of the nominal phrases in lines 4 and 8–9 (*restauranten, den lille chokoladekiosk, den store sal* ‘the restaurant’, ‘the little kiosk’, ‘the large hall’) indicates that Niels presupposes that these rooms and departments are parts of collective memory (Givón 1984), and rightly so, as demonstrated by the committee’s answer in line 12. Thus, the aspects common to Niels and the committee members – familiar company scenes and company history – are foregrounded. In (1), personalization is more than a means to present Niels as an individual; it also establishes a common ground. The job interview continues in (2):

(2) 8.8–10.1

- 22 A jeg er osse kommet derind på en anden front, (0.5) eh::
 23 ved at jeg:: oprindelig, (0.4) er radioamatør – for mange mange år
 24 til[bage], (0.5) og var allerede som sekstenårig
 25 () [((clears throat))]
 26 A kortbølgeamatør, (0.6) og det gjorde at jeg havde: blandt andet en god
 27 venn der var:: tekniker i:ehm::, (0.3) i {hosting company} og blev
 28 uddannet der som – som tekniker, (0.5) så der havde jeg så osse min
 29 gang i {departments} og::, (0.5) og i de tekniske dele herude og det
 30 fortsatte jo så, (0.5) til vi så går over i min karriere – da jeg::
 31 effter, (0.7) mange år at have siddet på:: laboratorier og lavet
 32 elektronik det gjorde jeg i ti år, (0.6) eh:: på baggrund af min
 33 eh:: hobby, (0.5) kom jeg hurtigt ind i elektronikbranchen, (0.3)
 34 fik en grunduddannelse som: som radiomekaniker – læste videre senere
 35 til elektroniktekniker og havde så ti år, (0.3) hvor jeg udelukkende
 36 lavede elektronik, (0.8) og da jeg så var færdig som konstruktør var
 37 jeg klar over at jeg >godt ville prøve noget andet< og så hoppede jeg
 38 så over i, (0.4) det mere (0.3) forretningsorienterede (0.3) udadvendte
 39 (0.4) eh:: at – arbejde, (0.3) og så blev jeg salgssingeniør hos
 40 {company}, (0.5) og det var jeg i nogen år, (0.9) og:eh:: rejste::
 41 (0.4) land og rige rundt – havde jeg nær sagt altså det var
 42 selvfølgelig:: med kunder – hovedsageligt i danmark – eller udelukkende
 43 danmark men, (0.3) der var jo en meget stor leverandørkreds – i hele
 44 europa, (0.4) som jeg besøgte, (0.4) og:eh havde besøg af her og tog
 45 rundt med – og:: {hosting company} og {branch} her især var jo en af
 46 de gode kunder,
 47 () ((snorts))
 48 A hvo– hvor jeg ofte var ude at tale jeg tror der var en {full name}
 49 som jeg husker [mest].
 50 C5 [nå ()] [han] er her stadigvæk=
 51 () [(ja)] ((whispering))
 52 A =ja. (1.7)

- 22 A I have been in there often also for other reasons,
 23 since I am originally a radio amateur from many many years
 24 back, and was already at the age of sixteen
 26 a short wave amateur. And because of that I had among others a good
 27 friend who was a technician, in {hosting company} and was
 28 trained there as a technician. So at that time I frequented
 29 {departments} too and, and also the technical divisions out here and
 30 that continued, until we proceed into my career. When I,
 31 after having spent many years in laboratories manufacturing

- 32 electronics I did that for ten years, on account of my
 33 hobby, I quickly made my way into the electronics trade,
 34 got a basic education as a radio mechanic, studied on later
 35 to become an electronics technician and spent ten years exclusively
 36 manufacturing electronics. And then, when I was finished as a constructor
 37 I knew that I would like to try something else, so I leaped
 38 into the more business-oriented and extrovert
 39 kind of work, and then I was employed as a sales engineer with
 40 {company}, and this I was for some years. And I was driven,
 41 from pillar to post, one might say, it was
 42 with clients of course, mainly in Denmark, or exclusively
 43 Denmark but, there was a large group of contractors, in all
 44 of Europe, whom I visited, and saw here and accompanied,
 45 and {hosting company} and {branch} here especially was one of
 47 the larger customers,
 48 where I often spoke to, I think it was {full name}
 49 whom I remember the most.
 50 C5 Oh. He is still here.
 51 () Yes.
 52 A Yes.

In (2), Niels gives an account of his early professional experiences. As in (1), the account is personalized. In lines 23–30, he explains his entrance into the field of electronics through an account of personal hobbies and friendships. The extract has a somewhat narrative feeling: Niels presents himself as a first-person-singular agent in events chronologically arranged by means of several temporal junctures. Thus, his career history is presented in a format well suited for personalization and deformalization (Labov 1972).

The project of establishing common ground is taken further. More presumably collective memories are called upon: in lines 23 and 26, the male stereotype of a *radioamatør* and a *kortbølgeamatør* ‘radio amateur’, ‘shortwave amateur’; in 34 and 35, the positions in the field of electronics in those days, *radiomekaniker* and *elektroniktekniker* ‘radio mechanic’, ‘electronics technician’; in 31–32 and 36, the manual procedures associated with the field in those days, *lave elektronik* ‘manufacturing electronics’; and in 48, his acquaintance with a person still working in the company. The interview continues in (3):

(3) 10.1–10.4

- 53 A eh: så: jeg er kommet her meget på [det] tidspunkt der.
 54 () [()]
 55 A (0.5) på et ↑tidspunkt – eh søger jeg nye udfordringer det var jo i de
 56 der: eh: dage:: hvor det der med: job det var jo bare noget man slog
 57 op i avisen og så tog man en telefon og så havde man et nyt job, (0.5)
 58 ved ikke om i kan huske det men sådan var [det] dengang
 59 C5 [jo]
 60 C1 HE HE [.HHH]
 61 C5 [jo]
 62 A de dage de er [jo:
 63 C1 [sådan var vi alle!=
 64 A =[DE ER JO MEGET ANDERLEDES I DAG!]
 65 C [((ROARING LAUGHTER))]

- 53 A So I was here a lot at the time.
 55 A At some moment I begin looking for new challenges, it was in
 56 those days when a job was just something you picked out from
 57 a newspaper and then you got on the phone and there was your new job,
 58 don't know if you remember, but it was like that then.
 59 C5 Yes.
 60 C1 (Laughter)
 61 C1 Yes.
 62 A Those days are
 63 C1 We were all like that!
 64 A THEY ARE QUITE DIFFERENT TODAY!
 65 C (LAUGHTER)

Judged by the interaction, Niels is successful; there is plenty of rapport. The committee responds by giving supportive feedback and by offering additional information on certain collective memories, as in lines 12 and 50. The reference in 55–57 to the days when jobs were easily accessible and the remark in 57, *ved ikke om i kan huske det* ‘don't know if you remember’, even leads up to laughter and camaraderie in 59–65.

The language use – as well as the handshaking and the recognition of the director mentioned above – indicates that Niels is striving from the very beginning to induce a communicative style characterized by intimacy, familiarity, and equality. This is probably an excellent strategy. As Erickson & Shultz 1982 have shown, *co-membership* – shared backgrounds in terms of life history details – is critical in interactions with career GATEKEEPERS.

NARRATED DIALOGUE

Toward the end of Niels's introductory speech, (4) occurred. Niels is describing how an acquaintance of his, a managing director, tried to persuade him to accept a job as a manager of a production center:

(4) 14.9–15.3

- 1 A og:eh:: spurgte om ikke jeg havde lyst til at komme ud og blive:
 2 produktionschef, (0.6) og ansvarlig for et helt produktionscenter,
 3 (0.4) og det sagde jeg, (0.5) fandemig nej – det har jeg slet ikke lyst
 4 til fordi det er jo et brud på min karrie:re og [jeg] er jo
 5 () [mm]
 6 mere foretningsmand og indkøb er i øvrigt mit, (0.3) mit mit
 7 hjertebarn så det har jeg ikke lyst til. (0.5) men han bliver ↑ved med
 8 at bearbejde mig og:eh::: jo mere han fik fortalt jo mere lød s– eh::
 9 den her – ↑stilling, (0.4) og til sidst så bød han mig ti tusind mere
 10 om måneden og så: er: der jo:: nogen der bliver svage i knæene og jeg
 11 var en af dem, (1.1) og:: jeg sagde så ↑ja, (1.6) og gik så ind i det
 12 job.
- 1 A (He) . . . asked if I wouldn't like to come out there and become
 2 manager of production, and be in charge of a center of production.
 3 And I said, hell no, I don't feel like that at all
 4 because that is a break in my career and I am

6 more of a salesman and besides purchasing is my, my
 7 first love so I don't feel like that. But he keeps
 8 working on me and, the more he told me, the more
 9 this job sounded, and finally he offered me ten thousand (\$1400) more
 10 a month and then some people get weak, you know, and I
 11 was one of them. And I consequently said yes and took this
 12 job.

In (4), Niels's commitment to the field of sales is demonstrated. Niels characterizes himself as a *forretningsmand* 'salesman', and he emphasizes his emotional attachment through the phrase *mit hjertebarn* lit. 'the child of my heart', in the gloss 'my first love'. This expression implies that immediate and honest feelings were involved, as opposed to cynical strategic career calculation (Bourdieu 1984:372–74).

Again, the talk follows a narrative format featuring temporally organized dramatized events. The narrative's *raison d'être* in this context is to account for the fact that Niels left the field of sales. He has to account for this shift because the vacant position relates to sales and not to production. The events are dramatized more than in (1). Niels uses reported speech, with curses in it. This gives an air of authenticity; there is a difference between claiming to be committed to sales and narrating events demonstrating the commitment (Vincent & Perrin 1999).

Thus, recontextualization – in the form of applying narrative formats in the job interview – is not only allowing Niels to talk in accordance with a relaxed and democratic lifeworld ethos (Fairclough 1992:147), it is also strengthening his accountability. In this perspective, the strategy of aiming at closeness and equality is a strategy of obtaining control, of committing the interviewers to the truth of Niels' statements.

STYLIZATION

In all the job interviews in the corpus, the introductory speeches were followed by series of questions from the committee (Scheuer 2001). Excerpt (5) is drawn from this phase of Niels's interview:

(5) 32.3–36.0

1 C2 eh: (0.9) kandidateksamen. (0.4) [på] dieu (0.3) [og]
 2 A [ja] [ja]
 3 C2 handelshøjskole i århus, (0.4)
 4 A ja=
 5 C2 = {name of course providers}.
 6 A ja
 7 C2 de– det er:: vældig flotte ord. (1.1) kan du prøve:
 8 ((brings fist down)) – at=
 9 A =vil du kigge? ((offering diploma))
 10 C2 ja::men jeg har set det,=
 11 A =har du [set det? ((high pitch, lively))
 12 C2 [men vil du ikke prøve at beskrive over for:: for:: – for::
 13 ansættelsesudvalget her, (0.3) hvad er det? (0.5) det drejer sig om? (4.1)
 14 A det drejer sig om, (1.1) at (2.2) det: for – ikke alene dansk

- 15 erhvervsliv men osse for:: for for alle – eh: inden for det offentlige.
 16 (0.8) at (0.7) kvalitet (0.5) generelt er i fokus, (0.4) i øjeblikket.
 17 (1.9) at:eh:: – at man – osse – eh:: især med: (0.9) implementering
 18 af edb, (0.9) i alle (0.5) eh: dele af organisationen, (1.4)
 19 er bleven klar over at – eh:: man osse er nødt til at have mennesket
 20 med. (2.4) den uddannelse jeg har fået her, (0.4) eh:: >jeg kan
 21 egentlig bedst lide at kalde det en uddannelse frem for et kursus for
 22 det er jo en længerevarende sag<. (0.8) den går – meget på (0.8)
 23 at (0.9) kvalitetsstyring – ikke bare er et noget: administrativt ()
 24 man sætter i gang. (0.5) altså det er ikke bare noget iso ni tusind,
 25 (0.5) som gør at man skal overholde nogen bestemte regler på nogen
 26 bestemte områder og lave en bestemt form for dokumentation, (0.3)
 27 men den handler om, (0.4) at de mennesker – som er med i den organisme
 28 det handler om, (0.8) er – motiverede – og føler sig som en del af den
 29 kvalitet, (0.4) som organisationen præsterer. (1.4) og så handler hele
 30 det her uddannelsesforløb om – hvordan håndterer man egentlig det i
 31 praksis, (0.4) når man som projektledere eller (0.4) deltager eller på
 32 anden vis – er med i et sådant forløb. (2.0) og det vil sige det går
 33 jo på:, – > hvis man læser overskrifterne det har noget med:< (0.4)
 34 eh::: man lærer nogen – (me– m–) nogen værktøjer (0.3) at k– at at
 35 bruge: i forbindelse med:: – med:: hvis to – afdelinger skal arbejde
 36 mere sammen, (0.9) altså man har jo:: mange steder i virksomheder
 37 i [dag], (0.4) [eh:: eh::]
 38 () [()] [((clears throat))]
 39 A optimeret enkeltafdelinger, (0.3) men man er osse nået frem til det,
 40 (0.4) eh:: til den konstatering (0.4) at – hvis man skal længere
 41 så er det:, (0.3) kontaktfladerne imellem afdelingerne man skal ind
 42 at arbejde med for ligesom at [få] – det totale
 43 () [((clears throat))]
 44 A til at blive bedre. (0.7) og (d–) (0.3) det er nogen proces ser, (0.3)
 45 man skal have sat i gang som kræver nogen værktøjer. (0.8) mod–
 46 motivation altså det her handler meget om ledelses (0.3) teknikker –
 47 i praksis, (1.7) så det er ikke nogen iso ni tusind uddannelse =
 48 C2 =((coughs silently))
 49 A overhovedet (0.6) men men i høj grad: en uddannelse, (0.4) eh omkring
 50 det at have med mennesker at gøre, (0.4) eh som skal præstere en eller
 51 anden::, (0.4) kvalitet i en sammenhæng, (1.3) ved ikke om (at) jeg kan
 52 forklare det tydeligere, (0.7)
 53 C3 [eh: hvor lang] tid tog den uddannelse du?
 54 () [()]
 55 C1 et halvt år
 56 C3 et halvt år ((spoken silently))
 57 A ja – den løb over et halvt år. (1.7) foregik i århus, (0.3)
 58 den eh:: den er initieret – af (1.4) danske ingeniørers
 59 [efteruddannelse, (0.4)] i et samarbejde med: nogen professorer
 60 C1 [((coughs))]
 61 A på århus, (0.4) universitet – >og disse professorer< har specialiseret
 62 sig i: – ledelsesteknikker og kvalitetsstyring, (0.8) og:eh:::
 63 de tre professorer eh eh de har specialiseret sig, (0.5) eh: på hver
 64 deres område, (0.4) og der er:: – den ene for eksempel specialiseret
 65 i – hvordan måler man egentlig kvalitet så han er meget matematisk og
 66 målingsorienteret >der er en der meget<, (0.5) ledelses og
 67 menneskeorienteret og så er der en der går specifikt på, (0.3)
 68 kvalitet, (0.8) suppleret med dieu siden, (1.5) og:eh::m og det er::
 69 et et et s– et me↑get eh:: omfattende forløb man så har sat op,
 70 (0.5) og som ER EN: (0.6) en ehm::: (2.2) egentlig b– egentlig

- 71 betragter man den s:tod:: på niveau som en kandidatgrad, (0.5) eller
 72 sludder som et et eh:: liniefag tror jeg det hedder, (1.1) på (0.8)
 73 på:eh: cand merc studiet, (0.7)
- 74 C1 hm↑hm (1.5)
 75 A s::varer det på – dit spørgsmål?
 76 C2 det gør det helt klart.
 77 A okay
 78 C2 helt klart ((whispering))
 79 A og det har været meget spændende (vil jeg osse sige)
 80 C2 ja=
 81 A =meget [spændende
 82 C2 [det kan jeg:: –> det er jeg ikke i tvivl om<, ·hhh har du:eh::, (0.4) nej jeg
 vil godt stille dig et andet spørgsmål.
- 1 C2 A Master's degree from DIEU (ie abbreviation for institution providing in-service
 training courses for Danish engineers) and
 2 A Yes.
 3 C2 The School of Economics and Business Administration in Århus
 4 A Yes.
 5 C2 and {name of course providers}.
 6 A Yes.
 7 C2 Those are impressive words. Would you try to
 8 (brings fist down) to
 9 A Would you like to see for yourself? (waving diploma)
 10 C2 Yes, but I have seen it.
 11 A You have seen it?
 12 C2 But wouldn't you try to describe to
 13 this committee: what is it? what is the point?
 14 A The point is that not only in the Danish
 15 business sector, but for everyone within the public sector as well,
 16 quality is generally the main focus these days.
 17 That businesses, especially with the implementation
 18 of information technology in all branches of the organization,
 19 have become aware of the fact that you have to take the human being
 20 into account. The education I have gone through here – I
 21 prefer to call it an education rather than a course, because
 22 it is a process of long duration – it focusses very much on the fact
 23 that quality control is not only a something administrative
 24 you set going, it is not just a bit of ISO 9000 (i.e. standards for work procedures in
 business organizations)
 25 committing you to observe certain rules in
 26 certain areas and produce a certain kind of documentation,
 27 but it is about that the persons who are part of the organism
 28 concerned are motivated and think of themselves as a part of the
 29 quality provided by the organization. And then this complete
 30 education is about: how do you handle this in actual
 31 practice when you as a project leader or participant or in
 32 another way take part in such a process. And therefore this is
 33 about, if you go by the headlines, it is about,
 34 you are taught some tools
 35 for use in relation to if two departments are to work
 36 closer together, many branches in business companies have
 37 today
 38 optimized individual departments, but one has also come to
 39 to the conclusion that if one is to progress further
 40 it is the contact between departments one has to
 41 work with in order to sort of make
 42

- 44 the totality better. And these are processes
 45 you have to get going, requiring certain tools,
 46 motivation, this is very much about management techniques
 47 in practice. So it is no ISO 9000 education
 48 at all, but to a high degree an education centered on
 50 relating to people that are to produce some
 51 sort of quality in a certain context. Don't know if I can
 52 explain it more clearly ...
 53 C3 How long did that education take?
 55 C1 Half a year.
 56 C3 Half a year.
 57 A Yes, it lasted half a year took place in Århus.
 58 It is initiated by the Danish Engineers'
 59 Continuing Education (ie DIEU) in co-operation with professors
 61 from the University of Århus, and these professors have specialized
 62 within managing techniques and quality control, and
 63 the three professors have specialized within separate
 64 areas, and there is, one of them for instance has specialized
 65 in how to actually measure quality, so he is very mathematical and
 66 measurement oriented, there is one that is very much management and
 67 human resources oriented, and then there is one specifically going for
 68 quality supplemented by the DIEU perspective. And it is a
 69 a very elaborate process they have set up,
 70 it is actually
 71 it is regarded as an equivalent to a Master's degree, or
 72 nonsense, as a line course² I think it is called in
 73 business administration studies.
 74 C1 Ah.
 75 A Does that answer your question?
 76 C2 It definitely does.
 77 A Okay.
 78 C2 Definitely. (whispering)
 79 A And it was most exciting I would like to add.
 80 C2 Yes.
 81 A Most exciting.
 82 C2 I can, I am sure it was, do you, no I would like to ask you something else.

In (1) and (4), Niels recontextualizes informal discursive practices; in (5), he draws on the formal discourses of management theory.

The account in lines 14–51 of what leadership and optimization of business organizations is about, is textbook material and textbook quality; it is a convincing reproduction of some core aspects of contemporary organizational theory (Euske & Roberts 1987, Monge & Miller 1988). The terminology is characterized by such terms and phrases as *kvalitet*, *kvalitetsstyring*, *iso ni tusinde*, *organisationen*, *virksomheder*, *motivation*, *implemtering af edb*, *ledelses teknikker – i praksis* ('quality', 'quality control', 'ISO 9000', 'the organization', 'businesses', 'motivation', 'the implementation of IT', 'techniques of leadership in practice'). Organizations are called *organisme* 'organism', departments are *optimeret* 'optimized', leadership is about using *værktøjer* 'tools' for improving *kontaktfladerne* 'interfaces' between *afdelinger* 'departments', and ascertaining that employees, who are referred to as *mennesker* lit. 'human beings', are *motiverede* 'motivated' by thinking of themselves *som en del af den kvalitet*, *som*

organisationen præsterer ‘as a part of the quality provided by the organization’. This is modern management wording par excellence.

Another characteristic is Niels’s use of prosody. Consider, for instance, extract (6), consisting of lines 14–20 in (5), now divided into intonation units, each started off by an onset (cf Grønnum 1983, 1986, 1992).³

(6) (4.1)

- | | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | A | det ↑DREjer sig OM (1.1) |
| | | ‘the point is’ |
| 2 | | AT (2.2) |
| | | ‘that’ |
| 3 | | DET: FOR (.); |
| | | ‘for’ |
| 4 | | ↑IKke alEne DANSK erHVERVSliv. |
| | | ‘not only the Danish business sector’ |
| 5 | | men OSse for:: for for ALle (.) eh:: |
| | | ‘but also for everyone’ |
| 6 | | INden for det Offentlige. (0.8) |
| | | ‘within the public administration’ |
| 7 | | AT (0.7) |
| | | ‘that’ |
| 8 | | kvali↑TET (0.5) geneRELt er i FOKus (0.4) i ØJeblikket. (1.9) |
| | | ‘quality generally is the focus at the moment’ |

This is not fluid speech. Pauses are frequent, and some are very long, as before line 1 and in lines 1, 2, and 6. But neither is it hesitant or uncertain speech; on the contrary, it gives the impression of linguistic composure and preplanning. As pointed out by Jaworski 1993, silence may serve just about any communicative purpose, and in (6), it serves stylistic purposes.

Consider the clause expressed in lines 1–8. In terms of information structure, it may be divided into TOPIC and FOCUS – the entity talked about, and the most important information given (Dik 1989:264ff): *det drejer sig om* ‘the point is’ in 1, and *kvalitet generelt er i fokus* ‘quality generally is the focus’ in 8, respectively.

The phrase in line 1 expressing the topic echoes the last part of the committee member’s question; cf. line 13 in (5). Thus, it is made absolutely clear that this is the second part of a question-answer adjacency pair, and what the topic is.

In the given syntactic context, the conjunction *at* ‘that’ in line 2 expresses the boundary between topic and focus. This word is given special attention: Niels isolates and thus highlights it by means of pauses in lines 1 and 2. Thus, the pauses make it conspicuous for the listeners that salient information will follow, that the clause focus is next to come. The pauses in 1 and 2 are longish, and tension consequently builds up. Moreover, the focus is not expressed immediately. Instead, in 3–6 the ground for the focus to come is additionally prepared by a CIRCUMSTANTIAL OF EXTENT AND LOCATION stating the significant scope of the information coming up (Halliday 1994:152f). And after that, in 7, the conjunction ‘that’ is repeated and again highlighted by means of pauses, once again announcing the upcoming focus. Thus, the focus, given at last in line 8, is carefully prepared.

Prosodically, the passage consists of eight intonational units, three of which begin with relatively high onsets: lines 1, 4, and 8. Couper-Kuhlen (2001:43) suggests that high onset is a prosodic means of projecting “more to come,” so in terms of prosody there is a buildup too – given that Couper-Kuhlen’s observation applies in Danish (cf. Grønnum 1992:46f). Furthermore, it is remarkable that the pitch falls to low several times, at the ends of lines 4, 6, and 8. The straightforward case would be that low pitch would occur in 8 only, marking the end of the utterance (Grønnum 1986). However, as it is, several parts within the clause are prosodically expressed as if they were clauses, or, in other words, as self-contained units of speech. This goes for 4 as well as for 5–6, the first and second halves of the circumstantial of extent and location, and for 8, the embedded clause expressing the focus of the embedding clause. Thus, prosody meticulously spells out the structure of the utterance.

Niels is generally a fast talker; the stereotype of the slow-talking Scandinavian certainly does not apply to him. On the contrary, Niels is generally rather competitive when it comes to floor access (cf. 1–13 in (5)). Therefore, by his standards, the pace in (6) is markedly slow.

By various linguistic means, then, Niels makes the textual structure not just lucid, but blatantly lucid, thereby creating stylistic effects. He gives the impression of planning his speech carefully and of giving maximum attention to oral performance; thus, he employs a formal, nonspontaneous style. By also evidencing a marked degree of transparency, Niels makes it clear that he is carrying out the practice of explaining. He thereby claims a position for himself equivalent to that of a performer of pedagogy, a lecturer revealing an academic discipline to an audience of novices.

Adding to the style is the structure of *CLAUSE COMPLEXES* (Halliday 1994: 215ff). In brief, ‘clause complex’ designates a clause, or a clause expanded by one or more other clauses (Halliday 1994:225–50). An example is the passage in lines 20–29 in (5) above. In order to demonstrate the structure of this clause complex, a version with numbered clauses is given in (7) below; the English gloss is modified somewhat in order to reflect Danish syntax more closely.

The beginning and the end of each numbered clause are marked by #*n* and *n*#, respectively. Expanding clauses, embedded clauses included, are conceived as part of the expanded clause. Thus, clause 1 ends when clause 5 ends, since 5 is embedded in 1. Clause 5 ends when clause 7 ends, since 7 is an expansion of 5, and so on:

- (7)
- #0 #1 (2.4) den uddannelse #2 jeg har fået her, 2# #3 (0.4) eh:: >jeg kan egentlig bedst lide at kalde det en uddannelse frem for et kursus #4 for det er jo en længerevarende sag<. 4# 3# (0.8) den går – meget på #5 (0.8) at (0.9) kvalitetsstyring – ikke bare er et noget: administrativt () #6 man sætter i gang. 6# #7 (0.5) altså det er ikke bare noget iso ni tusind, #8 (0.5) som gør #9 at man skal overholde nogen bestemte regler på nogen bestemte områder #10 og lave en bestemt form for dokumentation, 10# 9# 8# 7# 5# 1# #11 (0.3) men den handler om, #12 (0.4) at de menesker – #13 som er med i den organisme #14 det handler om, 14# 13# (0.8) er –

motiverede – #15 og føler sig som en del af den kvalitet, #16 (0.4) som organisationen præsterer. 16# 15# 12# 11# 0#

#0 #1 the education #2 I have gone through here 2# #3 I prefer to call it an education rather than a course #4 because it is a process of long duration 4# 3# it focuses very much on the fact #5 that quality control is not only a something administrative #6 you set going 6# #7 it is not just a bit of ISO 9000 #8 which has the effect #9 that you are committed to observe certain rules in certain areas #10 and produce a certain kind of documentation 10# 9# 8# 7# 5# 1# #11 but it deals with the fact #12 that the people #13 that participate in the organism #14 it is about 14# 13# are motivated #15 and think of themselves as a part of the quality #16 that the organization provides 16# 15# 12# 11# 0#

The total clause complex, clause 0, consists of two clauses, 1 and 11 respectively. The former expresses what is not the case regarding Niels's education, whereas the latter expresses what is the case. Thus, in terms of interdependency and logico-semantic, the latter clause is a PARATACTIC EXTENSION of the former, or a REPLACIVE VARIATION (Halliday 1994:230).

Clause 1 comprises three clauses: 2, 3, and 5. Clause 2 is a defining relative clause, qualifying the nominal *uddannelse* 'education' (Halliday 1994:188). Clause 3 is an enclosed HYPOTACTIC ELABORATION, commenting on terminology. It comprises 4, a HYPOTACTIC ENHANCEMENT giving a reason for Niels' terminological preferences. Clause 5 is the complement of the predication *går – meget på* 'focuses intensely on', expressing facts about *kvalitetsstyring* 'quality control' (Halliday 1994:242ff).⁴ It comprises two clauses: 6 and 7. Clause 6 is a hypotactic elaboration characterizing the nominal group *noget: administrativt* 'something administrative'. Clause 7 is a PARATACTIC ELABORATION, an EXPOSITION explaining facts about quality control in other words. It comprises 8, a hypotactic elaboration characterizing the nominal group *iso ni tusind* 'ISO 9000'. Clause 8, in turn, comprises 9, the complement of the predication *gør* 'causes, has the effect'. Clause 9 comprises 10, a paratactic extension adding to the described effects of quality control.

Clause 11 comprises 12, the complement of the predication *handler om* 'deals with'. Clause 12 comprises two clauses: 13 and 15. Clause 13 is a defining relative containing another defining relative, 14. Both qualify nominals in embedding clauses. Clause 15 is a paratactic extension adding to the description of the mental state of the employees forming the organization. It comprises clause 16, a defining relative clause qualifying the nominal 'quality' in 15.

Altogether, clause complex 0 contains sixteen clauses, and eleven of these are expanded by other clauses. Three clauses are complements, and four are defining relatives. Thus, seven clauses are embedded. Eight clauses are non-embedded expanding clauses – that is, elaborating, extending, or enhancing dominant clauses. Four of these are hypotactically related to the dominant clauses, and four are paratactically related. Therefore, since embedded clauses are also hypotactically related to embedding clauses, the dominant type of interdependency is hypotaxis. In other words, the clause complex is rather close-knit.

In the light of the analysis above, it is fair to say that Niels's talk is organized in large chunks, comprising numerous expanding clauses and rich in logico-semantic relations. In terms of quantity and quality, then, the extract is a tour de force. At the same time, the information structure is nevertheless transparent. By means of replacive variation, Niels places the information most salient in the context – what his education actually consisted of – in the position where new information is expected to go: to the extreme right in clause 0, in clause 11 (Halliday 1994:296; Dik 1989:266). Thus, clause 1, actually the major part of the extract, serves preparing purposes: It sets up the proper context for the information to come, and some potential misunderstandings regarding *QUALITY CONTROL* are dealt with in advance. As in (6), then, the salient information is carefully prepared.

In terms of clause structure, as well, Niels adopts a style similar to that of formal lecturing. Talking in sizable chunks, rich in expanding clauses and internal logico-semantic relations and organized so that the salient information comes carefully prepared and in obvious positions, goes well with formal discursive practices such as pedagogy.

The stylistic variation in Niels's interview is considerable. Extract (1) features joking and mutual laughter, whereas (5) features formal lecturing. In the last case especially, it seems that *STYLIZATION* is the appropriate term for what is going on (Bakhtin 1981, Morson & Emerson 1990). The stylistic means employed by Niels are not subtle. The pace is markedly slow, pauses are markedly long, terminology is the jargon of management theory, and the structure of clauses is markedly complex, whereas information structure is markedly lucid. Thus, Niels makes it clear that this is “double-voiced” talking – that these discourses stem from and are authorized by academia.

STRUGGLE

Niels did not get the job. In light of the analysis above, this is perhaps somewhat surprising. He seems to manage well in many respects: He creatively recontextualizes life world discourses and management theory discourses; he accounts for his career in narrative formats and thereby obtains co-membership with committee members; and his interview exhibits stylistic variation that allows him at one point to participate in cheerful camaraderie, and at another to draw on the authority of academia. Now, however, I turn to some problematic features of the interview.

In one respect, Niels was a problematic applicant in the first place: He was not a university graduate. By formal standards, his educational level was low. It is evident from the committee's conversations before the interview that the director was aware of Niels's lack of formal education, and that he considered it to be a flaw in Niels's professional profile. It is evident from the retrospective interview that Niels expected his lack of formal education to present a problem.

Extract (5) presents a struggle focusing on this issue. In lines 1 and 4, the director reads aloud from Niels's curriculum vitae, addressing the question of education. His reading aloud is a significant and potentially face-threatening act, pointing to a problematic point in Niels's profile. In line 7 in (5), Niels responds by offering the director a copy of his exam diplomas. The director simply ignores the offer. Had he accepted, he would have found himself confronted with the symbolic authority of written documents. Consequently, the incident is part of a struggle to make Niels verbally accountable.

Apparently the phrase *kandidateksamen på dieu* 'a master's degree from DIEU' is in Niels's CV. This is a contradiction in terms: DIEU offers in-service courses for the master's in engineering but does not have the authority to give academic degrees. In formal terms, Niels does not have an academic degree, but apparently the written CV gives a different impression, and by saying *egentlig betragter man den stod på niveau som en kandidatgrad, eller sludder som et et eh liniefag tror jeg det hedder* 'actually it is regarded as an equivalent to a master's degree, or nonsense, as a line course I think it is called' in 70–72, Niels comes close to claiming that he is effectively educated to the master's level, though he does stop to correct himself halfway. Using the term *salgsingeniør* 'sales engineer' in 39 in (2) for a position he once held is a move of the same order. Formally speaking, Niels was not an engineer at the time, and still was not at the time of the interview.

From this perspective, it is obvious that Niels employs stylization in order to compensate. His well-formed orations are verbal substitutes for the written statements of academic degrees. His prolix formulations, and also his personalizing narratives, are face work aimed at repairing, if not denying, a flaw in an otherwise impeccable professional profile.

Struggle involves two parties. In (5), the committee participates through relatively brief turns. With regard to Niels's talk, the question in line 53 represents a distinct shift of perspective on the education – from theoretical content to duration, a blunt and non-negotiable measure of the level of academic competence obtained. It also represents a significant shift of style. The question ends with a deictic vocative tag, the second person singular personal pronoun *du* 'you' – a tag expressing a personal appeal and thus marking informality. Therefore, in the formal context of 14–52, 53 is conspicuous, discontinuous, and marked; it flouts the social norm of RECIPROCATION (Edmondson 1981, Erickson & Schultz 1982). Consequently, the question in 53 is not a simple question; it is part of a struggle about perspectives and styles. And in the eyes of the committee, it is a struggle won: Niels admits to the information given – and repeated – by committee members in 55 and 56.

I have argued that informal style may be thought of as a means of gaining control. The formal style of (5) may serve the same purpose. Well-formed orations of the kind in 14–52 and 57–73 in (5) may be ways of resisting dialogue by monopolizing the floor. In fact, Niels was the most voluble among the six appli-

TABLE 1. *Amount of words.*

Data on interviews	Niels	Average for all applicants
Number of words spoken	7935	4283
Percentage of speech	67%	50%
Mean length of turn	31	21
Maximum length of turn	607	322

cants; he was the high scorer on the four counts shown in Table 1. Niels's volubility rendered interviewing him difficult, and he was asked the fewest questions among applicants: 28, against an average of 59. It seems that he was aiming at staying in control by generally dominating the floor.

The committee also participated in the struggle by means of silence – by withholding minimal response (Jaworski 1993). Niels received the fewest minimal responses from the committee spokesman: once for every 180 words he spoke. The mean among applicants was 102 words. The committee did not support Niels's verbosity, and it was clear from the discussion after the interview that committee members found Niels's speech style annoying, dominating, and manipulative (see below).

EXPLICIT FACE THREATS

Extract (5) does not present an open dispute; meaning-making is implicit, and appearances are kept up. However, open struggle did occur in Niels's job interview. Niels's CV stated that, in one of his jobs, he was in charge of logistics in a large hardware store with a very high turnover rate.⁵ A committee member focused on this:

(8) 43.2–45.9

- 1 C4 ·h >men det var nu ikke det jeg ville spørge dig om men < jeg er fuld
 2 af beundring over at du kunne omsætte med (den) hasti-
 3 omsætningshastighed på fireogtyve=
 4 A =ja [det:]
 5 C4 [den] må du forklare mig nærmere det er jo hver fjortende dag du
 6 omsætter lageret fak[tisk]
 7 A [ja] det er korrekt. – og [jeg
 8 C4 [gjorde du virkelig
 9 det?=
 10 A =ja – det gjorde jeg.

... ((lengthy narrative from Niels on his work in the store; he explicitly states that it was not a regular *store*, but a *buffer* for short-lived storage before shipment, so a high turnover rate was normal))

- 11 C4 nej men det var det der med fireogtyve det slog mig helt ud
 12 () [()]
 13 C1 [JO MEN ALTSÅ][()]NIELS DU HAR
 14 A [DA JEG VAR – DA JEG VAR PÅ {COMPANY}
 DER LÅ DEN PÅ
 15 () [(committee members laugh and talk
 16 C1 SELV GIVET ()] jamen Niels lad – lad være med] – at
 17 A MELLEML EN HALV OG TRE ↑IK!]
 18 () committee members laugh and talk)]
 19 C1 snakke udenom=
 20 C4 =ja=
 21 C1 =du er kraftedeme lige så god som jeg er, (0.3) eller i hvert fald
 22 næsten lige så god=
 23 () =he
 24 C1 ·hh ehm – ved du hvad, (0.3) ↑det ↑du taler om – det er en
 25 ↑helt ↓anden situation end et normalt lager. – ·h for
 26 [↑ikke engang radiom–
 27 A [(det er jo) ikke noget lager=
 28 C1 =·h nej=
 29 A =det er ikke noget [lager,]
 30 C1 [nå men] det var bare det [jeg ville have] dig
 31 A [det er en buffer]
 32 til [at sige ↑ik
 33 A [det [er en buffer
 34 C4 [ja ha ha ha
 ... ((long discussion on stores and buffers))
 35 C1 men altså – eh m:in imponerethed forsvandt.
 36 () ((committee members laugh))
 37 C4 ja det gjorde min også.
 38 C1 ja [HA HA HA HA HA HA
 39 () [(committee members laugh))
 ... ((accounts from Niels: during his time as a manager the rate changed from 19 to 24.
 After that an account for management principles))
 40 C4 jeg ved ikke hvor meget den er oprettet ()
 41 () ((committee members laugh, making noise))
 1 C But that was not what I wanted to ask you ... I am full
 2 of admiration for your being able to circulate the inventory with a
 3 rate of turnover of 24 days
 4 A Yes, that ...
 5 C You have to tell me more about that, once every two weeks you circulate
 6 the inventory, actually.
 7 A Yes, that is correct, and I
 8 C Did you really do
 9 that?
 10 A Yes I did.
 (... lengthy narrative from Niels on his work in the store; he explicitly states that it
 was not a regular *store*, but a *buffer* for short-term storage before shipment, so a
 high turnover rate was normal ...)
 11 C No, but it was the rate of 24, that hit me like a hammer.

- 13 C YES, BUT ... NIELS, YOU SAID
 14 A WHEN I WAS AT <COMPANY NAME> IT WAS
 15 C (Committee members laugh and talk)
 16 C YOURSELF... No, but Niels, don't
 17 A BETWEEN 1 AND 3½ RIGHT
 18 C (Committee members laugh and talk)
 19 C talk your way out of this one.
 20 C Yes.
 21 C Damn it, you are as cunning as I am, or, anyway,
 22 almost as cunning.
 23 () He
 24 C You know what? What you are talking about, that is a
 25 situation different altogether from a normal store. Because
 26 not even radio ...
 27 A But it is not a store.
 28 C No.
 29 A It is not a store.
 30 C Well, that was just what I wanted you
 31 A It is a buffer.
 32 C to say, right?
 33 A It is a buffer.
 34 C Yes. (laughs)
 (... long discussion on stores and buffers ...)
 35 C But my awe (over the rate of 24) disappeared.
 36 C (committee members laugh)
 37 C Yes, so did mine.
 38 C Yes. (laughter)
 39 C (committee members laugh)
 (... accounts from Niels: during his time as a manager the rate changed from 19 to
 24. After that an account for management principles ...)
 40 C I don't know how much it is re-established (ie the awe).
 41 C (committee members laugh, making noise)

Linguistically the interview, is nonorderly in (8), or rather, it follows a system of struggle. Formal turn-taking routines are disrupted, and participants fight over the floor by means of interruptions and simultaneous talk. Voices are raised. Swearing and accusations appear (cf. 21 and 16–19).

The principles of politeness are reversed: Disagreement is maximized (Brown & Levinson 1978, Leech 1983). Even though Niels readily explains that the store was in fact a buffer, the committee insists on taking up the issue again in 11–34, and Niels is accused of talking deceptively. In 35–38 and 40, committee members explicitly state that their regard for Niels's achievements is decreasing. This is explicit hostile face work. It seems that the committee even draws on the power of group dynamics. On several occasions, committee members back each other up so that Niels is confronted with a choir of voices in unison. Committee members also team up in the laughter, which seems to be derisive, since it systematically follows face threats (cf. 38–39 and 41). The climate of the interview is unfriendly; it is obvious that the critical project of establishing co-membership is now failing (Erickson & Schultz 1982).

EXTENDING THE ANALYSIS

The analysis has so far identified certain discourses and demonstrated how recontextualizations create certain effects, stylistically and in other ways. But in terms of motivating the employment of the recontextualizations in a wider social context, little has been said. Consequently, the following analysis focuses on Niels's socialization. I shall demonstrate that Niels's interview makes a good case for analyzing linguistic data in the wider perspectives of social practice (Fairclough 1992), not in terms of producing ad hoc running commentary on grand politics but in terms of applying LOCAL SOCIAL THEORY focusing on practices of work and professional fields (Fairclough 2000:165).

HABITUS, TASTE, AND SOCIAL IDENTITY

In his own words, Niels is *oprindelig* 'originally' a *radioamatør* 'radio amateur' and *allerede som sekstenårig kortbølgeamatør* 'already at the age of sixteen a shortwave amateur', cf. 23–26 in (2). Through the word *allerede*, being a shortwave amateur is construed as an achievement, and through the word *oprindelig*, as a core feature of Niels's personality. It is apparent from the way he phrases it that electronics is to be thought of as an essential part of Niels's identity. Even in his adolescence, he had friends working in the field, so it seems that electronics also served as an arena for articulating social relations. It is plausible that electronics supported subgroup identity among Niels and his friends, and that their preoccupation with this new and developing high-tech field made feasible a distinction between ingroup and outgroup. Therefore, one motive for focusing on electronics is to use it as a marker of distinction in order to establish a social identity and a social network.

Following Bourdieu, this may be considered a spontaneous and unsophisticated choice, based simply on taste. Niels calls his preoccupation with electronics a 'hobby,' and hobby activities are by definition taste-driven. From this perspective, things are simple: Niels chose electronics because he found as a young man that electronics was potent – in the same way that other young men found that motorbikes were potent (Bourdieu 1984:320, 466).

In terms of socialization, such a choice may have wide implications – for instance, regarding gender identity. Connell suggests a scope for studies of gender: "We need at least a three-fold model of the structure of gender, distinguishing relations of (a) power, (b) production and (c) cathexis (emotional attachment)" (1995:73). Applying this model, and thus taking gender into account, may broaden our understanding of Niels's career. We may do this by assuming that relations of power are articulated in the gendered divisions of prestige and authority in electronics, that relations of production are articulated in the gendered divisions of labor, and that relations of cathexis are articulated in the gendered divisions of taste – of subjective dispositions toward the gestalts of the field.

At the time of Niels's entry, electronics was an arena for articulating gendered positions, since the field was practically monopolized by men. On the production side, the only work that women did was assembly-line work in the large-scale electronics industry. This work was not essentially linked to the field of electronics, but to the production industry as such. Positions of insight and authority were occupied exclusively by men, and electronics was a field for articulating masculinity. Electronics in the private sphere was no less gendered and gendering; here it was a field for articulating masculinity as well. In (1), Niels defines electronics as a hobby practice, and at the time hobbies were generally men's prerogatives. The concept of "hobby" presupposes a sharp dividing line between work and recreation. In the case of the wage-earning father, the line was obvious, crossed twice every working day; in the case of the housewife, it was not. Thus, the concept of hobby fits into the gendered division of labor in general.

Hobbies are popular cultural phenomena, and so was electronics. In the 1950s and 1960s, a magazine such as *Populær Mekanik*, the translated but otherwise unedited Danish version of *Popular Mechanics*, was very popular, targeting enthusiasts directly. Besides popular semi- or even pseudo-scientific articles, the magazine included guidelines for hobby activities. From *Populær Mekanik*, men might learn how to construct anything: one-person airplanes, go-carts, golf carts, shortwave transmitters, microscopes, binoculars, remote-controlled garage door openers, and even handy gadgets that would make a woman's life easier as well, such as tools for high-tech cooking, beautiful gas-driven garden barbecues, or stylish furniture. *Populær Mekanik* was a recipe book for the Anglo-American middle-class lifestyle, and also a model for gendered divisions of time, space, and labor – for middle-class hegemonic heterosexual masculinity and femininity (Connell 1995).

Niels's attraction to electronics should be understood against the background of a social semiotics of this nature. His attraction and his disposition toward working in this field supported the juvenile project of establishing a gender identity. Through practices of electronics, Niels practiced masculinity.

The gender perspective may shed additional light on how apparently immediate and impulsive taste may be a product of a strategy-generating principle, a mechanism for making socially adequate distinctions. Niels's taste and his professional entrance into the field of electronics offered not only prestige and symbolic capital to a young person; it also offered a social network and a gendered position.

CAREER TRAJECTORY

Thus, Niels's career in the field of electronics began in the second half of the 1960s, when he was an adolescent. At that time, electronics production using transistor technology was a new and rapidly growing industry. There were few

academically trained workers, and learning electronics as a craft through apprenticeship was a quick route into this prestigious field. The field was relatively open: It was possible to gain admittance without going through educational formalities. It is clear from (2) that Niels made his way into it through his practical experience, his hobby. And he was trained in the field through an apprenticeship, in a practical manner as opposed to a theoretical or academic one.

For ten years, Niels explains, he *lavede elektronik* ‘manufactured electronics’, working manually. His trajectory in the field includes positions such as *radio-mekaniker*, *elektroniktekniker*, and *konstruktør*, cf. 34–36 in (2). These are gradually more prestigious and knowledgeable positions in the symbolic hierarchy of the field, in that they go from repairing, to constructing, and even to some extent designing electronic circuits. But they all imply manufacturing – producing manually – and they are positions of practical work, as opposed to academic work.

During the 1970s, changes in the industry and in the educational system were restructuring the field of electronics. The industry grew rapidly, and operators on Niels’s level in the symbolic hierarchy became numerous. Furthermore, academically trained specialists (e.g. electronics engineers), educated to support and control mass production, emerged and occupied the influential positions in the field. Hence, the field of electronics was closing; it became increasingly difficult to achieve a prestigious position without having gone through long-term education and having gained academic capital.

Had the dynamics of the field not changed, Niels’s trajectory might have led to an excellent position, but during the 1970s his opportunities in electronics became mundane. Niels responded by developing a taste for trade. In line 38 in (2), he characterizes sales, in comparison with electronics, as *det mere forretningsorienterede udadventde* ‘the more business-oriented and extrovert’. Particularly the first characteristic indicates that this change in taste coincided with a desire for symbolic capital – with ambition. ‘Business-oriented’ means grand and powerful. The prestigious title that came with his new job, *salgsingeniør* ‘sales engineer’, also implies increased symbolic capital.

Trade in electronics was a growing field in the early 1980s. Digital technology based on integrated circuits (ICs), electronic components consisting of huge numbers of tightly packed transistors, was beginning to gain momentum on the market. This technology was not well suited for self-production or repair work. Typically, high-tech companies reduced their own electronics production. In many cases, e.g. within computer technology, the profitable procedure was to buy ready-made electronics from large contractors, typically from abroad.

The change of position implied an upward movement in Niels’s trajectory. There were fewer operators on the level of sales engineer than on the level of electronics constructor. He was probably also gaining prestige in another respect: At this moment in time, sales is likely to have been considered a more prestigious area within electronics than production because the former was related to the technology of the future, IC, whereas production was related to pre-IC technology.

Niels's career involved numerous job changes. During the 1980s, he left the area of sales. Several of his employers in that period were companies restructuring by implementing computer technology full-scale in the departments of sales, purchasing, and inventory. Niels was typically in charge of such implementation, and the content of his work became logistics and management more than trading. In the late 1980s and early 1990s, he was employed by different companies as production manager and chief of logistics; he was getting still closer to the executive level.

Though this is a full and heterogeneous career, the guiding principles behind it may be formulated in a simple and rational manner. In Bourdieu's terms, it is all about gaining prestige through making distinctions (Bourdieu 1977:183). In Niels's youth, making distinctions was about articulating a social identity – about gaining access to a youth-culture subgroup. Later in his life, making distinctions became a question of occupying prestigious positions in company hierarchies, and Niels's identity came to reside in obtaining still more hierarchical power. This may be regarded as an effect imposed on his habitus by his career trajectory (Bourdieu 1984:333).

The governing principle is making distinctions where and when it is possible, under the conditions set by time and place, history, and culture. From Niels's perspective, things may be even simpler. One of the manifestations of habitus, the principle generating career strategy, is taste. So, from Niels's point of view, no CONSCIOUS aiming at ends was necessary, though it was certainly possible (Bourdieu 1977:72). For Niels, a magnificent career may be perceived as the consequence of the guiding potential of an accommodating taste.

The trajectory of Niels's career changed radically in 1992, when he was made redundant on account of general restructuring in the company he worked for. The kind of jobs he might apply for, those at the top level in his areas of competence, were not easily accessible. In 1994, the year of this job interview, Niels was still unemployed.

LINGUISTIC HABITUS

The career trajectory is inscribed in the habitus, which in turn produces strategies for coping with social life. Some strategies are linguistic. Thus, Niels's career trajectory is relevant for the analysis of his job interview. In the following, I shall focus on the relation between Niels's career trajectory and the linguistic aspects of his habitus, his LINGUISTIC HABITUS (Hasan 1998, Chouliaraki & Fairclough 2000).

Above, I related Niels's choice of the field of electronics to enacting or "doing" masculinity, an important aspect of his whole career as well as of the formation of his linguistic habitus. All the positions in Niels's trajectory may be thought of as platforms for doing masculinity. Commerce in electronics and high hierarchical positions in logistics and management, all within private-sector busi-

ness, are primarily if not exclusively the professional arenas of men, given the time and place and the gendered structure of Danish organizations in general (Antal & Izraeli 1993). Niels's career is a man's career, and doing masculinity is a theme that pervades his professional history as a structuring principle, parallel to and integrated with what might be called "doing power," or obtaining positions of prestige.

The positions have linguistic implications in their gendered as well as professional aspects. Several authors have associated stereotypical masculinity with dominant verbal behaviors (Coates 1986, Coates & Cameron 1988, Cameron 1992, Tannen 1993). Other scholars emphasize the importance of perceiving social behavior as determined by more than binary sex or gender. There are many forms of masculinity, the argument goes, and studies of gender and social practices should take into account this multiplicity, as well as the multi-dimensionality of the interplay between gender and other social categories (Bourdieu 1984:107f, Eckert 1989, Eckert & McConnell-Ginet 1992, Connell 1995, Edley & Wetherell 1995, Mac an Ghail 1996, Johnson & Meinhof 1997). In the present framework, gender need not be seen as an isolated direct cause of language behavior; the latter, more qualified argument may be pursued. In Niels's youth, electronics was available as a field compatible with the dispositions of his habitus at the time, and with doing masculinity in accordance with the strategies generated by that habitus. Entering the field and learning new practices made other fields available, compatible with the habitus now accumulated, and with doing masculinity in accordance with this habitus. In general terms, then, Niels pursued a certain career, and because of discursive practices related to the positions in that career, he acquired a certain linguistic habitus.

Niels was a salesman (or 'sales engineer') and a manager. These professions have a common dimension as far as interaction goes: standard work procedures involve verbal struggle. Verbal interaction includes negotiating, arguing, manipulating – various forms of taking and exercising control. A linguistic habitus articulated in this arena, through these practices, inevitably becomes capable of dominance.

The demand for exercising control in the job interview was accentuated by Niels's background. In the retrospective interview, he explained that he came from a working-class family, and that in his youth academic education was unattainable for economic reasons. For some time, this did not impede him in having a career involving prestige, high salaries, and high positions in organizational hierarchies. Niels successfully obtained prestigious positions on account of his practical professional experience. He was able to do so because the dominating principle of hierarchization in these fields at this time did not favor academic capital over experiential capital (Bourdieu 1993:40f).

However, as pointed out by Bourdieu, principles of hierarchization change over time, and the structures of capital in fields change accordingly. In the field of electronics, Niels's possibilities of advancement were obstructed by changes in

the educational system and the growing demand for academic training. The dominating principle of hierarchization in the field gradually became based on educational capital. Changing to the field of trade only partly solved this problem – apparently Niels still found it necessary to use the academic title of “engineer.” And in the area of logistics and management, principles of hierarchization were not to his advantage, either: He made his way into that area by means of his experiential capital. During the 1980s, however, the dominating principle of hierarchization in business organizations generally changed in favor of educational capital. The outcome of this process is reflected in the committee’s interest in Niels’s formal degrees, as well in the following discussion. Thus, one of the director’s opening remarks in the committee’s discussion after Niels’ interview was *han er jo ikke akademiker for helvede* ‘he is not an academic, damn it’ (Discussion 1.0), and the issue was touched on several times by the director during the discussion; *han har ikke nogen højere uddannelse* ‘he has not got a university degree’ (Discussion 1.0); *set med mine briller mangler han det formelle status stemplet ovre i højre hjørne* ‘from my point of view he lacks the formal status, the stamp in the upper right corner’ (Discussion 5.5). The last remark accentuates the symbolic nature of the issue.

Thus, principles of hierarchization became a constant threat to Niels during his career. Coping with, compensating for, and fighting – often through language – an ever more important shortage of academic capital was a basic condition of most of his professional life, and thus a basic ingredient of his linguistic habitus.

A result of this process is expressed in the retrospective interview. Accounting for his strategies regarding talking in job interviews, Niels states that he *prøver at præsentere så jeg ligesom forudser spørgsmålene og lukker dem* ‘tries to give accounts in such a way that I sort of anticipate the questions and obstruct them’ (Retro 51.6). He prefers *præsentere mig som en personlig helhed* ‘introducing myself as a personal whole’ (Retro 51.7) to *sidde og svare eh på på på: eh: sekvenser bagefter* ‘answering questions in sequences afterwards’ (Retro 51.6), the disadvantage of the latter alternative being that he is then *afhængig af at at tolkeren skal sætte elementerne sammen til en helhed* ‘dependent on the interpreter’s putting the pieces together’ (Retro 51.7). Niels prefers to *give helheden selv* ‘present the totality myself’ (Retro 51.7). Behind this, one glimpses the anxiety of being evaluated in unfavorable contexts. Making substantial statements in order to avoid answering questions is equivalent to controlling the context.

Niels furthermore explains that he strongly prefers that company representatives *præsenterer virksomheden først sådan så jeg kan præsentere de kvalifikationer jeg har som er relevante til jobbet* ‘give an account of the company first so that I may give an account of my job-relevant qualifications’ (Retro 51.8). Thus, he prefers his qualifications to be evaluated against the background of the current needs of the company, as opposed to a more general context. This is understandable. Addressing current and particular needs may be done in terms of practical experience, but a more general account of qualifications would more likely involve

issues of formal education. Therefore, Niels's preferences go well with the need to escape certain perspectives; they are compatible with a strategy of avoidance.

As demonstrated, the result is a habitus generating strategies for the job interview conceived in and suited for a context of struggle. This implies establishing platforms and strongholds on a personal level. Niels tries to establish committing personal relations by direct physical address, such as handshaking, and by personalizing the interaction through narratives about life and career history as in (1)–(4). This also implies establishing a stronghold of professional competence. Niels attempts to do this by accounting for an impressive career based on practical experience, as in (4). This furthermore implies establishing a dominating position in terms of monopolizing the floor. Niels obtains this through prolix formulations (5), and through generally talking extensively (cf. Table 1).

The committee's discussion after the interview demonstrates the impact. Niels was repeatedly characterized as a *sælger* 'salesman', lit. 'seller'; all members of the committee used this term, and Niels was furthermore, in that capacity, characterized by the director as *kraftedeme god* 'damn good' (Discussion 2.8), and by the committee spokesman as *bragende god* 'cracking good' (Discussion 4.6) and *fabelagtig* 'fabulous' (Discussion 18.0). Niels generally gave the impression of carrying out, with excellence, the practices of selling. These practices were described in various ways, but often quite negatively. In terms of fancifulness, they were described as *pralende* 'bragging' (Discussion 3.3), *for smart* 'too fancy' (Discussion 3.3), and *blær* 'show-off' (Discussion 2.4). Regarding dominance, the following statements were given: *han har power* 'he is powerful' (Discussion 5.4) and *han er gennemslagskraftig* 'he is full of impact' (Discussion 5.4). Niels's selling was compared to *slå alle sine kunder i hovedet* 'hitting all your clients in the head' (Discussion 6.6). His verbosity was characterized as *for meget* 'too much' (Discussion 20.3), and he was called *lidt af en pladespiller* 'a bit of a record-player' (Discussion 14.8). His recognition of the director was characterized as downright untruthful: *så tror jeg det er en decideret usandhed når han siger han har mødt mig før* 'I think it is a decided untruth when he says he has met me before' (Discussion 14.4). It was considered a part of a scheme: *jeg tror det er en scene han sætter op når han kommer ind og siger en af dem har jeg set før* 'I think it is a scene he sets up, when he comes in saying I have met one of you before' (Discussion 14.5), the purpose of which was to create *den der familiære stemning* 'this atmosphere of familiarity' (Discussion 14.7). In the retrospective interview, Niels told me that he set up the recognition scene on the basis of a very faint memory, and justified doing so in these terms: *jeg var ikke bange for at gøre det da jeg kom ind fordi at de er jo meget: nærmest familiære i den organisation* 'I was not afraid of doing so when I entered because they are very, almost familial in that company' (Retro 31.3).

On the basis of these strengths and weaknesses, Niels then launches his boldest claims: the claims of a high level of formal education. These are made directly through the use of certain phrases (e.g. *kandidateksamen* 'master's degree', and through the offering of an exam diploma, and indirectly through adapting an

academic communicative style (see excerpt 5). In making these claims, Niels does not treat levels of formal education as hard facts. On the contrary, he mentions master's degrees that cannot be documented. In other words, he acts as if his level of formal education is to be resolved through bargaining – as if education is an object that may be obtained through verbal struggle.

In a context of struggle, such moves are intelligible; as the products of a strategy generated by a habitus accustomed to struggle, they are to be expected. However, in the context of the job interview, given the dominating principle of hierarchization, such moves are unacceptable. Levels of formal education and other aspects of the CV certainly are considered hard facts by committee members, as indicated by probing questions and remarks such as line 53 in (5) and 24 and 30–32 in (8), and by the director's remarks in the discussion. Niels's attempts at bargaining are considered downright untruthful, as in 16–19 in (8). Therefore, in his case, the recontextualization of practices learned from prior experience is fatal: It creates a distrustful and unfriendly climate, as seen in (8).

What becomes obvious in the framework proposed is that socio-history is a driving force as well as a burden. As mentioned above, Niels creatively recontextualizes discourses and discursive practices from his past. This linguistic creativity is made possible by his habitus – the resources structured by his past and aimed at transforming his future (Bourdieu 1977:76,82). However, the linguistic creativity is at the same time his Achilles' heel. In the eyes of the committee, it goes too far, giving the impression of deception and patronization. The empowering and delimiting factors are one and the same: the ability to argue, stipulate, sell, bend, dominate – in brief, the disposition for struggle. Therefore, the linguistic habitus is at once enabling and constraining.

CONCLUSION

I argue that Bourdieu's concepts may be helpful in offering some guidelines for strengthening the methods of critical discourse analysis. If concepts such as habitus are incorporated, the analysis must focus on local contexts of various sorts. The agent's language use, then, is not to be explained along grand political lines. Since the analyst will have to search for explanations in the agent's habitus, a product of the experiences of this particular agent, the analyst must consider the life story of the agent, the individual choices and events of life particularizing the agent, and the social factors conditioning him or her. Thus, the agent will be perceived as an individual as well as a member of various social groups – in concrete cultural and historical environments, and not in political contexts chosen by the analyst. What Bourdieu's perspective brings out is the fact that Niels cannot be conceived simply as a member of the working class, or the male gender, or in terms of occupying a certain position in the production system. In order to grasp his language use and linguistic strategies as far as recontextualization goes, a dynamic historical and cultural perspective involving the particulars as well as

the generalities of his socialization must be applied, and this perspective is what thinking along the lines of habitus, field, trajectory, taste, and so on may offer. Pursuing such concrete perspectives may relieve the critical discourse analyst of the temptation to make unwarranted claims on a political level.

In terms of a single detailed study, I hope to have demonstrated the strength of applying a concept such as habitus in CDA. What has been left out of this essay, however, I fear may also have demonstrated the weaknesses that may follow.

Here I have considered recontextualization across interactions; a social agent's recycling of discursive practices learned in prior experience, outside the job interview in point. As a result, the linguistic analysis is incomplete. In order to give a complete account, an internal perspective should be fully applied, as recommended by Schegloff 1997. This would imply much more attention to the interaction among the participants in the job interview. As it is, the analysis focuses predominantly on one agent, as if the interview were just a product of Niels's habitus and not an interaction among participants, each with a habitus of his or her own. In the present case, I consider this weakness a consequence of scope. My purpose here is not to give a full analysis, but to suggest a line of inquiry regarding recontextualization that may contribute fruitfully to a full analysis.

A weakness of this sort, however, might also be a consequence of adopting Bourdieu's views on language. Hasan 1998 argues convincingly that Bourdieu considers language to be an EPIPHENOMENON of social life. In the works of Bourdieu, the habitus is preestablished before any interaction, and what goes on in the interaction, therefore, is a second-order artifact, a dim effect of something more real, something having more impetus: the social structures embodied in the habitus. Thus, in this view, language is a mere symptom of the social; the relationship between the two is one of causation, not a dialectical one. It seems, then, that the concept of habitus may coexist with a concept of language that is deeply incompatible with CDA.

In my view, such a concept of language is not, per se, a consequence of thinking along the lines of habitus. It is rather a consequence of thinking of the social and language as related in a oversimplified manner, one simply causing the other. If one thinks of habitus as linguistically structured, as formed and re-formed not only by social determinants but also by language use in ongoing interactions, a dialectical view of language and the social may be sustained.

Thus, Bourdieu offers tools for determining some relevant contexts external to the text itself. However, in terms of understanding language use on the basis of text-internal analysis, micro-sociological paradigms such as Conversation Analysis are more appropriate inspirations for CDA, as acknowledged by Fairclough (1992:152ff), among others.

I believe that the present study has both methodological and theoretical implications. A quality of the framework presented is balance – for instance, a balance between determinism and creativity. The agent may be creative in that he may draw on discourses and discursive practices in unforeseen ways, and thereby

break new ground and obtain originality and individuality. However, the habitus is not only an empowering principle; it is also a principle of relative determinism, since it is always grounded by experience.

Niels may be characterized as an artful and knowing performer drawing on multiple resources. However, the analysis above demonstrates that socio-history structures reflexivity and multiplicity. Niels is as reflexive and artful and multi-voiced as his experience allows him to be. His resources are grounded – limited as well as empowered – by real-life experience.

Authors have argued that a focus in linguistics on the “unconscious and repetitive seem rather ‘Fordist’” (Rampton 1999), thereby criticizing a deterministic concept of the agent as a will-deprived object being passively assembled by social forces. I think that the analysis presented keeps a balance by admitting, without relying solely on, a Fordist perspective. A notion such as habitus, or embodied practice, obviously implies some degree of unconsciousness and repetition, and at times this seems to be the appropriate perspective. Taking his experiences and abilities into account, it is remarkable that Niels, who is accustomed to presenting and defending his professional profile and to interacting with professionals on professional terms, conducts himself in a manner so much off the mark. A person this resourceful and motivated ought to be able to do better in terms of anticipating and adapting to the committee’s preferences and sense of appropriateness.⁶ Thinking of language and linguistic strategies as products of an embodied habitus reduces the mystery. Acts of the body may be repetitive, unconscious, and ill suited for the existing surroundings, as some of Niels’s acts are.

Nevertheless, the notion of embodied habitus does not imply total repetitive unconsciousness. Bourdieu (1977:73) explicitly argues against deterministic models. The point is that the habitus generates strategies for creatively coping with the unforeseen on the basis of concrete experience. The case study demonstrates the force of drawing, on the one hand, on linguistic analysis of discourse and discursive practices, and, on the other hand, on cultural and social analysis of life history and local processes of socialization.

NOTES

*This study was carried out as part of the research project “Democracy in language,” financed by the Danish Research Council for the Humanities. I would like to thank Lilie Chouliarakis, University of Copenhagen, for reading and discussing with me innumerable drafts of this paper. I would also like to thank Sally Johnson, University of Lancaster, for her very useful comments.

¹ The notation follows the CA conventions presented in Atkinson & Heritage 1984. For reasons of comprehensibility, excerpts are also presented in an edited English version. Note that a few insignificant turns have been omitted in the English version. *C* with indexes denotes committee members. *A* denotes the applicant, Niels. Confidential information is replaced by text in braces. Above each excerpt the time of occurrence is given, measured in minutes. Thus, excerpt (1) starts at 8.2 minutes and ends at 8.8 minutes. In the interview, it lasts a little more than half a minute.

² In Denmark, the master’s degree is the normal successful outcome of an education at university level and is obtained by writing a dissertation. The phrase ‘line course’ is a tentative translation of Danish *liniefag*, which normally designates a selection of courses that university students follow in order to specialize within a certain academic subfield, typically before writing their master’s dissertation.

³ In (6), the transcript notation follows the conventions presented in Couper-Kuhlen 2001. The following conventions differ from those used in the rest of the article:

SYLLable	stress
(.)	brief pause
Phrase.	pitch falling to low
Phrase;	pitch falling to mid
↑	high onset

In comparison with (5), the English translation is modified somewhat in order to reflect Danish syntax more closely.

⁴ Alternatively, clause 5 might be analyzed as a “projection” (Halliday 1994:288ff).

⁵ In this context, “store” refers to a complex function in the production system – the management of stocks and supplies, of all the bits and parts needed in order to keep the production going. In contrast, buffer refers simply to a location for keeping finished products before shipment. Normally the logistics involved is significantly simpler in the latter case, and the turnover rate is much higher.

⁶ Bourdieu 1984 supplies the social agent with a sense of self-censorship that might have blocked some of Niels’s infelicitous acts.

REFERENCES

- Adelswärd, Viveka (1988). *Styles of success. On impression management as collaborative action in job interviews*. Linköping Studies in Arts and Science 23. Linköping: University of Linköping.
- Akinnaso, F. Niyi, & Seabrook Ajirotutu, Cheryl (1982). Performance and ethnic style in job interviews. In John Gumperz (ed.), *Language and social identity*, 119–44. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Antal, Ariane Berthoin, & Izraeli, Dafna N. (1993). A global comparison of women in management: Women managers in their homelands and as expatriates. In Ellen A. Fagenson (ed.), *Women in management: Trends, issues, and challenges in managerial diversity*, 52–96. London: Sage.
- Atkinson, J. Maxwell, & Heritage, John, (eds.) (1984). *Structures of social action: Studies in conversational analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail M. (1981). *The dialogic imagination*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Bernstein, Basil (1990). *The structure of pedagogic discourse*. Vol. 4., *Class, codes and control*. London: Routledge.
- Bourdieu, Pierre (1977). *Outline of a theory of practice*. Trans. Richard Nice. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. First pub. 1972.
- (1984). *Distinction: A social critique of the judgement of taste*. Trans. Richard Nice. London: Routledge. First pub. 1979.
- (1991). *Language and symbolic power*. Trans. Gino Raymond & Matthew Adamson. Cambridge: Polity Press. First pub. 1977–1984.
- (1993). *The field of cultural production*. Trans. Richard Nice et al. Cambridge: Polity Press. First pub. 1968–1987.
- Brown, Penelope, & Levinson, Stephen C. (1978). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cameron, Deborah (1992). *Feminism and linguistic theory*. 2nd ed. London: Macmillan.
- Chouliaraki, Lilie, & Fairclough, Norman (1999). *Discourse in late modernity: Rethinking critical discourse analysis*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- , ——— (2000). Bourdieu on language and power. A response to Hasan’s critique of Bourdieu. *Linguistics and Education* 11:399–409.
- Coates, Jennifer (1986). *Women, men and language*. London: Longman.
- , & Cameron, Deborah (eds.) (1988). *Women in their speech communities*. London: Longman.
- Connell, Robert W. (1995). *Masculinities*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Couper-Kuhlen, Elizabeth (2001). Interactional prosody: High onsets in reason-for-the-call turns. *Language in Society* 30: 29–53.
- Dik, Simon C. (1989). *The theory of functional grammar. Part I: The structure of the clause*. Dordrecht: Foris.

- Eckert, Penelope (1989). The whole woman: Sex and gender differences in variation. *Language Variation and Change* 1:245–67.
- _____, & McConnell-Ginet, Sally (1992). Think practically and look locally. Language and gender as community-based practice. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 21:461–90.
- Edley, Nigel, & Wetherell, Margaret (1995). *Men in perspective: Practice, power and identity*. London: Prentice Hall.
- Edmondson, Willis (1981). *Spoken discourse*. New York: Longman.
- Erickson, Frederick, & Shultz, Jeffrey (1982). *The counselor as gatekeeper: Social interaction in interviews*. New York: Academic Press.
- Euske, Nancy A., & Roberts, Karlene H. (1987). Evolving perspectives in organizational theory: Communication implications. In Frederic M. Jablin et al. (eds.), *Handbook of organizational communication*, 41–69. London: Sage.
- Fairclough, Norman (1992). *Discourse and social change*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- _____. (2000). Discourse, social theory, and social research: The discourse of welfare reform. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 4:163–95.
- Givón, Talmy (1984). *Syntax: A functional-typological introduction*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Grønnum, Nina (1983). Standard Danish sentence intonation – phonetic data and their representation. *Folia Linguistica* 17:187–220.
- _____. (1986). Sentence intonation in textual context – supplementary data. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America* 80:1041–47.
- _____. (1992). *The groundworks of Danish intonation: An introduction*. Copenhagen: Museum Tusulanum Press.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1994). *Introduction to functional grammar*. 2nd ed. London: Edward Arnold.
- Hasan, Ruqaiya (1998). The disempowerment game: Bourdieu and language in literacy. *Linguistics and Education* 10:25–89.
- Jaworski, Adam (1993). *The power of silence: Social and pragmatic perspectives*. Newbury Park: Sage.
- Johnson, Sally, & Meinhof, Ulrika (eds.) (1997). *Language and masculinity*. Cambridge: Blackwell.
- Labov, William (1972). *Language in the inner city: Studies in Black English Vernacular*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Leech, Geoffrey (1983). *The principles of pragmatics*. London: Longman.
- Linell, Per (1998a). *Approaching dialogue: Talk, interaction and contexts in dialogical perspectives*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- _____. (1998b). Discourse across boundaries: On recontextualizations and the blending of voices in professional discourse. *Text* 18:143–57.
- Mac an Ghail, Máirtín (ed.) (1996). *Understanding masculinities: Social relations and cultural arenas*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Monge, Peter R., & Miller, Kathrine I. (1988). Participative processes in organizations. In Gerald M. Goldhaber & George A. Barnett (eds.) *Handbook of organizational communication*, 213–29. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Morson, Gary Saul, & Emerson, Caryl (1990). *Mikhail Bakhtin: Creation of a prosaics*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Rampton, Ben (1999). Styling the other: Introduction. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 3:421–27.
- Schegloff, Emanuel A. (1997). Whose text? Whose context? *Discourse and Society* 8:165–87.
- Scheuer, Jann (1998). *Den umulige samtale: Sprog, køn og magt i jobsamtaler* [The impossible conversation: Language, gender and power in job interviews]. Copenhagen: Academic Press.
- _____. (2001). Recontextualization and communicative styles in job interviews. *Discourse Studies* 3:223–48.
- Tannen, Deborah (1993). The relativity of linguistic strategies: Rethinking power and solidarity in gender and dominance. In Deborah Tannen (ed.), *Gender and conversational interaction*, 165–88. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Vincent, Diane, & Perrin, Laurent (1999). On the narrative versus non-narrative functions of reported speech: A socio-pragmatic study. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 3:291–313.
- Wodak, Ruth (1996). *Disorders of discourse*. London: Longman.

(Received 2 February 2001; accepted 25 January 2002)