<https://helda.helsinki.fi>

Democrac' as othering within Finnish education

Simpson, Ashley

2018

Simpson , A 2018 , ' Democrac' as othering within Finnish education ' , International Journal of Bias, Identity and Diversities in Education , vol. 3 , no. 2 , pp. 77-93 . <https://doi.org/10.4018/IJBIDE.2018070106>

<http://hdl.handle.net/10138/299910>

<https://doi.org/10.4018/IJBIDE.2018070106>

acceptedVersion

Downloaded from Helda, University of Helsinki institutional repository.

This is an electronic reprint of the original article.

This reprint may differ from the original in pagination and typographic detail.

Please cite the original version.

Introduction: Democracy in Finnish education

The aim of this paper is to focus on the ways discourses about democracy and human rights within Finnish education are framed through nationalistic and/or ethnocentric ideologies. Finland has been ‘described’ as a country ‘that shows what equal opportunities look like’ (Sahlberg, 2012), and a country with ‘high levels of equality’ (Aylott, 2016). In a further example, Niemi, Toom, & Kallioniemi. (2012) note the importance of teachers as actors of democracy in Finland and stress strong social cohesion as a factor in Finland’s educational successes. The Ministry of Education and Culture in Finland has published on the need for Finland to do better in terms of inclusion and participation in its schools (Ministry of Education and Culture, 2008). Moreover, the Ministry has gone on to stress that Finland recognises the importance of curriculum development, literacy, and, teacher training for human rights education (Ministry of Education and Culture, 2011). In compulsory education, section 2 of the Basic Education Act in Finland states: ‘(2) Education shall promote civilisation and equality in society and pupils’ prerequisites for participating in education and otherwise developing themselves during their lives’ (Ministry of Education and Culture, 2016, p. 1). The translation and interpretation of what these words mean in practice is yet to be seen. Lappalainen & Lahelma (2015) argue that discourses on equality in Finland have generated a number of assumptions about what society should be like, in contrast to what Finnish society is like. Simola (2014) argues that within Finland a number of discursive formations over time have produced ‘myths’ around ‘educational clientelism’ and notions of ‘social democracy’. Indeed, some studies on Finnish education have indicated that Finnish schools do not encourage students to develop their own ‘political voice’ (Sandström, Einarson, Davies, & Asunta, 2010) in comparison to other countries. Finally, some commentators have indicated a potential ‘democratic crisis’ in sections of Finnish society (Andersson & Sjöblom, 2013). Seemingly, a number of questions remain surrounding the meanings and practices of democratic values within Finland.

The paper offers a deeper gaze within Finnish education by looking at the ways the word ‘democracy’ is uttered by practitioners within the field of education. As I have previously noted, within Finnish education democracy discourses are present in policy documents, teacher training resources, and, national curricular documents. It is therefore important to deconstruct the ways practitioners utter and use the word democracy as the speakers themselves carry symbolic significance in how other interlocutors (teachers, students etc.) are influenced by their utterances. Inspired by Mikhail Bakhtin’s (1981) work on dialogism, this paper focuses on heteroglossic discourse functions to uncover cultural stereotyping and othering in terms of how democracy discourses are discussed and expressed within the context of Finland. Excerpt 1 is shown before excerpt 2 in order to situate the meta-discourses about democracy within Finnish education, thus, one can then go on to demonstrate the relationships between the meta-discourses about democracy and individual utterances. Excerpt 1 shows a discussion at a conference on democracy and human rights and shows the discursive interactions of interlocutors within a dialogue. Excerpt 1 is taken from a conference I co-organised on democracy and human rights. This dialogue offers a rare insight into the dialogues between human rights practitioners within Finland, international scholars, and experts in the field. The conference in excerpt 1 shows the contestation of ideas between academics and human rights practitioners on the issues surrounding democracy and human rights, generally, and specifically, within the Finnish context. Excerpt 2, like excerpt 1, focuses on the utterances of NGO [Non-Governmental Organisation] practitioners being confronted by an other – in this instance, me (a non-Finnish citizen living in Finland). Excerpt 2, like excerpt 1, offers an insight into the discourses of human rights practitioners when confronted by an other. Here, I play the role of a ‘devil’s advocate’ in the conversation whereby I contest the narratives and ideologies presented by the speakers. In excerpt 2 the youth participation conference was mainly attended by Finnish school students and Finnish teachers, thus, the excerpt shows how practitioners utter discourses about democracy and human rights amongst other practitioners within the field of education. Only two excerpts are used as the focus is to show how two sets of practitioners from two different events utter discourses about democracy. In using the two excerpts in my analysis I am not attempting to generalise the whole of the Finnish context from these examples, rather, the excerpts used indicate sentiments that can be hidden within conversations about democracy and human rights (such as, cultural stereotypes, essentialisms, ethnocentrisms etc.) whereby speaker utterances and discourse strategies can be traced.

Democracy, education and discourse: The problematique

The role of education and democracy has been much debated. John Dewey (1916) explored the role that education plays in a democratic society and focused on education as part of a broader project that encompassed an exploration of the nature of experience, knowledge, society and ethics. Dewey argued that the link between community and pedagogy was paramount and that educators needed to consider the connection between community life and the life within the classroom (Dewey, 1916). Dewey’s work is often cited and/or quoted on issues of democracy within education without much critical inquisition (For example, Mintz, 2000; Hecht, 2010). It is important to note however that Dewey’s work has been critically examined by a number of commentators. Some scholars have noted the contradictions of progressive education (Howlett, 2013) and Dewey’s failure to address the role of democratic communities and how democracies emerge and come in-to-being (Joas, 2000). This has raised a number of questions in terms of how democracy is developed and understood (Carr, Plum, & Howard, 2014), and, who defines democracy (Zhao, 2014).

Such questions on how democracy is constituted has resulted in scholarly interest in rediscovering the communitarian, pluralist, participatory forms of democracy as a challenge to representative democratic systems (Mouffe, 2009). Chantal Mouffe argues that inherent antagonisms lie at the centre of democracy which raise important questions on the ethics of democratic values and the organization of society (Mouffe, 2009). The foundation of democratic values can be somewhat unstable, thus the logics and meanings of democratic values often appear to be ambiguous and contradictory (Biesta & Lawy, 2006). For example, Mouffe's (2000; 2005) work on agonistic democracy is critical of Jürgen Habermas's rationalist deliberative approach to democracy (see Habermas, 1995), central to Mouffe's argument is that liberal thought is blind to the political as it essentialises being as presence thus engendering a politics of us versus them (Mouffe, 2000; 2009). In this sense, it is important to note that democracy discourses are multivoiced (Bakhtin, 1981; 1984) and susceptible to othering the self and others (Koro-Ljungberg, 2007).

Mikhail Bakhtin reminds us that a word is born within a dialogue containing 'otherness' and 'our-own-ness' which is constantly re-worked and re-accentuated by one's self (Bakhtin, 1981). The processes and relationships between one's self and one's Other[s] relates to the intersubjective manifestations of how one's identity comes-into-being through discourse (Ibid.). These processes are not fixed and are situated within dialogically uttered discourses – a chain of statements, responses repetitions, and, quotations (Ibid.). Within dialogues individual utterances play an important role in how one listens, speaks, and ultimately, understands one's other[s] (Ibid.). Here it is important to delineate the concept of othering – by othering I mean discourses which hierarchically marginalise and discriminate against people and/or groups through the uses of stereotypes, prejudices, and representations (Dervin, 2016). Othering can refer to logics and/or practices that are ethnocentric and/or racist (Said, 1978), culturally ignorant (Karim & Eid, 2012), and, demonising (Graham, 2005). Othering has also been associated with the discourses of (neo)colonialism from the perspectives of objectivised (Tiessen, 2011) and colonised identities (Harris, 2016). 'Othering' is a discursive construct which has been closely linked to the [re]production of power/knowledge in society especially in its ability to marginalise, stereotype and discriminate against people and/or groups through essentialising identities (Said, 1978).

The functions and uses of discursive concepts: some examples

Mikhail Bakhtin's dialogical approach (Bakhtin, 1981) focuses on the use of polyphony ('many-voiced') within the multi-layered language system of heteroglossia. Heteroglossia means that discourses are 'living', in the sense that they interact with other discourses – heteroglossia is thus a multidiscursive concept which means that a speakers utterances are constantly interacting with other discourses (Ibid.). Heteroglossia encompasses the multiplicity of voice and the multiplicity of meaning-making is recognised as important in understanding the speech situation of particular utterances and the meanings generated within dialogues (Bakhtin, 1981).

Within all utterances the heteroglot of diversity can be traced through and by multiple voices and multiple dialects within dialogue (ibid). Bakhtin describes heteroglossia as 'another's speech in another's language' (Bakhtin, 1981, p. 324) – Bakhtin here means, a language system which is characterised by the refracted interplay of who is speaking within a given context. Bakhtin's dialogism here means that any discourse is interrelated to all other discourses within a chain of discursive signification. As a result, discourses react to preceding discourses and anticipate further discourses (Zienkowski, Östman, & Verschueren, 2011).

One of the ways one can trace heteroglossia in discourse is through discourse markers (Aijmer & Simon-Vandenberg in Zienkowski, Östman, & Verschueren., 2011). Discourse markers or 'pragmatics markers' are embedded within a wider discursive pragmatics framework (Aijmer & Simon-Vandenberg in Zienkowski, Östman, & Verschueren., 2011). Discourse markers are a 'set of linguistic items that function in cognitive, expressive, social, and, textual domains' (Maschler & Schiffrin in Tannen, Hamilton & Schiffrin 2015, p. 189). Discourse markers are situated within processes of social interaction (Schiffrin, 1988), and in this sense, utterances are social acts (Bakhtin, 1981; 1984). Discourse markers as a form of analysis focus on the distribution of markers (Which? Where? Why?), the performativity of utterances (What is the form? What is the meaning?) and, interaction (What is the contact? How are the relationships constituted?) (Maschler and Schiffrin in Tannen, Hamilton & Schiffrin, 2015).

Discourse markers are heteroglossic (Aijmer & Simon-Vandenberg, 2006) as they have an argumentative and interactional function. Discourse markers are also reflexive (White, 2003), in the sense that utterances are interpreted by other speakers and hearers within dialogue. Discourse markers indicate how discourses relate to other discourses, how utterances containing discourse markers are a response to preceding discourses, and, how discourse markers are orientated towards the hearer's presumptions (Rühlemann, 2007). Ultimately, discourse markers are important indicators that can reveal speakers' beliefs and/or attitudes through a number of strategic devices (Östman, 1995).

Some of the strategic devices that will be discussed in this paper include ventriloquising/voicing, hedging, backchanneling, evidentiality, heteroglossic pronouns, and, indexical stance markers. Ventriloquising (Tannen, 2007) or voicing (Bakhtin, 1981) is when a speaker in a conversation animates [an]other's voice in the presence of

an[other] (Tannen, 2010). In this sense, the ventriloquised voices are the dialects of ‘social voices’ (Bakhtin, 1981). Thus, ventriloquism can be used to establish dominance or distance oneself from the persona being referred to or the ‘object’ being ventriloquised (Sullivan, 2016).

Heteroglossic utterances can also be traced through the use of pronouns. De Sousa and Correia (2014) show how the heteroglossic utterances of the pronouns ‘You’ and ‘One’ shows the discursive ‘act’ of Self and Other – a metamorphoses of mirroring and multiple ‘inner’ voices. Using Bakhtin’s framework (Bakhtin, 1981; 1984) De Sousa and Correia (2014) show how pronouns (for example, I, we, they, them, us, it, their etc.) are heteroglossic – an endeavour between speakers and addressees whereby the voices of the ‘Other[s]-within-the Self’ overlap creating multiple discourses and multiple voices. In this sense, the heteroglossic function of pronouns act as indexical stance markers establishing social relationships and identities (Bauman, 2005).

Speakers modify their utterances through the processes of hedging. Hedging or ‘hedges’ (particles, lexical and clausal hedges, pragmatic idioms) are discourse markers that attenuate (or weaken) the strength of an utterance (Wilamova, 2013). Modal expressions such as; suppose, perhaps, could, maybe; and vague language such as; sort of or just, are all examples of hedging. Holmes (2013) shows how discourses uttered in greetings, apologies, and compliments impose ‘negative politeness’ (Holmes, 2013, p.74) which acts to mitigate against possible confrontations between speakers in conversations.

The term backchanneling has been used extensively in discourse analysis when referring to the feedback loop of verbal (e.g., yes, uh huh) and nonverbal cues (e.g., head nods, smiles). Backchannels are devices which can give important clues and indicators into how utterances are generated and the intonations behind the verbal cues – such as the dynamics of evidentiality (Nuckolls & Michael, 2014). Evidentiality refers to the responses of speaker[s] to previous utterances and statements, usually words or gestures one does not think much about, but these words/actions can indicate deeper meanings and logics. For example, backchanneling can indicate stereotyping (Precht, 2008) in conversations which take the form of small talk and/or gossip (Paz, 2009).

The many voices and faces of democracy and human rights within Finnish education

Excerpt one is a conversation from a conference I co-organised in February 2016. Taken from the conference, the dialogue below is between two academics (Speaker A and Speaker D) and two human rights practitioners (Speaker B and Speaker C). Speaker B is a Finnish PhD candidate in human rights law. Speaker C is a human rights practitioner working for an international human rights NGO (Non-Governmental Organisation) based in Finland. Speaker B and Speaker C both presented their work and reflections on human rights in Finland, below is an excerpt from the questions and answers which followed their presentations.

Excerpt 1: Conference speakers’ questions and answers.

1. Speaker A - Erm....I am still struggling with the idea of human rights...I wonder how much the new curriculum
2. is going to help kids to reflect upon the instability of human rights and reflect on how human rights are used as
3. an excuse, in a sense, to compare different parts of the world and to make some parts of the world better than
4. others. I am thinking here about China and how much China has been struggling with the idea of human rights,
5. and many other parts, the idea of human rights being typically Eurocentric - when you look at the history of
6. human rights. What about the idea of human duties? Why rights only? And, to what extent has this idea been
7. developed in your fields?

[inaudible muttering – deliberations of who should respond to the question]

8. Speaker B– I think human rights....often have a duty...it’s both ways...and all of us are, you know...as a
9. teacher for example we are trying to protect the rights of the child but, erm...we have human rights as well, and
10. it goes back to the individualI don’t know about this Eurocentric thing, it’s an old argument, nowadays it’s
11. more or less seen that human rights are universal. There are different cultural perspectives in terms of what they
12. are and what they mean and China is having its own understanding...erm... in the major conventions there are
13. lots of states outside of Europe that are committed to them and acting them and so on..... on this human duties
14. idea, you know, that human rights should contain obligations and duties, sometime it is related to the wording, I
15. think human rights already contain duties towards others, if we just have rights there will be conflicts all the
16. time, we have to respect the rights of the other that comes inside the human rights approach.

[pause]

17. Speaker B - There are different cultural interpretations but human rights are still universal, they have a core
18. content, I think, at schools with the curricular the purpose is to identify different fields where human rights are
19. relevant, such as the rights of a child, asylum seekers rights, freedom of speech – which could contain different
20. points of view.

Excerpt 1 starts with a question from Speaker A to Speakers B and C – there is a period of inaudible muttering before it is decided that Speaker B will respond to the question. Speaker B's response (starting on line 8) includes a number of hesitant pauses and backchannels (e.g., 'you know' line 8), here the backchannel 'you know' acts as evidentiality – affixing an 'assumed' relationship between Speaker A and Speaker B based upon the (assumed) knowledge of both speakers. A number of attitudes are expressed which overlap, such as, 'we have human rights as well' (line 9), here the utterance of human rights proceeds the utterance that teachers 'are trying to protect the rights of the child' and that 'it's more or less seen that human rights are universal' (line 11). 'As well' (line 9), 'trying' (line 9), and 'more or less' (line 11) indicates that the speaker is carefully managing the conversation but is unaware of how the speakers' voices are overlapping. 'We have human rights as well' (line 9) is an afterthought to the idea that teachers are 'trying to protect the rights of the child' (line 9). At this stage the disunity in Speaker B's voices suggests a number of potential indicators – that Speaker B is reproducing a number of 'soundbites' on the idea of human rights (ie, that human rights are universal) – and, that Speaker B is unwilling to engage in a dialogue which contests the notion of human rights. In tracing the voices of Speaker B heteroglossic pronouns can reveal deeper meanings and logics especially when different countries and/or cultures are discussed within conversations. From Speaker B's utterance that 'it's more or less seen that human rights are universal' (line 10 and line 11) a number of heteroglossic pronouns are uttered when discussing the Chinese context and human rights. Speaker B utters 'we' (line 9 twice), 'they' (lines 11 and 12), and 'them' (line 13 twice) indicating the multivoiced discourses of the speaker. The uses of 'they' and 'them' indicates an externalising and distancing of the conversation subject matters (of human rights, and, of the Chinese context), but, also, Speaker B dismisses the contestation of the Chinese context (and human rights generally) by uttering 'human rights are still universal' (line 17). Here Speaker B stresses on the word 'still' (line 17) which reinforces the dominant stance position of Speaker B – that human rights are universal – but this can also reveal a number of ventriloquised meta-discourses – such as, the idea that Finland has an 'A grade for human rights' as designated by the International Coordination Committee of National Institutions for the promotion and protection of human rights (Human rights centre, 2016). Such meta-discourses reinforce discourses of othering as the other (China, here, as a counter narrative) is dismissed and marginalised at the expense of Speaker B's dominant view point that human rights are 'universal'. Speaker B's utterances from lines 17 to 20 were preceded by a large pause – indicating this section as an afterthought – the connective 'but' (line 17) shows a shift in the speech topic and a dismissiveness to the prior utterance 'that there are different cultural interpretations' (line 17). Following these comments a number of supplementary questions were asked from other conference participants.

21. Speaker D- I'm just thinking, whether you need some form of moral education with human rights education.
 22. What do you think is the relationship between human rights and the moral education curriculum?

23. Speaker C – Well, I think, now there is a lot of human rights in religious studies and ethical studies – for those
 24. who do not belong to a church then you go to these classes, I think the way to teach human rights in schools is
 25. through stories and it will be through stories about ethical issues how you learn the rights, in a way, because I
 26. think inside the stories you need to think what is right and what is wrong, it is all ethical discussion without
 27. which you cannot understand the system at all.

28. Speaker A – How can we do that when, in many places we are manipulated by the media? Going back to China
 29. again, this guy who got the Nobel Prize for Peace is under house arrest etc. Of course, he is revered all around
 30. the world. What people do not know about this guy is that in the 1970s that he was anti-people, he did not like
 31. people, if you can read Chinese, that he despised the people, he was part of the upper class in China even though
 32. officially there was no upper class, now if you do not know this about this person and if you only look at how
 33. the West advertises for this guy on issuing the positive part as a counter reaction towards China, so, how do you
 34. do it? Because then you are contributing to propaganda against what you are trying to fight against. Do you see
 35. my point? There is always a counter narrative to the true stories you are telling about human rights, for example,
 36. for me, education should prepare kids to question these excerpts and to be extremely careful about these tokens
 37. of good human rights or fighters for human rights etc.

38. Speaker C – Well, I think we need to be honest and tell the critical points of view on human rights and how they
 39. are....

40. Speaker A – But, are teachers prepared for that?

[Pause]

41. Speaker A – I doubt it ...

42. Speaker C – Well they should be [laughs].

Within conversations speakers can alter, shift and re-work their own discourses depending upon their roles as interlocutors and the contexts the conversations take place within. Facework (Goffman, 1955; Haugh, 2013) is a strategic device which speakers can use to maintain a consistent face. Facework can give further insights into how

the identities of the self and the other are negotiated, co-constructed and performed (Bravo, 2008). Bravo (2008) illustrates how facework is multivoiced as speakers' manifest how she/he wishes to be seen within group discussions thus creating multiple voices and multiple identities. Speakers use facework strategies when the face becomes threatened – 'the avoidance face' neutralises any potential threats by avoiding disputes with participants, 'corrective facework' re-establishes the equilibrium in a conversation, and, 'aggressive facework' is deployed by speakers to gain something in/through social encounters (Goffman, 1955 in Haugh, 2013).

Speaker C marks facework by laughing at the end of this conversation (line 42) marking the embarrassment of the speaker due to face threats, though one has to look at Speaker C's previous utterances to determine this. In Speaker C's response to Speaker B, Speaker C utters that in the narratives on human rights 'you can decide what is right or wrong' (line 26). However, when Speaker A contests these notions (line 28 to 37) Speaker C responds with 'the avoidance face' to avoid confrontation with Speaker A – characterised by the response tokens of Speaker C (lines 38 and 39). But as Speaker A continues to contest the narrative of Speaker C the hedge 'should' (line 42) - distances Speaker C from their previous utterances - and laughter (line 42) marks the embarrassment of Speaker C's detour. Here when Speaker C's face is threatened, Speaker C is dismissive (of Speaker A's counter narrative, including the Chinese context), thus Speaker C attempts to save their face by laughing (line 42). In this sense, Speaker C creates a symbolic boarder of othering (Ueno & Gentile, 2015), engendering an essentialised boundary between the Chinese context and the Finnish context.

This excerpt raises questions on how human rights and democracy are understood by educators and human rights practitioners and how they interpret policy documents and legislation. It is important for human rights practitioners and educators to be aware of how their utterances can [re]produce othering and essentialist logics (See Dervin, 2016) when contesting narratives and differing contexts (such as China) are discussed in relation to democracy and human rights. From this excerpt both speakers were dismissive to different contexts and differing narratives on democracy and human rights and were perhaps, unable to understand how democracy and human rights can be understood as a starting point rather than an end (Rancire, 2007). Chantal Mouffe (2000; 2005), in her attack against liberal forms of democracy, demonstrates that democracy (and democratic values such as human rights) cannot be understood or practiced universally. This excerpt illustrates, what Mouffe (2005) would argue as the demarcation of a politics of 'us' versus 'them'. Whereby, one context (Finland) is situated as being hegemonically superior contra to the other (in this instance, China). Thus, it is important to problematize the meaning and relevance of democracy and human rights rather than uttering these concepts as mere simplistic answers.

Instead of focusing on idealised notions of democratic values, discourse offers a way not only to trace and observe discursive forms and practices, but, also enables one to question and critique the very essence of how, why, and in what ways, society is constituted (Fairclough, 2013). Excerpt 2 shows the utterances between myself and two NGO practitioners in Finland. The excerpt shows the interplay of discourses when democracy and human rights are questioned and critiqued (my utterances) and the responses to this questioning (the NGO practitioners). The following excerpt shows the discursive strategies speakers use when being confronted by an other which in turn can indicate the sentiments and meanings behind the speakers' utterances.

Reproducing essentialisms through democracy discourses

Excerpt 2 is a conversation which took place in November 2015 at a Youth Participation Conference in Helsinki, Finland. As well as showcasing youth participation within Finnish schools the event also included a number of International Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs). The dialogue in excerpt 2 is a conversation between two employees of an International NGO and myself. The conversation focuses on human rights and democracy education within Finland with regard to othering. By othering, I mean, instances where NGOs [re]produce discourses of victimhood (Kamler, 2013), denial (Apas & Akpınar, 2015), 'humanising' language and/or practices (Orgad & Nikunen, 2015) as well as, patronising attitudes and/or behaviour (Henderson, 2015). In this sense, the white guilt logic of helping and/or saving others (culturally, geographically, linguistically etc.) can [re]produce the logics and practices of neo-colonialism (Larsen, 2015), thus further marginalising and discriminating against the people NGO practitioners are so-called meant to be 'helping'. For example, research has been conducted on romanticised discourses and practices of International NGOs and how romanticised discourses can act as meta-discourses in distorting the information on a particular place/country/culture which can inadvertently [re]produce a number of generalisations and assumptions (such as stereotypes) about a particular place/country/culture (see Amutabi, 2013). During this conversation as one of the interlocutors within the discussion I played the role of the 'devil's advocate' to provide counter narratives to the utterances of Speaker X and Speaker Y. The aim of this was to make both Speaker X and Speaker Y critically aware of the discourses they were using and to contest the logics behind their utterances.

Excerpt 2: A conversation with two employees of an International Non-Governmental Organisation based in Finland

1. A.S – There are a lot of academic discourses, a lot of academic work about the role of organizations and
2. countries in the West (Europe, America, etc.) about how we talk, when we talk about human

3. rights/development issues it is always the external other. There are issues of democracy, issues in terms of rights
4. and minority rights that we need to discuss. So my question is...how do we bridge the gap between the
5. domestic issues and this idea that 'we need to help the world'?
6. Speaker X – [A long pause]...
7. A.S - The issue I have is that, Finland is completely different to an African country, you cannot replicate
8. Finland in Africa so what we are saying... On the one hand we will give you aid, we will help you train
9. ...But how does it actually alleviate poverty, how do we actually work towards big aims and goals?
10. Speaker X - Are you asking... like.... what are the results and are there results?
11. A.S - Yes, sure. What are the results of this work?
12. Speaker X - Actually next week I am going to Zambia and we have this project in there and I can answer
13. you better after that (laughs)... But actually, in my point of view, I've been with different democratic
14. projects I think there are events and there is a lot of evaluating and monitoring going on with all the projects...
15. So I am not sure, what are you asking in a bigger context?
16. A.S – My issue is when we talk about democracy, we talk about democratic rights, we talk about including
17. people. Obviously, it is important to raise awareness amongst Finnish people, I am not saying it is good or bad
18. at all. What I am saying is that we need to be careful when we say that we need to go to an African or Asian
19. country and we impose some ideas, some beliefs about how we think the world should be. Who are we to say
20. that?
21. Speaker X - Of course, we don't ideally say that 'you should do this', we always have like partner
22. organizations that tell ...like... 'we want to do this and we have these kind of issues'... I think it is
23. cooperation... It is not that we just tell them..... That's the ideal way of doing it.

Excerpt 2 starts with two questions to the interviewees – the only interjection between the first (lines 1-5) and second question (lines 7-9) is characterised visually as an ellipsis '...' on line 6. The first audible utterance of Speaker X begins on line 10 – 'Are you asking...' here the reference point of dialogic interaction begins. Here heteroglossic markers organise/arrange the dialogical interaction including accepting and/or rejecting the speakers' topic and conveying the speaker-addressee attitude (Manoliu, 1999). The utterances on line 12 start with the temporal adverb 'next week', Miecznikowski, Gili, & Bazzanella. (2015) show how temporal adverbs (such as now, then etc.) can act as argumentative indicators, especially, when functioning as distance reference points. Moreover, here one must note the passive-aggressive use of laughter (line 13) as a phatic device (Stenström, 2014) – here laughter acts as a phatic function as no-one uttered something funny (i.e., a joke). Combined with laughter are lexical phrases 'in my point of view' (line 13) and 'so I am not sure' (line 15) marks embarrassment and facework (Haugh, 2013). Here Speaker X became embarrassed by my alternative narrative (line 1 to 9) to the work of NGOs and was unable to propose a counter-narrative. Here the face of Speaker X came into direct contact with an other, as a result Speaker X decided to ignore my utterance by uttering 'there is a lot of evaluating and monitoring going on' (line 14). The utterances of Speaker X raise a number of concerns with regard to the generalising language used when discussing 'human rights' and/or 'democracy'.

Here, indexical markers help one understand the social identity (speaker roles), social acts (request), activities (narration), affective stance (attitudes/beliefs) and epistemic stance (degree of certainty) of particular words/concepts/phrases within units of discourse (Silverstein, 2003; 2010). The indexical beliefs of Speaker X characterised by the repetition of 'I' (for example, 4 times in Speaker X's first set of utterances), 'I am' (line 15), 'I think' (line 14) - are contradictory to the multivoiced discourses – the shifts between 'I', 'we' (line 22), and, 'them' (line 23). One can see here how the indexical beliefs of Speaker X are heteroglossic, rather than being fixed or unitary. This function can be described as 'indirect indexicality' (Bauman, 2005; Silverstein, 2010) or 'social indexicality' (Silverstein, 2003). Here, speech acts become social acts. Though, it is important to note that as the self is not one unified or fixed entity, indirect indexicalities can help one understand social relationships and the meanings behind speakers' utterances (Bauman, 2005). The importance of indirect indexicalities in how 'democracy' is understood and practiced cannot be as simple as René Descartes proclaimed – 'I think therefore I am (Cogito ergo sum)' (Descartes & Sutcliffe, 1968) – indirect indexicalities show the heteroglossic function of language and self, which is thus, incompatible with 'objective' or 'fixed' generalisations of one's identities and/or intersectionalities.

24. A.S - So how can we raise more awareness within schools, and, how can we do more about how we teach these
25. issues within schools?
26. Speaker X - They should be part of the ...I don't know... official programmes of the school, I think that
27. it has grown a lot and nowadays there are more these kind of lectures in schools but I think that it should be
28. more like in the schools and not....

29. Speaker Y - I think they've combined these kind of ideas into different subjects in schools. So, for
30. example, I think, we don't have that kind of material, but some organizations have material so they can use
31. them in like mother language classes or maths classes, so they can kind of get the global ideas from, it is not
32. like 'now you are learning global ideas' you get like global ideas from all the subjects you learn at schools. So I
33. think it's a good start.

34. A.S - And what in your opinion, working in this organization, what are these global aims, what are they?

35. Speaker X - For us they are the sustainable development goals and also no poverty, no hunger, those are
36. like the general...

37. A.S - The issue I have when it comes to international law and rights we have an objective right for some and a
38. subjective right for others. To some extent, we sort of have a veiled ignorance behind a constitution or EU law
39. but actually beyond that.... these rights are not translatable (to other parts of the world. It is ok to strive for
40. them... but they are not rights for everybody. So, how can we get to this situation where we have rights for
41. everybody instead of just rights for a few?

42. Speaker X - I think these human rights are the rights that should be, everybody should have them... So I
43. don't think that those are kind of negotiable, of course there are different ways to organize society and as we've
44. talked before, that it is a cooperation and we kind of listen to the partners and it's not like that. But I think
45. human rights are non-negotiable.

46. A.S - But in many places they are, they don't exist...

47. Speaker X -Yeah! That's why we kind of work to get them, we work for them.

One way of tracing cultural stereotyping and 'othering' is through the cultural representations speakers utter (Dervin, 2012). Mikhail Bakhtin reminds us that 'Our speech, that is, all our utterances are filled with others' words, varying degrees of otherness or varying degrees of "our-own-ness"' (Bakhtin, 1986, p. 89). Here, the 'multivoicedness' (Bakhtin, 1981) of Speaker X and Speaker Y reveals clues in terms of the stance markers both enunciators use in terms of 'othering'. Speaker X and Speaker Y engender othering through uttering distancing speech acts. Both Speaker X and Speaker Y constantly shift between 'I' (lines 12, 13, 14, 29, 30, 32), 'us' (line 35), and, 'them' (line 31, 47), 'they've' (line 29), and, 'they' (line 30, 31). Both Speakers through speech act exteriorisations ('us' and 'them') engender a particular logic of democracy – a logic of oppositions. In this sense, the democracy spoken by Speaker X and Speaker Y contributes as a logic of othering – not strictly in how discourses of democracy are uttered in Finnish schools or at Finnish conferences, but, rather, through the indirect speech acts of describing and talking about democracy with others. In the final utterance 'we work for them' (line 47) here we encounter the exteriorisation of democracy and human rights within the Finnish context. 'Them' can refer to the Zambian citizens this NGO is working with, it can refer to an 'objective' and simplistic interpretation of human rights, it can also refer to the way democracy and democratic values are discussed in schools (such as, the exterior student council/representative board). The speech act exteriorisation of democracy can simultaneously mean all of these things and nothing. Democracy is seemingly always a distant referential object – an Other.

At this juncture, it is also important for me to be reflexive of my own utterances during the interview (Pezalla Pettigrew & Miller-Day, 2012). As I have previously noted, during the interview I was intentionally provocative with both Speaker X and Speaker Y. Part of the reason for this was from my own experiences of speaking to other practitioners and academics about democracy and human rights in Finland where I was always left unsatisfied. Interlocutors were quite happy to talk about democracy and human rights in other contexts yet when the conversation topic switched to Finland there were seemingly a number of taboos and issues that made people uncomfortable (for example, Muir & Worthen, 2013 on Finland's role in the Holocaust). The other potential reason behind my provocative stance in the interview was that I was interested in the discursive devices the speakers would use (for example, facework) if they were confronted. Perhaps one thing which can be deduced from these provocations is that the provocations I made were unexpected – the speakers did not expect to be questioned about these matters and did not expect me to use counter-narratives to support my argument. The conversational positions both Speaker X and Speaker Y take in the dialogue could indicate naïve and/or simplistic understandings about democracy and human rights which may hint at wider societal ambivalences about the subject matters (for example, Langford & Schaffer, 2015).

Excerpt 2 shows that when practitioner utterances about democracy and human rights are contested they use facework strategies in order to maintain a consistent face in communication. Simultaneously, speaker utterances are constantly refracted. Yet, these refracted utterances index meta-discursive representations about the symbolic and ideological positions of democracy and human rights discourses within Finland. When the speakers are confronted in the dialogue they engender discourses which can lead to othering – this might be indicative of what some researchers call the Nordic exceptionalism of democracy and human rights discourses (Loftsdóttir & Jensen, 2016). Such discourses of how one country and/or context has 'better' democracy and human rights than an other can be

deeply problematic as they can index nationalistic and/or ethnocentric representations about, not only, how democracy and human rights can be understood and practiced, but also, how representations about particular contexts can be manipulated as forms of ideology (De Oliveira Andreotti, Biesta & Ahenakew, 2015).

Conclusion: Heteroglossia as a way to move beyond essentialisms about democracy?

This paper has considered democracy and human rights as discursive constructs. The paper has discussed discourses on democracy in education within Finland, however, the aim has not been to generalise discourses on democracy and human rights in Finland, but, rather, to indicate and reveal some of the sentiments and meanings which may hide behind democracy and human rights within the Finnish context, particularly, those which can contribute to othering – marginalising and discriminating against people and/or groups.

The vast amount of discourses on democracy in education means one is never quite sure what one is exactly talking about. There are a number of ambiguities and contradictions surrounding democracy in education. Today, democracy is often found within national curricula, teaching syllabi, teacher training courses and programmes, and, within schools. As student participation, democracy and human rights become buzzwords within education little reflection is made upon what these words mean.

Self-reflexivity through heteroglossia allows one to accentuate and re-accentuate one's own utterances – this can be particularly useful when politicians, policy-makers, academics and social commentators continuously utter 'buzzwords' such as democracy in education. A reaccentuation (Bakhtin, 1981) of democracy can enable the possibility of intersectional narratives for marginalised and/or 'othered' people and/or groups. Heteroglossic and self-reflexive approaches have already been used to rework generalised logics on gender (Zhang, 2013), sexual orientation (Reinertsen, 2013), and, race and/or ethnic minority issues (Wade, 2015).

Within Finland it would appear that educational and human rights practitioners need to do much more, in terms of how democracy is discussed and what this means for society. These excerpts show that behind the discourses on democracy and human rights uttered by practitioners within the field are discourses that contribute to othering. Othering can marginalise and discriminate against sections of Finnish society. It is important for NGO workers, human rights practitioners and teachers alike to develop competences on how to discuss democracy within their different fields and to share insights and reflections on what democracy may mean within Finland. It is important to problematise whether competencies on democracy can be developed alongside and in conjunction with, intercultural communication (Clark & Dervin, 2014; Dervin, 2016), so teachers and practitioners can be aware of how their utterances can detect and prevent 'democratic othering'.

A departure from the language of what 'democracy is or is not' is necessary to prevent othering. Research has been conducted on how othering [re]produces nationalism in schools (Mavroudi & Holt, 2015), neo-colonialism in schools (DesRoches, 2013), as well as, racial, ethnic and Eurocentric stereotypes (Philippou & Theodorou, 2014). A heteroglossic understanding of 'democracy' could avoid marginalisation, othering, and discrimination through rejecting discourses which label and/or categorise people and/or groups.

This paper also hints at some of the deeper issues of democracy in/for/and education. Indeed, democracy is often uttered as an end which seemingly is never internally critiqued or reflected upon. Instead, one must re-work democracy through heteroglossic approaches in order to detect and prevent cultural stereotyping, othering, and/or any form of discrimination.

References

- Aijmer, K. (2013). *Analyzing modal adverbs as modal particles and discourse markers*. In Degand, L., Cornillie, B. & Pietrandrea, P. (Eds.). 2013. *Discourse Markers and Modal Particles: categorization and description*. (pp. 89-106). Amsterdam/Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Aijmer, K., & Simon-Vandenberg, A.M. (2011). *Pragmatic markers* In Zienkowski, J., Östman, J. O., & Verschueren, J. 2011. (Eds.), *Discursive Pragmatics*. (pp. 223-247). Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Aijmer, K. & Simon-Vandenberg, A.M. (Eds.). (2006). *Pragmatic markers in contrast* (Vol. 2). Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Amutabi, M.N. (2013). *The NGO factor in Africa: The case of arrested development in Kenya*. London: Routledge.
- Andersson, K. & Sjöblom, S. (2013). Localism in Finland: The changing role and current crisis of the Finnish municipal system. *Local Economy*, 28(3), 240-256.
- Aras, B. & Akpinar, P. (2015). The role of humanitarian NGOs in Turkey's peacebuilding. *International Peacekeeping*, 22(3), 230-247.
- Aylott, N. (Ed.). (2016). *Models of Democracy in Nordic and Baltic Europe: Political Institutions and Discourse*. London/New York, NY: Routledge.
- Bakhtin, M.M. (1986). *Speech genres and other late essays*. Trans. VW McGee. Ed. C. Emerson and M. Holquist. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Bakhtin, M.M. (1984). *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*. Edited and Translated by Caryl Emerson. Introduction by Wayne C. Booth. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Bakhtin, M.M. (1981). *The Dialogic Imagination*, trans. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Bauman, R. (2005). Commentary: Indirect indexicality, identity, performance: Dialogic observations. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 15(1), 145-150.
- Bessant, K.C. (2014). The relational genesis of community: Self-other dialogue. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, 24(6), 467-478.
- Biesta, G. & Lawy, R. (2006). From teaching citizenship to learning democracy: overcoming individualism in research, policy and practice. *Cambridge journal of education*, 36(1), 63-79.
- Bravo, D. (2008). The implications of studying politeness in Spanish-speaking contexts: a discussion. *Pragmatics*, 18(4), 577-603.
- Carr, P.R., Pluim, G., & Howard, L. (2014). Linking global citizenship education and education for democracy through social justice: What can we learn from the perspectives of teacher-education candidates. *Journal of Global Citizenship & Equity Education*, 4(1), 1-21.
- Clark, J.S.B. & Dervin, F. (2014). *Reflexivity in language and intercultural education: Rethinking multilingualism and interculturality*. London: Routledge.
- De Oliveira Andreotti, V., Biesta, G. & Ahenakew, C. (2015). Between the nation and the globe: Education for global mindedness in Finland. *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 13(2), 246-259.
- Dervin, F. (2016). *Interculturality in education: A theoretical and methodological toolbox*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Dervin, F. (2012). Cultural identity, representation and Othering. In Jackson, J. (Ed.). (2012). *The Routledge handbook of language and intercultural communication*. (181-194). London: Routledge.

- Descartes, R. and Sutcliffe, F. (1968). *Discourse on Method and the Meditations*. London: Penguin.
- De Sousa, A.M.P. and Correia, A.M. (2014). From Modernity to Post-Modernity: Conflicting Voices in Literary Discourse—A Corpus Analysis of You and One. *Topics in Linguistics*, 13(1). 1-13.
- DesRoches, S. (2013). Intercultural Citizenship Education in Québec:(Re) producing the Other in and through Historicised Colonial Patterns and Unquestioned Power Relations. *Educational Research for Social Change*, 2(2), 5-16.
- Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and Education: An Introduction to the Philosophy of Education*. New York, NY: Macmillan.
- Fairclough, N. (2013). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Goffman, E. (1955). On face-work: an analysis of ritual elements in social interaction. *Psychiatry: Journal for the Study of Interpersonal Processes*, 18(3), 213–231.
- Graham, S.D.N. (2005). Remember Fallujah: demonising place, constructing atrocity. *Environment and planning D: society and space*, 23(1), 1-10.
- Habermas, J. (1995). Reconciliation through the public use of reason: remarks on John Rawls's political liberalism. *The journal of philosophy*, 92(3), 109-131.
- Haugh, M. (2013). Disentangling face, facework and im/politeness. *Sociocultural pragmatics*, 1(1), 46-73.
- Hecht, Y. (2012). *Democratic Education: A beginning of a story*. Roslyn Heights, NY: AERO.
- Henderson, P. (2015). New Directions in Child and Youth Research in Africa. In Massart, G., & Ntarangwi, M. (2015). *Engaging children and youth in Africa methodological and phenomenological issues*. (61- 94). Baltimore, MD: Project Muse.
- Holkeri, K. (2009). The Citizen Participation Policy Programme, Finland. *OECD Studies on Public Engagement*, 145-150
- Holmes, J. (2013). *Women, men and politeness*. London: Routledge.
- Homer, K. (2005). Reimagining the nation: discourses of language purism in Luxembourg. In Langer, N. & Davies, W. (Eds.). (2005). *Linguistic purism in the Germanic languages*. (166-185). Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Howlett, J. (2013). *Progressive education: A critical introduction*. New York, NY/London: Bloomsbury publishing.
- Human Rights Centre. (2016). *Human rights centre annual report*. [online] Available at: http://ihmisoikeuskeskus-fi-bin.directo.fi/@Bin/8646d96cec9ace53c4c519874a6ae9fd/1469027531/application/pdf/3391122/HRC_Finland_Annual_Report_2015_Summary.pdf [Accessed 20 Jul. 2016].
- Joas, H. (2000). *The Genesis of Values*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Kamler, E.M. (2013). Negotiating narratives of human trafficking: NGOs, communication and the power of culture. *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research*, 42(1), 73-90.
- Karim, K.H. & Eid, M. (2012). Clash of ignorance. *Global Media Journal—Canadian Edition*, 5(1), 7-27.
- Koro-Ljungberg, M. (2007). ‘Democracy to come’: a personal narrative of pedagogical practices and ‘Othering’ within a context of higher education and research training. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 12(5-6), 735-747.
- Langford, M & Schaffer, J. K. The Nordic Human Rights Paradox: Moving Beyond Exceptionalism (September 4, 2015). *University of Oslo Faculty of Law Research Paper No. 2013-25*. Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=2275905>
- Lappalainen, S. & Lahelma, E. (2015). Subtle discourses on equality in the Finnish curricula of upper secondary education: reflections of the imagined society. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 1-21.
- Larsen, M. (Ed.). (2015). *International service learning: Engaging host communities (Vol. 17)*. New York, NY: Routledge.

- Loftsdóttir, K. & Jensen, L. (Eds). (2016). *Whiteness and postcolonialism in the Nordic region: exceptionalism, migrant others and national identities*. London/ New York, NY: Routledge.
- Malhi, R. L., & Boon, S. D. (2007). Discourses of “Democratic Racism” in the Talk of South Asian Canadian Women. *Canadian Ethnic Studies*. 39(3), 125-149.
- Manoliu, M.M. (1999). *Interrogative utterances as non-questions. Romanian markers of talk-interaction*. Romanistik in Geschichte und Gegenwart. Trier/Hamburg: Helmut Buske Verlag.
- Maschler, Y. & Schiffrin, D. (2015). Discourse markers: language, meaning, and context. In Tannen, D., Hamilton, H.E. & Schiffrin, D. (2015). *The handbook of discourse analysis*. (189-221). New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.
- Mavroudi, E. & Holt, L. (2015). (Re) constructing Nationalisms in Schools in the Context of Diverse Globalized Societies. In Matejskova, T., & Antonsich, T. (2015). *Governing through Diversity: migration societies in post-multicultural times*. (181-200). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Miecznikowski, J., Gili, B. and Bazzanella, C. (2015). Words in context. Agreeing and disagreeing with allora. *L'Analisi Linguistica e Letteraria* 2008-1,16, 205-218.
- Ministry of Education and Culture. (2016). Basic Education Act. [online] Available at: <http://www.finlex.fi/en/laki/kaannokset/1998/en19980628.pdf> [Accessed 2 Sep. 2016].
- Ministry of Education and Culture. (2016). Key competences for lifelong learning in Finland. Education 2010 – interim report. [online] Available at: http://www.minedu.fi/export/sites/default/OPM/Koulutus/Liitteet/Education_2010._Interim_report_2009._Finland.pdf [Accessed 9 May 2016].
- Minedu.fi. (2011). *OKM - The 36th Session of the General Conference of UNESCO*. [online] Available at: http://www.minedu.fi/OPM/Puheet/2011/10/The_36th_Session_of_the_General_Conference_of_UNESCO.html?lang=fi [Accessed 2 Sep. 2016].
- Minedu.fi. (2008). *OKM - Towards inclusion*. [online] Available at: http://www.minedu.fi/OPM/Julkaisut/2008/Matkalla_osallisuuteen?lang=en [Accessed 2 Sep. 2016].
- Mintz, J. (2003). *Homework and recess all day: How to have freedom and democracy in education*. Roslyn Heights, NY: AERO.
- Mouffe, C. (2009). Democracy in a multipolar world. *Millennium-Journal of International Studies*, 37(3), 549-561.
- Mouffe, C. (2005). *On the political*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Mouffe, C. (2000). *The Democratic Paradox*. London: Verso.
- Muir, S. & Worthen, H. (Eds.) 2013. *Finland's Holocaust: Silences of History*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Niemi, H., Toom, A. and Kallioniemi, A. (Eds.). (2012). *Miracle of Education*. Rotterdam: Sense publishers.
- Nuckolls, J. & Michael, L. (Eds.). (2014). *Evidentiality in interaction (Vol. 63)*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Orgad, S. and Nikunen, K. (2015). The humanitarian makeover. *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies*, 12(3), 229-251.
- Östman, J.O. (1995). Pragmatic particles twenty years after. In *Organization in discourse: Proceeding from the Turku Conference* (95-108).
- Paz, A. (2009). The circulation of chisme and rumor: Gossip, evidentiality, and authority in the perspective of Latino labor migrants in Israel. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 19(1), 117-143.
- Pezalla, A.E., Pettigrew, J. & Miller-Day, M. (2012). Researching the researcher-as-instrument: An exercise in interviewer self-reflexivity. *Qualitative Research*, 12(2), 165-185.
- Philippou, S. & Theodorou, E. (2014). The ‘europeanisation’ of othering: children using ‘Europe’ to construct ‘others’ in Cyprus. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 17(2), 264-290.

- Precht, K. (2008). Sex similarities and differences in stance in informal American conversation. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 12(1), 89-111.
- Rancire, J. (2007). *Hatred of Democracy*. London: Verso.
- Reinertsen, A.B. (2013). Queer School-Based Self-Assessment, Inspiration Research, and Second-Order Cybernetics as Thinking Tool. *International Review of Qualitative Research*, 6(1), 79-102.
- Rhlemann, C. & McCarthy, M. (2007). *Conversation in context: A corpus-driven approach*. London: Continuum Intl Pub Group.
- Sahlberg, P. (2012). A Model Lesson: Finland Shows Us What Equal Opportunity Looks Like. *American Educator*, 36(1), 20-40
- Said, E. (1978). *Orientalism*. New York, NY: Patheon Books.
- Sandstrm K. M., Stier, J., Einarson, T., Davies, T. and Asunta, T. (2010). Pupils' voices about citizenship education: comparative case studies in Finland, Sweden and England. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 33(2), 201-218.
- Schiffrin, D. (1988). *Discourse markers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Silverstein, M. (2010). Direct and indirect communicative acts in semiotic perspective. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 42(2), 337-353.
- Silverstein, M. (2003). Indexical order and the dialectics of sociolinguistic life. *Language & Communication*, 23(3), 193-229.
- Spitzmller, J. (2007). Staking the claims of identity: Purism, linguistics and the media in post-1990 Germany. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 11(2), 261-285.
- Stenstrm, A.B. (2014). 'Avoid silence! Keep talking!: Pragmatic markers as phatic devices in teenage conversation'. *Functions of Language*, 21(1), 30-49.
- Sullivan, G.C. (2016). In your own words: Investigating voice, intertextuality, and credibility of Rachel Jeantel in the George Zimmerman trial. *Proceedings of the Linguistic Society of America*, 1, 1-13.
- Tannen, D. (2010). Abduction and identity in family interaction: Ventriloquizing as indirectness. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 42(2), 307-316.
- Tannen, D. (2007). *Talking voices: Repetition, dialogue, and imagery in conversational discourse*. (Vol 2). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tiessen, R. (2011). Global Subjects or Objects of Globalisation? The promotion of global citizenship in organisations offering sport for development and/or peace programmes. *Third world quarterly*, 32(3), 571-587.
- Ueno, K., & Gentile, H. (2015). Moral identity in friendships between gay, lesbian, and bisexual students and straight students in college. *Symbolic Interaction*, 38(1), 83-102.
- Wade, J.P. (2015). Reality as Fiction: Autoethnography as Postmodern Critique. *Memory Studies*, 22(2), 194-215.
- White, P.R.R. (2003). Beyond modality and hedging: A dialogic view of the language of intersubjective stance. *Text & Talk*, 23(3), 259-284.
- Wilamova, S. (2013). On the function of hedging devices in negatively polite discourse. *Brno studies in English*, 31(1), 85-93.
- Zhang, Y. (2013). Articulating Sadness, Gendering Space: The Politics and Poetics of Taiyu Films from 1960s Taiwan. *Modern Chinese Literature and Culture*, 25(1), 1-46.
- Zhao, G. (2014). The Public and Its Problem: Dewey, Habermas, and Levinas. *Journal of Educational Controversy*. 8(1), 1-14
- Zienkowski, J., stman, J.O., & Verschueren, J. (Eds.). (2011). *Discursive pragmatics* (Vol. 8). Amsterdam/Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins Publishing.