

'Is interethnic integration possible in Estonia?': ethno-political discourse of two ethnic groups



Discourse & Society
 Copyright © 2003
 SAGE Publications
 (London, Thousand Oaks,
 CA and New Delhi)
 www.sagepublications.com
 Vol 14(6): 667–697
 [0957-9265
 (200311) 14:6;
 667–697; 036121]

VERONIKA KALMUS
 TARTU UNIVERSITY

ABSTRACT. This article compares ethno-political discourse of pupils belonging to the majority and minority groups in Estonia. The article also seeks to understand the role of different socializers in ethno-political socialization. Ninth formers from an Estonian and a Russian school in Estonia wrote an essay on interethnic integration after they had read the corresponding texts in their civics textbook. Semi-structured interviews were conducted with pupils representing different viewpoints. Within the framework of Critical Discourse Analysis, 57 essays and 13 interviews were studied at several levels of discursive structure (topics, propositions, argument schemes, strategic moves, storytelling, style and intertextuality). The analysis reveals a number of differences between the discourses by Estonian and Russian pupils. Intertextual analysis and the data obtained from the interviews suggest that pupils' personal experiences and reflections, the media, some teachers and family members play the most important roles in the process of ethno-political socialization.

KEY WORDS: *Estonia, ethno-political socialization, interethnic integration, school textbooks*

1. Introduction

Different ethnic groups in a society tend to have different interpretations of history, and of historical and social justice. Such interpretations often serve as a bedrock for different ideologies – 'the basis of the social representations shared by members of a group' (Van Dijk, 1998: 8). The most direct social counterpart of ideological representations and structures are group positions and relations (p. 161). Various ideologies and social practices (including intergroup relations) most probably 'constitute each other in a "dialectical" process' (p. 164). Ideologies and, thus, discursive interpretations of the past and the present, definitely play an important role in the (re)production or challenge of intergroup

relations in societies in which social practices have recently changed, e.g. in societies in which the formerly dominating ethnic group has lost its privileged position.

Estonia serves as an example of such societies. At the time of restoration of the country's independence from the Soviet Union in 1991, the Russian-speaking population (further referred to as 'Russians'¹) was deprived of its hitherto privileged status as the dominant language group of a multinational empire, and became a numerous ethnic minority in a country with an ambition to restore its political position as a nation state. The status of ethnic Estonians, in turn, changed from that of a dominated minority to the titular group, slightly outnumbering other linguistic communities in Estonia. These social processes resulted from and contributed to ongoing symbolic and discursive struggles between the groups in the political and communicative spheres.

During the years since the country's re-independence, the *integration* of one million ethnic Estonians and half a million Russians has been one of the most burning social, as well as sociological, problems in the society. Integration, defined as a process of political and social 'inclusion of the excluded', and their competitiveness in education and on the labour market (Heidmets and Lauristin, 2002), is the aim of several research projects, social campaigns and programmes financed by the Estonian state, as well as by international organizations. At the sociocognitive level, integration means removing barriers that prevent the minority from participating in the local social and political life (Heidmets and Lauristin, 2002), that is, achieving mutual understanding and tolerance between the majority population and immigrants.

The most important target group for integration programmes is young people, particularly schoolchildren. Youngsters acquire their ethnic beliefs and attitudes from many different sources and socializers (e.g. family members, peers, the media, school, personal interethnic encounters, etc.). Among those agencies, the one most easily controlled by the state and the majority is the education system, particularly comprehensive schools with their formal and hidden curricula, and educational media² (Kalmus and Pavelson, 2002). Ideas of multicultural education (Banks, 1992; Gutmann, 1996), which are becoming more and more prominent in Estonian educational discourses, demand that school textbooks, beginning with primers, are culturally inclusive (representing different ethnic groups in the society). More advanced textbooks, e.g. civics textbooks, should help to form the democratic values and social competencies necessary for reaching consensus in common interests – tolerance, mutual respect, the ability to engage in respectful discourse with other cultures and identities, and readiness 'to deliberate about politically relevant disagreements' (Gutmann, 1996: 160).

Democratic, multicultural, ethnocentric or any other norms and values in school textbooks are not, however, automatically internalized by pupils. Every individual interacts directly with a textbook or other media, and constructs his or her own meaning in the social processes of reading and learning (cf. Buckingham, 1993; Iser, 1980; Taxel, 1989). The process of learning activates

the knowledge and beliefs relevant to the concept, object, event or actor to be learned about. Interpretation of the information to be learned, and the way in which it will be accepted, rejected or added to the structure of beliefs existing in one's mind, will depend on factors such as the similarity to existing knowledge and attitudes, the credibility and authority of the source, and the context of the situation (Grueneberg, 1991).

Educational texts are normally used in a context in which there is one person who knows the correct answer (the teacher) and others (the pupils) who are controlled and tested in relation to the correct answer (Selander, 1995). Thus, the texts in school textbooks usually have greater 'authority' (Olson, 1989) than other texts open for meaning-making, which means that the potential for different interpretations is 'much less than infinite' (Buckingham, 1993: 270). In particular fields of knowledge, textbooks constitute the sole, and trusted, source of information, in which case they are most likely to affect the factual beliefs of pupils. The same is not necessarily true about evaluative, or ideological, beliefs, especially when other available discourses provide pupils with alternative opinions. Ideological socialization is a process of cumulative effects of various events, experiences and discourses, and textbook discourse is merely one of them.

I presume that the cumulative influence of socializing discourses largely manifests itself in individuals' discourse. Inferences about the availability of different discourses to pupils and their interpretations of ideological meanings can be made by means of intertextual analysis and comparison of pupils' discourses and other discourses (e.g. discourses in the media and textbooks) as forms of indirect reception analysis (cf. Fairclough, 1995; Jensen, 1991). Also, pupils may be asked directly in interviews whence they may have derived their beliefs about, say, ethnic relations in the society.

This study has two main aims. First, I focus on the similarities and differences in the discourse by Estonian and Russian schoolchildren. The study is conducted within the general framework of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA; see Fairclough, 1995; Van Dijk, 1993). Earlier CDA research has usually been carried out in societies in which power relations between the dominant and dominated groups have been established and legitimated through discourse for a long time (e.g. Western Europe, North America and Australia; see Van Dijk et al., 1997, for an overview). My analysis of ethno-political discourse by young members of the majority and minority groups in a newly re-independent country offers quite a unique opportunity to see how power relations between the groups are being enacted and negotiated through discourse in a society where social structures have recently changed. I focus on aspects of the content and form of such discourse to reveal what discursive positions are being enacted by Estonian and Russian schoolchildren, whether and how those positions interact with each other in discourse, and what discursive strategies pupils use to act out those positions. Second, the article seeks to understand the role of different socializers (including school textbooks) and pupils' experiences in ethno-political

socialization, that is, in forming attitudes towards different ethnic groups in the society, and in setting up perspectives on interethnic integration.

According to the principles of CDA, my own position has to be made explicit: I am in favour of multicultural democracy, and critical of any forms of ethnocentrism or chauvinism.

2. Historical and discursive context of interethnic relations in Estonia

2.1. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF THE CURRENT SITUATION

From the 13th century to 1918, representatives of foreign nations (mainly Germans, Swedes, Poles and Russians) executed political and administrative power on the Estonian territory. During the first period of independent statehood in 1918–1940, Estonians realized their opportunity to act as a civic nation. Estonian laws provided ethnic minorities with one of the most extensive cultural autonomies in pre-War Europe, in spite of the fact that ‘those minorities consisted mainly of representatives of the formerly dominant nations’ (Lauristin and Heidmets, 2002: 20).

Soviet occupation in 1940, the subsequent German occupation in 1941–1944, and involuntary membership of the Soviet Union until 1991 placed Estonians once more in the position of a suppressed nation in their own country. The Stalinist era (the 1940s) witnessed large-scale repression and deportation of Estonians to Siberia. Since the 1950s, almost half a million Russian-speaking people have been settled in Estonia. According to the 2000 Population Census, Russians form 25.6 percent of the population of Estonia, while 40.4 percent of Russians hold Estonian citizenship, 20.9 percent hold Russian citizenship and 38.4 percent are permanent residents without citizenship (2000 Population and Housing Census II, 2001). Russians have formed a strong, relatively closed community with its own social networks, leaders, media channels, schools, cultural life and mentality. The restored Estonian state has been faced with a complicated task of introducing a democratic minority policy, while simultaneously creating the political institutions of a nation state (Lauristin and Heidmets, 2002).

2.2. ACADEMIC AND POLITICAL DISCOURSES

The historical events have evoked various discursive interpretations and meta-narratives in different institutional contexts. In Estonian academic discourse (and exceptionally in the works by foreign scholars), de-historization of Estonian nation-building has been unpopular: linguistic constructions such as ‘post-imperial state’ or ‘post-colonial state’ are used not only rhetorically, but also conceptually (Ruutsoo, 2002). What concerns suggestions for practical policy-making is that almost all historical narratives and arguments related to the Soviet occupation, repression of individuals, deportation, etc. are disfavoured by scholars (although not by politicians) (Ruutsoo, 2002).

Estonian political discourse in the first half of the 1990s was subjected to the

meta-narrative of restitution, which idealizes the pre-War republic with its ethnic composition (a large majority of Estonians and comparatively small minority groups), as the 'golden era'. The lack of any constructive ideas about how to deal with the real situation led to more or less intentional 'official silence' in terms of the goals of the state minority policy. Not until February 1998 did the Estonian government issue its first political statement concerning Estonian minority policy. The government defined integration as its central political goal and declared that the governmental programme, supporting the integration process, should be elaborated and financed (Lauristin and Heidmets, 2002).

2.3. DEVELOPMENTS IN THE MEDIA DISCOURSE

The media discourse during the decade of re-independence can be characterized in terms of three developmental phases. In the first half of the decade, media representations of interethnic relations in Estonia cultivated distrust and polarized images (Kõuts and Tammpuu, 2002). Linz and Stepan (1996) argued that the ideology of a nation state prevalent during this period of re-independence brought with it a set of descriptive terms whose discursive effect was to create political polar identities and work against the formation of multiple complementary identities for Russians. The next phase in interethnic relations, the mid-1990s, has been called 'tacit separation' (Heidmets, 1998), characterized by indifference and distance between Estonians and Russians. The depiction of Russians in public discourses became more neutral in that period, although the Estonian media still exploited 'ideological and ethnic stereotypes born during the mythological phase of political culture' (Vihalemm et al., 1997: 239). The current phase of media discourse reveals growing tolerance and recognition towards Russians in Estonia, and strong orientation to integration, although some ethnic prejudices have survived in more implicit forms (Kõuts and Tammpuu, 2002).

2.4. TRENDS IN PUBLIC OPINION AS AN EVIDENCE OF THE EXISTENCE OF DIFFERENT DISCURSIVE COMMUNITIES

The latest monitoring of interethnic integration in Estonia (Kruusvall, 2000) revealed that about one fifth of Estonians (21%) carry a strong exclusive attitude towards Russians living in Estonia. This group is distributed relatively equally among all age, educational and income groups. This indicates that repelling attitudes among Estonians probably appear in 'clutches' or discursive communities (families, friends, territorial or work-related communities, etc.). The data also reveal that non-exclusive attitudes towards Russians are related to the communicative level of integration – interpersonal contacts with Russians that, in turn, are related to the frequency of watching Russian television and knowledge of the Russian language (Kruusvall, 2002). This leads to a hypothesis that the formation of non-ethnocentric attitudes is dependent on the individual's participation in significant discursive communities that include different voices and discourses.

2.5. TEXTBOOKS AS REFLECTIONS OF THE MAJORITY DISCOURSE

Numerous studies, which have focused on ethno-political discourse in school textbooks, tend to support the argument that, more often than not, textbooks reproduce a dominant discourse, which legitimizes the opinions, attitudes, ideologies and beliefs of the majority (see, e.g. Grueneberg, 1991; Sleeter and Grant, 1991; Wood, 1981). History textbooks, for instance, often define and create an enemy for national identity construction. The historiography of the pre-War republic and the Soviet Estonia presented Baltic Germans as conquerors and exploiters of the Estonian peasantry (Lagerspetz, 1999). Some history textbooks from the 1990s replace Baltic Germans with a new enemy – the Soviet rule and everything connected with it. Russians in Estonia are treated as the remains of the Soviet rule in those textbooks. The most popular interpretative scheme, however, is to ignore the issue of the Russian minority in Estonia: most authors of contemporary history textbooks present Estonia as an exclusively monocultural society (Ümarik, 2001).

Research on ABC-books and civics textbooks published in the 1990s has shown that ethno-political discourse in those textbooks is scarce, relatively ethnocentric and culturally exclusive (Kalmus, 2002). The implied reader of the textbooks in Estonian is an Estonian or a fully integrated representative of an ethnic minority. Similarly to history textbooks, the existence and problems of minorities are often ignored, or treated with concessions. In this respect, Estonian versions of the textbooks reflect the currently dominant view on the society, according to which many Estonians do not realize how the presence of minorities could potentially benefit the country (Kruusvall, 2000).

Diachronic changes in the textbook discourse reveal that civics textbooks are relatively conventional in relation to their institutional context: the newer the textbook, the more it corresponds to the democratic aims expressed in the National Curriculum from 1996. The most ethnocentric textbook in the sample was written before the curriculum was approved. Moreover, the discourse in Estonian ABC-books and civics textbooks follows, with certain inertia, the changes in the media discourse of the last decade. The most ethnocentric textbook, published in 1996, is closest to the phase of 'distrust and polarized images' in the Estonian media that lasted until the mid-1990s. Estonian textbooks from 1997 mirror the phase of 'tacit separation' (Heidmets, 1998) in the mid-1990s. A textbook from 1998, emphasizing the need for tolerance and mutual respect between people of different nationalities, indicates the transition to the next phase of public discourse – orientation to integration.

Russian translations of civics textbooks employ a number of euphemisms and omissions to mitigate the discourse for Russian-speaking pupils. Textbooks in Russian are more inclusive and multicultural, less critical of the Soviet Union and Russia, and place more emphasis on the construction of multiple – both ethnic and civic – identities. This can be explained by the fact that the translators and some of the reviewers and editors of those textbooks belong to the Russian ethnicity and are thus more observant of unintentional symbolic violence in the

original versions of the textbooks. Moreover, the Russian translations were published one year after the Estonian originals. The media monitoring has shown (Kõuts and Tammpuu, 2002) that one year, beginning from the mid-1990s, is a crucial space of time in the development of public discourse on interethnic integration in Estonia.

3. *Data and method*

3.1. DATA CORPUS

The corpus consists of essays by and interviews with a sample of the ninth formers (aged 14 and 15) from one Estonian and one Russian school in Tartu, the second biggest city in Estonia. The selected schools are typical of the city and are similar to each other in terms of the number and average academic proficiency of pupils. A total of 57 pupils (36 in the Estonian and 21 in the Russian school who made up 43% of the ninth formers in those schools) wrote an essay 'Is integration of different peoples possible in Estonia? If yes, what needs to be done to achieve this?'. Because I was interested in finding out whether school textbooks play any role in ethno-political socialization, the study³ was conducted after pupils had gone through the texts on interethnic integration in their civics textbook⁴ (in December 2000 in the Russian school and in January 2001 in the Estonian school). It was explained to the pupils that 'integration' means reaching mutual understanding and tolerance between different ethnic groups. In addition, semi-structured interviews were conducted with 13 pupils whose essays represented different viewpoints. The interview questions focused on the sources of the ideas the respondents had expressed in the essays, their strategies of the use of the textbook, and their habits of media consumption.

3.2. METHODOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK AND RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The analysis is conducted within the broad framework of CDA that has proved valuable for the analysis of ethnocentric and racist discourses. Earlier discourse studies conducted in this paradigm have mainly examined the ways in which the dominant groups enact and reproduce their power through text and talk (see, e.g. Van Dijk et al., 1997; Wodak, 2001; Wodak and Matouschek, 1993). The historical context of interethnic relations in Estonia conditions a somewhat different research problem: How do Estonians as the majority (and the formerly dominated group) and Russians as the minority (and the formerly privileged group) enact and negotiate power relations through discursive practices? More concretely, owing to the nature of the data, I focus on the following questions: What do Estonian and Russian pupils write and talk about interethnic integration? How do they ground their arguments? What discursive positions do they write and speak from? Do the positions interact with each other in discourse? What discursive strategies do pupils use to act out those positions? Finally, what texts, discourses and experiences do they draw upon in the constitution of their discourse?

3.3. DISCOURSE STRUCTURES TO BE STUDIED

Because the corpus of texts in this study is relatively large, I start with content-level analysis to reveal what *topics* and *propositions* related to interethnic integration are represented in the pupils' discourse. The topics of discourse represent what a discourse 'is all about', thus embodying most important information of a discourse (cf. Van Dijk, 2001). Topics as higher level categories usually comprise lower level subtopics and propositions, the analysis of which allows us to observe, for instance, what aspects of the problem are treated and what is left out. This, in turn, enables us to see whether the argumentation by a particular group suffers from *global bias*, that is, 'the result of a neglect of global aspects or dimensions in the controversial issue' (Kienpointner and Kindt, 1997: 558). (Pupils' essays, of course, cannot be criticized in the same way as scientific argumentation. Therefore, I interpret a neglect of an aspect of integration as global bias only if the aspect is discussed more extensively by members of the other group.) Global bias derives from the discursive position of language users and may serve the strategic aim of positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation.

Two main topics in the essays ('Possibility of interethnic integration in Estonia' and 'What needs to be done for integration?') were determined by the task given to pupils. Therefore, it makes sense to analyse the meaning content of the essays mostly at the level of *propositions*, here defined as general assertions usually explained or justified by facts or arguments.

Further analysis of argumentation in the essays is informed by the general principles of the pragma-dialectical theory of Van Eemeren and Grootendorst (1992), which postulates that any argumentative discourse is characterized by the opposition of argumentative roles. The purpose of argumentation is, accordingly, to resolve the difference of opinion. Analysis of the propositions in pupils' essays revealed two pairs of discursive positions, whose proponents are probably more or less aware of the existence of other positions. I proceed with the analysis of *argument schemes* to reveal what schemes concur with those discursive positions, and whether and how the positions interact with each other in arguments and their counter-arguments. I treat argument schemes in the Aristotelian sense of *topoi* (Aristotle, 1984a, 1984b), by focusing on the guarantee function of argument schemes. This function allows us to equate *topoi* with inference warrants in the sense of Toulmin (1958): 'they guarantee the plausibility of the transition from the premises to the conclusion' (Kienpointner and Kindt, 1997: 562). Because *topoi* are often used in an intertextual way, being pursued from one domain to the next, the analysis of such 'life of arguments' (cf. Titscher et al., 2000: 158) allows us to make inferences, inter alia, about significant agents of ideological socialization.

Typical structures in ethnocentric or racist discourse are *argumentative and local strategic moves* such as *apparent denial*,⁵ *apparent concession*,⁶ *transfer*⁷ and *reversal*,⁸ which serve as parts of the overall strategies of positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation (cf. Van Dijk et al., 1997). Moreover, they enable speakers or writers to convey prejudice while simultaneously seeking to disguise

it for the sake of political correctness or discursive norm-respect (cf. Wodak and Matouschek, 1993). The analysis of such moves may reveal pupils' underlying opinions and attitudes about the other groups. Also, it allows us to find out to what extent young people at the age of 14–15 have been socialized to the discursive norms of political correctness.

Partly in parallel with other structures, I pay attention to *storytelling*. Telling stories about negative actions by others enables speakers or writers to assign guilt or responsibility and to make evaluations based on 'objective facts'. Moreover, this discursive strategy allows language users to present themselves as free of prejudice or even as victims of 'reverse' prejudice (cf. Wodak and Matouschek, 1993). Different ways and styles of storytelling (narrating about one's own or others' experiences, using more or less overt accusation) are indicative of pupils' discursive position.

The next discourse structures to be analysed are some *stylistic features*. Style can be defined as 'the variable expression of meanings as a function of context' (Van Dijk et al., 1997: 171), which means that style varies depending on the speaker's or writer's discursive position and the *context model*, that is, the language user's mental model of the communicative situation in which the current discourse is being produced (Van Dijk, 1998). Stylistic features are among the major means of communicating ethnic opinions, and play a significant role in the overall strategies of positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation. I focus on three aspects of style: the use of *pronouns*, *word selection* and the use of *active or passive sentences*.

By the use of *pronouns* (*we* and *they*, in particular, but also *you* and *I* in some contexts), speakers or writers can construct identities, draw or erase borders between groups, and stress social distance or resentment against the other groups (cf. Van Dijk et al., 1997). Use of the pronoun 'they' in situations where the name of the group would have been more appropriate may sometimes serve the purpose of avoiding blaming the (majority) group explicitly.

The *selection of words*, whether formal or informal, neutral or emotionally loaded, straight or mitigated, signals the speaker's or writer's attitudes about the other groups, as well as his or her context model of the situation. Words are also powerful means in the strategies of positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation.

The use of *active or passive sentences* allows the speaker or writer to show or hide agency and causality (Fairclough, 1989). This, in turn, is indicative of his or her discursive position, and forms part of the strategies of positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation.

The next discursive feature to be looked at is *manifest intertextuality*, particularly *discourse representation* (Fairclough, 1992). This analytical focus enables me to trace the references to different texts and discourses in the pupils' discourse. This, in turn, allows us to make inferences about the relevance of the corresponding socializers and experiences in the cumulative process of ethno-political socialization. To obtain a closer interpretative insight into that process, I provide a detailed analysis of two cases with specific emphasis on intertextuality.

The limits of space do not allow me to provide a systematic analysis of any other discourse structures at the corpus level. In case of some extracts and the detailed analysis of two cases, I pay attention to some other relevant structures such as enthymemes, some rhetorical structures (metaphors, similes, etc.), adverbs, etc.

4. *The pupils' discourse*

4.1. TOPICS AND PROPOSITIONS

Table 1 presents the absolute frequencies of propositions in the pupils' essays (a few propositions posed by just one pupil are omitted). In the following analysis, I focus, owing to the limits of space, mainly on those propositions that reveal crucial differences in the discursive positions enacted by Estonian and Russian pupils, and allow making inferences about global bias in their argumentation.

Topic 1: Possibility of interethnic integration in Estonia

The analysis revealed that Russian pupils expressed, in general, somewhat more optimistic and pro-integration views than their Estonian peers. In proportional terms, 62 percent of Russians versus 44 percent of Estonians believed that interethnic integration is possible in Estonia. Five pupils in the Estonian school (14%) conceded a potentiality of only partial integration. Their main argument was that there will always be ethnocentric or racist people among Estonians, or foreigners who do not accept the idea of integration. That type of argument was employed by only one Russian schoolboy who denied possibility of integration by making an allusion to Estonians' conspiratory nationalism. One of the most striking findings is the proportion of Estonian pupils (14%) who did not consider integration possible under any conditions. Most of them used causal argument schemes oriented towards the past to ground their proposition (see also Section 4.2).

Topic 2: Restrictions to integration

The discursive positions of young Estonians and Russians departed clearly in imposing conditions or restrictions to integration. A proportion of Estonian schoolchildren took the position of a small vulnerable nation whose survival, security and majority status in its own country have to be guaranteed. A great number of foreigners in the country was presented as a potential existential threat.

(1) And if more foreigners start to come here, then what will remain of us, Estonians? Shall we die out like the dinosaurs did? . . . Other ethnicities should comprehend Estonians and understand us, and, at the same time, they should try to become more melted into our society. They should not want try to show themselves different from us. (EG20⁹)

This discursive position can be called that of *endangered majority*, in case of which a newly empowered titular nation in a post-colonial country is still presenting

TABLE 1. *Topics and propositions in the essays by Estonian and Russian pupils*

<i>Topics (T) and propositions (P)</i>	<i>Estonian pupils</i> n = 36	<i>Russian pupils</i> n = 21
T 1: Possibility of interethnic integration in Estonia		
P 1.1: Integration is (probably) possible	16	13
P 1.2: Integration is partly possible	5	–
P 1.3: Integration is possible in the future/under certain conditions	9	5
P 1.4: Integration is by no means possible	5	1
T 2: Restrictions to integration		
P 2.1: Estonians must retain the status of the majority (there must always be more Estonians than foreigners in Estonia)	5	–
P 2.2: Estonians must retain their culture	–	2
P 2.3: Foreigners must be harmless to the society (there must be no criminals, alcoholics, or gays among foreigners)	3	–
T 3: Obstacles to/problems with integration		
P 3.1: Foreigners are not willing to learn Estonian (to integrate)	5	–
P 3.2: There are not enough (cheap) opportunities for learning Estonian	2	2
P 3.3: Estonians are intolerant/prejudiced against foreigners	7	4
P 3.4: Estonians and foreigners are intolerant towards each other	6	2
P 3.5: Estonia is too small	2	–
T 4: What needs to be done for integration?		
P 4.1: Laws must be changed (to support integration, to guarantee equal rights to all ethnic groups)	3	2
P 4.2: The state should give material support (e.g. a free flat) to foreigners	2	4
P 4.3: The state should raise the level of economic development, welfare and order in Estonia	–	6
P 4.4: The state should create more (cheap or free) opportunities for foreigners to learn Estonian	1	5
P 4.5: International relations (between Estonia and Russia) should be improved	4	–
P 4.6: Foreigners should be employed (not discriminated against in the labour market)	–	3
P 4.7: (Russian) schools should foster integration	3	–
P 4.8: There should be more opportunities to use Russian (in shops, schools, universities)	–	5
P 4.9: Attitudes of both Estonians and foreigners should change/be changed	5	2
P 4.10: Estonians should become more tolerant towards foreigners	6	5
P 4.11: Foreigners should make an effort (to learn the Estonian language and culture and/or change their attitudes)	8	3

itself as threatened by the formerly dominant ethnic group. In Extract 1, that argumentative position is emphasized rhetorically by two *parallel rhetorical questions* and a drastic *simile* (to 'die out like the dinosaurs'). That kind of emotional micro-context serves to justify the author's imperative, rather assimilation-oriented, proposition at the end of the essay.

Few Estonian pupils enact the discursive position of endangered majority through another proposition (P. 2.3), according to which any deviance among foreigners (but not among Estonians) is presented as a clear and present danger to the society. Those children *presuppose* that there are illegals, criminals, etc. among foreigners. Extract 2 represents the most extreme case of that type of ethnocentrically selective discourse of deviance.

(2) [I] would not want all kind of chauvinists, soakers (unemployed) and loafers in our beloved Estonia! . . . HIV-positive gays should be arrested and deported, irrespective of nationality (except Estonians). (EB17)

Proposition 2.2, presented by a couple of Russian pupils, reveals the discursive position of *superior minority*, in which case representatives of the post-colonial diaspora of a big nation enact their 'cultural superiority'. Owing to the actual minority status of the group in the society, that discursive position is predominantly enacted through implicit assumptions (Extracts 3–6).

(3) However, one must not force [integration] by any means. Estonia has to retain her culture, language. . . . not to borrow everything from Russians. . . . It's better for Estonians in an Estonian school, but for Russians in a Russian [school] because Russians have more culture – many authors in literature. (RG4)

Extract 3 contains three *enthymemes* or incomplete syllogisms that omit one or more logical components to be supplied by the audience from the premises in their own belief system. In creating enthymemes, authors reveal their 'ideology or "implicit philosophy" about the nature of reality, the nature of their community, and their conception of appropriate social relations' (Gill and Whedbee, 1997: 171–2; cf. Van Eemeren et al., 1997). The hidden logical coherence in Extract 3 is reconstructed in (4), (5) and (6); implicit parts are given in brackets. The implicit ideological assumptions in these enthymemes form, most probably, a firm basis of shared beliefs among chauvinistically minded Estonian Russians, especially in building and reception of arguments against the necessity to learn Estonian.

(4) *Premise 1:* [A bigger nation who has more world-famous writers has also more superior culture.]

Premise 2: Russians [are bigger nation and they] have more [world-famous] writers.

Conclusion: Russians have more [superior] culture.

(5) *Premise 1:* [In the process of integration a smaller and culturally inferior nation will lose its culture and language by borrowing them from a bigger nation.]

Premise 2: [Estonians are smaller and culturally inferior than Russians.]

Conclusion: In the process of integration Estonians would lose their culture and language by borrowing them from Russians.

(6) *Premise 1:* It is desirable that [both] Estonians [and Russians] retained their [different] culture[s].

Premise 2: [Only a segregated school system can transmit respective cultures.]

Conclusion: It is desirable to retain a segregated school system in Estonia.

Topic 3: Obstacles to integration

The integration problems described by Estonian and Russian pupils converge upon the language barrier and attitude problems. The same difficulties were most frequently related to integration in both the Estonian and the Russian language press in 1999–2001 (Kõuts and Tammpuu, 2002).

The line of argumentation in Estonian and Russian essays is, however, quite different. The overall argumentative discourse of both parties suffers from *global bias*. Russian pupils mention the lack of cheap and convenient opportunities to learn Estonian (P. 3.2), and neglect the problem of the unwillingness of many Russians to acquire the language of a small nation (P. 3.1). They are also less willing than Estonians to concede ethnocentric attitudes in their own group (P. 3.4). Instead, Russian pupils tend to accuse Estonians of prejudice and intolerance (P. 3.3). However, they do it implicitly rather than explicitly by using storytelling, passive voice, the pronoun ‘they’ or Russian equivalents of indefinite pronouns (see Extracts 14, 18 and 19). That sort of argumentation is indicative of covert strategies of positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation. In those propositions, Russian pupils, nevertheless, implicitly admit their minority status and seek support and impartial treatment from the side of majority to overcome obstacles to integration. The discursive position related to Propositions 3.2–3.4 may, thus, be called that of *reconciled minority*.

Estonian pupils, in turn, tend to blame Russians for not knowing the Estonian language (P. 3.1), whereas the difficulties of language learning are conceded by only two Estonians (P. 3.2). A number of Estonian children explicitly admit the existence of ethnic intolerance, either among Estonians (P. 3.3) or between the groups (P. 3.4). Estonian pupils tend to justify ethnocentric attitudes of the in-group, often by using causal argument schemes oriented towards the past (Extract 7; see also Extracts 9 and 10). In those cases, Estonians write either from the discursive position of *endangered majority* or that of already *established majority*, whose negative attitudes towards minority are to be strategically excused.

(7) But Estonians do not tolerate Russians because they made war against Estonians with their whole army. They took us under their control . . . (EB32)

The discursive position of *endangered majority* reveals itself also in Proposition 3.5: a couple of Estonians argue that Estonia is too small to integrate a great number of different people.

Topic 4: What needs to be done for integration?

Estonian and Russian pupils have some common ideas about possible solutions to integration problems – improving laws (P. 4.1), giving material support (e.g. a free flat) to immigrants (P. 4.2), and changing the attitudes of Estonians and foreigners (P. 4.9 and 4.10). Other propositions, however, reveal differences in Estonians' and Russians' discourse.

Russian pupils are more inclined to argue for measures to be taken by others (the state and Estonians). This strategy enables one to show oneself as free of responsibility and to implicitly blame the others for inactivity and carelessness. Relatively few Russians admit that foreigners themselves should make an effort – to learn the Estonian language and culture (P. 4.11) or change their attitudes, too (P. 4.9).

Under this topic, Russians' discourse accommodates two argumentative positions. On the one hand, they write from the position of *superior minority*, which reveals itself in Propositions 4.3 and 4.8. By demanding that the government should improve the economic situation, welfare and order, Russian pupils imply that Estonia is less developed and, hence, inferior than some other countries, including the foreigners' homeland (see Extract 8). The appeal for more opportunities to use Russian in shops, schools, and universities is in line with implicit ideological assumptions reconstructed in Examples 4–6, which lead to the conclusion that representatives of a big nation should have a right to use their language in public domains of a smaller country.

(8) The state should make the country comfortable and cosy so that it would remind non-citizens their homeland. (RG20)

Propositions 4.4, 4.6 and 4.11 in Russians' essays, on the other hand, manifest the discursive position of *reconciled minority*. Some Russian pupils acknowledge the need to learn the national language of Estonia (P. 4.11), while others expect the state to create more opportunities for it in the first place (P. 4.4). Three Russian pupils emphasize the need for a non-discriminating labour market policy (P. 4.6). (The problem of the higher risk of unemployment among Russians is, as an instance of global bias, neglected by Estonian pupils.)

Estonians' suggestions for fostering integration mostly manifest the position of *established majority*. The discursive position of *endangered majority* reveals itself partly in Propositions 4.5 and 4.11 (stated explicitly in Extract 9).

(9) To my opinion [integration] is not possible. . . . Because I have heard that Russians are discriminated against and Finns are not respected either. . . . Russians are not wanted in Estonia because they have conquered Estonia or smashed [it] at the point of the sword. . . . In order to make integration possible, one must get security from that state that the state would not strike a knife into our back. We are most afraid of Russia . . . Russia could be more friendly to us and the Russians here could be more friendly. Because of the Russians here I have a nasty feeling about the whole Russia. (EB25)

Summary

Analysis of the propositions revealed two pairs of typical discursive positions in the essays by Estonian and Russian pupils: established majority versus reconciled minority, and endangered majority versus superior minority. The first pair of positions expresses the actual social relations between the two groups, and is manifested explicitly in the essays. The latter pair of positions reflects, on the Russians' side, the implicit conception of appropriate social relations shared by a part of Estonian Russians. That conception, rooted in the past rather than in the present, is expressed implicitly through hidden assumptions. Estonian pupils, however, expose the position of endangered majority explicitly to justify restrictive minority policies.

The analysis revealed instances of global bias in Estonians', as well as Russians', argumentation. In both cases, the tendency can be seen as a part of an overall strategy of positive self-presentation – unfavourable characteristics of the in-group or the (historical) homeland tend to be neglected.

4.2. ARGUMENT SCHEMES

Pupils use mainly four types of logical argument schemes in their essays: causal schemes oriented towards the past, schemes containing part–whole relationships, schemes of comparison, and causal schemes oriented towards the future.

Causal schemes oriented towards the past

Those schemes present past events (the Soviet occupation, the massive deportation of Estonians, etc.) as the cause of the current state of affairs (interethnic intolerance or Estonians' ethnocentrism; cf. Kienpointner and Kindt, 1997). Causal schemes oriented towards the past are employed by Estonian pupils (e.g. Extracts 7, 9, and 10), being presented either from the discursive position of *endangered majority* or that of *established majority*. Four of those five Estonians who strongly rejected any possibility for integration justified their proposition by such schemes (e.g. Extract 9). Schemes oriented towards the past mostly comprise the argumentative move of *transfer* (not us, but they, are responsible for interethnic intolerance) or *victim–agent reversal* (not they, but we, are the victims), sometimes manifesting the implied argumentative interaction with Russians (Extract 10).

(10) Estonians are angry at Russians because Russians deported many Estonians to Russia during the war. Russians say that they have been treated badly in Estonia. Why, it is just the other way round. (EB22)

It is noteworthy that causal schemes oriented towards the past occur also in the ninth form civics textbook used by the pupils (see Section 4.3), as well as in some textbooks of Estonian history. Obviously, those argument schemes help to construct a suitable image of the 'enemy' and to justify xenophobic attitudes of Estonians.

Pupils in the Russian school do not expose any causes for the current state of affairs. Only one Russian girl who studies in the Estonian school¹⁰ makes a reference to historical events (see Extract 17). In belonging to a discursive community of Estonians, she is aware of their frequently used arguments and tries to understand Estonians' ethnocentrism. She, however, avoids naming the people (Russians) against whom Estonians 'had to fight'.

Schemes containing part-whole relationships

In this case, properties of parts (some Russians, Estonian Russians) are transferred to the whole (all Russians, Russia) or vice versa (cf. Kienpointner and Kindt, 1997). Those schemes, too, are employed only by Estonian pupils, and concur with the position of endangered majority. In Extract 9, for instance, the author transfers his negative attitude towards Estonian Russians to Russia as the whole, after having previously justified Estonians' Russophobia by referring to Russia's past military activities and potential aggression.

Some Estonian pupils, by stating or implying that all foreigners are not similar, present counter-arguments to part-whole relationships (see, e.g. the analysis of Case 2). Those pupils, representing the position of established majority, enter into an intertextual argumentative dialogue with the defensive position of endangered majority.

Schemes of comparison

Those schemes rely on similarities or differences between entities (cf. Kienpointner and Kindt, 1997), often containing an inference rule called the 'rule of justice' by Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca (1969). According to this rule, similar cases or entities have to be treated in the same way. The rule of justice is employed by several Estonian pupils to ground the proposition that Russians should learn the Estonian language: those pupils argue that immigrants, as a rule, have to acquire the national language of the state they live in. In those cases, Estonians write from the discursive position of established majority, joining in implied argumentative interaction with Russians' position of superior minority (according to which there should be more opportunities to use Russian in Estonia).

Estonian pupils writing from the position of endangered majority use a strategy counteracting appeals to the rule of justice: they emphasize that Estonia is smaller than other countries and, thus, not able to let in any more foreigners. That kind of argumentation serves as a response to the proposition that there should be even more Russians and other peoples in Estonia. That suggestion, made by a Russian girl representing the position of superior minority, is grounded by another rule of justice: 'You know, Estonians, too, live not only in Estonia' (RG10).

Causal schemes oriented towards the future

These kinds of arguments are often instances of the general scheme of argumentation called 'pragmatic argument' by Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca (1969).

According to that scheme, an action is evaluated depending on its positive or negative consequences (cf. Kienpointner and Kindt, 1997).

Pragmatic arguments are used exclusively by pupils in the Estonian school who support integration. Both the position of the established majority and that of the endangered majority are represented in those arguments. As the main positive consequences of integration, pupils mention the prevention of war (see also Case 2), the accession of Estonia to the NATO or the European Union (Extract 11), creating positive image of Estonia, and handling foreign labour power to be imported in the future due to the negative growth in population. Except the prevention of war, all those issues were treated excessively in the Estonian media prior to our study. Thus, those arguments can be seen as indirect intertextual links to mediated political discourses.

(11) If we want to get into the European Union (super stuff), Estonia has to be ready to help people to integrate. (EB17)

Summary

Estonian pupils use significantly more logical argument schemes than their Russian peers. This may be because Russians, in writing from the position of the reconciled minority, take the necessity of integration for granted, and build their essays on implicit assumptions and concrete suggestions rather than on logical argumentation. The discursive position of the superior minority cannot, owing to the actual power relations in the society, be argued for explicitly. Estonian pupils, in writing from the position of the (newly) established majority, need to justify their standpoint for themselves as well as for their readers. It is noteworthy that ethnocentric Estonians tend to orient their arguments towards the past or the present by using intertextual references to history, part-whole relationships and schemes of comparison, whereas pro-integration pupils tend to employ future-oriented arguments that occur also in mediated political discourses.

4.3. ARGUMENTATIVE AND LOCAL STRATEGIC MOVES

Several Estonian pupils use well-known argumentative and strategic moves in their essays. For instance, the author of Extract 12 begins with a classical *apparent denial*, proceeds with *storytelling* by using her personal experience as justification, and concludes with another denial and a generalized moralizing statement (the indefinite pronouns 'one' and 'you' serve to avoid naming Russians and to add validity to the argument as a universal truth).

(12) I personally do not consider any nationality less important or inferior than other [nationalities]. . . . However, some Russians act more arrogantly than it would be necessary. For instance, I went shopping with my sister when we were visiting our relatives at Kohtla-Järve [a town where the majority of population are Russians]. . . . A shop assistant asked something in Russian but I did not understand. Instead of learning Estonian in Estonia and trying to explain the matter peacefully or calling someone for help, the shop assistant rolled her eyes and made such a sour face that when I thought about it again, I lost my appetite. If a person of another nationality lives in

Estonia, I have nothing against it. Let him/her live. However, one should take into account that you have to merge to the culture of your neighbourhood. (EG29)

Many Estonian pupils, however, are not concerned about political correctness and take on overtly negative other-presentation (e.g. by means of word selection; see Section 4.5). A strategic move found in some Estonians' essays is not as usual in more 'correct' adult discourse – I would call the move *reverse* or *delayed denial*. In that case, a person first (naively) expresses a prejudiced or ethnocentric attitude, and then denies it by saying something positive or neutral about minorities (Extract 13).

(13) Actually it would be better, if only Estonians lived in Estonia. Foreigners could come here only as tourists. It is not possible and I, perhaps, would not want it either that only our people lived here in Estonia, because if we had, for instance, no Russians, then our country would be somehow monotonous. (EG21)

The use of such argumentative moves indicates contradictory influences in the process of socialization. On the one hand, young Estonians have learned (most probably at school and from the media) that all people must be treated equally. On the other hand, some negative experiences with foreigners and a socially shared knowledge of historical injustice give rise to ethnocentric or even xenophobic attitudes. The same layers of thought and argumentation occur in the Estonian version of the ninth form civics textbook. Its authors *concede* that Russophobia exists among Estonians, and then, by using a causal scheme oriented towards the past, *transfer* the responsibility for it to a 'huge number of [Russian-speaking] immigrants' who were settled in Soviet Estonia in the course of 'deliberate policy of Russianization' (Möldre and Toots, 1997: 189).

Russian pupils do not use any of those argumentative or strategic moves in their essays. In writing from the position of the minority, either superior or reconciled, they have no symbolic power to convey prejudice to be denied before or after expressing it.

4.4. STORYTELLING

Storytelling is employed by Estonians (e.g. in Extract 12 and Case 1) as well as by Russians (e.g. Extract 14). The main difference between their stories is that Estonian pupils, writing either from the position of established or endangered majority, tell about their personal experiences and blame Russians explicitly. Russian pupils, conversely, tell about their acquaintances' experiences or general events, and accuse Estonians rather implicitly by using passive voice, the pronoun 'they', or the Russian equivalent of the indefinite pronoun 'one' (see also Extracts 18 and 19). In Extract 14, a Russian boy combines in storytelling the use of passive voice and the pronoun 'they' (although the label 'Estonian members of the committee' would have been, perhaps, more appropriate) to avoid blaming the majority group explicitly.

(14) And Estonians *are treated* better, I mean, if [you have] Estonian surname. For instance, my friend wanted to go to study (to work on tourism). She has an excellent

command of Estonian, she has many Estonian friends and she knows the language better than many of them. Generally speaking, when she went to enter [the school], she *was spoken to*, everything was normal, only when her passport *was opened* and a Russian surname *was seen*, *they* asked whether she is Russian or not (because she had so good command of Estonian). *They* told her that the programme is very difficult and because she is Russian, [she] supposedly would not cope with the programme. I want to say by this that all nationalities, I mean, irrespective of a name [and] surname, a person *should be valued* according to his knowledge. (RB17)

4.5. STYLISTIC FEATURES

The use of pronouns

Extracts 1, 7, 9 and 13 allow us to predict that Estonian pupils tend to build overt we–they discourse. Use of the pronouns ‘we’ and ‘they’, alternately with ‘Estonians’ and ‘Russians’, is, in fact, massive in Estonians’ essays. By using ‘we’ and ‘they’, Estonian pupils draw a clear demarcation line between indigenous people and foreigners. The constitution of the in-group is ethnocentrically exclusive: ‘we’ includes only Estonians, by ‘them’ Estonian pupils mean foreigners, Russians, Slavs. That discursive feature is common to the position of endangered majority (e.g. Extract 15) and that of established majority.

(15) So, all in all, I agree on this [integration] but I repeat that there must be foreigners no more than Estonians among the nation. *They* must not ‘take’ *our* home from us . . . (EG21)

Few Russian pupils who study in the Estonian school provide exceptions to this pattern in their schoolmates’ discourse. By the systematic use of the pronoun ‘they’, a Russian boy in the Estonian school distances himself from both ethnic groups and, at the same time, avoids overt accusation of Estonians by not naming them and by attributing agency to ‘Estonia’ as a state (Extract 16).

(16) In my opinion *Estonia* does not like Russian people, as *they* want to expel Russian people living in Estonia, but in my opinion it is wrong that *they* want to expel *them*. *They* should just help *them* more. (RBE5)

A Russian girl in the Estonian school uses an inclusive ‘we’ with respect to all peoples in Estonia. She does not identify herself with any of the groups either (Extract 17). This may be indicative of the fact that Russian pupils in the Estonian school prefer to construct rather civic than ethnic identity to feel more or less comfortable in both discursive communities.

(17) There are Estonians, Russians, Finns, a.o. [in Estonia]. . . . *We all* have lived and worked together. . . . Maybe Estonians feel bad that *they* had to fight for *their* country and foreigners came to live here and now have the same rights as *they* do. (RGE28)

Pupils from the Russian school are rather careful not to contrast ‘us’ and ‘them’. The pronoun ‘we’ tends to be used in the inclusive sense, designating all ethnic groups in Estonia (e.g. Extract 18), or avoided. Occasionally, Russian pupils use the pronouns ‘I’ or ‘you’ to refer to the in-group without making any claims to collective rights (e.g. Extracts 18 and 19). The pronoun ‘they’ is usually reserved

for other foreigners or non-citizens (Extract 19); more seldom it is used to refer to Estonians while seeking to avoid accusing them explicitly (e.g. Extract 14). For the same purpose, the authors of Extracts 18 and 19 employ the Russian equivalent of the *indefinite pronoun* 'one' and/or *passive voice*.

(18) I would like to *be treated* well. . . . May *we all* find a common language. May *we all* start to be friends. (RG20)

(19) It can not be allowed that *I* or another ethnic group *would be treated* differently There are also Black people and Chinese [in Estonia]. . . . *One* must not treat *them* like animals, after all. (RG3)

It is important to note in this context that the Russian version of the ninth form civics textbook fosters an identification with Estonia through the use of the pronoun 'our', occasionally in instances where the original version uses the more neutral adjective 'Estonian' or the noun 'Estonia' instead (e.g. 'our state' vs. 'Estonia'). The textbook in Estonian, moreover, contains some exclusive assumptions, e.g. in a sentence: '. . . politics is humane, i.e. raises human interests to the foremost position and guarantees life worthy of a human being to *the citizens*' (Möldre and Toots, 1997: 35), in which non-citizens (mostly Russians) living in Estonia are discursively excluded. The textbook in Russian omits such exclusive assumptions.

Word selection

As part of the overall strategies of positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation, Estonian pupils use a number of explicit adjectives and emotionally loaded verbs and nouns as well as metaphors (e.g. Extracts 2, 9 and 12, Case 1). The wording emphasizes difference between Estonians and foreigners; euphemisms and mitigation are seldom employed. The explicitness of Estonian pupils' discourse ranges to the degree of vulgarity (in the essays by a couple of boys), not to mention instances of slang and colloquialism. As an overall result, Estonians succeed in portraying themselves as peaceful, patient, deliberative, friendly and complaisant, while foreigners, especially Russians, are colourfully depicted as criminal, aggressive, (potentially) disloyal, uncultured and arrogant. At the same time, many Estonians state or imply that all Russians are not similar (see, e.g. Case 2).

The wording in Russian pupils' essays is much more neutral and formal; the words 'Estonians' and 'citizens' are mentioned without any adjectives. At the level of wording, the Russians' discourse contains practically no instances of explicitly positive self-presentation or negative other-presentation.

Active and passive sentences

Extracts 14, 18 and 19 have demonstrated that Russian pupils, when writing about or making allusions to ethnic discrimination, prefer to use covert forms of accusation, particularly the passive voice, to leave the responsible agent (Estonians) unclear. The same pattern is observable in several other essays by

Russians, although cases in which Russian pupils blame Estonians explicitly in active sentences are very rare. It is noteworthy that the Russian version of the civics textbook, just like many Russian pupils, employs a strategy of covert criticism of Estonians. By reproducing an article entitled 'Estonia voted for the Constitution and against the enlargement of the circle of voters' that was published in a Russian-language newspaper in Estonia six years previously, the textbook employs the voice and authority of the represented media discourse as well as a *metonymical* inanimate agent 'Estonia' to covertly blame Estonians for not granting the right to vote to non-citizen spouses of Estonian citizens.

Estonian pupils use predominantly the active voice when blaming Russians, especially in cases of causal argument schemes oriented towards the past (e.g. Extracts 7, 9 and 10). That part of the overall strategy of negative other-presentation is sometimes combined with positive self-presentation by means of avoiding naming the responsible agent in case it belongs to the in-group. In Extract 9, that strategic combination (which is at the same time the move of victim-agent reversal) is realized through use of the active and passive voice: having conceded that 'Russians *are discriminated against*', the author starts blaming them for that explicitly by using historical references as justification.

Summary

Using stylistic means, Estonian pupils tend to construct the in-group as culturally exclusive, to portray themselves positively and the others, especially Russians, negatively, and to attribute responsibility for conceded ethnic discrimination to Russians. Pupils in the Russian school avoid drawing a clear demarcation between themselves and Estonians; rather, they try to build a common identity at the level of civic nation. Also, Russian pupils avoid the strategies of positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation; instead, they employ a strategy that can be called *covert other-accusation*.

The greater discretion of Russians' discourse in comparison with Estonians may be partly conditioned by the institutional context of the study and, accordingly, by *context models* pupils had about the communicative situation. The essays were written in comprehensive public schools that represent the state power, in relation to which Russians are in a less privileged position. Social atmosphere and power relations between teachers and pupils are more formal and authoritative in Russian schools. Finally, the pupils knew that the essays would be read by Estonians. All these factors might increase the impact of social desirability on Russians' discourse to some extent, and result in the greater politeness, formality and more covert forms of other-accusation. However, taking into account the broader sociopolitical context of interethnic relations in Estonia and the authors' actual status (minority vs. majority) allows us to assume that essays by Russian pupils express their sincere wish to avoid ethnic antagonism and to construct common we-identity with Estonians.

4.6. MANIFEST INTERTEXTUALITY

The previous analysis has already revealed some intertextual references in pupils' essays – to historical events, mediated political discourses and arguments by proponents of different discursive positions. In addition, pupils use some other manifest intertextual references, which make an allusion to possible sources of their ideas. Most common are references to everyday, media and mediated political discourses. The latter two are used to justify pro-integration (e.g. Extract 11) as well as ethnocentric standpoints (Case 1). This bears witness to the fact that young people tend to pick up those arguments in the 'heterogeneous and partly contradictory media coverage on minority issues' (Kõuts and Tammpuu, 2002: 316), which support their ideological beliefs.

Intertextual references to everyday discourses, conversely, tend to be negotiated or rejected by pupils. In Extract 20, for instance, a Russian boy in the Estonian school contests an ethnic stereotype by using his own observations and an argument from the human rights discourse he probably learned at school.

(20) . . . it is sure that different peoples have the same human rights, e.g. no one can say: 'Gypsies can do nothing but wander'. Usually those people are themselves under-educated and they try to cover that with their stories. (RBE1)

The pupils, however, never make manifest intertextual references to their textbooks or to teachers in the essays. Although asked directly in the interviews whence they may have derived their thoughts, pupils most often refer to personal experiences and reflections, the media, some teachers and family members. Moreover, even similar sources (the same teachers and textbooks) may lead to radically different ideas. I demonstrate this through the detailed analysis of the discourse by two classmates.

4.7. TWO CASES

Case 1: an ethnocentric Estonian girl

An extract from the essay 'Is integration of different peoples possible in Estonia?'

No, it is not, because there are many different nationalities in Estonia. There are Russians, Finns, Swedes, Latvians, and, of course, Estonians [in Estonia]. In my opinion Russians feel themselves like kings in Estonia and want to beat to treat Estonians as slaves. I personally have been beaten by a Russian. There was no reason, I just walked past the Russians' school and as I did not notice a quarrelsome fellow (he was a boy), neither did I understand, why [should I], what he is talking, I don't know Russian, why [should I], he came running after me and landed me a blow on the nose with all his might. It happened years and years ago. I was then about ten years old but I still hate Russians. They yell and bawl all the time, this is already getting on my nerves. Russians are also quarrelsome. I have many acquaintances (among young people) and Russians have picked a quarrel with almost all of them. Who has then been beaten and who has then beaten the quarrelsome fellow himself/herself. When I watch police programmes on TV, half of the criminals are Russians. . . . I am completely sure that integration is by no means possible in Estonia. I like only one human being of one nationality – this is Estonian and no one else. I will always hate Russians. (EG7)

The essay begins with a categorical negative answer to the question posed in the title. The author justifies her standpoint by a factual argument about the multi-ethnic nature of Estonia. She implies that integration is impossible because the culture and manners of the ethnic groups are too different. This *discourse of difference*, common to discourses about migrants in the mass media of other European countries (see, e.g. Titscher et al., 2000), is, in the rest of the essay, reduced to bipolar categorization (Estonians vs. Russians). The category of 'Russians' is, in turn, associated with thematical elements identical to those found in neo-racist discourse in Europe – difference, deviance and perceived threat (see Wodak and Matouschek, 1993). The ethnocentric girl depicts Russians as the superior group ('kings') who distance themselves from Estonians, emphasizes Russians' deviance (they are blatant, quarrelsome and criminal), and implies their potential danger (one can always be beaten up by a Russian). That sort of negative other-presentation leads the author to the firm resolution about the impossibility of integration and serves to justify her ultimate ethnocentrism and xenophobia explicitly expressed in the last two sentences.

The author of this essay uses two strategic means of justification: *storytelling* and *victim-agent reversal*. By narrating her own negative experience as well as those of her friends (she elaborates more on the latter in the interview) the girl defines Estonians as innocent victims at the hands of aggressive and unpredictable Russians. That context allows her to openly express hatred and to make generalizations about Russian people. The victim-agent reversal is extreme in this case: the minority group is shown as enjoying the power position in the society. The *metaphor* of kings and slaves obviously refers to the historical context: Russians are still seen as the formerly dominant group and as carriers of colonial mentality. In the interview the girl explained the use of that metaphor by mentioning the Soviet occupation in 1940 and the deportation of Estonians to Siberia. In the contemporary context she exemplified unequal power relations between Russians and Estonians by experiences of her friends who had been beaten or robbed by Russians in the streets.

Another form of linguistic realization deserves a closer look – the use of the Estonian adverb 'ju' ('why'; 'now'; 'already'; 'after all'; German 'ja'). In this context, the closest translation is 'why [should I]', i.e. the adverb expresses the taken-for-grantedness or naturalness of a matter, in this case the non-proficiency in Russian. The ethnocentric Estonian girl justifies her inattention towards a Russian boy by her non-proficiency in Russian at the age of ten (which, as she assumes, led to the violent act by the boy). In referring to the present ('I don't know Russian'), she has struck out the adverb 'ju'. It is impossible to say whether she made that discursive choice for the stylistic reason (to avoid word repetition like she obviously did in case of the repeated 'then' below in the essay), or because she realized that the taken-for-grantedness of non-proficiency in Russian at the age of fourteen may not be shared by her readers (social scientists). Anyway, the initial double use of that adverb indicates her own deep-seated assumption that members of the majority have not to know the language of the minority.

The essay contains a *manifest intertextual reference* to media discourse (see also Section 4.6). That discursive choice can also be seen as an implicit quasi-rational argumentation within the discourse of difference: because Russians form less than half of the Estonian population, their proportion among criminals should also be less than 50 percent. The equal number of Estonian and Russian criminals 'proves' the greater inclination towards deviance among Russians.

In the interview the girl referred to historical knowledge and conversations with her friends as the sources of her ideas. She described her close discursive community as consisting of young people who do not tolerate Russians and consider Estonians to be the best people in the world. This supports the hypothesis set up by Estonian sociologists (Kruusvall, 2000): repelling attitudes among Estonians most probably appear in 'clutches' or small discursive communities.

Case 2: a pro-integration Estonian girl

An extract from the essay 'Is integration of different peoples possible in Estonia?'

In my opinion integration is possible in Estonia. Because people cannot live in one country being consistently at loggerheads. The mixing of peoples is in the nature of things in life. There are always Estonians who like foreigners. I believe that the mixing of blood is the most probable way to live in peace. If people are allied by blood with so-called half-breeds, they will get to know foreigners and will understand that Estonians are not the only good people. In getting to know foreigners better, their true nature uncovers itself, on the grounds of my experiences it changes to better. People should finally understand that Russians' 'black sheep' was Lenin. He has left the opinion as though all Russians were like him, this is wrong.

The Estonian Government should create more opportunities for foreigners to learn the language. I know a man who tries to pass the Estonian language exam. He has tried it for several times, insofar unproductively. . . . In these days Estonians do not accept foreigners just because they do not speak the language of the state they live in.

Foreigners should be called for to celebrate Estonians' holidays. Following traditions helps to break ice that has formed between the peoples. Russians should polish their manners! Most of Russians spit on ground, chew sunflower seeds all the time, and throw garbage out of the window. This is not a myth but reality that you see walking around in Estonia.

Thus I believe that integration is possible. (EG3)

Although the perspective on integration in this essay differs diametrically from that in Case 1, the essays share some discourse structures, namely, thematic elements of the *discourse of difference*. Use of the concepts 'mixing of blood' and 'half-breeds' by the pro-integration girl indicates her assumptions that ethnicity is a biological phenomenon and ethnic groups differ from each other by nature. In addition, she brings forth that foreigners differ from Estonians by not knowing the national language and by not celebrating the same holidays. Russians, in particular, are also shown as norm-ignoring and, thus, deviant. The third component, characteristic of the discourse of difference – perceived threat – is

implicit and weak in this case (the girl assumes that a possibility of conflicts exists, and believes that the 'mixing of blood' is the most probable way to avoid it).

Alongside the discourse of difference, the pro-integration girl explicates the *discourse of tolerance* that is completely denied by the ethnocentric girl. The discourse of tolerance and recognition that emerged in the Estonian media in the late 1990s (Kõuts and Tammpuu, 2002) appears in this case in topics such as intergroup marriages, learning more about foreigners, and creating opportunities for language learning. The two discourses are intertwined in the essay as well as in the Estonian press, although the media communicates ethnic stereotypes in more implicit forms.

Another major difference between the two cases lies in the *discursive position* the girls speak from. While the ethnocentric girl defends the position of endangered majority (which, in this case, is clearly victimized and almost minoritized), her pro-integration classmate speaks from the power position of established majority by giving indirect orders to Estonian people, to the government and to Russians (by using the modal verb 'should' and even an exclamation mark).

The essay embraces a number of *intertextual references*, mostly to everyday language and beliefs. The most remarkable intertextual relations appear in *negations*, in which the author negotiates the commonsense beliefs she assumes to exist. For instance, in the first negation ('... people ... will understand that Estonians are not the only good people') the girl refers to a taken-for-granted assumption characteristic of positive self-presentation ('Estonians are good people'). She agrees with that assumption but denies its exclusive aspect presumably shared by a number of her compatriots (as though Estonians were the only good people).

Another intertextual reference ('People should finally understand that Russians' "black sheep" was Lenin. He has left the opinion as though all Russians were like him, this is wrong.') is significant for its relation to the historical context of interethnic relations in Estonia. The girl explained in the interview that she and her classmates had written papers in history lessons about Lenin and Stalin. She supposed that all people learned about the genocide and repression in school, and they probably reached the conclusion that 'those governments were bad and all Russians are of that kind'. The pro-integration girl thus hypothesized the influence of school on ethnic stereotypes while showing herself as resistant to that kind of impact. Moreover, she said in the interview that she had dropped her acquaintance with a friend whose boyfriend was a skinhead – she did not like that they had tried to intrude their racist views on her. This shows that a young person may also leave a discursive community in case his or her views become too different from the ones shared by the community.

The third significant intertextual reference in the essay is the argument that an ethnic stereotype about Russians' uncultured behaviour is not a myth. In this case, the pro-integration girl argues against the discourse of tolerance that seeks to deconstruct any negative stereotypes. Most probably she had encountered the label of 'myth' in the media discourse; that, however, contradicted with some of her personal experiences.

It is significant that the two Estonian girls mentioned the same sources as the primary origins of their ideas – lessons and history textbooks, and personal experiences. The ethnocentric girl (and her friends) had had some negative experiences with Russians, she stated that Russians had deported Estonians to Siberia, and claimed that she could never like Russians because of that. The tolerant girl had had positive as well as negative experiences with Russians, she ascribed the responsibility for the genocide against Estonians in the 1940s to the antihuman Soviet governments and Stalin, and rejected Russophobic statements based on argument schemes containing part-whole relationships (e.g. ‘Those governments were bad and all Russians are of that kind’) that she had often heard in Estonians’ everyday discourse. These findings confirm the importance of *mental models*, that is, ‘representations in personal memory of events or . . . episodes’ (Van Dijk, 1998: 79) in the process of discourse comprehension. Also, the findings support Wodak’s assumption that ‘hearers and readers construct not only the text but also the social context, and that text and context interact with one another’ (Titscher et al., 2000: 156). The ethnocentric girl probably interpreted the facts about the massive deportation reported in her history textbooks against the background of minor conflicts between Estonians and Russians that she had heard about or participated in. Also, she might have perceived chilly interethnic relations in Estonia in the historical context of injustice and ethnic antagonism and, thus, rejected any possibility of interethnic integration. The tolerant girl had probably comprehended the facts about the deportation in the history books, the Russophobic talk of Estonians, and her own positive and negative experiences with foreigners in the context of contemporary multi-ethnic society with its problems and advantages, and become convinced in the possibility and necessity of integration.

5. Conclusion

Analysis revealed a number of differences between the discourses by Estonian and Russian pupils. Young Russians are, in general, more optimistic and supporting of interethnic integration in Estonia, whereas young Estonians’ discourse is more heterogeneous ranging from overt ethnocentrism to expressive tolerance. The argumentation by both groups suffers from global bias that serves as a part in the strategy of positive self-presentation. Russian pupils use very few logical argument schemes (only schemes of comparison); they avoid any references to historical context, e.g. causal argument schemes oriented towards the past. Such schemes are, conversely, often used by Estonian pupils.

It is possible to distinguish two pairs of typical discursive positions in pupils’ essays: established majority versus reconciled minority, and endangered majority versus superior minority. Proponents of those positions are probably aware of the existence of other positions, as they occasionally enter into intertextual argumentative dialogue with each other. The very existence of the positions of

endangered majority and superior minority implies that interethnic relations in Estonia, though established politically, are covertly struggled over in discursive practices.

Estonians' position of majority, either established or endangered, enables them to employ strategies of positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation in relatively overt ways. Several Estonian pupils, however, have been socialized into the norms of political correctness to the extent that they feel obliged to use argumentative and local strategic moves to disguise their prejudice while communicating it. Estonians, nevertheless, define the in-group in exclusive terms. Russian pupils, in writing from the position of the minority, employ the strategy of covert other-accusation and more implicit means of positive self-presentation. They avoid drawing a discursive frontier between themselves and Estonians, and try to build a common we-identity at the level of civic nation.

The analysis revealed some parallels between the Estonian and Russian versions of the ninth form civics textbook and the correspondent discourses of ninth formers. The intertextual analysis and the data obtained from the interviews with pupils, however, do not allow interpretation of this correspondence as an indicator of a socializing effect of the textbook. Pupils never make manifest intertextual references to their textbooks or teachers in the essays. Instead, they use arguments picked from the media and political discourses to justify pro-integration as well as ethnocentric standpoints. Intertextual references to everyday discourses are often negotiated or rejected by pupils on the basis of their personal intercultural experiences. In the interviews, pupils mention their own reflections and experiences, the media, some teachers and family members as the sources of their ideas. The detailed analysis of two cases demonstrated that even the same sources (history lessons and textbooks) may lead to radically different ideas depending on the mental model or interpretative context previously constructed by the pupil. The make-up of the interpretative context is determined, to a great extent, by the pupil's personal experiences and the views shared by the discursive communities where she participates.

Is interethnic integration possible in Estonia? The analysis of pupils' discourses suggests that new discursive and interpretative contexts of interethnic relations in Estonia are needed. On the Russians' side, the current context practically lacks honest historical references and suffers from global bias, which may hinder comprehension of the reasons for the current state of affairs and every aspect of the integration process. Even bigger problems lie on the Estonians' side where contemporary social context is sporadically overshadowed by the historical context, which is hardly susceptible to forgiveness, tolerance and the construction of a common identity. New discursive and interpretative contexts should neglect neither historical nor contemporary social dimensions, and lay more emphasis on the latter. The media and the educational system, including school textbooks, can contribute to the construction of such contexts.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am grateful to Jüri Allik, Marju Lauristin, Margit Keller, and Helen Sooväli for helpful critical comments on earlier versions of this article.

NOTES

1. 'Russians' is considered to be the most neutral short term to designate all Russian-speaking people (Russians, Byelorussians, Ukrainians, etc.) in Estonia. Other possible terms such as 'non-Estonians', 'Russophones', etc. may imply connotations to 'otherness'.
2. By 'educational media' I mean school textbooks in particular, but also the whole range of possible texts, pictorial illustrations, films, computer programs, etc., which are produced for educational purposes, that is, 'to inform and convince the reader/the viewer/the listener that the presented information and perspectives are correct' (Selander, 1995: 9).
3. I am grateful to psychologist Jelena Jedomskihh for conducting research in the Russian school.
4. The textbook in question is a ninth-form civics textbook (Möldre and Toots, 1997), originally written in Estonian, and translated into Russian in 1998. The two versions of the textbook are currently used as the main teaching material in the compulsory ninth-form civics course in most schools in Estonia, both those with Estonian and Russian as the language of instruction.
5. Typical of racist/ethnocentric discourse is 'the move of *apparent denial*, in which a positive first clause denies prejudice or racism, and is followed by a contrasted *but* clause saying or implying something negative about minorities, as in the classical phrase 'We having nothing against blacks, but . . .'" (Van Dijk et al., 1997: 170).
6. In the case of an apparent concession 'it is conceded that we have done something wrong (or they have done something well), but it is then added that our negative action is excused or mitigated, or that their positive action is not that positive at all' (Van Dijk et al., 1997: 170).
7. The move of transfer expresses a thought that there may be, for instance, racism, but *they*, not *us*, are responsible for that (cf. Van Dijk et al., 1997).
8. The move of victim-agent reversal is used to argue that *we*, not *they*, are the victims; *we*, not *they*, are discriminated against (cf. Van Dijk et al., 1997).
9. EB = Estonian boy; EG = Estonian girl; RB = Russian boy; RG = Russian girl; RBE = Russian boy in the Estonian school; RGE = Russian girl in the Estonian school; the number designates the individuals' number in the sample of the school. All extracts have been translated from Estonian or Russian by the author. Italics in quotes designate my emphasis.
10. About 7 percent of Russian-speaking children study in Estonian-language schools (see Pavelson and Vihalemm, 2002).

REFERENCES

- Aristotle (1984a) 'Topics', in J. Barnes (ed.) *The Complete Works of Aristotle*, pp. 167–277. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Aristotle (1984b) 'Rhetoric', in J. Barnes (ed.) *The Complete Works of Aristotle*, pp. 2152–69. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

- Banks, J.A. (1992) 'Curriculum Guidelines for Multicultural Education', *Social Education* 55: 282.
- Buckingham, D. (1993) *Children Talking Television: The Making of Television Literacy*. London: Falmer Press.
- Fairclough, N. (1989) *Language and Power*. London: Longman.
- Fairclough, N. (1992) *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Fairclough, N. (1995) *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language*. London: Longman.
- Gill, A.M. and Whedbee, K. (1997) 'Rhetoric', in T.A. van Dijk (ed.) *Discourse as Structure and Process. Discourse Studies: A Multidisciplinary Introduction. Vol. 1.*, pp. 157–84. London: Sage.
- Grueneberg, R. (1991) 'The Representation of Minorities in Israeli Civics Textbooks', MA thesis Discourse Analysis, Faculty of Humanities, University of Amsterdam.
- Gutmann, A. (1996) 'Challenges of Multiculturalism in Democratic Education', in R.K. Fullinwider (ed.) *Public Education in a Multicultural Society: Policy, Theory, Critique*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Heidmets, M. (1998) 'The Russian Minority: Dilemmas for Estonia', *Trames* 2(3): 264–73.
- Heidmets, M. and Lauristin, M., (2002) 'Learning from the Estonian Case', in M. Lauristin and M. Heidmets (eds) *The Challenge of the Russian Minority: Emerging Multicultural Democracy in Estonia*, pp. 319–32. Tartu: Tartu University Press.
- Iser, W. (1980) 'The Reading Process: A Phenomenological Approach', in J.P. Tompkins (ed.) *Reader-Response Criticism: From Formalism to Post-Structuralism*, pp. 50–9. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.
- Jensen, K.B. (1991) 'Reception Analysis: Mass Communication as the Social Production of Meaning', in K.B. Jensen and N.W. Jankowski (eds) *A Handbook of Qualitative Methodologies for Mass Communication Research*, pp. 135–48. London: Routledge.
- Kalmus, V. (2002) 'Ethno-Political Discourse in Estonian School Textbooks', in M. Lauristin and M. Heidmets (eds) *The Challenge of the Russian Minority: Emerging Multicultural Democracy in Estonia*, pp. 255–63. Tartu: Tartu University Press.
- Kalmus, V. and Pavelson, M. (2002) 'Schools in Estonia as Institutional Actors and as a Field of Socialisation', in M. Lauristin and M. Heidmets (eds) *The Challenge of the Russian Minority: Emerging Multicultural Democracy in Estonia*, pp. 227–36. Tartu: Tartu University Press.
- Kienpointner, M. and Kindt, W. (1997) 'On the Problem of Bias in Political Argumentation: An Investigation into Discussions about Political Asylum in Germany and Austria', *Journal of Pragmatics* 27: 555–85.
- Kõuts, R. and Tammppuu, P. (2002) 'Changing Media Discourse on Minority Issues: From Ignorance towards Recognition', in M. Lauristin and M. Heidmets (eds) *The Challenge of the Russian Minority: Emerging Multicultural Democracy in Estonia*, pp. 305–16. Tartu: Tartu University Press.
- Kruusvall, J. (2000). 'Understanding Integration', in M. Lauristin and R. Vetik (eds) *Integration in Estonian Society: Monitoring 2000*, pp. 14–21. Tallinn: Institute of International and Social Studies and Integration Foundation.
- Kruusvall, J. (2002) 'Social Perception and Individual Resources of the Integration Process', in M. Lauristin and M. Heidmets (eds) *The Challenge of the Russian Minority: Emerging Multicultural Democracy in Estonia*, pp. 117–62. Tartu: Tartu University Press.
- Lagerspetz, M. (1999) 'The Cross of Virgin Mary's Land: A Study in Estonia's "Return to Europe"', *Idäntutkimus* 3–4: 17–28.
- Lauristin, M. and Heidmets, M. (2002) 'Introduction: The Russian Minority in Estonia as a Theoretical and Political Issue', in M. Lauristin and M. Heidmets (eds) *The Challenge of*

- the Russian Minority: Emerging Multicultural Democracy in Estonia*, pp. 19–29. Tartu: Tartu University Press.
- Linz, J.L. and Stepan, A. (1996) *Problems of Democratic Transition and Consolidation: Southern Europe, South America, and Post-Communist Europe*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.
- Möldre, L. and Toots, A. (1997) *Kodanikuõpetus: 8. – 9. kl.* [Civics: Forms 8–9] Tallinn: Koolibri.
- Olson, D. R. (1989) 'On the Language and Authority of Textbooks', in S. de Castell, A. Luke and C. Luke (eds) *Language, Authority and Criticism: Readings on the School Textbook*, pp. 233–44. London: Falmer.
- Pavelson, M. and Vihalemm, T. (2002) 'The Russian Child in the Estonian Language School', in M. Lauristin and M. Heidmets (eds) *The Challenge of the Russian Minority: Emerging Multicultural Democracy in Estonia*, pp. 265–76. Tartu: Tartu University Press.
- Perelman, C. and Olbrechts-Tyteca, L. (1969) *The New Rhetoric: A Treatise on Argumentation*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Ruutsoo, R. (2002) 'Discursive Conflict and Estonian Post-Communist Nation-Building', in M. Lauristin and M. Heidmets (eds) *The Challenge of the Russian Minority: Emerging Multicultural Democracy in Estonia*, pp. 31–54. Tartu: Tartu University Press.
- Selander, S. (1995) 'Pedagogic Texts – Educational Media', *Internationale Schulbuchforschung* 17: 9–23.
- Sleeter, C.E. and Grant, C.A. (1991) 'Race, Class, Gender, and Disability in Current Textbooks', in M.W. Apple and L.K. Christian-Smith (eds) *The Politics of the Textbook*, pp. 78–110. London: Routledge.
- Taxel, J. (1989) 'Children's Literature: A Research Proposal from the Perspective of the Sociology of School Knowledge', in S. de Castell, A. Luke and C. Luke (eds) *Language, Authority and Criticism. Readings on the School Textbook*, pp. 32–45. London: The Falmer Press.
- Titscher, S., Meyer, M., Wodak, R. and Vetter, E. (2000) *Methods of Text and Discourse Analysis*. London: Sage.
- Toulmin, S.E. (1958) *The Uses of Argument*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ümarik, M. (2001) 'National Identity and Ethno-Political Discourse in Estonian History Textbooks'. Available at [accessed 28 September 2001]: <http://www.ehi.ee/ehi/academic/renord/National%20identity.html>
- Van Dijk, T.A. (1993) 'Principles of Critical Discourse Analysis', *Discourse & Society* 4(2): 249–83.
- Van Dijk, T.A. (1998) *Ideology: A Multidisciplinary Approach*. London: Sage.
- Van Dijk, T.A. (2001) 'Multidisciplinary CDA: A Plea for Diversity', in R. Wodak and M. Meyer (eds) *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*, pp. 95–120. London: Sage.
- Van Dijk, T.A., Ting-Toomey, S., Smitherman, G. and Troutman, D. (1997) 'Discourse, Ethnicity, Culture and Racism', in T.A. van Dijk (ed.) *Discourse as Social Interaction. Discourse Studies: A Multidisciplinary Introduction*, Vol. 2, pp. 144–80. London: Sage.
- Van Eemeren, F.H. and Grootendorst, R. (1992) *Argumentation, Communication, and Fallacies: A Pragma-Dialectical Perspective*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Van Eemeren, F.H., Grootendorst, R., Jackson, S. and Jacobs, S. (1997) 'Argumentation', in T.A. van Dijk (ed.) *Discourse as Structure and Process. Discourse Studies: A Multidisciplinary Introduction*, Vol. 1, pp. 208–29. London: Sage.
- Vihalemm, P., Lauk, E. and Lauristin, M. (1997) 'Estonian Media in the Process of Change', in M. Lauristin and P. Vihalemm (eds) *Return to the Western World*, pp. 227–40. Tartu: Tartu University Press.

- Wodak, R. (2001) 'The Discourse–Historical Approach', in R. Wodak and M. Meyer (eds) *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*, pp. 63–94. London: Sage.
- Wodak, R. and Matouschek, B. (1993) "‘We Are Dealing with People Whose Origins One Can Clearly Tell Just by Looking’": Critical Discourse Analysis and the Study of Neo-Racism in Contemporary Austria', *Discourse & Society* 4(2): 225–48.
- Wood, D. (1981) 'Social Studies Textbooks in a Multicultural Society', *The History and Social Science Teacher* 17(1): 21–9.
- 2000 Population and Housing Census II. (2001) Tallinn: Statistical Office of Estonia.



VERONIKA KALMUS is research fellow at the Department of Journalism and Communication, and doctoral student of sociology at the University of Tartu. Her research interests are the school textbook as an agent of socialisation, the 'hidden curriculum' of educational media, and the emerging media society in Estonia. She has published in *Trames: A Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*. ADDRESS: Department of Journalism and Communication, University of Tartu, 18 Ülikooli St., 50090 Tartu, Estonia. [email: veronica@uninet.ee]

