Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION
INTRODUCTION

This chapter examines the structure of control exercised in contemporary political, social & religion discourses, with the potential of resistance. In particular it sheds light on several cases in which it has met with resistance in its attempts to exercise control. By critically analysing the contemporary issues, it aims to provide a frame work of thinking. My inspiration for this thesis came largely from the thought provoking discussion in later work of Fowler (1991-1996).

DA is an emerging field. This has enormous implications for critical thinking: To better understand this field in terms of power and resistance, this thesis addresses the question of how contemporary discourses exercise control and how this control can be resisted.

The role of discourse and the construction of meaning are essential to shape human minds. Prof. Lakoff has put it: “Language comes with what is called framing and agenda-setting as mechanism that helps authority, yielding power to utilise the same to construct a message. Language is therefore used to express impress and suppress information. This power of language relies on the control of communication. It is a double-edged weapon. It is also used as counter power (Castells, 2009 P3), which I call ‘Resistance of the statuesque’. Several extracts and authors have been analysed in orderto critically theorise control and resistance. Jurgen Habermas (2000) took a conciliatory stand by postulating that in any discourse context is it political, social or religion, there is scope for consensus which can be reached through discursive engagement in a public sphere in which power is eliminated and nobody is excluded. In politics, the power is hidden and secret and exercise of power by a hegemonic plat-form is perfectly visible.
1.2. Language as Metaphor.

Discourse analysis unveils how current political, social and religious issues enact a recurrent pattern of ‘control and resistance’ and how the users are affected by several tactical discourses. One way of metaphorically putting it is that words “can inform our mind, caress and comfort our feelings, excite and thrill our spirit and kindle the flame of our hearts. They “can slap our face, punch us in the stomach, rattle our nerves, and destroy our self-confidence”.

Extracts from political speeches are full of elevated language. It inclines us to believe in certain ways or adopt opinions or attitudes without resistance. Similarly, researchers are interested in the empirical study of language use across several contexts. In the following chapters, I will look at the ways in which language functions: how it influences/controls thoughts and how it varies according to age, class, ethnicity, gender and beliefs.

1.3. Defining Discourse.

‘Discourse’ as a concept is used by social theorists (e.g. Foucault, 1972; 1977), and other critical linguists. All researchers classify discourse in their own ways adopting various speculative and corrective standpoints. I will now dwell on the meanings of the term and spell out how I propose to use it. Discourse is often defined in two different ways. According to the formalist or structuralist paradigm, discourse is ‘language above the clause’ (Stubbs, 1983: 1). This social aspect of language is emphasized by the second, so-called functionalist paradigm, which states that discourse is ‘language in use’.

According to the functionalist paradigm, the analysis of language cannot be divorced from the analysis of the purpose and functions of language in human life. Discourse is therefore seen as a culturally and socially organized way of speaking. As Richardson (2007: 24) notes, researchers who adopt this definition of discourse ‘assume that language is used to mean something and to do something’ and that this meaning and doing’ is linked to the context of its usage. If we want to interpret a text properly, we should agree with Talbot i.e. ‘Text’ refers to ‘the observable product of interaction’, whereas discourse is ‘the process of interaction itself: a cultural activity’ (Talbot, 2007: 9).
This view of language as action and social behaviour is emphasized in CDA. In other words, language represents and contributes to the (re)production of social reality. This definition of discourse establishes a link to our view of institutional discourse as engaged in ‘reality construction’.

A different view of discourse that has also been incorporated into the theoretical framework of CDA, especially the one developed by Fairclough (1992), is by Foucault. This is because he offers important theoretical concepts for understanding institutions as sites of discursive power. This means that discourse (or discourses in the social theoretical sense) can limit and restrict other ways of talking and producing knowledge about it (e.g. discussing working-class crime as an individual problem in the media can marginalize an alternative conception of it being a social problem).

1.4. Objectives of Critical Discourse Analysis.

I intend to study the use of language as a system of exercising control on the interlocutors and where control fails; it gives rise to resistance-movements. I prefer CDA most for this purpose. Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) is ‘a hypothesis and technique thata person after exploit .The theme of division in the society is discussed by them. Because of their apprehension with the examination of the ‘often obscure relationships’ between discourse practices and wider collective and enriching social structures, CDA practitioners take an ‘unambiguous socio-political stance’ (ibid.: 252). In this respect, CDA is poles apart from the one-time main, and more evocative, move towards everyday discourse i.e. Conversation Analysis (CA).

CDA highlights on the interdisciplinary aspect of discourse, mediating between the linguistics and other allied disciplines (see. Chouliaraki and Fairclough, 1999; Weiss and Wodak, 2003). Unlike CA, CDA consequently describes current topics. There is not just one way of doing CDA and the various methodologies reflect the theoretical and philosophical orientations of the researchers (Fairclough, 1992; van Dijk 1993; Wodak, 2001). Fairclough (1992) works from a broadly Marxist perspective.) ; Van Dijk (1993, 2001), on the other hand, has developed a socio-cognitive framework of analysis. Wodak’s discourse-historical approach brings information from texts, written in the past. VanLeeuwen centres on political issue such as racism, multiculturalism etc.
CDA analyses texts focusing various themes, problems, pertaining political, social and religious subjects. It deals with abuse of power. It combines scholarship with social responsibilities.

So, I would examine how the powers of language are under the control of its users and help to shape the struggle of the social order of societal issues.

Although Critical Discourse Analysts are analysing linguistic structures like inequality, authority, dogma and process of manoeuvring, other scholars have emphasized *multimodal* aspects of analysis, supporting and espousing different opinions, which are used to explain the visual representation of events, of what Kress and van Leeuwen (1996) have termed ‘the grammar of ocular design’. Just as linguistic structures, visual structures also express (ideological) meanings and reinforce the general meaning of texts.

### 1.5. Ideology and Power Dynamics.

Since CDA is concerned with exposing the often hidden ideologies that are reflected, reinforced and constructed in everyday and institutional discourse, the concept of ideology is crucial. All talks and texts contain hidden messages.

Gramsci’s (1971) writes about ‘domination by consent’, links it to the process of sustaining asymmetrical relations of power and inequalities – that is to the process of maintaining domination. In the words of Fairclough (1995b: 14), ideology is ‘meaning in the service of power’.

Social power is defined as power belonging to people who are rich and influential. However, analysts maintain that, in many situations, power is ‘jointly produced’, for example, People are led to believe that dominance is legitimate in some way or other.

The question what power is, and where it is located and how it can be studied in language has been an important question in many critical language studies. I therefore set out to provide an overview of some of the concepts of power which have been used in sociological and linguistic research.
1.6. Power: Authority and Influence.

Although power is pervasive in social systems and their institutions, its conceptualization has remained a matter of disagreement (Lukes, 1974). Scott (2001) make a useful distinction between what he terms the ‘mainstream’ and ‘second-stream’ traditions of power research. The mainstream tradition has tended to focus on the corrective forms of the power of the state and its institutions. So it is important for an understanding of centrality of discourse in the workings of institutions, I therefore review them here.

The classic account of the mainstream tradition goes back to Weber (1914) and his analysis of authority in modern and pre-modern states through the varying abilities of actors is to secure the compliance of others, even against their resistance. Weber made the important point that power not only resides within the state, but also in other sovereign organizations, such as businesses and the church. In democratic systems, power needs to be legitimate to be accepted by people. This is generally expressed in symbolic forms by means of language: It is discourse that justifies official action of an institution or the institution itself. At the same time, legitimation implies that opposing groups will be delegitimated. Van Dijk (1991) found that accusations of racism on the part of ethnic minorities in newspaper reports were not only construed as doubtful and therefore as less legitimate, but they also did not go unchallenged by the (white) authorities.

The mainstream tradition culminates in Luke’s (1974) critique of power studies is limited to those forms of power that could be seen. Luke’s describes three different views or ‘faces’ of power, two of which he found inadequate: a one-dimensional view which focuses on decisions over which there is some observable conflict of interest. This view was developed by Dahl (1957, 1961), who argued that power was a matter of individual agency, residing in individuals rather than in institutions. According to this view, power only exists in so far as it can be observed empirically in visible instances of decision-making.

This somewhat simplistic one-dimensional view, which focuses on conscious and explicit decision-making, was criticized by Bachratz and Baratz (1962). They emphasised a ‘second face’ to the exercise of power that prevents issues from coming to the point of
decision through what they termed ‘non-decision-making’. Non-decision-making may work in that the powerful do not attend or listen to demands articulated by the less powerful. The two-dimensional view focuses on mechanisms which prevent decisions from being reached on issues where conflicts of interest are apparent, thereby introducing the notion of ‘bias’ and defending the interests of the powerful. A case in point is how powerful groups in society use the news media for securing their powerful position.

If institutions are able to shape the values of people, then they may be able to make them do things that are against their true interests. Luke’s view then stresses the ways in which people, but above all groups and institutions, use power. As Luke’s (1974:34) puts it; this happens mainly through discourse and the capacity of power to act ideologically.

Luke’s conception of power as an ideological phenomenon has been prominent in many accounts on the interconnectedness between language, power and institutions. Althusser (1971) was one of the first to describe power as a discursive phenomenon and stressed the significant roles of ideologies in reproducing or changing political relations through so-called ‘ideological state apparatuses’. One current example of this is the construction of citizens as ‘consumers’, for instance, the language of public health materials in late modernity construct readers as ‘consumers’ who should take personal responsibility for their health through proper ‘life-style choices’. By accepting the role of subjects with personal choices in a consumer culture, people are reproducing the ideology of consumerism and the construction of health problems as individual rather than public or structural problems that need collective solution.

1.6.1. Power as Persuasion.

The persuasive form of power associated with the use of language has provided important insights of orthodox accounts of power. Here the focus is not so much on specific organizations of power, but rather on strategies and techniques of power, in which language is given a central role.

A central feature in the development of power as consent (Chomsky’s manufacture of consent) and Gramsci’s (1971), highlight the mechanisms by which people in power influence/manipulates others. Power is therefore not exercised coercively, but persuasively. Authority camouflages its real intention of controlling the innocent are uses
languages of deception. It is because CDA explores how discourse constructs ideological (hegemonic) attitudes, opinions and beliefs that often appear as common sense that it is such an important concept for critical analysis.

Like Althusser, Gramsci took the view that it is through the cultural formations of individuals (‘subjects’) by the institutions of civil society (the family, the educational system, churches, courts of law, the media) that dominant groups in society can gain a more stable position for themselves than through the repressive powers of the state. An important factor in this process is ‘consent’: which Chomsky names as ‘manufacture of consent,’ giving the state and its institutions unbridled authority. As a practice of power, hegemony operates largely through language.

1.6.2. The Workings of Hegemony.

This may give rise to a view of hegemony as total consent. However, domination is only ever achieved partially and temporarily, as an unstable equilibrium. Gramsci (1971) points out that dominant group have to work at staying dominant. They attempt to secure domination first, by constructing a ‘ruling group’ through building and maintaining political alliances; second, by generating consent (‘legitimacy’) among the population; and, third, by building a capacity for coercion through institutions such as the police, the courts and the legal system, prisons, and the military to create ‘authority’. Each of these hegemonic functions rely on language, which involves and confirm the practices and discourses of the ruling group’ (Louw, 2005: 98).

Dominant groups rule by ‘consent’. To take an example from the media, Richardson (2007) points out that the work of mainstream journalism supports hegemony by naturalizing or taking for granted the inequalities of contemporary capitalism, mainly reporting events as they are seen by officials and side-lining other voices. In news as institutional discourse, some of the professional and institutional practices of journalism are examined by many researchers.
1.7. Foucault on Power.

Foucault sees institutions as sites of disciplinary power and disciplinary ‘micro practices’ (Mumby, 2001: 607). In this view, power is not solely exercised form above in terms of repression and ideology through the state and other sovereign institutions. In fact, Foucault refuses to identify any particular institution or set of practices as a constant source of power (e.g. a framing of all power relations within a capitalist system of domination). Instead, he sees power as far more diffused and dispersed, and describes it as a ‘productive network which runs through the whole social body’ (Foucault, 1980:131), and which is characterized by a complex and continuously evolving web of social and discursive relations. Power, Foucault (1977: 194) says, ‘produces reality, it produces domains of objects and rituals of truth’ and it produces discourse. These rituals of truth can be understood as rules for what counts as true or false in any society. For example, in the more recent cultural and economic changes of late modernity, the reorganization of workers into teams has changed the way power is exercised in institutions. Control shifts from managers to workers themselves through the establishment of work teams that engage in ‘self-surveillance’. In this way, ‘power is produced from the bottom up through the everyday discursive practices that construct team members’ identities’ (Mumby, 2001: 607). This demonstrates how power does not just prohibit and negate but produces: it produces identities, knowledge and possibilities for behaviour and it does this through discourse.

Power, then, is inextricably linked with knowledge: specific institutional settings to regulate the conduct of its members and the general public. Imprisonment for example, can be seen as the prime example of the symbiotic relationship between knowledge and power, in that the disciplinary surveillance of the prison creates a new kind of ‘knowledge’ of the prisoner’s body and mind which in turn creates a new kind of power. A body of knowledge about the nature of criminals is essential to justify rehabilitation and discipline.

As with Gramsci’s notion of hegemony, power, for Foucault, is ‘secured not so much by the threat of punishment, but by the internalization of the norms and values implied by the prevailing discourses within the social order’ [Mesthrie et al., 2000: 324]. People are formed as ‘subjects’, that is, free but disciplined individuals. This process
occurs in modern capitalist societies mainly through the work of ‘experts’ who are empowered by their formation of scientific and technical forms of discourse. Expertise has become an important feature of disciplining populations and is central to the dynamics of power in modern societies and their institutions (Scott, 2001: 92). Of course, is to be expected, (see, for example, Silverman, 1997; Houghton, 1995; Pelissier-Kingfisher, 1966).

Foucault’s views on externally imposed discipline in the form of regimentation, classification and surveillance are already well-developed in Weber’s (1914) work on modern authority and administration. However, his work on how the techniques of discipline attempt to produce internal self-discipline is an important contribution to the discussion of institutional power. Experts inculcate practices of self-reflection and self-control in those they deal with. A notable development in this respect is the emergence of ‘discourse technologists’ in the workplace and other institutional settings who offer people guidance in linguistic and social tools (‘social and communication skills training’) and which are often based on therapeutic models of ‘co-operative’ talking.

1.8. Systemic Functional Linguistics and CDA.

It was stated earlier that CDA is concerned with exposing the often hidden ideologies that are reflected, produced and reproduced in everyday and social discourse. To achieve this, a multifunctional view of discourse is necessary. The most influential theory of language in CDA that is socially oriented and informed is Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL).

While there are undoubtedly other theoretical models that are also critical, SFL is useful for CDA precisely because it sees language as meaningful behaviour and interprets language as a process of making meanings; it is because SFL provides language that is socially constructed and embedded in culture that it becomes useful for its application in CDA.


Power is used for the welfare of people, but, some institutions misuse it. I analyse language is used as a powerful tool: to influence the subjects. The media tends to function
ideologically, not so much due to bias, but simply through the nature of established routine practices of controlling the readers and pre-empting any form of resistance. The power of institutions needs to be legitimized and justified to be accepted by people.

There have been three strands that have been identified in the study of the relationship between social discourse, and power (Mumby and Clair, 1997: 195): (1) the study of how members of oppressed groups can ‘discursively penetrate the institutionalized form of their oppression’; (2) how subordinate individuals ‘discursively frame their own subordination’ thereby perpetuating it; and (3) analysis of how dominant groups ‘discursively construct and reproduce their own positions of dominance’ I am particularly concerned with the hegemonic rise of specific institutional discourses and the reason why language plays such significant role in the social issues is because of it being ‘knowledge-driven’, that is, constantly generating knowledge about the world and how people are to act in the world (e.g. in the institutional discourses).

The nation that impacts on social issues has immense power which authority imposes on people. (E.g. Weber, 1984; Althusser, 1971; Habermas, 1987). Other accounts, however, have adopted a more complex view of social issues and their power, in which power is achieved not by mere oppression but also by persuasion and consent and the complicity on the part of people (e.g. Gramsci, 1971; Foucault, 1979). I shall come back to these later.

This is the view that power of discourse constitutes social reality. There are now an abundance of examples on discourses, interaction and practices which have been concerned with understanding the relationship between discourse, ideology and power (e.g. Mumby, 1988, 2001; Cameron, 2000; Thorn borrow, 2002; Iedema, 2003; Tietze et al., 2003). Issues addressed specifically in Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) are the discourse of media organizations (Fairclough, 1995a), language and education (Fairclough, 1993, 1995b; Chouliaraki, 1998); communication barriers in institutions (Wodak, 1996); ‘new’ capitalism and neo-liberalism (Fairclough, 2000), bureaucratic discourses in late modern society (Sarangi and Slembrouck, 1996; Iedema, 1998), racism (van Dijk, 1993, 1997); anti-immigration discourse (Iedema and Wodak, 1999) and the reproduction of class inequalities in media discourse (Richardson, 2007).
1.10. Social Discourse and Power.

I now distinguish between ‘communicative use of language, aimed at producing understanding and strategic uses-oriented for success and making people do things. An important contribution is the study of social. So social discourse and power has been studied in terms of Habermas’ (1987. 196) notion of the colonization of a ‘natural’ unspoilt life-world by rational-instrumental social systems expressed in bureaucratic-administrative discourses (e.g. Fairclough, 1992; Wodak, 1996), which further underpin and maintain institutional and hierarchical power. The argument is that to analyse institutional practices and discourses solely from the perspective of domination, control oppression and exclusions ignore how these discourses and practices ‘enlist subjects to their “natural” cause’ (Iedema, 1998: 497). This ‘productive’ view of institutional power provides an important angle for the analysis of institutional discourse and will be followed up later. All the marginalised communities succumb to pressure but beyond a point resist rabidly such suffocation.

This point was also explored by Giddens (1981) in his ‘theory of structuration’. Giddens argues that social actors are not completely overwhelmed by institutional power and dominance and institution have a potential for domination as well as emancipation. For instance, new workplace practices (e.g. teamwork), which favour a more egalitarian relationship between the management and the workforce, are often said to give workers more space to exercise their abilities and to fulfil themselves. In this way, workplaces would be enabling as well as constraining. Such in the prison, power relations are very real and cannot be ignored. People in power twist the mandate given to them for their selfish interest. I have emphasised the merits of CDA.

In my collected examples I have shown the elements of ‘power-struggle’. I explain how power is described, enacted, manipulated, legitimatised etc., by its user’s in political, social and religious contexts. I pay special attention to the formulation of ideological link in connection with theories of political, social and religious studies/context. Here, I plan to make the readers agree how the study of discourse, especially political, social and religious moves from sentence to context. My observation is to make analysis that discourse exhibits internal structures. I would explore linguistic aspects of language used in discourse, a “text is a unit of language in use”.

11
From perspective of domination, oppression I unearth layer of hidden meaning. I survey social, political and religious movements; study of its climates and its long term changes. These attempts provide the rapidly changing history of events, especially in the context of political, social and religious movements; there emerge distinct controversies; between the power users and the oppressed and to prove what types/what system of relations (power hierarchy or else dominance) may be established between them?

I would also explore a productive view that political, social and religious actors are not completely overwhelmed by institutional power and dominance and institutions have a potential for domination as well as emancipation. For instance, in political social and religious discourses (e.g. political talks, debates), which favour a more unrestricted relationship between the politicians, social activist and religious gurus and the public are often said to give public more space to exercise their abilities and to fulfil themselves. In this way, political social and religious discourses would be enabling as well as constraining. Such is the power relations which are very real and cannot be ignored.

I would like to mention a few which are also central to my research.

- How ideology functions in political, social and religious discourse.
- How people obtain and maintain power within a given community.

I analyse political, social and religious interviews, debates and extracts to find some answers to these questions.

- The notion of ‘context’ is often, examined i.e, how much information I need to explore and assess the powerful impact of language used in political, social and religious discourses.
- Analysis of political, social and religious interviews, debates and extracts provide some answers to these questions.

1.11. Language: A LoadedWeapon.

Human beings are a clever species of tool makers and tools users. Some of the most remarkable human tools are the specific languages that particular groups of humans have developed and adapted for use in their lives. Over the years, the languages have evolved as conventional instruments for communication and, are used to control and
Influence human behaviour. People prefer communication to be authentic and transparent. For them, the use of a language should be like exercising influence on the thoughts and feelings of persons. The individuals can communicate directly their undistorted thoughts and feelings. It can ‘kill’ and ‘cure’. Positive communication is empowering and negative communication i.e. resistance, insinuation, slanders is destructive in nature.

The study of language use is not confined to one or even a few academic disciplines. It involves several disciplines; Osgood’s (1953) comment on language behaviour, made almost 40 years ago, is still relevant today and applicable to the study of language use: “In terms of content, study of language behaviour runs the gamut from neurophysiology of speech mechanisms and aphasia, through comparative, experimental, developmental, and social psychology, into cultural anthropology and the philosophy of science” (pp: 726-727). Insofar as major developments in the study of language in use are concerned it is certainly true that they have occurred in Pragmatics (Leech, 1983; Levinson, 1983) and Sociolinguistics (Fasold, 1984, 1990; Labov, 1966; Trudgill, 1974), two disciplines that are centrally concerned with the subject. Concurrently, developments have also been made in a number of neighbouring fields. These include linguistic philosophy (Austin, 1962; Grice, 1975), conversation analysis (Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson, 1974), ethnography of speaking (Gumperz&Hymes, 1972), discourse analysis (Potter & Wetherell, 1987; van Dijk, 1985), social psychology (Giles & Robinson, 1990), and communication science (Berger & Chaffee, 1987; Knapp & Miller, 1985). The developments are centred mainly on linguistic variables, although non-linguistic or nonverbal variables, such as kinesic (gaze, posture, and gesture) and proxemic (interpersonal distance, touch, and orientation) features are still very much evident in current research.

In writing about power in language, we are not concerned with language as an idealized. Chomskyan structure, but with the situated use of a language and some of the effects this use may have (see Harris, 1983). We assume that our language users use only those abilities that any average member of a linguistic community will have acquired by about the age of five. These include the motivation to communicate, the ability for intersubjectivity, the establishment of interactive routines with others, stringing of words into purposeful utterances, initiating and sustaining a conversation, and tracking an on-going conversation by the application of metacognitive monitoring (see Haslett, 1984, for a
summary). Other abilities are also involved, but as long as the readers bear in mind that we are not referring to infants but to older children and adults, the above list will be sufficient. It goes without saying that literacy will also be assumed when we talk of the impact of written language.

The fact that language provides a culturally conventional tool for power does not mean that words will always succeed or that they will necessarily function more effectively than other tools and resources. For example, in a cultural context in which physical violence is condoned, a dominant person can be a man or women of few words. How this works, or fails to work, are concerns of my thesis.

1.12. Power as Control.

It is a commonly held view that if person A realizes a goal by successfully committing person B to a course of action that B would not otherwise take, then A must also have power over B. Another common view is that if A has power over B, then A must also be able to use B for realizing A’s goals. These views are correct to the extent that any instance of “power, to” must occur in a social context that comprises inter alia a certain power relation between the persons concerned. However, it is important also to recognize that the positive correlation between “power to” and “power over” may in fact be imperfect. Personal goals are typically achieved in and through relationships. Thus when combining the two senses of power into a single definition, Weber (1947) laid stress on both goal achievement and relational contingencies. I am particularly concerned with the following: Language is used in multiple contexts. It projects the reality of situations. Stereotyped behaviour, custom, convention rituals, opinions, beliefs impact one way or other, on the minds of the people.

1.13. Power of Language to Impress and Influence.

The relevance of speech to impression formation invoking the old meaning of personality, was derived from the Latin roots; meaning “through sound” (see also Scherer, 1979). I wish to underscore the fact that it is customary for humans to use language for enacting these influences.
Situations which attempts to influence persons are carried out fall into two main categories, depending on whether the direction of the attempt to influence is predetermined or relatively free flowing. The Prototype of predetermined, unidirectional influence is a monological speech or message directed from the source to the hearer. The monological paradigm has been used in numerous studies of compliance gaining, attitude change, and persuasive communication (Cialdini, 1984; Petty & Cacioppo, 1986; Simons, 1986). It lends itself easily to experimentation, facilitates the inference of causal relationships by predetermining the direction of influence, and simplifies the measurement of outcomes.

Free-flowing multidirectional influence, exemplified by peer group conversations or discussions, applies to the more interactive type of situations. To examine influence in the flow of sequential interaction between individuals is much more difficult than in a monologue. The difficulty is evident in early social psychological studies of social norm formation (Sherif, 1936), leader emergence (Bales, 1950), and group-based polarization (Moscovici & Doise, 1974) in which both past and contemporary researchers have been content with demonstrating influence but have seldom been able to ease out the sequential enactment of influence. Kelley (1984, 1991) pointed out, the problem here is the lack of conceptual tools that are available in social psychology for dealing with interactional sequence. Nevertheless, some of the conceptual tools are available for coding verbal exchange (e.g., Donohue, Diez, & Hamilton, 1984; Morley & Stephenson, 1977; Stiles, 1978) and analysing interactional sequence in both the nonverbal (e.g., Duncan & Fiske, 1977) and verbal (e.g., Sacks et al., 1974) domains. I will make use of these tools, especially those developed in conversation analysis (Sacks et al., 1974) and the related fields of sequential analysis and discourse analysis, for examining conversational influence and control.


We have status and competence on the one hand, and solidarity and attractiveness on the other. At least two studies (Bradac & Wisegraver, 1984; Gundersen & Perrill, 1989) have shown that status and competence can be independent,
The claim that impressions of communicators’ power are correlated with status and competence, but not with solidarity or attractiveness, is consistent with the results of a study by Bradac and Wisegarver (1984). Another study found a high correlation between rating scales measuring perceived communicator’s power on the one hand and effectiveness on the other – *effectiveness* defined in the study as the likelihood of the communicators fulfilling their intentions that is, getting their way (Bradac & Mulac, 1984a). A more recent study by Gibbons, Busch, and Bradac (1991) provided some evidence that various scales pertaining to control of others (dominance, influence, ability to lead, etc.) were correlated with a status-control factor primarily and not with a factor measuring sociability.

So, for us, impressions of power will pertain primarily to judgments of communicator’s status and competence. Are there other plausible components of such impressions? One that seems intuitively plausible and that also has some empirical justification is communicator’s dynamism. Represented by scales such as language variable is labelled as power of style.

A maximally powerful communicator is perceived to belong to a highly valued group, a maximally powerless communicator is perceived to belong to a devalued group (often but not necessarily an out-group), to be incompetent or ineffective, and to be passive and weak (see Bradac & Street, 1989/1990). “highly dynamic but incompetent and lower class”). Status, competence, and dynamism to be the three bases, or primary dimensions, of impressions of communicator’s power.

**1.14.1. Persuasion and Related Outcomes.**

The fact that people can get things done with words is to be noted. People make requests issue orders, threaten, cajole, exhort, persuade, and so forth – speech acts are designed by the speakers to get hearers to do things, Some things that we want others to do can be accomplished without language, such as moving out of our way (we can physically move them), and these goals are achieved essentially through language (see Gibbons, Bradac, & Busch, 1992).

Language is the primary instrument for achieving influence. Although nonverbal factors such as physical attractiveness undoubtedly play a significant role in persuasion
and compliance gaining (Burgoon et al., 1990), these factors are in the final analysis ancillary, because for person A to understand what person B wants – the very baseline of influence – B’s desire or need must be expressed in a linguistic form: “I want your money” or “I want your vote.” Of course, people can also communicate their desires indirectly: “I sure could use some cash” or “I am not a candidate for office at this time” may convey unambiguous meanings only if the communicator and message recipient have a normal grasp of linguistic conventions.

In this chapter and the next one I will examine connections between language use and influence, both persuasion and compliance gaining. Persuasion refers to affective or cognitive changes of message and recipients, and compliance refers to overt behavioural changes. (Cognitive dissonance; Brehm’s, 1966, reactance theory; and Bem’s, 1972, self-perception theory). In some situations threats and orders may produce compliance without producing a corresponding affective or cognitive change.

A reasonable question at this point is that indeed a number of studies have shown that perceived communicator’s competence and authoritativeness are directly related to attitude change on the part of message recipients (Burgoon, 1989; Burgoon, Jones, & Stewart, 1975). On the other hand, in some situations communicator’s solidarity or attractiveness will be a more important correlate of persuasion than with perceived competence, Another way of saying this is that sometimes beliefs about communicator’s abilities will guide decisions, whereas at other times affective reactions will be especially influential (Bradac, Sandell & Wenner, 1979).

1.15 Issues regarding High- and Low – Power Styles.

Two issues should be raised at this point: (1) Is powerless language the marked form or are both powerless and powerful styles marked as a result of their deviation from some neutral style, dwelling at the midpoint of a powerful-powerless continuum?

In regard to the first issue, which used brief written messages as experimental stimuli, I found that ostensibly powerful messages (that is, messages that did not contain any of the six features described above) were rated to the powerful side of the midpoint of a powerful-powerless seven-point scale, as were messages containing polite forms and intensifiers powerless forms also are marked. Bradac and Mulac study wherein all
respondents read and rated all messages. Accordingly, the powerful messages were compared with the powerless ones and may have been perceived as relatively powerful as a function of perceptual contrast effects. The opposite may equally be true.

A more recent study (Gibbons et al., 1991) had respondents read either powerless or powerful messages in a between-subjects design, and among other things. It has been shown in a large variety of contexts that people listen to rumours/scandals. In essence, what I have been proposing above is that to the extent that low-power speech is seen as negative, features may not always be perceived negatively. For example, hedges, intensifiers, and the like are customarily used among friends and (some would argue) by women to maximize conversational participation and foster the joint production of text. In this type of context, it may be the case that the absence of the low–power speech features will be perceived negatively and that this absence will become the more strongly marked form – if the negativity marked ness argument is generalizable. There is a strong need to investigate the effects of power of style in a variety of informal contexts.

The second issue mentioned above, that is, no researchers (to the best of my knowledge) have sampled speakers’ language across contexts and subsequently coded the data in terms of the variables identified by O’Barr and associates. We should note that the implication of O’Barr’s courtroom research is that power of style is a learned attribute – highly educated persons learn to talk in one way, and those with little education learn a different style. Bernstein’s (1971) uses the notion of a social class basic for elaborated and restricted codes – Historically, dialectologists have also taken this position: as a groups use particular dialects.

Speakers engage in style shifting as situations change. (Speakers may also shift styles to cause a situational change; see Giles &Hewstone, 1982.) Some shifts in style reflect changes from one communication genre to another, for example, as one moves from the description of an event to the telling of a joke (Hopper & Bell, 1984). Other shifts reflect changes in the speaker’s psychological state or mood, for example as one moves from a situation in which one feels certain about how to behave to a situation in which there is a high level of subjective uncertainty.
There is some evidence that found in speaker which are associated with lower levels of filled pausing (a form of hesitation; Berger & Calabrese, 1975), higher levels of lexical diversity (Sherblom & Van Rheenen, 1984), and higher ratings of fluency (i.e., low hesitation; Berger, Karol & Jordan, 1989; see also Berger & Bradac, 1982).

One intriguing study that involved recording and transcribing many hours of talk of a counsellor and a client in therapy sessions across time found that the patient increased her use of tag questions from early to later sessions that associate tag questions with evaluations of low speaker power; an attempt to gain a response from one’s listener rather than an increase in self-perceived powerlessness (see Chapters - 4 and -5, for a further discussion of the various roles of tag questions). Changes in psychological state can be associated with changes in level of tag question use.

1.15.1. Effects of Powerful and Powerless Styles.

One group of males heard a low-power message delivered by a female, another group of females read a high-power message delivered by a male, and so forth. The testimony was created by the researchers on the basis of actual courtroom transcripts, and in this, basic the testimony was transformed into high- and low-power versions. Both versions were audio recorded by an actor and an actress for use in the audio condition. High-power style boosts communicator credibility and attractiveness regardless of communicator or respondent gender. Thus an implication of this finding is that witnesses who use a low-power style may be judged less believable than those who use a high-power style, despite the fact that what they say is identical in substance.

Perhaps the most interesting result for this study was that higher blameworthiness was attributed to gender when he used the high-power style, regardless of his defendant or plaintiff status. Power of style did not affect respondents’ ratings of gender’s masculinity-femininity. It is worth noting that a pilot study conducted showed that the high-power style led to more positive evaluations of gender’s competence and attractiveness, a result paralleling the finding of Erickson et al. (1978).

A third study examined the effect of high- and low-power styles in different types of communication situations: a crisis-intervention context involving a counsellor and a client that a mildly depressed student had phoned into a counsellor seeking advice. The
respondents were told that they would hear an audio tape recording this interaction. An actor and an actress played both the counsellor and client roles, yielding two combinations: male counsellor / female client and female counsellor / male client.

The authors speculated that use of the high-power style by the counsellor might have a negative effect for respondent judgments of competence, because the counsellor might appear less open, more controlling, less empathic, and so on. But the results showed otherwise: The use of the high-power style by both client and counsellor, regardless of gender, produced higher ratings for status-competence (collapsed in one factor), attractiveness, and dynamism.

In one study, Carli (1990) asked male and female university students to listen to an audio tape of identical persuasive messages presented by a man or by a woman, half of which contained the low-power features of hedges, tag questions, and disclaimers. A strong effect of language style was obtained, and this was consistently unfavourable to the low-power style across measures of speaker competence, confidence, intelligence, powerfulness, and knowledge ability.

The outcome pertaining to warmth, friendliness, liability, and so forth, is the most surprising in some ways. It suggests that people are attracted to powerful persons. Alternatively, what might be unattractive about the low-power style is control, which is a stigmatizing trait in many Western cultures finding that low lexical diversity led to respondent judgments of low control of communicator behaviour.

In the first study reported by Carli (1990), pairs of respondents discussed a topic on which they disagreed and afterward indicated their opinions on the topic. The post discussion opinion of each respondent was compared with his or her initial opinion obtained some six weeks earlier. A change of opinion in discussion among partners was taken as indicative of the partner’s persuasiveness. It was found that women who used more hedges, tag questions, and disclaimers were more persuasive with men. The results of this experiment could have been confounded to the extent that speakers who used the low-power style were also more pleasant or friendly than those who used the high-power style. To control this possibility, a second experiment was carried out using an audio tape of identical persuasive messages that either contained or did not contain the low-power
features. The results pertaining to speaker’s persuasiveness confirmed the significant finding of the first experiment, namely, female speakers were more persuasive with male listeners when their messages were worded in the low- rather than in the high-power style. In addition, the reverse was found for female respondents listening to female speakers – they were less persuaded by low-than by high-power female speakers.

Gibbons et al. (1991):- the results indicated that argument strength was the sole determinant of persuasion,

1.15.2. Components of the Low-Power Style.

At the level of effects of message, it is rather easy to imagine contexts in which polite forms will be seen as indicating high rather than low competence – at a formal dinner attended by the presidents of several nations, for example.

In an initial study exploring the potentially dissimilar effects of the various components of the low-power style, Wright and Hosman (1983) examined the relationships among hedges (high versus low usage), intensifiers (high versus low), communicator gender, and respondent is gender. The questions were that whether hedges would produce respondent ratings of defendant credibility, attractiveness, and blameworthiness that differed from ratings produced by intensifiers?

Male and female respondents read and subsequently evaluated transcripts of testimony scripted by the experimenters represented one of the eight combinations of hedges, intensifiers, and gender. Results indicated that high and low levels of intensification did not differ on the variables measured (at the level of main effects). On the other hand, a high level of hedging reduced ratings of credibility and attractiveness but did not reduce ratings of defendant blameworthiness. There was also an interaction effect of speaker gender and intensification; a female speaker was judged to be more attractive than a male when a high level of intensification was used; at a low level of intensification, male and female speakers did not differ. A male speaker was judged to be more credible than a female speaker when a high level of hedging was exhibited; when few hedges were used, male and female speakers did not differ. There were no effects for respondent gender.
In a subsequent study, Bradac and Mulac (1984a) examined the separate effects of hedges, hesitations, tag questions, polite forms, deictic phrases, and intensifiers, using brief messages each containing three instances of one of the subcomponents of powerlessness. Different messages for each of the sub-components of “powerlessness” are studied.

Respondents rated the powerful messages as most effective and most powerful, as expected. Also rated as relatively powerful and effective were messages exhibiting high levels of politeness and intensification. Deictic phrases were rated as neutral, just about at the midpoint of the seven-point scales measuring power and effectiveness. Hedges and tag questions were perceived to be relatively ineffective and low in power.

In a related study, another group of respondents evaluated all 56 messages along a bipolar scale running from “will create desired impression” and half of the respondents were told that the communicator wanted to appear sociable. The questions were (1) would power of style interact with communicator intention to create an impression? (2) Would communicator gender interact with both power of style and intention?

The results indicated that power of style and perceived communicator intention did indeed yield an interaction effect but that, once again, communicator is gender had no apparent consequence.

Generally, use of hesitation forms and tag questions were judged as unlikely to achieve the desired impression for both the authoritative and sociable intentions, whereas use of intensifiers, polite forms, and ostensibly powerful forms was judged as likely to achieve the desired goal.

Hosman and Wright (1987) conducted a study on the combined effects of hedges and hesitation on judgments of communicator’s authoritativeness and attractiveness in a hypothetical courtroom context. Messages exhibiting high and low levels of hedging and hesitation were manipulated in a two-variable design, and respondent’s gender was added as a third variable. For ratings of authoritativeness, the highest ratings were given to messages that contained no hedges or hesitation forms; the lowest ratings were given to messages that contained both forms and to those containing many hedges but no hesitations.
In ratings attractiveness, once again the highest ratings occurred for the messages without hesitations or hedges. However, in this case the lowest ratings were produced by messages high in hesitations but low in hedges. Hosman and Wright (1987) speculated that there is something more familiar or less enigmatic about a message containing both features as opposed to a message containing many hesitations but no hedges and that this greater familiarity heightened attractiveness ratings.

The most ambitious studies attempting to examine the separate effects of the various components of power of style were conducted by Hosman (1989). Both of these were very complex in design. Accordingly, we will focus on what is most germane to this discussion: the combined effects of high and low levels of hesitation, hedging, and intensification on authoritativeness judgments when the various combinations were compared with a prototypically powerless message, that is, a message containing all of the features of powerlessness described earlier.

Another study of the potentially independent effects of the various features of the powerless style was undertaken by Vinson and Johnson (1989). These researchers thought that the powerless style might produce more negative reactions when presented in writing than when presented orally. Respondents were asked to either read or hear versions of a message that exhibited high or low levels of hedging and hesitation. Results demonstrated that both hedging and hesitation produced strong main effects on communicator credibility, there was also some evidence that respondents perceived more hedges in the written message but more hesitations in the oral presentation.

A recent study of the subcomponents of powerless style was conducted by Hosman and Siltanen (1991). The latter two variables are novel in this line of research. Control of others refers to the extent to which the communicator is perceived to be influential, dominant, a leader, and so on. Control of self refers to perceptions of the extent to which the communicator is confident, self-assured, and so forth. For authoritativeness, control of others, and control of self, a rather stable pattern emerged: the ostensibly powerful message and the intensifier message produced the highest ratings; the hesitation and tag question messages produced the lowest ratings; and the hedge message fell between these extremes, the latter message receiving the lowest rating.
A few tentative generalizations emerge. Use of particular forms – for example, hedges – may produce variable effects, depending on communicator is gender and medium of presentation, although relatively little research has been done on contextual qualifiers of the effects of these forms.

Hedges, hesitations, and tag questions seem to be the clearest indicators of low power. They seem to imply high communication uncertainty, tentativeness, and perhaps a lack of commitment to ideas or propositions expressed. Exploration of the language of uncertainty is likely to pay high dividends to theorists and researchers interested in the language-power connection. On the face of it, politeness does not seem to be clearly connected to perceived uncertainty;

Very little research has examined the effect of power of style on persuasion. I have also suggested that the negative effects of the powerless style are probably mainly attributable to a communicator’s use of hedges and hesitations. Polite forms, intensifiers, and even tag questions have a more ambiguous status. On the other hand, high levels of hedging and hesitation produced by adults are probably often noticeable and when noticed probably often lead to stigmatization.

Politeness is an especially interesting form. Polite language may reinforce an impression of servility when it is coupled with a speaker’s use of non-standard or stigmatized forms. Diaglossia research concentrates on superior and inferior variety of texts, taking into account the scholarly form of language use and informal use of language.

1.16. Power as a Problem of Resistance.

James Scott in his book “Weapons of the weak (1985) provides important insights of the use of language as ‘resistance’ Scott’s emphasis differs from that of Gramsci and Althusser in stressing not consent, complicity but a subtle means of pursuing an opposite point of view, which like ‘domination’ need not be a visible mode of operation. Linguistically, resistance can show up in a number of ways, including features of accent, grammar, naming practices, proverbs etc. Some studies suggest that power is not easily subverted say for instance, the term ‘Dalit’ which literally means oppressed is meant to challenge the ruling-class hegemony by pointing to human rather divine causes.
Halliday coined the term. His term is ‘lexicalisation’, which is a response to the repressive-control-apparatus.

Feminist researchers have identified areas of language structure and use that favour a male perspective and are demeaning the women. Cameran (1995. A:197) states, “ultimately it is men who have the power whereas women have only responsibility.

Boundien outlines four types of resources or capital available to human beings: economic, (wealth) social, cultural group and symbolic resources (honour).

This aspect of power-resistance model has much in common with Bernstein’s account of the differences between the working-class and the middle-class.

‘Resistance’ may take the forms of open confrontation, subtle subversion of power, disengagement with the authority and ambiguous accommodation with the power-centre. The above classification is based on resistance met in conflict-citation. Those who oppose the vested interests, they cry foul against inequality, injustice, biases, prejudices etc.


The first chapter set out to explore the concept of language, critical discourse and different issues in the present day society in the field of political, social and religious discourses. The tools and concepts introduced in the earlier chapters recur throughout the thesis. In the chapters on politics I would discuss issues on corruption and naxal issues, arguments of political leaders through different extracts from newspapers, magazines and books such as Orwell’s Animal farm, Norman Fairclough’s Language and power, Noam Chomsky’s understanding power, Propaganda and the public mind, on Language, ‘Introduction to Language Society and power’ and also I have taken James Paul Gee’s ‘A Toolkit on How to do Discourse Analysis’. I have worked with a broad understanding of these concepts, Domestic Violence, Honour Killings, Gender Discourses and also topics on language and Environment. I have examined the power of language used in religious discourses of renowned religious scriptures. (in chapter -6) through collected extracts from different Indian National and International News papers and books on Discourses about God, While each of these are areas of change in terms of the questions they ask, they have all, to some degree, also become implicated in a more general discussion of identity. Further, my discussion brings back to where I start, that is, the question of what the power of ‘language’ means in various issues of modern era and
what ideas of control and resistance operate. I suppose to identify about language used by its users in different discourses.

I assume that our readers are generally not specialists in the areas of language study and linguistics, and therefore need an introduction to the kinds of topics which feed into a broader examination of language and society. As such, my thesis does not offer comprehensive coverage of every possible issues within this vast areas but, instead, provides a stepping stone to exploring and thinking about how the writers influence the readers through various means. Thus, each of the chapters deals with a topic that has been the subject of academic/institutional investigation, and is supplemented with references to useful reading and other sources of material. There are extensive analysis throughout the text to help the reader engage more actively with the ideas being presented.

One of the things that the majority of the chapters I have in common, is that they seek to interpret the ways in which language and language issues can be deconstructed to reveal underlying ideologies, or beliefs. While all of the chapters have a solid academic grounding, it is important to bear in mind that any interpretation of what people do and say is necessarily going to contain a certain measure of bias. Thus, I can justifiably analyse newspaper articles, interviews of political leaders, opinions of social and religious activists only to prove my hypothesis.

Each chapter of my thesis deals with a different area of language, although there are connections between many of the chapter-topics. I have designed the thesis so that it can be read from cover to cover as a continuous text, and also individual chapters can stand alone and be read in their own right. I have divided chapters into subsections, partly to indicate the structure clearly with subtitles and partly to help one finds thesections one needsto read.

Chapter - 1 is designed to illustrate the total structure of my thesis, prearranged with some sub-sections; 1.1 is about brief description on the concept of "language", 1.2 Explains on the subject of the notion of Discourse and also about the views of different critics on the functions, 1.3. Defines the concepts of "CDA" and its importance to analyse the power of language used in various discourses, 1.4. Explains the power of “Ideology”, 1.5. Explains the importance of "Power", 1.6.includes power-management. In chaper-2, an extensive literature survey highlighting contemporary research trends are attempted. I have stated the rationale and the methodology used in chapter-3.
Chapter 4 interrogates the notion of 'political language', and raises some of the underlying questions and ideas that will be relevant as and when I move into other chapters. Chapter 3.1.2 all concentrate on the ideological properties of language in political discourses, and on how it can be used to influence the ways in which people think and behave, Chapter 3.2 is concerned with the connections between language, thought and representation, and considers the extent to which language can be said to shape and perpetuate our worldviews. Chapter 3.3 moves on from the conclusions of Chapters 1 to consider whether, and how, language can be used in politics, and in other fields, to persuade people for particular points of view. Chapter 3.4 considers how language is used, and to what effects, in political discourses such as newspapers and books news reporting, advertising and also sub chapters dealing with language use in connection with particular chapters within a well-designed framework.

The chapter on politics looks at the kinds of language-choices used by members in political discourse. Chapter 3.5 Chapter 3.6 deal with language and ethnicity and the chapters 7, are concerned with attitudes towards language, and the relationship between language and identity. I discuss language and political identity. Thus, Chapters 4, 5 and 6 deal with political, social and religious discourses respectively. The thrust is the same: analysing the mechanism of control and resistance embodied in the use of language.

1.18. Conclusion.

This chapter has been concerned with the work of scholars, theories and approaches. The power, control, critical discourse and explanation of its various meanings have been attempted. More specifically, the linguistic features, having the potential for domination and resistance were illustrated. The main model of Fairclough, developing a three-layered model of critical language studies, involving tests, extracts, discursive and social practices is followed. Emphasis is given particularly how the ideological effects of texts are produced.