Contemporary Trends of Discourse Analysis

اتجاهات تحليل النص الحديثة

المدرس المساعد
مصعب عبد الزهرة رحيم الخزعلي
جامعة الكوفة ـ كلية الآداب

Contemporary Trends of Discourse Analysis
اتجاهات تحليل النص الحديثة

المدرس المساعد
مصعب عبد الزهرة رحيم الخزعلي
جامعة الكوفة ـ كلية الآداب

الملخص :

يدرس هذا البحث اهم النظريات المعاصرة والحديثة حول تحليل النص. وتركزت الدراسة على طرح اهم مبادئ هذه النظريات والاتجاهات التي اسست على العلاقة بين النص اللغوي والعلاقات الاجتماعية للأفراد اضافة الى الايديولوجيات الفكرية مثل "عدم المساواة والعدالة و العنصرية" وغيرها. و بصورة عامة، فان الاتجاه الحديث هو ناقد بمعنى انه اجتماعي الهدف. الاساس في هذه النظريات ان البحث اللغوي يجب ان يتجه نحو دراسة الاستراتيجيات المستعملة من قبل الناطقين في المؤسسات السياسية والاعلامية وغيرها والافكار المضمرة وسوء استخدام اللغة للإقناع المغلف بالأيديولوجيات الخاطئة. اما الاتجاه الاخر فهو دراسة التراكيب الذهنية للناطق عن طريق تحليل التراكيب اللغوية للنص.

Introduction:-

Discourse analysis focuses on finding out the communicative value of stretches of sentences in a given context. It is achieved by exploring the relations that make connectivity and unity in texts at various levels: such as syntactic, semantic, phonological, pragmatic and the like (see Crystal, 2003: s.v. discourse; Matthews, 2007: s.v. discourse).

Generally speaking, the classical approaches to discourse analysis are numerous, but the most common are: the functional systemic approach {which means that texts (and language in general) is a system of interrelations}, functional sentence perspective (FSP) {which deals with the information that each utterance has in relation to one another, particularly the reference to what is called 'theme and rheme'}, and schematic cognitive discourse analysis {which studies the background knowledge of humans in terms of mental scripts or frames that enable them interpret various types of discourse }(see Brown & Yule, l983).

However, modern theories of discourse analysis concentrate on the hidden ideas at various cultural and mental levels such as social, political, economical, religious, advertisemental, racial, and so on. These are numerous, and we will focus on the most influential ones. Moreover, this study focuses that the way we perceive language is the foundation of our social construction and individual or group relationships, and studies in sociolinguistics have tried to explain this relationship between the use of language and the importance of perceptions. A particular discourse, spoken or written, can stem from different sources such as power, cultural or social background, region or social status. In this study, some of the most prominent approaches are to be discussed.

Critical discourse analysis (CDA)

Critical discourse analysis (CDA) is a rapidly developing area of language study. It regards discourse as ‘a form as social practice’ (Fairclough & Wodak, 1997: 258), and takes consideration of the context of language use to be crucial to discourse (Wodak, 2001a). It takes particular interest in the relation between language and power. CDA may be described as neo-Marxist; claiming that cultural and economic dimensions are significant in the creation and maintenance of power relations. The key figures in this area include Fairclough (2000, 2001,

2003), van Dijk (1999, 2001), Gee (1999), van Leeuwen (1995), Wodak (2000, 2001b) and Scollon and Scollon (2001).

It is generally agreed that CDA cannot be classified as a single method but is rather viewed as an approach, which consists of different perspectives and different methods for studying the relationship between the use of language and social context. For instance, Fairclough (2001: 121-22) thinks that CDA is a theoretical perspective or method on language and more generally semiosis which gives rise to ways of analyzing language within a broader sight of the social process. In other words, it is an interdisciplinary approach which needs to be mixed with other social theories and sciences.

CDA is a type of discourse analytical research that primarily studies the way social power abuse, dominance, and inequality are enacted, reproduced, and resisted by text and talk in the social and political context. With such dissident research, critical discourse analysts take explicit position, and thus want to understand, expose, and ultimately resist social inequality. Fairclough (1992: 135), in his definition, perceives CDA as aiming to systematically explore often opaque relationships of causality and determination between (a) discursive practice, events and texts, and (b) wider social and cultural structures, relations and processes; to investigate how such practices, events and texts arise out of and are ideologically shaped by relations of power and struggles over power; and to explore how the opacity of these relationships between discourse and society is itself a factor securing power and hegemony.

Some of the views of CDA can already be found in the critical theory of the Frankfurt School before the Second World War. Its current focus on language and discourse was initiated with the "critical linguistics" that emerged (mostly in the UK and Australia) at the end of the 1970s(Fowler et al., 1979; see also Mey, 1985). CDA has also counterparts in "critical" developments in sociolinguistics, psychology, and the social

sciences, some already dating back to the early 1970s (Wodak, 1996). As is the case in these neighboring disciplines, CDA may be seen as a reaction against the dominant formal (often "asocial" or "uncritical") paradigms of the 1960s and 1970s.

Because CDA is interested in power, domination and social inequality, it tends to focus on groups, organizations and institutions. This means that CDA also needs to account for the various forms of the social cognition that are shared by these social collectivities: knowledge, attitudes, ideologies, norms and values (Van Dijk, 2001: 113).

Other roots of CDA lie in classical rhetorical, text linguistics and sociolinguistics, as well as in applied linguistics and pragmatics. The notions of ideology, power, hierarchy and gender, and static social variables were all seen as relevant for an interpretation or explanation of text (see Wodak, 2001a: 1). Moreover, CDA is not so much a direction, school, or specialization next to the many other "approaches" in discourse studies. Rather, it aims to offer a different "mode" or "perspective" of theorizing, analysis, and application throughout the whole field. We may find a more or less critical perspective in such diverse areas as pragmatics, conversation analysis, narrative analysis, rhetoric, stylistics, sociolinguistics, ethnography, or media analysis, among others. Crucial for critical discourse analysts is the explicit awareness of their role in society. Continuing a tradition that rejects the possibility of a "value-free" science, they argue that science, and especially scholarly discourse, are inherently part of and influenced by social structure, and produced in social interaction. Instead of denying or ignoring such a relation between scholarship and society, they plead that such relations be studied and accounted for in their own right, and that scholarly practices be based on such insights. Theory formation, description, and explanation, also in discourse analysis, are socio-politically "situated," whether we like it or not. Reflection on the role of scholars in society and the polity thus becomes an inherent part of the

discourse analytical enterprise. This may mean, among other things, that discourse analysts conduct research in solidarity and cooperation with dominated groups. Critical research on discourse needs to satisfy a number of requirements in order to effectively realize its aims:

- As is often the case for more marginal research traditions, CDA research has to be "better" than other research in order to be accepted.
- It focuses primarily on , *social problems* and political issues, rather than on current paradigms and fashions.
- Empirically adequate critical analysis of social problems is usually *multidisciplinary.*
- Rather than merely *describe* discourse structures, it tries to *explain* them in terms of properties of social interaction and especially social structure.
- More specifically, CDA focuses on the ways discourse structures enact, confirm, legitimate, reproduce, or challenge relations of *power* and *dominance* in society.

Fairclough and Wodak (1997: 271-80) summarize the main tenets of CDA 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 interpretative and explanatory
8. Discourse is a form of social action.

Whereas some of these tenets have also been discussed above, others need a more systematic theoretical analysis, of which we

shall present some fragments here as a more or less general basis for the main principles of CDA (for details about these of critical discourse and language studies (see Fairclough, 1995).

Ideological discourse analysis

For all cultural and critical theorists there has been intense theoretical difficulty in deciding whether to draw on work which is based around the notion of ideology or work which refers to discourse (Mills, 1997: 29).

Ideological analysis of language and discourse is a widely practiced scholarly and critical endeavour in the humanities and the social sciences.

The presupposition of such analyses is that ideologies of speakers or writers may be uncovered by close reading, understanding or systematic

analysis, if language users explicitly or unwittingly express their ideologies through language and communication. Despite these widespread practices and assumptions, however, the theory that relates discourse and these underlying ideologies is far from explicit. Indeed, in discourse studies, as well as in cognitive and social psychology or the social sciences, we do not know much about how exactly ideologies are either developed by or through discourse, on the one hand, or how they control or otherwise influence text and talk, on the other hand.

In ideological discourse analysis, the aim of the analyst is to find the interrelation of discourse structures and ideological structures. In other words, how ideology constructs the discourse, and how discourse reflects the language user's ideology.

The major tenets of Van Dijk's (1998) approach concerning ideology are the following:

a. Among many other things, ideologies are systems of beliefs.

b. These systems of beliefs are shared by members of a social group.

c. Groups also share other beliefs, such as knowledge and attitudes.

d. The beliefs shared by a group will be called 'social representations' (SRs).

e. Ideologies are the organizing, 'basic' beliefs of these SRs. ,

f. Groups not only have their `own', ideologically based, «knowledge» (often called «beliefs» by other groups), but also share in more general, consensual, culturally shared knowledge, which may be called (cultural) `common ground'.

g. This cultural common ground may be seen as the foundation of all cognition, across and between different groups, and thus is also presupposed by different ideologies.

h. Common ground may be empirically assessed as all beliefs that are presupposed in public discourse. This means that, for a given culture, such common ground is noncontroversial, commonsensical, and hence non-ideological.

i. Pan of the common ground are also the general norms and values shared by the members of a culture.

j. Groups select some of these cultural values and organize them in their own ideologies, e.g., freedom, equality, justice or objectivity.

k. Ideologies probably have a canonical structure that facilities their acquisition, use and change.

m. Although we don't know yet what this structure might be, it is probably related to the basic social properties of a group, such as the criteria of group membership, activities,

aims, norms and values, relations to other groups, and specific group resources (or lack thereof) —or 'capital'.

n. Ideologies and their structures may also be seen as the cognitive core of the identity of a group and its members, that is, as a social self-schema of a group.

o. Ideologies and the social representations organized by them control the social practices of actors as group members.

Ideologies, thus defined, have many cognitive and social functions. First of all, as explained above, they organize and ground the social representations shared by the members of (ideological) groups. Secondly, they are the ultimate basis of the discourses and other social practices of the members of social groups as group members. Thirdly, they allow members to organize and coordinate their (joint) actions and interactions in view of the goals and interests of the group as a whole. Finally, they function as the part of the socio-cognitive interface between social structures (conditions, etc.) of groups on the one hand, and their discourses and other social practices on the other hand. Some ideologies may thus function to legitimate domination, but also to articulate resistance in relationships of power, as is the case for feminist or pacifist

ideologies. Other ideologies function as the basis of the `guidelines' of professional behaviour—for instance for journalists or scientists (see ibid, 2006b: 117) .

Fasold (2006) asserts that most language attitude work is based on a mentalist view of attitude as a state of readiness: 'an intervening variable between a stimulus affecting a person and that person's response' (p.147). A person's attitude, in this view, prepares her/his reaction to a given stimulus in one way rather than in another. The other view is the behaviourist view. According to this theory, attitudes are to be found simply in the responses people make to social situations. Moreover, Holmes (2001) notes that attitudes to language ultimately reflect attitudes

to the users and the uses of language. The standard variety in a community has "overt prestige" (p.344). Speakers who use the standard variety are rated highly in terms of educational and occupational status, and these ratings reflect the associations of their speech variety, which is generally held up as the best way of speaking in the community. "Covert speech" refers to positive attitudes towards vernacular or nonstandard speech varieties (p.348). Correspondingly, Giles and Coupland (1991) report a study in Kentucky where Kentucky students were asked to evaluate standard American and Kentucky accented speakers. The Kentucky speakers scored high on solidarity, low on status; standard American speakers scored low on solidarity, high on status. Likewise, Coupland et al (1994) found in their study that teachers in Wales rated Carmarthen English (characterised by one teacher as the Welsh version of RP) relatively highly not only for prestige, but also for dynamism, pleasantness, and "Welshness". RP, on the other hand, scored highly on prestige, and very low in all other respects. These studies imply that attitudes to language can be linked to social and cultural identity, to social status and to the notions of prestige and solidarity, and that attitudes to language and its varieties can be influenced by different factors related to the users of that specific language.

Socio-political discourse analysis

In order to formulate our research goals in a broader framework, it should first be emphasized that ideological discourse analysis should be seen as one specific type of socio-political analysis of discourse. Such an analysis, among other things, attempts to relate structures of discourse with structures of society. That is, social properties or relations of, e.g., class, gender or ethnicity, are thus systematically associated with the structural units, levels, or strategies of talk and text embedded in their social, political and cultural contexts. The same is true for the relations between social organizations, institutions, groups, roles, situations, power, or political decision making, on the one

hand, and discourse structures, on the other hand. (Fairclough, 1989, 1992; Kedar, 1987; Kress, 1985).

Political discourse analysis is a field of discourse analysis which focuses on discourse in political forums (such as debates, speeches, and hearings) as the phenomenon of interest. Political discourse is the informal exchange of reasoned views as to which of several alternative courses of action should be taken to solve a societal problem. It is a science that has been used through the history of the United States. It is the essence of democracy. Full of problems and persuasion, political discourse is used in many debates, candidacies and in our everyday life (Johnson *et. al*., 2000).

Chilton &Schaffner (2002: 5-6) define politics 'as a struggle for power, between those who seek to assert and maintain their power and those who seek to resist it', and oppositely 'as cooperation, as the practices and institutions a society has for resolving clashes of interest over money, power, liberty and the like'. The first definition clarifies the violent side of politics, whilst the second shows the peaceful one.

One of the significant problems in discourse which political discourse analysis deals with is that of ' representation'. Representation refers to the language used in a text or discourse to assign meaning to groups and their social practices (see Van Dijk, 2002; Jorgensen and Phillips, 2002: 45). This means that meaning is not found in the objective reality, but it is rather constructed by linguistic representations (cf. Laclau, 1996: 27). In fact, modes of representation vary in pursuance of perspective from which they are constructed, whether historical, socio-cultural and so on (Billig, 1991: 30). Ideology will also affect the manner in which groups represent matters of import and relevance to the body politic (Van Dijk, 1991: 45). Besides, there is a controversies among groups on how to represent correctly (Wodak, 200lb: 22). Thus, context has a very important role in deciding the type of representation of each group. Van

Dijk (2009: ix) asserts that the theory of context models accounts for the representations and processes involved in this "making relevant" of the cognitive and social properties of social situations. In this sense, the theory is not incompatible with the interactional approaches in much of the social sciences today. It integrates them by making explicit what is usually being taken for granted or formulated in vague descriptions. At the same time it extends current context-free approaches to text and talk by articulating a multidisciplinary framework that provides the much needed missing link between discourse, cognition and society.

According to Schaffner (1996: 202), political discourse, as a sub-category of discourse in general, can be based on two criteria: functional and thematic. Political discourse is a result of politics and it is historically and culturally determined. It fulfills different functions due to different political activities. It is thematic because its topics are primarily related to politics such as political activities, political ideas and political relations.

It is a common knowledge that politics is concerned with power: the power to make decisions, to control resources, to control other people's behaviour and often to control their values. According to Jones and Peccei (2004), politicians throughout ages have achieved success thanks to their "skilful use of rhetoric", by which they aim to persuade their audience of the validity of their views, delicate and careful use of elegant and persuasive language.

Although the use of language is unquestionably an important element of politics, Fairclough (2006) notes that it can "misrepresent as well as represent realities, it can weave visions and imaginaries which can be implemented to change realities and in some cases improve human well-being, but it can also rhetorically obfuscate realities, and construe them ideologically to serve unjust power relations" (p.1).

Van Djik (2006a) notes that political situations do not simply cause political actors to speak in certain ways, instead "there is a need for a cognitive collaboration between situations and talk or text, that is a context" (p.733). Such contexts define how participants experience, interpret and represent the for-them relevant aspects of the political situation. Political discourse is not only defined with political discourse structures but also with political contexts. Thus, acting as an MP, Prime Minister, party leader, or demonstrator will typically be perceived by speakers or recipients as a relevant context category in political discourse.

Wareing (2004) also mentions that words can also have a strong influence on our attitudes; which word is chosen affects people‟s perception of the others and of themselves. Similarly, Jones and Peccei (2004) point out that language can be used not only to steer people's thoughts and beliefs but also to control their thoughts and beliefs.

In such an account, language users are defined as members of communities, groups or organizations, and are supposed to speak, write or understand from a specific social position. Ideological analysis then

examines what ideologies are typically associated with that position, for

example, in order to defend or legitimate that position, typically so by

discourse. In relationships of dominance, such ideological discourse may

thus serve to sustain or challenge social positions. This socio-political approach to ideological analysis is classical, but hardly explicit. Rather crucially, it fails to tell us how exactly social positions of language users or of the groups of which they are members affect (or are affected by) text and talk. Men, and not women, may have recourse to specific topics, lexical style or rhetoric, or vice versa, and the same may be said for whites vs.

blacks, old vs. young people, or police officers vs. suspects. As is the case in sociolinguistics, such an analysis hardly goes beyond correlational description: It neither explains nor specifies how such group members may thus express their social positions, that is, what discourse production processes are involved in expressing such positions.

Trivially, since groups and institutions, as such, do not write or speak

or understand discourse, there is no way social structure itself may directly affect text and talk, unless through the agency of communicating

individuals as members of groups or social categories. That is, as is the

case for many other forms of social and political analysis, a fully fledged

explanation of the relations between discourse and society needs to cross

the well-known macro-micro and society-individual divide.

This discussion conveys that we should make a link between the social and discourse structures. One candidate for this interface is situated social interaction itself. Depending on one's perspective or sociological theory, either the macro or the micro may be taken as more basic in such an account (Collins, 1981; Fine, 1991).

Situations would then represent the unique combination of social members, categories, relations, processes or forces. For instance, a specific encounter between doctor and patient would be instantiating or enacting more abstract structures of medical institutions in general, and relations between doctors and patients in particular (Mishler, 1984; West, 1984).

Talk of social members in such a context might instantiate, more or less directly, one type of social relation, e.g., that of

dominance, politeness, assistance or solidarity. More specifically, this would probably entail the use of expressions that may be intended or interpreted as signalling such social relations, as may be the case for pronouns as markers of dominance or politeness.

In sum, the way we perceive language is the foundation of our social construction and individual or group relationships, and studies in sociolinguistics have tried to explain this relationship between the use of language and the importance of perceptions. A particular discourse, spoken or written, can stem from different sources such as power, cultural or social background, region or social status. This paper aims to discuss the realization of identity and background by means of language use in a political discourse, which is mainly grounded in Norman Fairclough's assumptions in critical discourse analysis.

Discursive psychology (DP)

Discursive psychology (DP) is a form of discourse analysis that focuses on psychological themes. It was developed in the 1990s by Jonathan Potter and Derek Edwards at Loughborough University. It draws on the philosophy of mind of Ryle and the later Wittgenstein, the rhetorical approach of Michael Billig, the ethnomethodology of Harold Garfinkel and the conversation analysis of Harvey Sacks. DP starts with psychological phenomena as things that are constructed, attended to, and understood in interaction. An evaluation, say, may be constructed using particular phrases and idioms, responded to by the recipient (as a compliment perhaps) and treated as the expression of a strong position. In DP the focus is not on psychological matters somehow leaking out into interaction; rather interaction is the primary site where psychological issues are live.

It is philosophically opposed to more traditional cognitivist approaches to language. It uses studies of naturally occurring conversation to critique the way that topics have been conceptualised and treated in psychology.

DP conducts studies of naturally occurring human interaction that offer new ways of understanding topics in social and cognitive psychology such as memory and attitudes. Although DP subscribes to a different view of human mentality than is advanced by mainstream psychology, Edwards and Potter's work was originally motivated by their dissatisfaction with how psychology had treated discourse. In many psychological studies, the things people (subjects) say are treated as windows (with varying degrees of opacity) into their minds. Talk is seen as (and in experimental psychology and protocol analysis used as) descriptions of people's mental content. In contrast, DP treats talk as social action; that is, we say what we do as a means of, and in the course of, doing things in a socially meaningful world. Thus, the questions that it makes sense to ask also change (see Edwards and Potter, 1992: 2; Edwards, 1996; Potter, 2001).

Generally speaking, there is a divergence and theoretical conflict between DP and what is called social representation theory (SRT).The basic differences can be summarized in the following discoursal concepts (see Potter & Edwards, 1999: 2-4):

1. Action. One of the primary differences between SRT and DP lies in

the way they characterize action, and in the relative importance they place on it. In DP, action is conceptualized in terms of the enormous range of practical, technical and interpersonal tasks that people perform while living their relationships, doing their jobs, and engaging in varied cultural domains. Action (practices, getting stuff done-the precise term is not meant to carry weight here) is central to people's lives, and therefore central to understanding those lives. We are not the

first to observe that SRT does not provide any elaborate account of action. This failure to theorize action is at the heart of a range of problems; in particular, it leads to methodological blind-spots, it encourages the drift towards cognitive reductionism, and it places crucial limitations on the way the central concept of representation is theorized.

2. Representation. Representation is an important notion in both SRT

and DP. However, it has almost the opposite role in each perspective.

In SRT, representations are primarily cognitive phenomena (although

they are sometimes considered as cultural objects) which enable people

to make sense of the world. The collective nature of this sense-making

is taken to enable intra-group communication and to provide a technical definition of the boundaries of social groups. In DP, representations are discursive objects which people construct in talk and texts. Analysis has concentrated not on the sense-making role of representations (although this is not excluded in principle), but on the way the representations are constructed as solid and factual, and on their use in, and orientation to, actions (assigning blame, eliciting invitations, etc.). Representations are treated as produced, performed and constructed in precisely the way that they are for their role in activities. For this reason, discursive psychologists treat understanding activity as the key to understanding representations (cf. Potter, 1996).

3. Communication. In SRT, one of the primary roles of social representations is to facilitate intra-group communication. In DP, the communication metaphor is rejected as inadequate for dealing with the

complexities of action and interaction1 We doubt that SRT researchers

would have much success if they attempted to make sense of a transcript of conversational interaction, say, if they try to discern 'messages' and places where they are 'transferred' from speaker to speaker2. Indeed, SRT researchers have simply avoided that problem by ignoring interaction and disparaging conversation as 'babble'. Conversation thus has the anomalous position of being at the heart of SRT as the engine for the generation and refinement of representations, and yet being a topic which has received no analytic attention, and where the relevant literature in conversation analysis (cf. Sacks, 1992) has been ignored.

4. Cognition. One of the features of SRT which has attracted mainstream social cognition workers has been its retention of central elements of perceptual-cognitivism. Perceptual-cognitivism treats people as perceivers of incoming perceptual information which they process in various ways (Edwards & Potter, 1992). In SRT, representations are, mostly, treated as cognitive structures or grids which make sense of information, particularly about unfamiliar social objects. DP rejects perceptual-cognitivism in favour of a systematic reformulation of cognition as a feature of participants' practices, where it is constructed, described and oriented to as people perform activities. topic of study. This facilitates the study of practices and avoids a range of confusions that arise from the cognitive analysis of talk and texts (cf. Edwards, 1996).

Practical Analysis

DP can be illustrated with an example from Derek Edwards' research on script formulations. Traditional social psychology treats scripts as mentally encoded templates that guide action. DP focuses on the foundational issue of how a description is built to present a course of action as following from a

standardized routine. Take the following example from a couple counselling session (the transcription symbols here were developed by Gail Jefferson). The Counsellor says: before you moved over here how was the marriage. After a delay of about half a second Connie, the wife who is being jointly counselled, replies Oh to me all along, right up to now, my marriage was rock solid. Rock solid = We had arguments like everybody else had arguments, but to me there was no major problems. One thing that discursive psychologists would be interested in would be the way that Connie depicts the arguments that she and her partner have as the routine kind of arguments that everybody has. While arguments might be thought as a problem with a marriage, Connie 'script formulates' them as actually characteristic of a 'rock solid' marriage. Action and interaction is accomplished as orderly in interactions of this kind. DP focuses on the locally organized practices for constructing the world to serve relevant activities (in this case managing the live question of who is to blame and who needs to change in the counselling). In the discursive psychological vision, scripts are inseparable part of the practical and moral world of accountability.

Application:

In the past few years, work in DP has focused on material from real world situations such as relationship counselling, child protection helplines, neighbour disputes and family mealtimes. It asks questions such as the following. How does a party in relationship counseling construct the problem as something that the other party needs to work on? Or how does a child protection officer working on a child protection helpline manage the possibly competing tasks of soothing a crying caller and simultaneously eliciting evidence sufficient for social services to intervene to help an abused child? What makes a parent's request to a child to eat different from a directive, and different in turn from a threat?

Conclusions:

Modern theories of discourse analysis, especially CDA, concentrates the hidden ideas at various cultural and mental levels such as social, political, economical, religious, advertisemental, racial, and so on. These are numerous, and we will focus on the most influential ones. Moreover, this study focuses that the way we perceive language is the foundation of our social construction and individual or group relationships, and studies in sociolinguistics have tried to explain this relationship between the use of language and the importance of perceptions. A particular discourse, spoken or written, can stem from different sources such as power, cultural or social background, region or social status. Further, DP is opposed to more traditional cognitivist approaches to language. It uses studies of naturally occurring conversation to critique the way that topics have been conceptualized and treated in psychology.

References

-Billig, M. (1991). *Ideology and Opinions*. London: Sage.

-Brown, G. and Yule, G. (1983). *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

-Chilton, P. & Schaffner, C. (2002) 'Introduction: themes and principles in the analysis of political discourse'. In: P. Chilton & C. Schafner (eds) , *Politics as Text and Talk*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

-Collins, R. (1981). 'On the micro-foundations of

Macrosociology'. *American Journal of Sociology*, 86: 5. 984-

1014.

-Coupland, N., Williams, A. and Garret, P. (1994) 'The social meaning of Welsh English: Teachers' stereotyped judgements', *Journal*

of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 15. 471- 491.

-Crystal, David (2003). *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics*. Oxford: Blackwell.

-Edwards, D. (1996). *Discourse and Cognition*. London: Sage.

-…….. and J. Potter (1992). *Discursive Psychology*. London: Sage.

-Fairclough, N.L. (1989). *Language and Power*. London: Longman.

-…… (1992). *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

-……..(1995) *Media Discourse*. London: Edward Arnold.

-…….. (2000). 'Discourse, social theory and social research: the

discourse of welfare reform'. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*,

4.2:163–95.

-…… (20/12/2006). 'Tony Blair and the language of politics'. In:

http://www.opendemocracy.net/democracyblair/blair_language_4205.jsp

-…… and Wodak, R. (1997). 'Critical discourse analysis'. In T. A. van Dijk (ed.), *Discourse Studies: A Multidisciplinary*

Introduction:. Discourse as Social Interaction, 2. 258- 84). London: Sage..

-Fasold, R. W. and Connor-Linton, J. (2006). *An Introduction to Language and Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

-Fine, G.A. (1991). 'On the macrofoundations of microsociology:

Constraint and the exterior reality of structure'. *Sociological*

Quarterly, 32: 2. 161-177.

-Fowler, R. , Robert Hodge, Gunther Kress and Tony Trew (1979).

Language and Control. London: Routldge.

-Gee, James. (1999). *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis*. NY: Routledge.

-Giles, H. and Coupland, N. (1991). *Language : Contexts and*

Consequences. Calif.: Brooks/Cole Pub.

-Holmes, J. (2001). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. Harlow: Longman.

-Johnson, David , W. Johnson &Roger, T. (2000). 'Civil Political

Discourse in a Democracy: The Contribution Of Psychology'. In: http://www.co-operation.org/pages/contro-pol.html

-Jones, J. and Peccei, J. S. (2004) 'Language and politics'. In Thomas,

L. (ed). *Language, Society, and Power*. New York: Routledge.

-Jorgensen, M. & Phillips, L. (2002). *Discourse Analysis as Theory and Method*. London: Sage.

-Kedar, L. (ed.) (1987). *Power through Discourse*. NJ: Ablex.

-Kress, G. (1985). *Linguistic Processes in Sociocultural Practice*.. Indiana: Indiana University Press.

-Laclau, E. (1996). 'The death and resurrection of the theory of ideology'. in *Journal of Political Ideologies*, 1(3). 201-20.

-Matthews, P. H. (2007). *Oxford Concise Dictionary of Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

-Mills, S. (1997). *Discourse*. London: Routledge.

-Mishler, E.G. (1984). *The Discourse of Medicine.: Dialectics in Medical Interviews*. NJ: Ablex.

-Potter, J. & Edwards, D. (1992). 'Social representations and discursive psychology: from cognition to action'. In: *Culture & Psychology*, 5(4): 447-458. London: Sage.

-……..(1996). *Representing Reality: Discourse, Rhetoric and Social Construction*. London: Sage.

-…….(2001). 'Wittgenstein and Austin: developments in linguistic philosophy'. In M. Wetherell *et. al.* (eds.). *Discourse Theory and Practice*. London: Sage.

-Sacks, H. (1992). *Lectures on Conversation* (2 vols). Oxford: Blackwell.

-Schaffner, C. (1996). 'Editorial: political speeches and discourse analysis'. In: *Current Issues in Language &Society*, 3, (3).201- 204.

-Scollon, R. and Scollon, S. (2004). *Nexus Analysis: Discourse and the Emerging Internet*. London: Routledge.

-Van Dijk, T. A. (1991). *Racism and the Press*. London and New York: Routledge.

-……. (1998). *Ideology: A Multidisciplinary Approach.* London: Sage.

-……. (1999). 'Context models in discourse processing'. In: H. van Oostendorp and S. R. Goldman (eds.). *The Construction of*

Mental Representations During Reading . 123–148. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

-……. (2001). 'Multidisciplinary CDA'. In: Ruth Wodak & Michael Meyer (Eds.). *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. 63-95. London: Sage.

-…….. (2002). 'Political discourse and political cognition'. In: P. Chilton & C. Schafner (eds). *Politics as Text and Talk*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

-……. (2006a) 'Politics, ideology, and discourse', in Brown, K.(ed), *The Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*. 9

Oxford. 728-740. New York: Pergamon Press

-…….. (2006b). 'Ideology and discourse analysis'. In *Journal of Political Ideologies*. 11(2). 115-140. London: Routledge.

-…… (2009). *Society and Discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

-Van Leeuwen, T. (1995). 'Representing social action'. In : *Discourse and Society, 6*. 81–106. Victoria: Deakin University Press.

-Wareing, S. (2004). 'What is language and what does it do?'. In Thomas, L.(ed),. *Language, Society, and Power*. New York: Routledge.

-West, C. (1984). *Routine Complications: Troubles with Talk between Doctor and Patients*. London: Longman.

-Wodak, R. (2000). 'From conflict to consensus? The co-construction of a policy paper'. In: P. Muntigl et al. 73–114.

-……(2001a). 'The discourse-historical approach'. In: Ruth Wodak & Michael Meyer (Eds.). *Methods of critical discourse Analysis*. 63-95. London: Sage.

-……...(2001b). 'What CDA is about'. In: Ruth Wodak & Michael Meyer (Eds.). *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. 63-95. London: Sage.