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

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

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

Table of Contents

1. Introduction

This article outlines the field of FOUCAULTian discourse analysis as a developing subdiscipline in the area of qualitative social research. We speak of "field", because discourse analysis which is informed by or oriented to the work of FOUCAULT is not an integrated paradigm in the sense made famous by KUHN (1962). After the FOUCAULTian notion of discourse and the conception of discourse analysis that "works with FOUCAULT" are presented, some of the different local/national scenes of discourse analysis are sketched. This will be done mainly by reference to national approaches because so far there does not seem to be a strong transnational structure of the field—although there are some

networks, such as in the "sub"-fields of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), that transcend national boundaries. Then we shall discuss current strands and perspectives of FOUCAULTian discourse analysis as far as they are represented in the articles of this special issue. In short, can we state: (1) the collection of articles in this *FQS* issue presents converging developments but also the heterogeneity of the field of FOUCAULTian discourse analysis and (2) the different groups and national scenes have started to connect themselves internationally. [1]

2. The FOUCAULTian Conception of Discourse and FOUCAULTian Discourse Analysis

Today the theoretical work of Michel FOUCAULT is widely regarded as being part of the theoretical body of social sciences like sociology, social history, political sciences and social psychology. But FOUCAULTian notions are also fundamental in other dynamic fields such as cultural studies, gender studies and postcolonial studies. Discourse theory concepts and arguments are no longer restricted to linguistics or other sciences of language use. Today they are part of the social sciences.[1] One of the reasons for this spread beyond the purely linguistic is that FOUCAULT conceived discourse as social structure and discursive practice as social practice. "Discourse" is not simply dialogue or philosophical monologue. The term "discourse" was first used to signify the grammatical structure of narratives (BARTHES, 1988). Here "discourse" was conceived as the order overarching the level of the sentence. For a long time the various purely linguistic approaches to discourse were dominant (VAN DIJK, 1985, 1997a, 1997b). In socio-linguistic approaches and conversation analysis (TEN HAVE, 1999) "discourse" means an interactional order which emerges in social situations, so here "discourse" is an interactionist concept (ANGERMÜLLER, 2001). In the different traditions of French structuralism and (so called) post-structuralism the term discourse is omnipresent. In the structuralist era discourse is introduced as the underlying deep structure of the human mind (LÉVI-STRAUSS) or the human psyche (LACAN). [2]

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

---

1   See for the English-speaking world http://www.michel-foucault.com/ and the online-journal Foucault Studies.

several articles in this special edition discuss the relationship between a discursive matrix and subjectivation/subjectification (ROMÁN BRUGNOLI, 2007; AMIGOT LEACHE, 2007; TATE, 2007, and, in the context of dispositif, see also BÜHRMANN & SCHNEIDER, 2007). They focus on the subject and the discursive constitution of the subject: in this way, FOUCAULTian discourse analysis enters the micro-level. [3]

FOUCAULT worked out his concept of discourse and discursive practice in *The Archaeology of Knowledge* (FOUCAULT, 1972a), which was announced as a methodological supplement to his epistemological magnum opus *The Order of Things* (FOUCAULT, 1970). FOUCAULT offers in the *Archaeology of Knowledge* his principles of discourse theory. Using this approach—located "beyond hermeneutics and structuralism" (DREYFUSS & RABINOW, 1983)—FOUCAULT wishes to distance himself from certain central hypotheses of the traditional treatment of history. For FOUCAULT, the goal of the *Archaeology of Knowledge* (1972a) is to engage in a pure description of discursive events, which treats the material in its original neutrality, serving as a horizon for the investigation of the unities constructed within it. And in this context FOUCAULT first scrutinizes the concepts of "tradition", "discipline", "development" or "author" because he assumes these imply the illusion of historical continuity. Where representations of continuity are asserted FOUCAULT introduces the category of discontinuity and the concepts of "rift", "threshold", "series," "rupture" and "transformation". Second, FOUCAULT problematises the category of meaning. He wishes to scrutinize the discourse concerning the fact and conditions of a discourse's manifest appearance and not to dwell on the content that may be concealed therein, but rather on the transformations that the discourses have effected. Finally, FOUCAULT abandons the notion of a sovereign subject in so far as he conceives of discourses as a self-contained order, which is inaccessible with regard to the intentions of the individuals involved in them when one's attempt ignores the objects or contexts of the discourses. [4]

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

asks who authorized it; and finally, he asks which strategic goals are being pursued in the discourse. [5]

Yet in his *Archaeology of Knowledge* FOUCAULT still delivers a theoretical work, within which discourse is presented as a system of statements ("enunciations"). It is this character of an "ordered system" which is constitutive of statements, rather than the intentionality of individuals in situations (although individuals still have to enact discourses and statements). These statements are produced (diachronically) in an ongoing discursive stream, whereby the preceding statements build the (virtual) context of previously-enacted statements. Ongoing statements have to respect the set of rules which is inherent in this context of preceding statements. If they fail to do this, they will not have an impact; they will not be accepted or even recognised in the social area or social field as "serious speech acts" (DREYFUSS & RABINOW, 1983). To identify and to analyse discourses is equivalent to identifying and analysing systems of statements as bearers of their *rules of formation* i.e. the rules that made the statements possible and that simultaneously already reside in the (system of preceding) statements. They are not external to the statements themselves and they must be understood as the result of a socio-historic process in which the discourse as a field of knowledge and a system of rules emerges. These rules are said to be "responsible" for the organised—i.e. systematic and pre-structured—ways of using "concepts", of referring to "objects", of thinking in strategies and of formatting the ways of speaking. So one can speak of these ways of making statements as discursive practices. [6]

These discursive practices are productive: they produce the specific semantics of the words in use, and they relate words to objects and to strategies of acting towards and thinking about things, persons etc. In this way, ontologising categorisations and evaluations are integrated, and they appear as "natural" as opposed to "constructed" or as the contingent result of discursive practices. In this sense, discourses produce a perception and representation of social reality. This representation forms part of hegemonic strategies of establishing dominant interpretations of "reality" (see the contributions in LACLAU, HOWARTH, NORVEL & STAVRAKAKIS, 2000). It is this aspect of discourse as a mediator and tool of power through the production of knowledge that feminist (e.g. BUTLER) and postcolonial theorists (e.g. SAID and SPIVAK) have explored when engaging with FOUCAULT's concept of discourse. Discourses, as SAID (1978) and SPIVAK (1987) note, are not innocent explanations of the world. They are, as SPIVAK emphasises, a way of *worlding*, of appropriating the world through knowledge. The strands of knowledge with which we engage in our attempt to describe and understand the world are produced in complex power relations in which different actors and institutions work to establish a dominant interpretation of "reality". It is in regard to the understanding of discourse as an instance of hegemony that SAID and SPIVAK look at the question of what kind of *truth* has been produced within the context of European colonialism. Furthermore, they investigate what kind of descriptions of world, people and things have been discursively conveyed as the "Other" in the name of the "Orient" and the "gendered subalternised Other". Discourses are understood in these approaches

as instances of ideology, showing how ideology needs to be analysed beyond the MARXist paradigm of "false consciousness". Instead, FOUCAULT's concept of discourse brings us to the question of hegemony and the power of discourses in establishing a dominant or a counter-hegemonic representation (GUTIÉRREZ RODRÍGUEZ, 1999). Discourse does not only imply the semantic structure of individual utterances or political speeches, but, as HARAWAY (1991) notes, it delineates a material-semantic knot, in which subjective experiences and objects of knowledge are inscribed. Discursive practices are interwoven with non-discursive practices. This distinction leads to the concept of the "dispositif".[2] Here, institutional and technical forms of social practices are embedded in discourses and vice versa. The dispositif is the constitutive interface for power-knowledge relations which FOUCAULT has analysed in many of his socio-historical studies, in particular in his work on governmentality, which became extraordinarily famous in the last three decades (FOUCAULT, 1977, 1978; LEMKE, KRASMAN & BRÖCKLING, 2000; GUTIÉRREZ RODRÍGUEZ & PIEPER, 2003, BÜHRMANN, 2004; BÜHRMANN & SCHNEIDER, 2007). [7]

Discourses are studied in their socio-historical development, which is not theorised as a continuous unfolding of an a priori existing "logic", but as a process that is characterised by discontinuities and ruptures. The early notion of discourse emphasises the existence of a system of rules which is inherent in discursive practices, and stresses the coherent organisation of discourse. Later, FOUCAULT (1972b) and especially his follower Michel PÊCHEUX (1975) "opened" this structural position by including incoherencies and contradictions. The FOUCAULTian notion of discourse was first developed in the area of the historical epistemology of sciences and in applications in social history in France. Here in the 1960s discourse researchers started to reflect upon the methodology of discourses analysis. But this first strand of FOUCAULTian discourse analysis remained a Francophone research area with little international reception (HAK & HELSOOT, 1995; WILLIAMS, 1999; HELSLOOT & HAK, 2007; DIAZ-BONE, 2003, 2007). [8]

Instead the *theoretical* concepts in the FOUCAULTian work received a wider international reception in various social sciences. These were adopted and combined with other theoretical traditions in sociology and linguistics. In short, in different disciplines researchers started to work with the FOUCAULTian concept of discourse as an empirical concept. The starting point for the development of discourse analysis outside of France, however, was an interdisciplinary heterogeneity of different syntheses. [9]

Over the last twenty years, one can speak of an increasing interest in methodological positions and the methodological consequences of FOUCAULT's considerations about how to explore discourses, i.e. the empirical analysis of discursive structures and discursive practices. Some of the methodological debates have focussed the question on whether there is one methodology in FOUCAULTian work, and if there is just one, to ask questions like: What are its

---

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

standpoints, its strategies etc. (DREYFUSS & RABINOW, 1983)? Some discourse researchers started exploring methodological strategies and collecting tools for empirical discourse analysis (KENDALL & WICKHAM, 1999; KELLER, 2004) or to present the results of their methodological experiences as "schedules" for discourse analysis (e.g. MEYER & WODAK, 2001; JÄGER, 2004). [10]

Since the 1990s different researchers and research groups that use the FOUCAULTian notion of discourse started to become aware of each other and to influence each other. For the situation in Germany one can say that different conferences and workshops built the platform for discussions. First, discourse researchers compared theoretical uses of FOUCAULTian notions and different theoretical paradigms and disciplinary footings. Soon, handbooks,, overviews (BUBLITZ, BÜHRMANN, HANKE & SEIER, 1999; KELLER, HIRSELAND, SCHNEIDER & VIEHÖVER, 2001, 2003, 2005; KERCHNER & SCHNEIDER, 2006) and an increasing amount of monographs emerged. In France the situation was similar, but there linguists and historians kept a more prominent role in the development and continuity of FOUCAULTian discourse analysis (WILLIAMS, 1999; CHARAUDEAU & MAINGUENEAU, 2003; GUILHAUMOU, 2005). Here, following the seminal works of PÊCHEUX, different groups started to develop methodological tools for discourse analysis. The influence of this FOUCAULTian discourse analytic perspective weakened in the 1980s, but is now experiencing a kind of renaissance. [11]

All these national and international initiatives mobilised the recognition and acknowledgement of others, which supported the emergence of a field of FOUCAULTian discourse analysis. A field—in BOURDIEU's (1985, 1988) sense —differs from a paradigm by virtue of its widely recognised cleavages and differences (MARTIN, 2003; DIAZ-BONE, 2002). The groups and individuals that recognise each other as part of the field share common topics, methodological questions and interests. Today the field of FOUCAULTian discourse analysis is an important instance of an international field of qualitative social research.[3] [12]

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

---

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

linguistics attempts to find out more about (current and historical) political ideologies. This diagnosis may have been valid up until the beginning of this decade. However, today only a part of this diagnosis is correct. One can argue that the newer sociological strand of FOUCAULTian discourse analysis is meso- or macro-oriented (KELLER, 2007; DIAZ-BONE, 2002, 2006a) and the main problem with linguistic analysis in the so-called post-structural discourse analysis is with the use of small corpuses of data. But like many others in the field, ANGERMÜLLER (2001) points to surprising methodological and theoretical convergences, which have been discussed in many conferences and workshops. Perhaps the most interesting facet of this debate is that both paradigms can be understood as modifications and developments of FOUCAULTian discourse analysis. That does not mean that they totally align with such an approach, but that they all refer more or less to the methodological principles of FOUCAULTian discourse analysis. [13]

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

Today, the structure of the field of FOUCAULTian discourse analysis—or of forms of discourse analysis that are strongly influenced by the works of FOUCAULT—is not an internationally integrated field. One can speak of different national histories of the reception of FOUCAULT and different national situations in which FOUCAULT-oriented approaches are embedded. So one can speak of a fragmented international field containing national "subfields", which are more or less self-oriented. Some of these have a rich tradition of their own and focus mainly on this tradition (as, for example, does French discourse research); some are more internationally oriented. Although in the last few years national traditions have started to intensify their transnational relations, we present shortly some insights into certain national scenes. We as editors are an internationally recruited group and all of us have collected experience in the field of discourse analysis for many years, but nonetheless our perspective may be biased. So if we present information about a national scene such as French discourse analysis or the British scene of discourse analysis, other countries—or even complete conti-nents—may be neglected. This is the case especially for Latin America, where, for example, in Brazil there is a tradition of the influence of the work of Michel PÊCHEUX (but for Argentina see HAIDAR, 2007 and for Chile see ROMÁN BRUGNOLI, 2007). Another underrepresented area is the USA, where—as far as we can see—the impact of FOUCAULTian discourse *theory* is enormous and the methodological orientation toward discourse analysis is increasing, if we use the second and third editions of "The SAGE handbook of qualitative research" (DENZIN & LINCOLN 2000, 2005) as an indicator. In the USA, FOUCAULTian concepts are extensively referred to and one can find the taken-for-granted use of the concept of FOUCAULTian discourse analysis (with the chapter "Foucauldian discourse analysis" in the articles in GUBRIUM & HOLSTEIN [2000, p.493ff.]; HOLSTEIN & GUBRIUM [2005, p.490]). In the third edition a new article is included which discusses the methodological foundations of FOUCAULTian discourse analysis (esp. archaeology and genealogy) and presents an enormous literature of works in the field of education, where the authors use FOUCAULTian

theoretical notions or work with FOUCAULTian methodologies (SCHEURICH & MCKENZIE, 2005). [14]

In this *FQS* special issue, reports from different research groups—especially from Germany—are collected (see table of contents). However, we want to present some schematic remarks about the national scenes of discourse analysis as they integrate or are oriented by FOUCAULTian concepts. The relative length of the presentation of different nations is not correlated to the relative importance of the different national scenes (as if such a thing could ever be adjudicated upon). And of course we do not assert that our presentation is exhaustive. [15]

3.1 France

The French situation is in some way paradigmatic, not only because Michel FOUCAULT was a French philosopher, epistemologist and historian, but also because here the groups in the Parisian region which promoted a FOUCAULTian form of discourse analysis as an empirical method were interdisciplinary from the beginning—as later in other countries—and made transdisciplinary exchange possible since the late 1960s. In France, historians, linguists and social psychologists formed the first interdisciplinary research groups in the late 1960s. One important influence was the French tradition of the ANNALES School, another the work and the projects of Michel PÊCHEUX (HAK & HELSLOOT, 1995; HELSLOOT & HAK, 2007; see below Section 3.4). Both integrated linguistics foundations with the FOUCAULTian notion of discourse. As Glyn WILLIAMS (1999) has pointed out, the beginnings of "French discourse analysis"—although first focused around FOUCAULTian notions discourse—were in this era embedded in the wider context of post-structuralism and therefore not narrowly oriented only to the works of one author. The works of the French school of "epistemology" influenced the whole movement of structuralism and post-structuralism (WILLIAMS, 1999; DIAZ-BONE, 2002, 2007). The founder of this school was Gaston BACHELARD; his student, Georges CANGUILHEM, was a teacher not only of FOUCAULT but also of PÊCHEUX and other world-renowned social scientists (such as Pierre BOURDIEU and Louis ALTHUSSER). WILLIAMS (1999) traces the different formations, the works and projects of Michel PÊCHEUX. Connected with PÊCHEUX are the French historians who combined the FOUCAULTian notion of discourse (as a materiality of its own, as PÊCHEUX [1975] formulated) with the so-called ANNALES tradition (the name stems from the historical journal ANNALES, which was founded by Lucien FEBVRE and Marc BLOCH [see DOSSE, 1994]). Here, the historical "archives" of discursive knowledge (especially in the era of the French revolution) were the main research topics. The works of Régine ROBIN (1973), Georges GUILHAUMOU (2003, 2005; GUILHAUMOU, MALDIDIER & ROBIN, 1994) and Dominique MAINGUENEAU (1984) can be cited as landmarks (MAINGUENEAU & ANGERMÜLLER, 2007). In the 1970s the FOUCAULTian impact vanished because of the MARXist dominance of French discourse analysis. Today one cannot speak of a clearly marked French field of FOUCAULTian discourse analysis. But the FOUCAULTian influence has regained influence since the 1980s. Linguists and historians reoriented their work towards FOUCAULTian and

more sociological topics. The French field today is heterogeneous and gains in visibility by special issues of (mainly) linguistics journals (such as *Langages*, No. 17/1995 "Les analyse du discours en France"; *Marges Linguistiques*, No. 9/2005 "Analyse du discours. L'état de l'art et perspectives", available at) and conferences.[4] What is remarkable about the state of French FOUCAULTian discourse analysis is that subdisciplines like Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) are not present, that sociology is not so influential as in Germany or England, and that the linguistic perspective integrates FOUCAULTian work. In France, discourse analysis (including FOUCAULTian perspectives) is mainly organised in research centres in the Parisian region. Johannes ANGERMÜLLER (2007) discusses three such centres/perspectives. There are a few exceptions, such as the publication by a group from Rennes, where political, linguistic and sociological perspectives are integrated, and techniques for computer-aided discourse analysis are presented (RINGOOT & ROBERT-DEMONTROND, 2004). The French scene of discourse analysis is mainly nationally oriented, but there have always been "go-betweens" and bridges, such as the discussions between Michel PÊCHEUX and Jürgen LINK (resulting in the elaboration of the—different—concepts of interdiscourse, DIAZ-BONE, 2006b), the exchange between Reiner KELLER and Jacques GUILHAUMOU (see GUILHAUMOU, 2003), and the work of Johannes ANGERMÜLLER (2007).[5] [16]

3.2 Germany

The early reception of FOUCAULTian discourse theory—from about the 1970s on to the 1980s—was mainly done in women's studies, history, literary studies and criminology. Researchers referred chiefly to the genealogical studies of FOUCAULT (1977, 1978, 1988, 1990). But they also pursued the role of discourses especially in the process of the "humanisation of punishment" or the "othering of women". Subsequently, the reception of FOUCAULT was more connected to implications of and possibilities for discourse analysis. Some researchers tried to combine FOUCAULTian discourse analysis with other socio-linguistic approaches and methods of conversation analysis. One of the first groups which started working systematically with FOUCAULTian discourse analysis was the so-called "*diskurswerkstatt* Bochum" (Bochum discourse workshop) which was founded by Jürgen LINK and which has published from the early 1980s the journal *kultuRRevolution* (see LINK & PARR, 2007). The second important group is housed at the Duisburger Institut für Sprach- und Sozialforschung (Duisburg Institute for Language and Social Research, DISS, see ZIMMERMANN, 2007). Both groups were very important for the further development in the German-speaking world of discourse analysis. Siegfried JÄGER, the main protagonist of DISS, published one of the most widely known methodological introductions to Critical Discourse Analysis (JÄGER, 2004). Furthermore, DISS organised annual meetings for researchers interested in discourse analysis. At first, the discourse researchers at DISS and especially

---

4   See the conference report of FEIN and FLOREA (2007).

5   We thank Johannes ANGERMÜLLER for his copious help. He is preparing a special edition of the French journal *Langage et société*, which will present the Germanic approach to discourse analysis.

JÄGER focused research on everyday conversation or talk and the so-called media discourse in newspapers. Here they refer to LINK, who focused on different societal functions of discourses and distinguished between so-called special discourses ("Spezialdiskurs"), elementary discourse ("Elementardiskurs") and interdiscourse ("Interdiskurs"). At first the *diskurswerkstatt Bochum* concentrated its research on special discourses and questions of ideology. But more recently its focus moved from that issue to more and more sociological questions. So some researchers investigated, for example, the relationships between Niklas LUHMANN's ideas and FOUCAULTian discourse theory, while others worked on the relationship between the work of Pierre BOURDIEU and FOUCAULTian discourse analysis (BUBLITZ, 1999; DIAZ-BONE, 2002; SCHWAB-TRAPP, 2004). [17]

This change indicates—we suggest—a new development in dealing with questions of discourse theory and discourse analysis in the German-speaking world. During this developing "sociologisation", a research group at the University of Paderborn was established—which today is called the *Paderborn approach* (BUBLITZ, 2007). Here different researchers tried to make FOUCAULT's *Archaeology of Knowledge* (1972a) productive for analysing the discourses of the crisis of modernity since 1900 (see BUBLITZ, 2007). But they also questioned the methodological impact of discourse analysis (see BUBLITZ, BÜHRMANN, HANKE & SEIER, 1999). [18]

Such questions were discussed at conferences at the University of Erlangen-Nuremberg (see ANGERMÜLLER, BUNZMANN & NONHOFF, 2001) Here one significant issue was the place of the work of LACLAU & MOUFFE (2001). Other important conferences and workshops have taken place since 1999 at the University of Augsburg organised by the Working group "Discourse Research in the Social Sciences" (Arbeitskreis "Sozialwissenschaftliche Diskursforschung") from Augsburg/Munich (see KELLER & SCHNEIDER, 2007). Perspectives and limitations in discourse theory and discourse analysis were discussed at these workshops and conferences (see KELLER, HIRSELAND, SCHNEIDER & VIEHÖFER, 2001, 2003).[6] Since the end of the 1990s the relationship between the sociology of knowledge and discourse analysis has been targeted by these activities (see KELLER, HIRSELAND, SCHNEIDER & VIEHÖFER, 2005), while Reiner KELLER (2004, 2005) has published an approach for grounding discourse theory and empirical discourse research in the sociology of knowledge (see also SCHNEIDER 1999; SCHNEIDER & HIRSELAND, 2005; DIAZ-BONE, 2003). [19]

Among these different research groups mentioned here a fruitful and productive exchange has been established. One could say that there is a very lively discourse scene—both theoretically and analytically.[7] One can find research or working groups but also "solo" researchers spread all over the German-speaking

---

6 There have been five workshops of the Arbeitskreis "Sozialwissenschaftliche Diskursforschung" (Augsburg/München): "1. Workshop: Perspektiven der Diskursanalyse", March 11-12, 1999 (Augsburg); "2. Workshop: Perspektiven der Diskursanalyse II", March 30-31, 2000 (Augsburg); "3. Workshop: Diskurs-Wissen-Kultur", September 25-26, 2003 (Augsburg); "Praxis-Workshop Diskursanalyse", June 17-18, 2004 (Augsburg); "2. Praxis-Workshop Diskursanalyse", June 14-15, 2005 (Augsburg). For programs, see http://www.diskursforschung.de/ [Retrieved: 09.11.06].

world. As far as we can see the main research interests in this scene are the following issues: methodological work on (FOUCAULT's) discourse analysis and theory; the expansion of discourse analysis and theory towards interdiscourse theory; dispositif research; the analysis of everyday conversation, media discourses and (narrative) interviews; and, finally, the combination of discourse theory with other theories or concepts like BOURDIEU's praxeological theory or LUHMANN's theory of differentiation, LACLAU and MOUFFE's concept of hegemony, and BUTLER's idea of the heteronormative matrix. [20]

3.3 Great Britain

In Britain there exists a strong tradition in the different strands of linguistic and socio-linguistic discourse research (KELLER, 2004). In the British context FOUCAULTian discourse analysis (or forms of discourse analysis which strongly refer to FOUCAULT) has been developed from at least three different perspectives: (a) critical linguistics and sociolinguistics; (b) social psychology; and (c) ideology and discourse analysis. Regarding the first perspective, the University of East Anglia (UEA) inaugurated critical linguistics with the publication of "Language and Control" in 1979. The "linguistic turn" in the social sciences and the "critical paradigm" within linguistics led not only to critical linguistics but also to Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). The project of critique opened up the space in the 1970s to think about the relations of power and representation. In continuation of this tradition, the *School of Language, Linguistics and Translation Studies* organised an international conference on *Critical Approaches to Discourse Analysis Across Disciplines* (CADAAD) in June 2006, inaugurating the *Research Centre for Language and Communication*. CADAAD hosts an [on-line journal](), which published its first issue in February 2007. The on-line interdisciplinary journal engages in critical approaches to discourse analysis and with a variety of methodologies. Another hub for CDA is based at the *Department of Linguistics and English Language* at Lancaster University, where Norman FAIRCLOUGH, since the early 1980s, has been working on CDA, including the place of language in social relations of power and ideology, and how language figures in processes of social change. Ruth WODAK (see Section 3.4) is also based there as *Chair in Discourse Studies*. Under the guidance of Professor Paul CHILTON and Ruth WODAK the project [New Discourse in Contemporary China]() (NDCC) has been developed. [21]

The second strand is represented at the Manchester Metropolitan University (MMU), where a [Discourse Unit]() in social psychology was established. The Discourse Unit is a trans-institutional collaborative centre, which supports a variety of qualitative and theoretical research projects contributing to the development of radical theory and practice. The term "discourse" is used primarily in critical hermeneutic and structuralist senses to include inquiries

---

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

influenced by feminism and psychoanalysis. The centre functions: (1) as a teaching resource base for qualitative and feminist work; (2) as a support unit for the (re)production of radical academic theory; (3) as a networking centre for the development of critical perspectives in action research.[8] The initiators of the MMU Discourse Unit are Ian PARKER and Erica BURMAN, both critical psychologists. The Discourse Unit has been established as a centre for qualitative and theoretical research on the reproduction and transformation of language, subjectivity and practice.[9] [22]

The third strand on ideology and discourse analysis is hosted by the World Network in Ideology and Discourse Analysis based at the *Centre for Theoretical Studies in the Humanities and Social Sciences* and the *Department of Govern-ment* at the University of Essex. The IDA World Network facilitates the exchange of ideas and information in Ideology and Discourse Analysis. In June 2007 IDA World will hold the 5th Annual IDA World workshop with Ernesto LACLAU. [23]

3.4 Austria and the Netherlands

These two comparatively small countries are mentioned here because of two leading researchers: Teun A. VAN DIJK, who originally hailed from Amsterdam (where he worked for many years, although now he is based in Barcelona) and Ruth WODAK from Vienna (now based at Lancaster, see Section 3.3). VAN DIJK contributed two early interdisciplinary volumes that gathered contributions to the different forms of discourse analysis (VAN DIJK, 1985, 1997a, 1997b). He founded and edited discourse analytic journals such as *Discourse & Society*, and was one of the leading researchers in CDA (see his homepage). For the Nether-lands, the work of Tony HAK and Niels HELSLOOT must be mentioned. Their contribution consists in research on the work of Michel PÊCHEUX and foundations of "post-FOUCAULTian discourse analysis" (HAK & HELSLOOT, 1995; HELSLOOT & HAK, 2007). [24]

Ruth WODAK's work in the 1970s and 1980s founded the so-called Vienna school of CDA. Here a small discourse analytic oriented network in Vienna developed (see KENDALL [2007] and REISIGL [2007]). Ruth WODAK and Teun A. VAN DIJK are also outstanding examples of the internationalisation of discourse analysis. These two researchers are well connected with other prominent discourse researchers in CDA. CDA was initiated to work out theoretical and methodological first principles of a critical perspective in empirical discourse analysis which extended FOUCAULTian notions of discourse, power and society, and prominent in this endeavour were researchers such as Norman FAIRCLOUGH (England), Siegfried JÄGER (Germany), Günter KRESS (England), and Theo VAN LEEUWEN (the Netherlands) (MEYER & WODAK, 1991). [25]

---

8   Within this context in March 2007 the 6th Conference of the *Discourse, Power, Resistance Series* was held at MMU.

9   The centre runs short courses, including on critical psychology and discursive practice.

3.5 Spain

In Spain, discourse analysis—strongly inherited through the French tradition, and particularly through Michel FOUCAULT's work—has been implemented as a working tool in some research groups that are located in geographically distant universities such as The Autonomous University of Barcelona, The Complutense University of Madrid or The University of Valencia. Furthermore, some individual researchers are working along similar lines in areas such as Euskadi, Andalucía or Galicia. Discourse analysis is present in disciplines such as sociology, social psychology or linguistics. Recently, some historians have also started to explore the possibilities offered by discourse analysis (see also TIRADO, 2007). The Autonomous University of Barcelona's Social Psychology PhD program is a good example of where Michel FOUCAULT's theories have been developed. This institution has been contributing to academic discourse for more than ten years. Their program has produced teachers and researchers that understand the practice of Social Psychology using premises adopted from FOUCAULT; many of the researchers associated with this institution have utilised discourse analysis as a common tool of research and thought. Some of these researchers have formed or taken part in research groups such as *ATIC* (Research Group on Technology and Social Action) from *The Open University of Catalonia* and the *GESCIT* (Group of Social Studies on Science and Technology) of the Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona. All three universities share similar characteristics: (1) although located administratively in Departments and Faculties of Social Psychology, Humanities or Psychology, their components come from different disciplines, turning the aforementioned academic groups totally interdisciplinary; (2) one of the tools they use is discourse analysis. Regardless of the adaptation or version of discourse analysis employed by these institutions, its very utilisation reflects a strong connection to Michel FOUCAULT's work; (3) the focus on control, social transformation and the technological dimension of our reality constitutes the core of their varied research projects. All three groups have adapted elements of FOUCAULTian discourse analysis to utilise it in the analysis of the practices that managing technology imply. [26]

4. Trends and Perspectives

Based on these areas and topics outlined above, several trends and perspectives can be identified, but also a number of unsolved methodological issues and problems remain. [27]

First, there seems to be an emerging need for an ongoing discussion between different perspectives based on philosophy of language, linguistics and FOUCAULTian discourse analysis shaped in the context of the social sciences. What are the epistemological foundations of discourse theory (here "old questions" [see DREYFUS & RABINOW, 1983] have to be addressed such as how the work of BACHELARD, CANGUILHEM and the so called interpretative epistemology fits together)? How to combine semiotic analysis and the analysis of institutional practice? In other words: the more discourse analysis is established as a widely used theoretical and methodological perspective

analysing socially constructed reality from different disciplines, the more respective epistemological foundations concerning the relation between text, speech and action have to be considered. In the same way the various uses of corresponding concepts like practices, institutions, power, subjectivity (and other terms) have to be clarified not to gain one set of obligatory definitions but to ascertain the risks and profits of a shared or discrete discourse about key concepts in the field of discourse analysis within and between different disciplines and theoretical traditions. The attempt to clarify these terms in relation to discourse analysis represents a common perspective in the articles in this issue. [28]

These new approaches are represented by the contributions here. Discourse analysis involves an accurate reading of the relationship between discourse, representation, subjectivity and governance. The contributions from Shirley Anne TATE (2007), Jose Antonio ROMÁN BRUGNOLI (2007), Encarnación GUTIÉRREZ RODRÍGUEZ (2007), Patricia AMIGOT LEACHE (2007) and Victoria HAIDAR (2007) engage with these concepts. While TATE and ROMÁN BRUGNOLI focus on the impact of discourses on subjectivity, AMIGOT LEACHE centres her view on the genealogical analysis of a specific process of transformation of gender, while HAIDAR focuses on the analysis of political programmes of governing. AMIGOT LEACHE's article shows the transformation of the perception of gender in a group of Spanish working-class women in the context of the final years of Franco's dictatorship and the transition to democracy. These women took part in the activities of the so-called *Centros de Promoción de la Mujer y Cultura Popular* (Centres for Women's Promotion and Popular Culture). In this article the question of agency is approached through a discourse analysis of in-depth interviews with these women, thus engaging in the intersubjective nature of the process and of the practices involved in processes of transformation. AMIGOT LEACHE's perspective focuses on an analysis of ideologies and their impact on subjectivity. ROMÁN BRUGNOLI's article proposes a metaphorical approach to the study of the relationships between discourse, social subjection and subjectivation. A way of examining social knowledge is proposed, based on metaphoric-metonymic notions and the use of metaphors as a research tool to analyse relationships between discourse and social subjection through the example of a discourse analysis of a discussion group of self-employed working mothers in Santiago de Chile. TATE theorises hybridity within postcolonial studies by including the everyday interactional achievement within Black "mixed race" British women's conversations on identity to look at the production of an analytic method as process based on the task of the analyst as translator. This method as process *thinks* the links between FOUCAULT and BAKHTIN in the emergence of an ethnomethodologically-inclined discourse analysis which is called on to make sense of a hybridity of the everyday where black women reflexively translate discourses on identity positions in order to construct their own identifications in conversations. FOUCAULT's discourses and BAKHTIN's heteroglossia and addressivity allow us to theorise this movement in the talk which ethnomethodological transcription and theory enables us to first pinpoint occurring. [29]

In her contribution, GUTIÉRREZ RODRÍGEZ works through examples of ethnographic research with domestic and care workers and their employers in Germany with a discursive-deconstructive approach to *reading affect*. This is done to discuss (a) "the speaking subject" embedded within a discursive framework, and, (b) "intensity" in the encounters between domestic and care workers and their employers. It is by thinking through the words of those who inhabit this gendered and ethnicised heterotopia that the paper looks at the following questions: how can this encounter be read on the basis of affective bonds? how can we grasp affect as a moment of intensity in these relationships? what can reading FOUCAULT, DERRIDA and SPIVAK and *thinking through* them add to the theorisation of *affect*? [30]

From a slightly different perspective, HAIDAR's article engages with the interfaces between a social point of view and the mobilisation of techniques of decision making. This is illustrated by the discourse analysis of the programme of the National Department of Work in Argentina between 1907 and 1915, through which the governing of risks at work was organised within a liberal rational framework. HAIDAR is engaging here with governmentality studies and discussing its applicability in the Argentinean context. [31]

The article from Francisco TIRADO and Anna GÁLVEZ (2007) outlines positioning theory as a discourse analysis of interaction, focusing on the topic of conflict. Moreover, this theory is applied to a new work environment for the social sciences: virtual spaces. The authors review key psychosocial issues which define the topic of conflict, and discuss virtual environments as a new work space for the social sciences. TIRADO and GÁLVEZ conduct a synthesis of positioning theory and its FOUCAULTian legacy, while appreciating its particular appropriateness for analysing conflictive interaction in virtual environments. [32]

Looking at concrete developments in methodology and methods of discourse analysis, a wide range of different positions can be identified. Current reflections on methodological basics and practice reveal several combinations of theoretical backgrounds (e.g. from sociology of knowledge to ethnomethodology and positioning theory) and methodological strategies (e.g. from grounded theory to combining quantitative and qualitative strategies). In addition, not only text documents that are found in archives or in media samples are at the core of empirical work on discourses. Increasingly, interviews, talk-in-action and everyday talk is employed to widen the data resources of research work within this field. [33]

These trends tend to produce a methodological discourse about discourse analysis, where most of the protagonists prefer to look at FOUCAULTian discourse analysis as some kind of a theoretical and methodological tool box that can be filled up with all the necessary methods that support the particular research questions. Nonetheless, discourse analysis needs some methodological foundations that can guide empirical research, even though one can find empirical research without clear-cut methodological designs. [34]

Rainer DIAZ-BONE (2007) argues that FOUCAULTian discourse analysis can be conceived as a transformation of the French tradition of epistemology. Since the 1960s the work of Gaston BACHELARD and Georges CANGUILHEM built the epistemological foundations of French structuralism and post-structuralism. In particular, BACHELARD's analysis of the internal structure of scientific theories can be interpreted as a proto-version of FOUCAULTian discourse analysis. DIAZ-BONE proposes to reconstruct important elements of FOUCAULTian discourse analysis by tracing the influence of BACHELARDian concepts in the work of FOUCAULT. Thus DIAZ-BONE tries to reconstruct the methodological position of FOUCAULTian discourse analysis by looking backwards in time. [35]

Niels HELSLOOT and Tony HAK (2007) contribute to a reconstruction of the methodological position of empirical discourse analysis by tracing forward in time the FOUCAULTian starting point and the subsequent phases in the discourse analytic work of Michel PÊCHEUX. In France, PÊCHEUX became one of the most important and influential discourse researchers, but outside of France his contributions to empirical discourse analysis are—until today—almost unrecognised (in fact he is better known as a researcher in ideology theory). HELSLOOT and HAK use PÊCHEUX's work for the development of an instrument for discourse analysis. They show also that in his later work Michel PÊCHEUX criticized the structuralist approach to discourse research and developed a more reflective theory of "interdiscourse". [36]

Questioning the relation between discursive and non-discursive practices (WRANA & LANGER 2007) leads to a more developed discussion about the analytical range of discourse analysis: but what about concepts like power, body, everyday practices and subjectivation when doing empirical research which do not concentrate only on institutional speech? Daniel WRANA and Antje LANGER show how to shift discourse analysis from public speech to private talk (even, perhaps, to oneself) to embodied feelings as its analytical goals. [37]

The article by Anne WALDSCHMIDT, Anne KLEIN, Miguel Tomayo KORTE and Sibel DALMAN-EKEN (2007) offers methodological considerations of the relationship between everyday life and discourse. They discuss in their article the following main points: (1) a differentiation between three types of discourse, namely special discourse, interdiscourse and elementary discourse; (2) the contribution to the conceptualisation of everyday discourse in respect to Peter BERGER's and Thomas LUCKMANN's (1966) sociology of knowledge; and finally (3) the subjectivation of everyday knowledge is also analysed. [38]

Another field of concrete discussions and research trends is the relation between discourse and institution—not least because discourse defined as institutional and public speech narrows the perspective unreasonably. Therefore the concept of institution as it is used within sociology—for example by social constructionists like BERGER and LUCKMANN—should be rewritten in a discourse-sensitive way. This leads to a concept of dispositif that aims at combining the analysis of discursive and—as an analytical differentiation—non-discursive practices in

different institutional fields and the link to power relations effecting positioning and forming subjectivity and the self. [39]

Reiner KELLER (2007) makes clear in his article how the use of Michel FOUCAULT's ideas about discourse for empirical research induces a linguistic bias which misses FOUCAULT's interests in the power-knowledge relation. Against such tendencies, KELLER's article argues for a grounding of discourse theory and empirical discourse research in the sociology of knowledge, especially in the German-based *Hermeneutische Wissenssoziologie,* which follows BERGER's and LUCKMANN's (1966) approach to knowledge. Finally, the article insists that discourse research should not be reduced to the analysis of spoken or written texts. Instead, different kinds of materiality—for example as dispositifs— have to be considered. [40]

The article from Andrea BÜHRMANN and Werner SCHNEIDER (2007) introduces the conceptual and practical field of dispositif analysis. They examine the conceptual instruments and methodological procedures of dispositif analysis, the relations between discourse and non-discursive practices, subjectification, everyday orders of knowledge and institutional practices. They also point out the methodological possibilities and limitations of dispositif analysis and demonstrate these possibilities and limitations. BÜHRMANN and SCHNEIDER provide an extension of the perspectives of FOUCAULTian discourse theory and research by stressing the relations between normative orders of knowledge, their effects on interactions and individual self-reflections connected with them. [41]

So it could be asked: what is promised by dispositif analysis when dealing with questions of analysing institutional practices, interaction orders and forming subjectivity (self-presentations in biographical narrations)? In this context Elisabeth TUIDER (2007) discusses ways of analysing new forms of subjectivity. She suggests a methodological link between discourse analysis and biography analysis. Linking these two research traditions will eliminate the deficiencies of both research traditions: while discourse analysis just revealed new forms of subjectivations without finding adequate methods to study them, biography analysis simply focused on subject positions without connecting them systematically to their surrounding discourses. Taking the subject position *muxé,* found in Juchitán/Southern Mexico, as an example, she illustrates the possibilities of such a methodological combination. [42]

What are the specific theoretical and methodological requirements of analysing dispositifs in relation to the FOUCAULTian concept of discourse using different formats of data ("natural" texts, which are produced by the investigated field itself in combination with interview data, pictures, observation protocols)? Or the requirements of using speech, talk and visuality, or of using non-textual materials like pictures? In connection with this, Cornelia RENGGLI (2007) analyses from a FOUCAULTian standpoint not only what can be said but also what can be seen— in contrast to the unseeable and unsayable. She discusses how to apply the FOUCAULTian methodology in the analysis of pictures. [43]

Another element of dispositif analysis is the examination of the discursive production of space and area location and its consequences for practices and self concepts. Sybille BAURIEDL (2007) deals with discursive practices and the order of space. She stresses in her article that discourses are embedded in the social context of their evolutionary history and, moreover, that they are spatially embedded. Therefore a discourse analysis needs a historical and a spatial perspective. Working with these two perspectives raises epistemological and methodological problems. So for BAURIEDL it is clear that making conclusions about the spatial anchoring of discourses and about the relation of these discourses requires us to embed the terms "space", "place" and "locality" into the conception of discourse research. Furthermore, there is urgent need of a methodology which can measure the reflexive processes of construction and constitution of spaces and systems of signification. [44]

Georg GLASZE (2007) tries in his discourse analysis to combine quantitative and qualitative methods. He argues in his article that a triangulation of two linguistic methods is appropriate to reveal temporary fixations: by means of corpus-driven lexicometric procedures as well as by the analysis of narrative patterns, the regularities of the linkage of elements can be analysed (for example, in diachronic comparisons). GLASZE gives an example of a geographical research project. Here he demonstrates how the historically contingent constitution of an international community and "world region" can be analysed. [45]

A number of new fields of applied discourse analysis, such as governmentality studies, cultural studies, gender studies, postcolonial studies, analysis of welfare/workfare etc. have become popular in recent times, but are these merely fashionable concepts or are they the location for the substantial rewriting of basic conceptions? Gary WICKHAM and Gavin KENDALL (2007) deal with the FOUCAULTian governmentality approach, and argue that this approach relies on a KANTian teleology. For WICKHAM and KENDALL, FOUCAULT's governmentality approach implies an ultimate purpose to human endeavour, the quest for ever-growing human reason, a reason that is the universal basis of moral judgements. Drawing on some of Max WEBER's methodological insights, WICKHAM and KENDALL develop the argument that critical discourse analysis, in taking on the FOUCAULTian approach, gives up the best traditions of description, explanation and the identification of causes in favour of the expression, in many different forms, of this teleology. [46]

Anna VITORES and Miquel DOMENECH (2007) show the importance of FOUCAULT's theory within social studies of science and technology. They also illustrate how FOUCAULT's analysis can be useful for studies of science, technology and society focused on power effects. To accomplish these objectives they analyse the emergence of a specific techno-scientific innovation: the electronic monitoring of offenders. They map the discontinuities and discursive dispersions linked to those practices that constitute different materialisations of this electronic device. While they start from questions concerning power technologies, rather than simply analysing the ideologies and knowledges that legitimate electronic monitoring and its technical reliability, VITORES and

DOMENECH attend to the assemblage of discourses, rhetorics, vocabularies, techniques and procedures by which knowledge is intertwined and joins with the exercise of power. In this way, they show how one of FOUCAULT's technologies of power—disciplinary technology—is articulated, nourished and contradicted by other emergent logics drawing on new forms of regulation and social control. [47]

Brendan K. O'ROURKE and Martyn PITT (2007) try to combine FOUCAULTian insights with the techniques of conversation analysis. They concentrate on research interview data and make clear a FOUCAULTian perspective on the interview as a research instrument, questioning the idea of "naturally-occurring discourse". The "technology of the confessional" operates, not only within research interviews, but within other interactions as well. Drawing on FOUCAULT does not circumvent the problems of the interview as research instrument, but rather shows these problems cannot be escaped by simply switching to more "natural" interactions. O'ROURKE and PITT combine these ideas with recent developments within discourse analysis. In this way, they can provide analytical resources for, rather than barriers to, the discourse analysis of research interviews. They show how a research interview might be subjected to a discourse analysis using elements of this approach. [48]

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

In Section 2 we pointed out that the theoretical work of Michel FOUCAULT is in many social sciences an established part of their theoretical body (or is currently establishing itself, as in political science and history outside France). The international "sciences movements" such as gender studies, cultural studies, postcolonial studies and especially governmentality studies force the integration of FOUCAULT's works into the international and interdisciplinary landscapes of the social sciences. But we have to point out the difference between research in the area of FOUCAULTian discourse theory, research done with reference to the theory of FOUCAULT on one side and empirical FOUCAULTian discourse analysis on the other side. [49]

FOUCAULTian discourse analysis is not a theoretically informed "attitude" or just another "perspective" in the area of qualitative social research. Many researchers in the last few decades have become more and more aware that the socio-historical analyses of FOUCAULT and his methodological considerations about archaeology and genealogy have laid the groundwork for a new methodological area for empirical research that conceives itself as a form of scientific and self-reflexive practice: FOUCAULTian discourse analysis as methodological discourse of social discourses and discursive practices. [50]

It follows, then, that discourse research has to reflect on the coherence of the research practice and the degree of fit with the theoretical notions of FOUCAULTian discourse theory, its underlying assumptions and models. It follows also that there are (or have to be developed) specific form of research design, modes of explanation, methodological standards and quality criteria for the evaluation of FOUCAULTian analysis—as the articles in this issue

demonstrate. Yet these articles demonstrate also that discussions are still active about the question: does FOUCAULTian discourse analysis include or prescribe certain methods, research tools and instruments, their design and use in the practice of discourse analysis? And how can other approaches and paradigms be combined with FOUCAULTian discourse research? [51]

The collection of articles in this special issue demonstrates that there are different strands of FOUCAULTian discourse research and that FOUCAULTian discourse analysis is not integrated in the way that one could speak of a FOUCAULTian paradigm. But the different research groups have begun to recognise each other and to identify shared methodological problems and topics. And here new perspectives for FOUCAULTian methodology emerge, as concepts such as "interdiscourse", "dispositif", "materialities" (as techniques, bodies, visual materials, media), events, other forms of practices and performativity force questions about the consequences of adequate methodological adaptation. The authors in this issue address many of these questions. We suggest that this special issue gives insight into the state of the art in FOUCAULTian discourse research as an emerging field of qualitative social research that forges its international integration. [52]

References

Amigot Leache, Patricia (2007). Más allá del discurso: Análisis genealógico de un proceso de transformación intersubjetiva de género [67 paragraphs]. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research, 8*(2), Art. 9, http://www.qualitative-research.net/fqs-texte/2-07/07-2-9-s.htm [Retrieved: 31.05.07].

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

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

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

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

Bauriedl, Sybille (2007). How to read space: Methods for a spatial analysis in discourse research [86 paragraphs]. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research, 8*(2), Art. 13, http://www.qualitative-research.net/fqs-texte/2-07/07-2-13-d.htm [Retrieved: 31.05.07].

Berger, Peter & Luckmann, Thomas (1966). *The social construction of society*. New York: Doubleday.

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

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

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

Bublitz, Hannelore (Ed.) (1998). *Das Geschlecht der Moderne*. Frankfurt/M.: Campus.

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

Bublitz, Hannelore (2007). Research report: Paderborner Ansatz der Diskursanalyse: "Die Ordnung der Geschlechterverhältnisse. Archäologie und Genealogie der Geschlechterdifferenz im Diskurs über die Kulturkrise um 1900" (DFG-Projekt von 1995-1999). *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung /*

Forum: Qualitative Social Research, *8*(2), http://www.qualitative-research.net/fqs-texte/2-07/07-2-P6-d.htm [Retrieved: 31.05.07].

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

Bührmann, Andrea D. (1998). Die Normalisierung der Geschlechter in Geschlechterdispositiven. In Hannelore Bublitz (Ed.), *Das Geschlecht der Moderne* (pp.71-94). Frankfurt/M.: Campus.

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

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

Burchell, Graham; Collin, Gordon & Miller, Peter (Eds.) (1991). *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Diaz-Bone, Rainer (2003). Entwicklungen im Feld der foucaultschen Diskursanalyse. Collective Review: Glyn Williams (1999). French discourse analysis. The method of post-structuralism / Johannes Angermüller, Katharina Bunzmann & Martin Nonhoff (Eds.) (2001). Diskursanalyse. Theorien, Methoden, Anwendungen / Reiner Keller, Andreas Hirseland, Werner Schneider & Willy Viehöfer (Eds.) (2001). Handbuch Sozialwissenschaftliche Diskursanalyse. Band 1: Theorien und Methoden / Patrick Charaudeau & Dominique Maingueneau (Eds.) (2002). Dictionaire d'analyse du discours / Reiner Keller (2003). Diskursforschung. Eine Einführung für SozialwissenschaftlerInnen [66 paragraphs]. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, *4*(3), Art. 1, http://www.qualitative-research.net/fqs-texte/3-03/3-03review-diazbone-d.htm [Retrieved: 06.11.06].

Diaz-Bone, Rainer (2006a). Zur Methodologisierung der Foucaultschen Diskursanalyse [48 paragraphs]. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, *7*(1), Art. 6, http://www.qualitative-research.net/fqs-texte/1-06/06-1-6-d.htm [Retrieved: 06.11.06].

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Glasze, Georg (2007). Vorschläge zur Operationalisierung der Diskurstheorie von Laclau und Mouffe in einer Triangulation von lexikometrischen und interpretativen Methoden [73 paragraphs]. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, *8*(2), Art. 14, http://www.qualitative-research.net/fqs-texte/2-07/07-2-14-d.htm [Retrieved: 28.05.07]

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

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

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

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

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

Gutiérrez Rodríguez, Encarnación (2007). Reading affect—On the heterotopian spaces of care and domestic work in private households [41 paragraphs]. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, *8*(2), Art. 11, http://www.qualitative-research.net/fqs-texte/2-07/07-2-11-e.htm [Retrieved: 28.05.07].

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

O'Rourke, Brendan K. & Pitt, Martyn (2007). Using the technology of the confessional as an analytical resource: Four analytical stances towards research interviews in discourse analysis [58 paragraphs]. F*orum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 8(2), Art. 3, http://www.qualitative-research.net/fqs-texte/2-07/07-2-3-e.htm [Retrieved: 28.05.07].

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

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

Renggli, Cornelia (2007). Selbstverständlichkeiten zum Ereignis machen: Eine Analyse von Sag- und Sichtbarkeitsverhältnissen nach Foucault [38 paragraphs]. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 8(2), Art. 23, http://www.qualitative-research.net/fqs-texte/2-07/07-2-23-d.htm [Retrieved: 28.05.07].

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Tuider, Elisabeth (2007). Diskursanalyse und Biographieforschung. Zum Wie und Warum von Subjektpositionierungen [81 paragraphs]. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, *8*(2), Art. 6, http://www.qualitative-research.net/fqs-texte/2-07/07-2-6-d.htm [Retrieved: 28.05.07].

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

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

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

Vitores, Anna & Doménech, Miquel (2007). Tecnología y poder. Un análisis foucaultiano de los discursos acerca de la monitorización electrónica [86 paragraphs]. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, *8*(2), Art. 2, http://www.qualitative-research.net/fqs-texte/2-07/07-2-2-s.htm [Retrieved: 28.05.07].

Waldschmidt, Anne; Klein, Anne; Korte, Miquel Tamayo & Dalman-Eken, Sibel (2007). Diskurs im Alltag – Alltag im Diskurs: Ein Beitrag zu einer empirisch begründeten Methodologie sozialwissenschaftlicher Diskursforschung [69 paragraphs]. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, *8*(2), Art. 15, http://www.qualitative-research.net/fqs-texte/2-07/07-2-15-d.htm [Retrieved: 28.05.07].

Wickham, Gary & Kendall, Gavin (2007). Critical discourse analysis, description, explanation, causes: Foucault's inspiration Versus Weber's perspiration [30 paragraphs]. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, *8*(2), Art. 4, http://www.qualitative-research.net/fqs-texte/2-07/07-2-4-e.htm [Retrieved: 28.05.07].

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

Wrana, Daniel & Langer, Antje (2007). An den Rändern der Diskurse. Jenseits der Unterscheidung diskursiver und nicht-diskursiver Praktiken [62 paragraphs]. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, *8*(2), Art. 20, http://www.qualitative-research.net/fqs-texte/2-07/07-2-20-d.htm [Retrieved: 28.05.07].

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

Authors

Andrea D. BÜHRMANN, Dr. phil, M.A., is, since 2004, private lecturer ("Privatdozentin") at the University of Münster/Germany. Currently, she is acting professor of sociology at the Ludwig-Maximilians-University of Munich. Her main research areas and interests are: social and scientific theories, gender studies, empirical social research, and welfare studies.

Contact:

Prof. Dr. Andrea D. Bührmann

Institute of Sociology
Ludwig-Maximilians Universität München
Konradstr. 6
80801 München, Germany

Tel.: +49 (0)89-2180-3802

E-mail: andrea.buehrmann@soziologie.uni-muenchen.de

Rainer DIAZ-BONE, Dr. phil., Dipl. Soz.-Wiss., is assistant professor at the Institute of Sociology at the Free University of Berlin. Main research areas are: applied FOUCAULTian discourse analysis, empirical cultural sociology, economic sociology, empirical social research, social statistics, and social network analysis. Rainer DIAZ-BONE has published *two review essays* in *FQS: Does qualitative network analysis exist?* and *Developments in the field of Foucaultian discourse analysis, the articles Milieu models and milieu instruments market research* and *Developing Foucault's Discourse Analytic Methodology.* Also published are the two interviews *Practical Elaborations. About the Development of Foucaultian Discourse Analysis in Germany. Jürgen Link in Conversation With Rainer Diaz-Bone* and *Critical Discourse Analysis. The Elaboration of a Problem Oriented Discourse Analytic Approach After Foucault. Siegfried Jäger in Conversation With Rainer Diaz-Bone.*

Contact:

Dr. Rainer Diaz-Bone

Freie Universität Berlin
Institut für Soziologie
Garystrasse 55
14195 Berlin, Germany

Tel.: +49 (0)30-838-57620

E-mail: diazbone@zedat.fu-berlin.de
URL: http://www.rainer-diaz-bone.de/

Encarnación GUTIÉRREZ RODRÍGUEZ is Senior Lecturer in Transcultural Studies at the University of Manchester. Her research can be placed at the juncture of Critical Migration Studies, Gender, Queer and Postcolonial Studies. She works on politics of belonging and identity, affect and work, Europe and post-coloniality, deconstruction, discourse analysis and ethnography.

Contact:

Dr. Encarnación Gutiérrez Rodríguez

School of Languages, Linguistics and Cultures
University of Manchester
Oxford Road
Manchester M13 9PL, UK

Tel: +44-161-2758047
Fax: +44-161-2753031

E-mail: e.gutierrez@manchester.ac.uk

Gavin KENDALL is a sociologist at Queensland University of Technology, Brisbane, and was previously lecturer in psychology at Lancaster University. His books include *Using FOUCAULT's Methods* (Sage, 1999) and *Understanding Culture* (Sage, 2001), both written with Gary WICKHAM, and *The State, Democracy and Globalization* (Palgrave, 2004), written with Roger KING. His latest book, *The Sociology of Cosmopolitanism* (with Zlatko SKRBIS and Ian WOODWARD) will be published by Palgrave in 2008. Current research projects include ordinary understanding of risk, and the history of social theory. Gavin KENDALL is the corresponding author.

Contact:

Dr. Gavin Kendall

School of Humanities and Human Services
Queensland University of Technology
Brisbane, QLD4034, Australia

Tel.: +61 7 3138 4613
Fax: +61 7 3138 4719

E-mail: g.kendall@qut.edu.au

Werner SCHNEIDER, Dr. phil., Dipl.-Soz., studied sociology, psychology and pedagogic, and since 2003 has been professor of sociology at the University of Augsburg. From 1988 to 2003 he worked at the Institute of Sociology at the Ludwig-Maximilians-University Munich. Main research areas are: discourse theory and discourse analysis, sociology of knowledge and culture, sociology of medicine, sociology of death and dying, sociology of family and marriage, and empirical social research.

Contact:

Prof. Dr. Werner Schneider

Philosophisch-Sozialwissenschaftliche Fakultät

Universität Augsburg
Universitätsstr. 10
86135 Augsburg, Germany

Tel.: +49 (0)821-598-5570

E-Mail: Werner.Schneider@phil.uni-augsburg.de
http://www.philso.uni-augsburg.de/lehrstuehle/soziologie/sozio3/

FRANCISCO TIRADO holds a Dr. Ph. in Social Psychology. He is a Lecturer in the Social Psychology Department of Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona. He is full member of the Group for Social Studies of Science and Technology (GESCIT). His interests cohere around four main topics: a) Science and Technology Studies, b) power relationships and political action in new sociotechnical contexts, c) citizen participation in technoscientific controversies; d) care technologies in a FOUCAULTian context. He is currently leading a project funded by the Ministerio de Educación y Cultura on care technologies with a German research group from Munich University titled "Feeling at home with technologies? An analysis of the impact of (assistive) technologies for the elderly and disabled people". He is the author of several articles and books on STS and Power Relationships in new sociotechnical contexts.

Contact:

Francisco Tirado

Departament de Psicologia Social
Facultat de Psicologia, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona
08193Bellaterra (Barcelona), Spain

Tel.: +34935812353
Fax: +34935812125

E-mail: franciscojavier.tirado@uab.es

Citation

Revised 6/2007