LITERATURE REVIEW

In this chapter the different approaches to work carried out in the field of critical language studies that are most relevant to this thesis will be outlined. Firstly the term ‘discourse’ and how it is used within Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) will be discussed. Following this in Chapter 2.1, several approaches and perspectives on Discourse Analysis have been illustrated. Finally, the objective of research as crucial determinant in the choice of the analytical model is hinted.

2.1. Introduction.

(CL) and (CDA) mean the same thing. Only different researchers give the separate labels. The uses of words help us to know how we treat others, favourably or disparagingly. Remarks or the statements are not direct most of the time. One can discover the hidden motive by a careful critical analysis of the data.

Hence analysts are discussed the aspects of inequality. Individuals are governed by ideological considerations. Writer like Habermass sees a tact involved in making the grip of authority strong. Some researchers studied how people hold on to power by changing the rules and conventions. There are others, who want not to fall-in-line, but to initiate a counter move. Halliday (; 1978) moved away from analysis of sentence to analyse the function of language. Context-study then played a major role. Journals were published to carry forward the study of race, media, Gender etc. It was supported by Wodak et al, 1999; Verschueren, 1999, Van Dijk; (1977). These writers were engaged in qualitative data-analysis. They were agreements among the proponents of CDA, for a unique method of analysis.

2.1.1. Teun Van Dijk: A Reference.

Teun Van Dijk’s first book on racism, Prejudice in Discourse (1984), and then multiple joint projects and collaborations between the different scholars and approaches
were brought together. A criticism towards CDA, and the contribution of Michael Meyer), is made by Titscher et all; (2000)

2.1.2. The history of Critical Linguistics.

Linguists in the 70’s were interested in the study of formal properties of language. Later, the interest in Socio-Linguistics’ were seen practised, by Labov ;( 1972) and Hymes ;( 1972) Fowler ;( 1979).CL/ CDA stressed as socio-phenomenon. This analysis of political, social facts brought paradigm- change as a result of which literary- criticism also used the insights of CDA.In the end part of 20\textsuperscript{th}Century Fairclough;(1999) studied advertisement, Newspaper to discover the ways in which language is used to represent a particular point of view.

A new chapter was opened in explaining ‘biases’, ‘prejudices’ through manipulating the use features of language. Various scholars as documented in the Handbook of Discourse-Analysis undertook different projects and listed their findings as regards causes of consequences of inequality authoritarianism. Rhetorical analysis of Texts in the beginning of 21\textsuperscript{st} Century were extensively done.

Discourses have historical roots and are interwoven. Jager developed a very explicit research programme and methodology which allows analysis in several steps. The main topics of research have been right-wing discourses in Germany, as well as the analysis of tabloids (Bildzeitung). (See also Titscher et al., 2000 for an extensive overview of the Lesarten approach and the Duisburg school.)


The notion of ‘critique’ which is inherent in CDA’s programme is also understood very differently. Behind any utterance, there usually remains an explicit or implicit opinion on explaining these direct or indirect messages; one can easily locate a clear belief-pattern. Various CDA practitioners have investigated such patterns- conflict between who are powerful and who are powerless.
2.2.1. Objectives of Critical Theory.

Max Horkheimer, Director of the Institute of Social Research in Frankfurt in 1930, saw the relation between theory and practice, seen as dynamic: there is no unchanging system which fixes the way in which theory will guide human actions. He suggested that several methods of inquiry should supplement one another. Although the value of empirical work was acknowledged, he emphasized that it was no substitute for theoretical analysis.

The reference to critical theory’s contribution is as follows: Ideological interpretation of text is the pillar of CDA’s success. My understanding of life and society is right and I must impose it on others. This attitude creates social tension. Information in a text is given as per the assumptions and perceptions. Eagleton (1994) made a pioneering study on the role of ideology in the interpretation of texts. CL analyses the points of view of the persons in power and either agrees or differs from their understandings or presuppositions. Books or extracts show evidences of manipulating the information by the vested-interest of groups. The objective is to allow them to remain in the seats of power. The saying is apt: power corrupts and absolute power corrupts absolutely. Our society is very much fragmented. It is polarised on the basis of caste, religion, political-affiliations and society’s hierarchical structures contain address-system, kinship terms, naming-patterns show some underlying principles in operation which divides the society.

The ways in which some of CDA research is directly and indirectly related to the research produced in the tradition of critical theory are particularly evident when one considers central concepts which they focus.

2.3. Approaches to CDA.

The methodical aspect often becomes the distinguishing feature, because research is regularly legitimized as scientific by means of intelligible methods. There is a systematic discipline in the process of data collection and data processing. If one proceeds systematically wrong turnings are avoidable. CDA brings to light aspects of social discrimination. In the analytical framework of critical language studies, extralinguistic variables like culture, ideology are significant.
There is a difference between the various approaches to discourse. Norman Fairclough focuses on study of words with multiple meaning. Ruth Wodak, like Teun van Dijk, introduces a sociocognitive level.

For instance many CDA scholars regularly analyse subjects and the role they precisely play in different contexts. In principle I analyse how explicitly or implicitly CDA makes use of a concept of the so-called linguistic surface, but, there is an implied meaning too. It is the duty of the researchers to explain the meaning in a given context.

Is it possible for any research to be free of a priori value judgements and is it possible to gain insight from purely empirical data without using any preframed categories of experience? As for the first question, CDA agrees even with dogmatic positivistic methodology which permits value judgements in the process of the selection of objects and questions under investigation.

2.4. Theoretical Underpinning of CDA and its Objectives.

Many disciplines have contributed to the growth of CL/CDA. They are: Sociology, Psychology, Hermeneutics, Linguistics, Pragmatics, Semantics, and Stylistics etc. Language as a tool of persuasion has been attempted in rhetorical – analytical studies. Noted Jager among them is introduces a dualism of discourse on reality, where the role of social actors is strongly reminiscent of Umberto Eco’s (1985) Lector in fabula. Jager evolves a consolidated concept where speech determines, consolidates and ensures the continuance of authoritarian tradition exponent of social-psychology. Siegfried Jager refers mainly to general social theories.

2.5. The Discourse-Historical Approach and other Approaches: An Analytical Framework.

Defining the approach

I prefer explaining the relationships between various ‘symptoms’ which we can study, in a more hermeneutic and interpretative way (Wodak, 2000a). Moreover, I endorse a more pragmatically oriented theoretical approach. Only interdisciplinary research will be able to make such compiled relationships between politics, media and society more transparent. Simple conspiracy theories do not seem valid in our global societies. In
research of this kind, discourse analysis, and specifically critical discourse analysis (CDA), is only one component of the multiple approaches needed. Not only discursive practices are to be focused on, but also a wide range of material and semiotic practices are needed.

2.5.1. Socio-political Orientations.

The discourse-historical approach is the following:

1. With socio-diagnostic critique, the analyst exceeds the purely textual or discourse internal sphere. She or he makes/ embeds the communicative or interactional structures of a discursive event in a wider frame of social and political relations, processes and circumstances.

2. It refers to public institutions by elaborating proposals and guidelines for reducing language barriers in hospitals, schools, courtrooms, public offices, and media reporting institutions (see Wodak, 1996a) as well as guidelines for avoiding sexist language use (Karg1 et al., 1997)). I have discussed many approaches devoted to CDA.

2.5.2. Political and Discriminatory Discourses.

Recent studies on ‘Identity’, ‘marginalisation’, ‘Feminism’ ,’Ageism’, etc. are extensively pursued. Discourse studies are cross-disciplines with many sub disciplines and areas, each with its own theories, descriptive instruments or methods of inquiry. It emphasizes that for each study a thorough theoretical analysis of a social issue must be made, so as to be able to select which discourse and social structures to analyse and to relate.

2.5.3. Which Discourse Structures Should We Analyse?

Although we have argued that especially in CDA, a text-context theory is crucial, let us briefly make some remarks on discourse structures the field. However, if one is interested in a critical analysis of sexism or machismo in society, one would not typically limit oneself to the rather specific structures of intonation and volume, but probably begin
with a study of interaction control on the one hand and with an analysis of ‘content’, such as choice of topics, propositions and lexical items, on the other hand.

2.5.3.1. Levels And Dimensions of CDA – An example.

By way of example, we shall illustrate our theoretical framework and analytical categories in a brief description of a text, (the Centre for the Moral Defence of Capitalism, downloaded from internet (www.Moraldefense.Com).

2.5.3.2. Topics: Semantic Macrostructures.

Hence in the social relevance of topics in discourse in interaction and social structure: they define what speakers, organizations and groups orient towards and that has impact on further discourse and action.

Language is used as strategic devices for the inference or assignment of topics as intended by the speaker or writer. This also allows for the purpose of influence and manipulation. Speakers and writers may thus emphasize meaning. These cognitive and social roles of topics will be further explained below.

Because topics have such an important role, and since topical (macro structural) analysis can also be applied to larger corpora, I usually recommend starting with such an analysis. Since summaries by definition express macrostructures, we can – for all practical purposes, describe a method that can be repeated for various levels of abstraction.

2.5.3.2.1. Meanings.

My analytical choice would be a study of meanings of words, grammar, linking devices. Again, the reason for such a choice is mostly contextual. Data show that we communicate indirectly. Nobody wants to hurt others and avoids telling the blunt truth. We call information implicit when it may be inferred from (the meaning of) a text, without being explicitly expressed by the text. In theoretical terms this means implicit information.

We normally do not want to deviate from our custom, convention, beliefs, rituals, and use many expressions, which have been traditionally used. This choice of words gives messages a fixed pattern of understanding. In the present study, I am not interested to
explore how nonverbal features, body language, paralanguage (stress, intonation, accent, articulatory variety can signal the intended meaning, because it will be too vast to report in this thesis.

Of the many formal properties of our sample text, we may thus observe the repeated use of passive constructs that typically hide agents, such as ‘this freedom has been under attack’, and ‘creative geniuses of the business world ... [are] being branded as oppressive tyrants’. The obvious function is that the Centre may be vague in its accusations by omitting the agents of negative actions, or vaguely identifying them in terms of laws. Besides these and other syntactic structures that realize underlying semantic representations, the most obvious formal structure that would deserve attention in a CDA approach would probably be the complex argumentative framework, in which general norms and values as well as ideological principles function as general arguments, business case. Language is a suitable device for manipulating human minds.

2.5.4. Context and Event Approaches.

We may distinguish between local and global contexts. Local context usually is defined as the area where communication takes place in issues arising of international arena that form the basis of global context. Theory of context recognizes that such an analysis of the cognitive and social properties of communicative events is relevant, but defines (local) contexts in cognitive terms. For instance, age, gender or profession, as well as aims or knowledge of participants often do influence talk and text, but only if it is defined in the context model of the speaker or writer. Context models allow us to explain what is relevant to the social situation for the speech participants.

Context models may also be seen as specific cases of the kind of personal, subjective mental models people construct of their many daily experiences, from getting up in the morning to going to bed at night. Communicative events are just a prominent type of such ‘models of everyday experience’.

Context models have the same cognitive status and schematic structure as other mental models, to which we shall turn below. At this point it is only relevant to emphasize. Indeed, style may be defined as the set of formal properties of discourse that are a function of context models, such as lexicalization, word ordering and intonation.
➢ Writers know the expectation of the readers and present facts accordingly.
   Reader’s response is crucial in presenting certain subjects/topics.

➢ Text presupposes existent general knowledge about what resources politics draws upon, as well as specific knowledge.

2.5.4.1. Event Models.

We had to use the notion of a mental model above several times to explain various properties of discourse meanings. Thus, local and global coherence of discourse is defined in terms of functional relations between its propositions (such as generalization, specification, example and explanation). We shall see below that there is also a broader definition of persuasion in terms of the control of opinions.

Mental models probably consist of a schematic representation of the personally and socially relevant dimensions of events, such as setting, participants (in various roles), actions, and so on. However, model theory of discourse goes much beyond the explanation of meaning and contextually controlled variation in text and talk. Mental models explain how a discourse can exhibit both personal and social properties, and indeed how in the same social situation each discourse is different. It is this complex series of links that theoretically adequate CDA research focuses on.

Because CDA is interested in studying why somebody dominates others and how it may be due to our age-old beliefs, practices, values. Although many books have been written about these ‘social representations’, we in fact know very little. I assume that such control takes basically two forms, a direct and an indirect form. Thus, knowledge or attitude may be manifested in different ways by the use of language. The second way such socially shared representations are expressed in discourse is through mental model that is through application to a specific event or situation.

We now have a very rough picture of the way groups and power are able to affect discourse and vice versa, namely through the social representations shared by groups, and the mental models that in turn are the specific instances of these social representations.
2.5.4.2. Knowledge.

It makes sense to distinguish between different kinds of knowledge, namely personal knowledge, group knowledge and cultural knowledge. Personal knowledge is represented in mental models about specific personal events, as explained above. Group knowledge is shared by specific social groups, such as professionals, social movements or business companies. Such knowledge may be biased and ideological, and not be recognized as ‘knowledge’ by other groups at all, but be characterized as mere ‘belief’. Of course, the beliefs of some groups have more influence, power and legitimacy than those of others, as is the case for scientific discourse. Cultural knowledge that is to say the awareness and practices of language- feature etiquettes, manners are specific to particular community, and of which a vast part of presupposed knowledge is part of the shared socio-cultural common ground. Many properties of discourse, such as overall topics, local coherence, pronouns, metaphors and many more require definition in terms of this kind of socially shared cultural knowledge. One of the main theoretical challenges has been the organization of knowledge in memory, for which many proposals have been formulated, for instance in terms of scripts, schemas, scenarios, and many more. These proposals are not only relevant for cognitive science, but also for CDA, because such knowledge structures (directly or through models) also organize the structures of discourse.

2.5.4.3. Attitudes.

Attitudes are developed by repeated practice. The general propositions of attitudes may also be ‘particularized’ as specific personal opinions in mental models, about the Microsoft case.

2.5.4.4. Ideologies.

They are at the basis of the knowledge and attitudes of groups such as socialists, neo-liberals, ecologists, feminists as well as anti-feminists. They probably have a schematic structure that represents the self-image of each group, featuring membership devices, aims, activities, norms and resources of each group. Ideologies feature the basic principles that organize the attitudes shared by the members of a group. Thus, a racist ideology may organize attitudes about immigration, education or the labour market.
2.5.4.5. Discourse and Society.

I have suggested that society may also be analysed in more local and more global terms. Social structure may only be related to discourse in two ways: firstly through the social representations of members about such social structures, and secondly through the instantiation of social structure (such as groups and organizations) through social actors, interactions and situations at the local, micro level. In other words, there is a cognitive and a social way to bridge the famous levels of differentiation in the account of social structure.

2.6. Other Contemporary Approaches to Discourse Analysis.

More attention is given to the use of language in political, social and religious aspects. Parallel to the Chomskyan Generative school, other schools have emerged:

- Language is not autonomous. They are:

  Functional Grammarian.

  Cognitive Linguistics.

  Sociolinguistics.

  Pragmatics.

Certain contemporary approaches are summarised below:

(i) Language as a system, Researchers need to find patterns.

(ii) Some researchers view language as a process and therefore they focus on interaction.

(iii) Some look for patterns: Their interests go beyond language.

They study culture, society, age, race, sex, (different disciplines have emerged)

- Pragmatics.

- Conversation-Analysis.

- Functional sentence perspective.

These studies are interested in finding out what happens when people use language. Discourse analysts explore the language of conversations, study power relations,
age, Gender, race and many other aspects of language in use. Study of speech acts, dexis, reference, presupposition, implicature form the basis of Pragmatics. Gricean theory of conversations, and cooperative principles raise many interesting questions. It can be seen that elements such as context, meaning beyond literal meaning understatement, speech acts are considered important ant components of pragma-linguistics.

Gumperz, a noted socio-linguist (1982) emphasises the social and cultural aspects. In brief Gumperz researches on interpersonal communication i.e. use of intonation, code-switching, Gestures, aspects of interactional order, concepts of ‘face’, ‘frame’ and ‘footing’ Brawn& Levinson (1987) Theory of politeness has undoubtedly been the most influential, so far. Another prominent sociologist Harwed Garfinkal’s (1967) finding is applied to describing the structure of interaction (turn-taking, adjacency, repair) which is pioneered by Harvey Sacks, Emanuel Schegloff and Gaul Jefferson.

There is in anthropological approach to Discourse Analysis which is propounded by Dell Hymes An essential feature of all ethnographic studies is the conviction and beliefs in cultural relatism. The central research question here is to find out the knowledge one should have in interacting with other people. Labov is the pioneer of variationist approach which focuses on analysis of phonological, syntactic, semantic and textual units. It is concerned with the language change.

Functionalist approach contrary to formalism relies on a pragmatic view of language as social interaction. They believe that a speaker can play with the organisation of the thematic and the information structures in order to produce a wide variety of rhetorical effects. Like Halliday, they consider three micro functions of language such as experiential (ideational) and no experiential textual/interpersonal element.

Post structuralists thinkers are worth-mentioning. They state that all meanings are textual and intertextual and view reality is much more fragmented, diverse, and culture specific.

Foucault, Bordieu and Bhaktin have made important contributions to the study of language and discourse. Foucault’s contribution to the theory of discourse is mainly found in analysing power-structure in society that each language expresses the desired message through a symbol.
Study of Bourdieu’s key concepts of symbolic capital, bodily hexis. Bhaktins view of language clearly opposes Saussrian linguists stating that language should be studied not as an abstract system but as a concrete reality. To him, language is dialogic and heteroglossic.

2.6.1. Mediated Discourse Analysis.

This is a study of discourse which focuses on human-social action and considers technology as meditational means within social action. It integrates concepts from mediated action theory, socio-cultural psychology, interactional sociolinguists, critical discourse analysis, and intercultural communication. They assume that social problems in the contemporary world are linked to texts. R. Scollon (2001.1) focuses not on social issues like CDA but on social action. It includes methods of observation, interview, surveys, questionnaire, and focus groups. The main aim is the identification and analysis of texts, images events and action. Computer-mediated discourse is a new challenge.

2.7. Conclusion.

There is not a single unit that can be used for all types of discourse analysis. Different approaches work within different units. It all depends on what constitutes the goal of the research. For example, in political discourse, the researcher’s primary goal has been to discover how language is used to express, impress and sometimes suppress information. A great part of medical discourse is the analysis of the power relationship between doctor and patient. Scholars working on CMD have focused on aspects such as power asymmetries, gender asymmetries or on the dominance of English language on the interest. The literature on CDA, and CL is vast. I have only provided a simple summary and referred to authors for extensive overviews.