

CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS: THEORY AND METHOD IN SOCIAL AND LITERARY FRAMEWORK

Roma Ulinnuha,
Wening Udasmoro
Yahya Wijaya

*State Islamic University of Sunan Kalijaga, Yogyakarta,
Indonesian Consortium of Religious Studies (ICRS) UKDW-UIN-UGM Yogyakarta
email: romaullinnuha@yahoo.com*

Abstract: Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) serves as one of the tools to analyze the linguistic and the social. This article aims at investigating the relevance of ideas amongst CDA figures—Fairclough, Van Dijk, Wodak, and Kristeva—to both social and literary studies. This includes some significant points such as discourse, social practice, representation, power and intertextuality. The article shows, based on literary study, the aim of CDA applied linguistic aspect is to reveal the hidden in the analytical level of individual, institutional or social, i.e. domination and the abuse of power. CDA figures agreed to some extent that the complex interactions of discourse and social could not be analyzed, unless it utilized the approaches of linguistic and social. In the course of identity, for instance, CDA abridges the social and the linguistic realm. CDA, in this regard, mainly advocates the under-privileged representations of everyday life.

Key Words: Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), social practice, literature, power, identity

Abstrak: Salah satu aspek analisa bahasa yang dapat dipakai sebagai metode dalam kerangka kajian sosial maupun sastra adalah Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) atau Analisa Wacana Kritis. Artikel ini menekankan relevansi ide tokoh-tokoh CDA dari Fairclough, Van Dijk, Wodak, dan Kristeva dalam kajian sosial dan sastra. Beberapa aspek penting CDA meliputi ‘discourse’/wacana, praktek sosial, ‘representasi’, ‘power’/kuasa dan intertekstualitas. Melalui studi pustaka, artikel ini menunjukkan tujuan CDA dengan menggunakan aspek bahasa untuk mengungkap apa yang tersembunyi dalam analisa tingkat individu, institusional maupun social, seperti dominasi dan penyalahgunaan kuasa. Para tokoh CDA menyepakati bahwa interaksi antara wacana dan masyarakat tidak dapat dianalisis kecuali dengan menggabungkan pendekatan sosial dan bahasa. Dalam hal analisa problematika identitas, misalnya, CDA mampu menjembatani antara ranah bahasa dengan ranah sosial. CDA, dengan demikian, utamanya berpihak terhadap representasi yang terpinggirkan dalam problematika kehidupan.

Kata Kunci: CDA (Analisa Wacana Kritis), praktek sosial, sastra, kuasa, identitas

The issue of identity questions the inter-relationship between particular entities such as society, religion and culture. Understanding the changing issue of how people express themselves related to both social and cultural

discourse seems necessary in order to achieve a constructive communication. According to Van Dijk (1995), CDA is a special approach in discourse analysis, which focuses on discursive conditions, components, and consequences of

power abuse by dominant (elite) groups and institutions. It examines, as Van Dijk argued, patterns of access and control over contexts, genres, text and talk, their properties, as well as the discursive strategies of mind control. The author continued to say that it studies discourse and its functions in society and the ways society and, especially, forms of inequality are expressed, represented, legitimated, or reproduced in text and talk. Van Dijk's research shows that CDA does so in opposition against those groups and institutions who abuse their power, and in solidarity with dominated groups, e.g., by discovering and denouncing discursive dominance, and by cooperating in the empowerment of the dominated. In this respect, Benwell (2006, p. 105) stated that Van Dijk is clear that Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) implicitly treats identities as effects of the ideological work. Benwell went on to say that CDA is not a sub-discipline of discourse analysis, nor a single method or theory, but a critical perspective of doing research. The author further argued that this perspective has a common interest in the role of language in the transmission of knowledge, the consolidation of hegemonic discourses and the organization of institutional life.

The Dawn of Critical Discourse Analysis and Prominent Figures

This section discusses the emergence of CDA in a historical framework. This description unpacks some major figures representing CDA development from Fairclough, Van Dijk, Wodak to Kristeva. These efforts of emphasizing the four lead to the characteristics and the relevance of CDA in the realm of social encounter.

Concerning CDA, Fairclough (1997, p. 5) initially explained the relationship between textual analysis and the sociocultural analysis, in that textual analysis can often give excellent insights about what is "in" a text, but what is absent from a text is often just as significant from the perspective of sociocultural analysis. The implicit content of the text, as Fairclough maintained, is a sort of halfway house between presence and absence.

Fairclough also believed that in some cases, the presupposition is absent from the text in the sense that it is not actually asserted there, and is commonly seen as supplied by the listener or reader in interpreting the text.

Explaining the discourse, Fairclough (1992, pp. 63—64) tried to regard language use as of a form of social practice, rather than a purely individual activity or a reflection of situational variables. According to Fairclough, this has various implications, such as discourse as a mode of action, a form in which people may act upon the world and especially upon each other, as well as a mode of representation. The research further states that it also implies a dialectical relationship between discourse and social structure, in that the social structure is both a condition for and an effect of a social practice. Discourse, as the author points out, is then a practice not just of representing the world, but of signifying the world, constituting and constructing the world in meaning.

The distinction of the three aspects of the constructive effects of discourse, according to Fairclough, can be seen as follows. Discourse contributes to the construction of what are variously referred to as "social identities" and "subject position" to social "subjects" and types of "the self." Secondly, discourse helps construct social relationships between people. And thirdly, discourse contributes to the construction of the systems of knowledge and belief. These three effects correspond respectively to the three functions of language and dimension of meaning which coexist and interact in all discourse—what Fairclough calls the "identity," "relational" and "ideational" functions of language. The author further argued that the identity function relates to the ways in which social identities are set up in discourse. The relational function, as Fairclough stated, relates to how social relationships between discourse participants are enacted and negotiated. Fairclough (1992) concluded that the ideational function relates to ways in which texts signify the world and its processes, entities and relation. Likewise, Cross (2010, p. 10) stated that if the

linguistic analysis of the text deals with both Fairclough's second level concerns of text production, interpretation and distribution and third level attention to discourse events, then the effect of competing ideologies and their bounded areas of power-knowledge on individual subjectivity and group identities and attitudes become subject to analytical scrutiny.

Furthermore, Fairclough (1992) argued that social practice has various orientations—economic, political, cultural, ideological—and discourse may be implicated in all of these without any of them being reducible to discourse. The author further stated that in this line, discursive practice is constitutive in both conventional and creative ways: it contributes to reproducing society (social identities, social relationships, systems of knowledge and belief) as it is, yet also contributes to transforming society.

To the role of discourse, Fairclough (2002, pp. 193—194) stated that one cannot take the role of discourse in social practices for granted, it has to be established through analysis. Discourse in this act, as Fairclough argued, shares three ways in social practice. First, it figures as a part of the social activity within a practice. Fairclough also believed that discourse as a part of social activity constitutes *genres*. Genres, as Fairclough maintained, are diverse ways of acting, of producing social life, in the semiotic mode. According to Fairclough, examples are everyday conversations, meetings, political and other form of interviews, and book reviews. Second, Fairclough went on to say that discourse also includes representations. The author continued to argue that social actors within any practice produce representations of other practices as well as “reflexive” representations of their own practice, in the course of their activity within the practice. Fairclough also argued that discourse also includes in ways of being, in the constitution of identities, for instance the identity of a political leader.

Elaborating social order, Fairclough stated that social practices networked in a particular way constitute a social order—for instance,

the social order of education in a particular society at a particular time. The research further states that the discourse/ semiotic aspect of social order is what we can call an order of discourse. The author further argues that it is the way in which diverse genres and, discourses and styles are networked together. An order of discourse, as Fairclough believed, is a social structuring of semiotic differences. Fairclough also argued that one aspect of this ordering is dominance: some ways of making meaning are dominant or mainstream in a particular order of discourse, while others are marginal, oppositional or alternative. For instance, as Fairclough maintained, there may be a dominant way to conduct a doctor-patient consultation in Britain, but there are also various other ways, which may be adopted or developed to a greater or lesser extent in opposition to the dominant ways. According to Fairclough (2002), an order of discourse is not a closed or rigid system, but rather an open system, which emphasized on what happens in the actual interactions. Concerning the open flexibility of CDA, Cross (2010) quoted Fairclough, in that CDA should open its analysis to different theoretical discourses which construct the problem in focus in different ways. Cross went on to say the items are as follows: colonization/ appropriation; globalization/localization; reflexivity/ ideology; identity/difference. According to Cross, there are two pervasive concerns within this agenda, which cut across items and are, therefore, best not included as items: power and hybridity. Cross concluded that given the orientation to problems, power and struggle over power are constant concerns for CDA.

Having discussed the relationship between Fairclough's text and its social context, it is now turning to what has been stated by Van Dijk (1993) on a study of relations between discourse, power, dominance, social inequality, and the position of the discourse analyst in such social relationship. Van Dijk claimed that in other word, the main concern deals with how one goes about doing “critical” analysis of text and talk.

According to Van Dijk (1993, pp. 249—

150), the study and the critique of social inequality focus on the role of discourse in the reproduction and challenge of dominance. Van Dijk pointed out that dominance is defined here as the exercise of social power by elites, institutions or groups that result in social inequality, including political, cultural, class, ethnic, racial and gender inequality. This reproduction process, as Van Dijk explained, may involve different “modes” of discourse—such as power relation, enactment, representation, legitimation, denial, mitigation or concealment of dominance, among others. More specifically, Van Dijk suggested that the analyst wants to know what structures, strategies, or other properties of text, talk, verbal interaction or communicative events play a role in these modes of reproduction.

Van Dijk continued to argue that the very effort is to contribute to a theoretical, descriptive, empirical, and critical framework between discourse and socio-political analysis. In this regard, as Van Dijk (1993) showed, CDA deals primarily with the discourse dimensions of power abuse and the injustice and the inequality that result from it. The author went on to say that it requires true multidisciplinary, an account of intricate relationships between text, talk, social cognition, power, society and culture.

Regarding power and dominance, Van Dijk (1993) stated that the concept of hegemony and its associated concepts of consensus, acceptance, and the management of the mind also suggest that a critical analysis of discourse and dominance is far from straightforward and does not always imply a clear picture of villains and victims. Van Dijk also maintained that many forms of dominance appear to be “jointly reproduced” through intricate forms of social interaction, communication and discourse. The analysis, as Van Dijk argued, will be able to contribute to our understanding of such intricacies. Van Dijk also believed that power and dominance are usually organized and institutionalized. The social dominance of groups, as the author suggested, is thus not merely enacted individually, but it is enacted by its group members, sanctioned by

the court, legitimated by laws, enforced by the police, and ideologically sustained and reproduced by the media or textbooks. Van Dijk also maintained that this social, cultural, and political organization of dominance also implies a hierarchy of power, some members of dominant groups and organizations have a special role in planning, decision making and control over the relations and processes of the enactment of power. According to Van Dijk, these small groups will be called here as the power elites. The definition of elites, as Van Dijk believed, deals with precision in terms of their “symbolic power” as measured by the extent of their discursive and communicative scope and resources.

Van Dijk (2009, pp. 248—253) further stated the relation between the discourse and contexts. Context, as the author pointed out, is defined as a theoretical term, within a broader theory of discourse that must account for the ways discourses are produced and understood as a function of the properties of communicative situation—as they are understood and represented by the participants themselves. The author further maintained that contexts may represent face-to-face communicative situations (micro contexts), such as a parliamentary speech or debate, but also various micro and macro levels of social situations and structure, such as parliament as an institution, or even democracy as a system. Such levels, as Van Dijk argued, may be made more or less relevant for ongoing text or talk. Also, as the author showed, we need to further examine the textual or contextual status and properties of the media that manifest discourse.

Furthermore, Van Dijk (1995) examined the nature of social power and abuse, and, in particular, the ways dominance is expressed or enacted in text and talk. The author went to argue that if social power is roughly defined as a form of control of one group by another, or if such control may extend to the actions and the minds of dominated group members, or if dominance or power abuse further implies that such control is in the interest of dominant group, this means that dominant social group

members may also exercise such control over text and talk. Van Dijk pointed out that discursively implemented dominance involves preferential access to text and context taken as a basis or resource of power, comparable to such social resources as wealth, income, a good job, position, status, knowledge, and education.

CDA as Van Dijk (2010) tried to define, deals with basic concepts, such as micro vs. macro and power as control. Van Dijk continued to argue that language use, discourse, verbal interaction, and communication belong to the micro level of the social order. Van Dijk also maintained that power, dominance and inequality between social groups are typically terms that belong to a macro level of analysis. This means that, as the author suggested, CDA has to theoretically bridge the well-known gap between micro and macro approaches. The author also believed that the macro and micro levels form one unified whole. Van Dijk explained that, for instance, a racist speech in parliament is a discourse at the micro level of social interaction in the specific situation of a debate, but at the same time it may enact or be a constituent part of legislation or the reproduction of racism at the macro level. In this regard, Van Dijk continued to say that there are several ways to analyze and bridge these levels, and thus arrive at a unified critical analysis: members-groups, action-process, context-social structure and personal and social cognition.

Regarding power as control, Van Dijk stated that a central notion in most critical work on discourse is that of power, and more specifically, the social power of groups or institutions. Thus, groups, as the author suggested, have more or less power if they are able to more or less control the acts and minds of member of other groups. According to Van Dijk, this ability presupposes a power base of privileged access to scarce social resources, such as force, money, status, fame, knowledge, information, culture, or indeed various form of public discourse and communication.

The historical perspective of the CDA, as Wodak (p. 5) in Kendall (2007) argued, began

in 1991 with a meeting organized by Van Dijk in Amsterdam, often viewed as the formal and institutionalized beginning of CDA. Wodak contributed to the focus of interdisciplinary and implementing interdisciplinarity.

The term “critical”, according to Wodak in Kendall (2007), means not taking a case for granted, opening up complexity, challenging reductionism, dogmatism and dichotomies, being self reflective in the research, and through these processes, making opaque structures of power relations and ideologies manifest. Wodak also suggested that “critical” does not imply the common sense meaning of being negative or rather skeptical. The author concluded that proposing alternatives is also part of being critical.

Wodak continued to argue that the most important development in CDA is a new focus on identity politics (transition and social change), language policies, and on integrating macro social theories with linguistic analysis. Moreover, Wodak signified the analysis of new genres (visual, internet, film, chat rooms, SMS, and multimodality). In this line, as the author maintained, CDA methodology integrates linguistic methods with a critical social standpoint. Wodak also believed that the theoretical approach in CDA is inherently interdisciplinary because it aims to investigate complex social phenomena which are inherently inter- or trans-disciplinary and certainly cannot be studied by linguistics alone. The notion of retroductable, as Wodak in Kendall (2007), argued, manifests since such analyses should be transparent so that any reader can trace and understand the detailed in-depth textual analysis. The author concluded that in any case all criteria which are usually applied to social science research apply to CDA as well.

Likewise, Wodak in Wodak & Meyer (2001) underlined the notion of critical to be understood as having distance to the data, embedding the data in the social, taking the political stance explicitly, and a focus on self-reflection as scholars doing research. In doing so, Wodak argued that the tasks of critical theory were to assist in remembering

a past that was in danger of being forgotten, to struggle for emancipation, to clarify the reasons for such a struggle, and to define the nature of critical thinking itself.

CDA in this regard, as Wodak in Wodak & Meyer (2001) pointed out, emphasizes the need for interdisciplinary work in order to gain a proper understanding of how language functions in, for example, constituting and transmitting knowledge, in organizing social institutions or in exercising power. Arguing on power, intertextuality, and recontextualization, Wodak stated that an important perspective in CDA is that it is very rare for a text to be the work of any one person. The author also showed that in texts, discursive differences are negotiated; they are governed by differences in power which are themselves, in part, encoded in and determined by discourse and genre. Therefore texts, as the author suggested, are often sites of struggle in that they show traces of differing discourses and ideologies contending and struggling for dominance. According to Wodak, a defining feature of CDA is its concern with power as a central condition in social life, and its efforts to develop a theory of language which incorporates this as a major premise. The author also believed that not only the notion of struggle for power and control, but also the intertextuality and recontextualization of competing discourses are closely attended to.

In relation to power, Wodak in Wodak & Meyer (2001) pointed out that power is about relations of difference, and particularly about the effects of differences in social structures. According to Wodak, the constant unity of language and other social matters ensures that language is entwined in social power in a number of ways: language indexes power, expresses power and is involved where there is contention over and a challenge to power. Power, as the author maintained, does not derive from language, but language can be used to challenge power, to subvert it, to alter distributions of power in the short and long terms. Additionally, Wodak stated that language provides a finely articulated means for differences in power in social hierarchical

structures. The author also argued that CDA takes an interest in the ways in which linguistic forms are used in various expressions and manipulations of power. Power, as the author believed, is signaled not only by grammatical forms within a text, but also by the writer's control of a social occasion by means of the genre of a text. Wodak continued to say that it is often exactly within the genres associated with given social occasions that power is exercised or challenged. The ways in which some CDA research is directly and indirectly related to research produced in the tradition of critical theory, as Wodak maintained, are particularly evident when one considers central concepts with which the various areas work, and social phenomena on which they focus. Wodak further explained that examples of these are pertinent in their approaches to questions such as: what constitutes knowledge; how discourses are constructed in and constructive of social institutions; how ideology functions in social institutions, and how people obtain and maintain power within a given community.

It is generally agreed, as Wodak in Wodak & Meyer (2001), p. 11) argued, that CDA must not be understood as a single method but rather as an approach that has different levels. According to Wodak, at each level a number of selections have to be made. At the programmatic level, a selection, as the author maintained, is made of (a) the phenomena under observation, (b) some explanation of the theoretical assumptions, and (c) the methods used to link theory and observation. Wodak further believed that methodical procedure will make it easier to record findings and to compile reports of experience. Secondly, at a social level, the author also stated that a specific peer group is formed as a distinctive part of a scientific community, and thirdly, at a historical level, each approach to social research is subject to fashion and expiry dates. According to Wodak, the nature of the problems with which CDA is concerned is different in principles from methods, which do not determine their interest in advance. In general, as the author suggested, CDA asks

different research questions. Wodak showed that CDA scholars play an advocatory role for groups who suffer from social discrimination. Whatever the case, in respect of the object of investigation, as the author maintained, it is a fact that CDA follows a different and critical approach to problems, since it endeavors to make explicit power relationships which are frequently hidden, and thereby, derive results which are of practical relevance.

In accordance with this, CDA, as Wodak in Wodak & Meyer (2001) argued, refers to such extra-linguistic factors as culture, society and ideology. The author signified that in any case, the notion of context is crucial for CDA, since this explicitly includes social-psychological, political, ideological components and, thereby, postulates an interdisciplinary procedure.

Furthermore, as Wodak in Wodak & Meyer (2001) argued beyond this, CDA, using the concept of intertextuality and interdiscursivity, analyses relationship with other texts, and this is not pursued in other methods. The author also suggested that from its basic understanding of the notion of discourse it may be concluded that CDA is open to the broadest range of factors that exert an influence on texts.

According to Wodak in Wodak & Meyer (2001), in relation to context, language and society, CDA does not take this relationship to be simply deterministic but invokes an idea of mediation. Wodak believed that there is a difference between the various concepts of discourse. The author explained that Fairclough defined the relationship in accordance with Halliday's multifunctional linguistic theory and the concept of orders of discourse according to Foucault, while the author, like Van Dijk, introduces a sociocognitive level. Wodak further stated that this kind of mediation between language and society is absent from many other linguistic approaches, such as for example, conversation analysis. Explicitly and implicitly, as the author argued, CDA makes use of a concept of the linguistic surface. Wodak also said that, for instance Fairclough speaks of a form and texture at the textual level, and the author of

forms of linguistic realization.

CDA, as Wodak in Wodak, R. & Meyer, M. (2001) pointed out, should be based on a sound theory of context. The author went on to say that within this Van Dijk claimed that the theory of social representations plays an important part. Social actors involved in discourse, in Wodak's view, do not exclusively make use of their individual experiences and strategies; they mainly rely upon collective frames of perceptions, called social representations. Social representations, as Wodak suggested, are shaped amongst members of a social group. Wodak also stated that, thus, they form a core element of the individual's social identity. Social representations, as the author believed, are bound to specific social groups and do not span society as a whole. Wodak (2001, p. 21) further pointed out that they are dynamic constructs and subject to permanent change.

Regarding this procedure, Wodak explained that data collection is never completely excluded, and new questions always rise, which can only be dealt with if new data are collected or earlier data are re-examined. Wodak also stated that Fairclough and Van Dijk preferred mass media coverage, while the author postulated that CDA studies always incorporate fieldwork and ethnography in order to explore the object under investigation as a precondition for any further analysis and theorizing.

According to Wodak (2001), CDA places its methodology, rather, in the hermeneutic than in the analytical-deductive tradition. As a consequence, as the author maintained, no clear line between data collection and analysis can be drawn. However, the author stated that the linguistic character of CDA becomes evident that CDA strongly relies on linguistic categories. This does not mean that, as Wodak argued, topics and contents play no role at all, but that the core operationalizations depend on linguistic concepts such as actors, mode, time, tense, argumentation, and so on.

Pertaining to validity of research, Wodak suggested triangulation procedures to ensure validity—which is appropriate to

whatever one's theoretical orientation or use of quantitative or qualitative data. Wodak's triangulatory approach can be characterized as theoretical and is based on the concept of context, which takes into account four levels: (1) The immediate language, or text-internal co-text; (2) the intertextual and interdiscursive relationship between utterances, texts, genres and discourses; (3) the extra-linguistic (social) level, which is called "the context of situation" and explained by middle-range theories; and (4) the broader socio-political and historical contexts. Permanent switching between these levels and evaluation of the findings from these different perspectives, as Wodak believed, should minimize the risk of being biased. In Wodak's view, in Wodak, R. & Meyer, M. (2001), triangulation among different types of data, participants' definitions of significance and issue-based analysis to establish the significance of the sites of engagement and mediated actions under study are suited to bringing the analyses back to participants in order to get their reactions and interpretations: to uncover divergences and contradictions between one's own analysis of the mediated actions one is studying and those of participants. Wodak (p. 30), in Wodak, R. & Meyer, M. (2001), continued to say that in the tradition of critical theory, CDA aims to make transparent the discursive aspects of social disparities and inequalities. CDA in the majority of cases, as the author argued, takes the part of the underprivileged and tries to unpack the linguistic means used by the privileged to stabilize or even to intensify iniquities in society.

To summarize, CDA according to Wodak (p. 65) Wodak, R. & Meyer, M. (2001), is not concerned with evaluating what is right or wrong. The author suggested that CDA should try to make choices at each point in the research itself, and should make these choices transparent. It should also, as the author further pointed out, justify theoretically why certain interpretations of discursive events (events given great media coverage) seem more valid than others.

Along with CDA's notion of intertextuality, Kristeva (1986, pp. 36—37)

stated the notion of intertextuality replaces that of intersubjectivity, and poetic language is read as at least double. The author further argued that defining the specific status of the word as signifier for different modes of (literary interaction) within different genres or texts put poetic analysis at the sensitive center of contemporary human sciences—at the intersection of language the true practice of thought with space the volume within which signification, through a joining of differences, articulates itself. To investigate the status of the word, as the author maintained, is to study its articulations with other words in the sentence and then to look for the same functions or relationships at the articulatory level of larger sequences. The word's status, in Kristeva's view, is thus defined horizontally: the word in text belongs to both writing subject and addressee, as well as vertically: the word in the text is oriented towards an anterior of literary corpus. The author further explained that the addressee, however, is included within a book's discursive universe as discourse itself. According to Kristeva, the addressee thus fuses with this other discourse, this other book, in relation to which the writer has written his own text. Kristeva concluded that hence horizontal axis (subject-addressee) and vertical axis (text-context) coincide, bringing to light an important fact: each word (text) is an intersection of word (texts), where at least one other word (text) can be read.

Kristeva continued to explain that the word as minimal unit, thus, turns out to occupy the status of mediator, linking structural models to cultural (historical) environment. The word, as the author suggests, is spatialized: through the very notion of status, it functions in three dimensions (subject—addressee—context) as a set of dialogical elements. Kristeva (1998, p. 37) further signified that the novel in particular exteriorizes linguistic dialogue.

In relation to cultural shift in post-modernity, Kristeva (1998) also noted that society is witnessing a period of depression. The values of good and evil are no longer the focus since these values have been so fundamentally questioned. In the contemporary

image on television, we witness an exposure of a phenomenon that is both psychological and political: the pulverization of identity. This occurs through violence and carnage. The pulverization of identity is not without risk. As Proust remarked, instead of being, one tries to belong. This shift from being as the foundation to identity to belonging forces a desire to adhere to a group, to an ideology, to a sect—because religions are in crisis. We ask questions about the image. We have critical attitude toward the image.

According to Pollock (1998, p.37), pertaining to the intertextuality, Kristeva believed that texts present a unified meaning and began to view them as the combination and compilation of sections of the social text. As such, as the author argued, texts have no unity or unified meaning on their own, they are thoroughly connected to on-going cultural and social processes. Kristeva's approach, in Pollock's view, seeks to study the text as a textual arrangement of elements which possess a double meaning: a meaning in the text itself and a meaning in what she calls the historical and social text. Meaning, as the author suggested, is always simultaneously inside and outside the text.

The Characteristics of CDA as a Theory and Method

This part describes the characteristics of CDA as one of the alternative approaches investigating power relations, hegemony and discourse. As a theory and method, CDA reveals texts and their social relation contexts. The review of CDA shares, as Fairclough and Wodak (p. 141) have stated, an eight-point program to define Critical Discourse Analysis as follows:

- (1) CDA addresses social problems.
- (2) Power relations are discursive.
- (3) Discourse constitutes society and culture.
- (4) Discourse does ideological work.
- (5) Discourse is historical.
- (6) The link between text and society is mediated.
- (7) Discourse analysis is interpretive and explanatory.
- (8) Discourse is a form of social action.

Wodak in Wodak & Meyer (2001) intensified preliminary investigation to the distinctive trait of CDA as a method in that the first question of researchers is not, "Do we need a grand theory?" but rather, "What conceptual tools are relevant for this or that problem and for this and that context?"

Let us turn to the field of politics. Wodak in Wodak & Meyer (2001) stated that if we take politicians, for example, as specific individuals and not as a homogeneous group of elites, then they are best seen both as shapers of specific public opinions and interests and as seismographs, that react and reflect to the articulation of changing interests of specific social groups and affected parties. The relationship between media, politics of all genres, and "people," as the author suggested, is very complex. Up to now, Wodak argued that we have not been able to provide clear answers about who influences who and how these influences are directed. Only interdisciplinary research, in Wodak's view, will be able to make such complex relationships more transparent. The author went on to say that simple conspiracy theories do not seem valid in our global societies. In research of this kind, critical discourse analysis, as the author maintained, is only one component of the multiple approaches needed. Wodak also believed that not only discursive practices are to be focused on, but also a wide range of material and semiotic practices. Thus, research in CDA, as Wodak pointed out, must be multitheoretical and multimethodical, critical and self-reflective.

What should be noted by analysts is that, according to Wodak in Wodak & Meyer (2001), CDA deals with certain approach. The discourse-historical approach, committed to CDA, adheres to the socio-political orientation of critical theory. As such, as Wodak argued, it follows a complex concept of social critique which embraces at least three inter-connected aspects, two of which are primarily related to the dimension of cognition and one to the dimension of action:

1. "Text or discourse immanent critique" aims at discovering inconsistencies, (self)

contradictions, paradoxes, and dilemmas in the text-internal or discourse-internal structures.

2. In contrast to the “immanent critique,” the “socio-diagnostic critique” is concerned with the demystifying exposure of the – manifest or latent—possibly persuasive or “manipulative” character of discursive practices. With socio-diagnostic critique, the analyst exceeds the purely textual or discourse internal sphere. She or he makes use of her or his background and contextual knowledge and embeds the communicative or interactional structures of a discursive event in a wider frame of social and political relations, processes and circumstances. At this point, we are obliged to apply social theories to interpret the discursive events.
3. Prognostic critique contributes to the transformation and improvement of communication (for example, within public institutions, by elaborating proposals and guidelines for reducing language barriers in hospitals, schools, courtrooms, public offices and media reporting institutions as well as guidelines for avoiding sexist language use).

In relation to the principle of triangulation, as one methodical way for a critical discourse analyst to minimize the risk of being biased in CDA, Wodak in Wodak & Meyer (2001) stated that one of the most salient distinguishing features of the discourse–historical approach is its endeavour to work with different approaches, multimethodically and on the basis of a variety of empirical data as well as background information.

Wodak in Wodak & Meyer (2001) further explained that in investigating historical, organizational, and political topics and texts, the discourse-historical approach attempts to integrate a large quantity of available knowledge about historical sources and the background of the social and political field in which “discursive events” are embedded. According to Wodak, further, it analyses the historical dimension of discursive actions by exploring the ways in which particular genres of discourse are subject to diachronic

change. Lastly, and most importantly, as the author pointed out, this is not only viewed as “information.” At this point, in Wodak’s view, we integrate social theories to be able to explain the so-called context.

The most important characteristics of historical CDA approach, according to Wodak (pp. 67-70) in Wodak & Meyer (2001) are as follows:

The approach is interdisciplinary. Interdisciplinarity is located on several levels: in theory, in the work itself, in teams and in practice. The approach is problem-oriented, not focused on specific linguistic items. The theory as well as the methodology is eclectic; that is theories and methods are integrated which are helpful in understanding and explaining the object under investigation. The study always incorporates fieldwork and ethnography to explore the object under investigation (study from the inside) as a precondition for any further analysis and theorizing. The approach is abductive: a constant movement back and forth between theory and empirical data is necessary. Multiple genres and multiple public spaces are studied; and intertextual, and interdiscursive relationships are investigated. Recontextualization is the most important process in connecting these genres as well as topics and arguments (*topoi*). The historical context is always analyzed and integrated into the interpretation of discourses and texts. The categories and tools for the analysis are defined according to all these steps and procedures as well as to the specific problem under investigation. Practice is the target. The results should be made available to experts in different fields and, as a second step, be applied with the goal of changing certain discursive and social practices.

Pursuing clear common features of CDA, I address what Jorgensen & Phillips (2008) stated about the use of the label of CDA in two different ways, both to describe the approach

and the label for a broader movement within discourse analysis. This broad movement, according to Jorgensen, is a rather loose entity and there is no consensus as to who belong to it. Jorgensen tended to discuss Fairclough's approach, consisting of a set of philosophical premises, theoretical methods, methodological guidelines and specific techniques for analysis. According to Jorgensen, some key elements shared by all approaches in CDA included:

...the character of social and cultural processes and structures is partly linguistic-discursive; discourse is both constitutive and constituted; language use should empirically analyzed within its social context; discourse functions ideologically; and critical research .

According to Jorgensen & Phillips (2008), it is central to Fairclough's approach that CDA tries to unite three traditions of detailed textual analysis, macro-sociological analysis of social practice and the micro-sociological, where everyday life is treated as the product of people's action, in which they follow a set of shared common sense rules and procedures. The benefit derived from drawing on the macro-sociological tradition, as the author suggested, is that it takes into account that social practices are shaped by social structures and power relations and that people are often not aware of these processes.

Pertaining to CDA review, Jorgensen & Phillips (2008) stated that Fairclough applies the concept of discourse in three different ways. In the most abstract sense, the author went on to say that discourse refers to language use as social practice; secondly, discourse is understood as the kind of language used within a specific field, such as political or scientific discourse. And thirdly, in the most concrete usage, Jorgensen stated that discourse refers to a way of speaking, which gives meaning to experiences from a particular perspective. In the last sense, as the author maintained, the concept refers to any discourse such as a feminist discourse, a consumer discourse or an environmentalist discourse. Jorgensen also argued that discourse contributes to the construction of: social identities, social

relations and systems of knowledge and meaning. In any analysis, as the author points out, two dimensions of discourse have these important focal points:

1. The communicative event—an instance of language use, such as a newspaper article, a film, a video, an interview or a political speech;
2. The order of discourse—the configuration of all the discourse types which are used within a social institution or a social field. Discourse types consist of discourses and genres.

A genre, according to Jorgensen (2008), is a particular usage of language which participates in and constitutes part of a particular social practice, for example, an interview genre, a news genre, or an advertising genre. Examples of orders of discourse, as Jorgensen stated, include the order of discourse of the media, the health service or an individual hospital. In Jorgensen's view, within an order of discourse, "there are specific discursive practices through which text and talk are produced and consumed or interpreted ."

Jorgensen & Phillips (2008) further stated that for instance, within a hospital's order of discourse, the discursive practices which take place include doctor-patient consultations, the scientific staff's technical language (both written and spoken) and the public relations' spoken and written promotional language. Jorgensen also argued that in every discursive practice—that is, in the production and consumption of text and talk—discourse types (discourses and genres) are used in particular ways. Jorgensen explained that every instance of language use is a communicative event consisting of three dimensions, seen as Fairclough's three-dimensional model for CDA: it is a text (speech, visual image or a combination of these); it is a discursive practice which involves the production and consumption of texts; and it is a social practice.

Relevance of CDA Approaches to Literary Research

The section discusses some elements of CDA and their relevance to literary study. Part

of the discussion is the relation between literature and cultural aspects. Discourse, as Beaugrande (2010) argued, serves as not merely something that people learn to produce and receive, but something that mediates most other modes of learning. In this act, according to Beaugrande, the text as a written and presumably closed artifact is “decentered” into discourse, as an open-ended transaction, which for some theories (such as Foucault’s) extend to broad social and institutional frameworks. Beaugrande signified the term intertextuality gained some currency for the visions of the “open” text as a meeting point or “weaving” of other texts.

Regarding a relational mode of CDA—containing various types of discourses—and literature in postmodernism framework, Hutcheon (1988, p. 184) stated that fiction can be read from the perspective of a poetic of postmodernism within which language is inextricably bound to social and ideological. Like much of contemporary theory, it argues that we need to critically examine the social and ideological implications operative in the institutions of our disciplines—historical, literary, philosophical, and linguistics. Hutcheon quoted the notion in Terry Eagleton’s term that discourse, sign-systems and signifying practices of all kinds, from film and television to fiction and the languages of natural science, produce effects, shape forms of consciousness and unconsciousness, which are closely related to the maintenance or transformation of our existing systems of power.

Furthermore, Hutcheon (1988) argued that we still need a critical language in which to discuss those ironic modern and postmodern texts. This, of course, according to Hutcheon, is where the concept of intertextuality has proved so useful. Intertextuality, as Hutcheon maintained, replaces the challenged author-text relationship with one between reader and text, one that situates the locus of textual meaning within the history of discourse itself.

Pertaining to CDA framework and interdisciplinary research of CDA, Wodak (2001) in Wodak & Meyer (2001) sought

to explore the political and discrimination discourse studying various media of investigation. The case varies, as Wodak tried to illustrate, from the publication and the media treatment; political commemoration; a memorial; and the premiere of the play *Heldenplatz* by Thomas Bernhard, which deals with Austrian anti-Semitism then and now and its psycho-terrorizing long term-impact on surviving Jewish victims.

The attribution of different genres and discourse in diverse discursive practices may correlate to the CDA research since it constructs, as Fairclough argued, the micro and macro aspects of entities. This act, I believe, will uncover the motivational ideologies and assumptions which sometimes are neglected. The literary genre—such as fiction, as a part of genres as a whole—constitutes the new development of CDA, as Wodak suggested, toward the emphasis of identity politics.

CONCLUSION

The dawn of CDA with some representations of figures discussing the field signifies the relation between language use and its social practices. This foundation leads to the analysis of events in everyday practices, which include further investigation on individual, institutional and social levels. In so doing, I am of the opinion that CDA actually underlines the discussion of power relations, ideological and social practices. CDA acts upon understanding strategies and tactics to advocate non-privileged representations in everyday life.

CDA, in my view, is a beneficial apparatus to investigate the blurred difference between what constitutes reality and what signifies myth and image. In this respect, I am interested in Fairclough’s notion to Baudrillard on the postmodernity consequence, saying that “in postmodernity the distinction between image and reality has collapsed, so that we are living in a hyperreality where it is impossible for instance to separate the images of war on TV and the actual thing” (1997, p. 16). In relation to the issue of media and access, Allen (2000, p. 182) stated that the new media or film,

television and video also provide people with main forms of access to local, national and global events. Allen believes that reality, we may say, is something which is partially created by media through which it is represented. This point, as Allen (2000) argued, has led many to focus on the relationship between reality and representation, fact and fiction.

It is relevant then for CDA to mediate the linguistic and the social. The CDA representatives agree to a large extent that the complex interactions between discourse and society cannot be analyzed adequately, unless linguistic and sociological approaches are combined. To sum up, the mediation, as Wodak argued, not only refers to socio-linguistic but also pinpoints the problem of modern people such as identity and representation in their everyday practices.

REFERENCES

- Allen, G. (2000). *Intertextuality*. London: Routledge.
- Beaugrande, R. (2010). Discourse analysis and literary theory: Closing the gap, *JAC* 13, 1-25.
- Benwell, B. & Stokoe, E. (2006). *Discourse and identity*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Chiapello, E. & Norman F. (2002). *Discourse and society*. London: Sage.
- Cross, T. (2010). Communication studies as critical: CDA and post-structuralism. Retrieved on October 14, 2010, from: http://www.adm.fukuoka-u.ac.jp/fu844/home2/Ronso/Jinbun/L36-1/L3601_0087..pdf.
- Fairclough, N. & Chiapello, E. (2002). *Discourse and society*, London: Sage.
- _____. (1997). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. New York: Longman.
- _____. (1992). *Discourse and social change*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Hutcheon, L. (1988). *A poetics of postmodernism: History, theory, fiction*. London: Routledge.
- Jorgensen, M. & Phillips. L. (2008). *Discourse analysis as theory and method*. Los Angeles: Sage.
- Kendall, G. (2007). What Is Critical Discourse Analysis? Ruth Wodak in Conversation With Gavin Kendall [38 paragraphs]. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 8(2), Art. 29. Retrieved from: <http://www.qualitative-research.net/fqs-texte/2-07/07-2-29-e.htm>.
- Kristeva, J. (1986). *The Kristeva reader*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Pollock, G. (1998). Dialogue with Julia Kristeva. *Parallax* 3, 5-16.
- Van Dijk, T.A. (2010). Critical discourse analysis. Retrieved on August 31, 2010, from: http://semiotics.nured.uowm.gr/pdfs/Critical_discourse_analysis_TEUN_A_VAN_DIJK.pdf.
- _____. (2009). *Society and discourse: How social contexts influence text and talk*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- _____. (1993). *Discourse and society*. London: Sage.
- _____. (1995). Aims of critical discourse analysis. *Japanese Discourse* 1, 17-27
- Wodak, R. & Kendall, D. (2007). What is critical discourse analysis. *Forum Qualitative Social Research*, 2, 1-7
- Wodak, R. & Meyer, M. (2001). *Methods of critical discourse analysis*. London: Sage.