



Linguistic and Literary Origins of Critical Discourse Analysis

 **Ayman Farid Ahmed Khafaga**

¹Department of English, College of Science and Humanities, Prince Sattam Bin Abdulaziz University, Saudi Arabia.

²Department of English, Faculty of Arts and Humanities, Suez Canal University, Egypt.

Corresponding Author: Ayamn Farid Ahmed Khafaga

Email: dr_ayman76@yahoo.com

Article Citation: Ahmed Khafaga, A. F. (2021). Linguistic and Literary Origins of Critical Discourse Analysis, *Applied Linguistics Research Journal*, 5 (5): 15–23.

Received Date: March 10, 2021

Accepted date: April 25, 2021

Online Date: May 5, 2021

Publisher: Kare Publishing

© 2021 Applied Linguistics Research Journal

E-ISSN: 2651-2629



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons, Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International

ABSTRACT

The main objective of this paper is to explore the linguistic and literary origins of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). The paper starts with defining the discipline in relation to its main principles and objectives as a model of analysis. Then it moves to shed light on the linguistic and literary origins of CDA by focusing on four approaches: critical linguistics (CL) and linguistic criticism (LC) on the linguistic level; and the deconstruction theory and the reception theory on the literary level. One main research question is presented in this study: to what extent does CDA derive its analytical and theoretical principles from the traditional linguistic models and literary theories? Findings reveal that CDA is dated back to both linguistic and literary theories, which in turn influences its theoretical and analytical framework to the extent that it is perceived as a deconstructive, reader-oriented approach to analyzing language that tends to end the sanctity of texts.

Keywords: critical discourse analysis, linguistic criticism, critical linguistics, deconstruction theory, reception theory, indeterminacy.

1. Introduction

Critical discourse analysis (CDA) is a branch of discourse analysis that started in the late 1970s and discussed by many linguists, such as Fairclough (1989; 1995), Fairclough and Wodak (1997), Fairclough, Pardo and Szczyński (2003), Van Dijk (1993; 1996; 2000; 2001a), Weiss and Wodak (2003), Wodak and Meyer (2001), Widdowson (2007), and others. CDA is defined by Widdowson (2007, pp. 128-129) as "a socio-politically motivated approach to the study of language in use that generally assigns ideological significance to texts on the basis of their linguistic features". Van Dijk (2001a, p. 352) states that critical discourse analysis 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".

CDA is critical because "it aims to show non-obvious ways in which language is involved in social life, including power/domination, and ideology; and points to possibilities for change" (Fairclough et al., 2003, p. 6) or because "it is rooted in a radical critique of social relations" (Billig, 2003, p. 38). Widdowson (2007, p. 71) states that CDA is critical in the sense that "it calls into questions ideas and assumptions that have become taken for granted as self-evidently valid on the grounds that they actually preserve a status quo," which, in turn, "sustains inequality and injustice by privileging the elite and the powerful at the expense of everybody else."

CDA focuses on social problems and political issues. This field perceives Discourse as a "form of social practice" (Fairclough & Wodak, 1997, p. 258). Van Dijk (2001a, p. 352) argues that CDA "exposes the ways discourse structures enact, confirm, legitimate, reproduce or challenge relations of power and dominance in society". The main concern of CDA then is to show how language reflects relations of power, reproduces dominance, and communicates ideologies.

Van Dijk (2001a, p. 353) points out that CDA has many types which are different from each other; the analysis of a conversational or narrative genre is quite different from the analysis of news reports in the press or political speeches in election campaigns. Each type has its own perspective, which is used within the framework of CDA. Yet, the clear fact is that all types of CDA discuss the way specific discourse structures are deployed in the reproduction of social dominance, whether they are part of a conversation, a narrative work, a news report, a political speech or any other genres and contexts (Van Dijk, p. 353).

2. CDA: Origin

The origin of CDA can be traced back to both literary and linguistic approaches.

2.1. Linguistic Origin

The linguistic origin of CDA can be traced back to both critical linguistics (CL) and linguistic criticism. Both approaches have been tackled by many linguists such as Fowler (1986, 1991b, 1995, 1996) and Fowler and Kress (1979). The two approaches are developed later to be critical discourse analysis (CDA).

2.1.1. Critical Linguistics

Fowler (1996) states that Critical Linguistics (CL) emerged from the writing of *Language and Control* as instrumental linguistics. For Halliday (1973, p. 9), instrumental linguistics is "the study of language for understanding something else". Critical linguistics aims to "expose misrepresentation and discrimination in a variety of modes of public discourse" (Fowler, 1996, p. 5). Fowler (1991b, p. 67) maintains that critical linguistics seeks, by studying the minute details of linguistic structure in the light of the social and historical situation of the text, to display to consciousness the patterns of belief and value which are encoded in the language and which are below the threshold of notice for anyone who accepts the Discourse as natural.

Teo (2000, p. 11) clarifies the main concern of critical linguistics as it is "a branch of discourse analysis that goes beyond the description of discourses to an explanation of how and why particular discourses are produced". Fowler (1991a, p. 89) emphasizes that CL is concerned with studying the details of the linguistic structure of the text in the light of its social and historical situation. Fowler (1996, p. 10) considers CL as "a form of history-writing or historiography", which means that the main concern of this approach is not "language as traditionally understood by linguists". Instead, CL focuses on "looking beyond the formal structure of language as an abstract system, towards the practical interaction of language and context" (Fowler, 1996, p. 10).

One conspicuous fact about critical linguistics is that it allows the reader to reinterpret and reconstruct texts. Fowler (1996, p. 6) argues that the importance of critical linguistics "would be seen primarily in its capacity to equip readers for demystificatory readings of ideology-laden text". Kress (1996, p. 16) argues that one fundamental critique of both critical linguistics (CL) and critical discourse analysis (CDA) has been that they "are heavily reception/reading oriented, with no strongly explicit account of production, or of producers". A critical discourse analysis of any text, therefore, is a deconstructive analysis since it undergoes certain factors that are essential in the analysis of a text, such as history, context, culture and the political, social and economic atmosphere in which such a text undergoes interpretation. Critical linguistics, then, has a close relationship with post-modern literary approaches such as deconstruction and reception theory or reader-response movement in the sense that the three approaches give more concern to the reader as the main element in the process of text interpretation.

2.1.2. Linguistic Criticism

Linguistic criticism is a critical approach developed from critical linguistics in the late 1970s and early 1980s. The main concern of this field is "the study of literature through its language" (Fowler, 1995, p. 11). This approach has a much longer history that dates back to the Russian formalists in the twentieth century. Linguistic criticism is a linguistic approach to literary and non-literary texts such as the media. Fowler (1995, p. 14) maintains that linguistic criticism "attempts to give an account of a text, or an author" and perceives a text as "a potential structure of meanings which can be realized by appropriate readers" (Fowler, p. 14). This approach "goes beyond the purely semantic meanings of words and sentences" (Fowler, p. 14). Linguistic criticism, thus, offers the reader an effective role in the process of interpretation. It "relates texts to writers and readers who exist within a culture and a history,

and who can thus achieve access to the social significance of texts" (Fowler, 1995, p. 14). The sole aim of Linguistic criticism is "deconstructing a text, using linguistic analysis and with the social contexts of the discourse very much in mind in order to understand how the text constitutes its own theory of reality and under what constraints" (Fowler, 1981, p. 22).

2.2. Literary Origin

This part presents the literary origin of CDA, which is related to two approaches: deconstruction theory and reception theory or reader-response movement. Both approaches have been the focus of many studies, including Fish (1976), Iser (1978; 1997), Norris (1982), Meyer (1983), Leitch (1988), Jauss (1997), Newton (1997), and Guerin et al. (1999).

2.2.1. Deconstruction Theory

The term *deconstruction* has come into the arena of literature on the hands of Roland Barthes as a reaction against structuralism. Guerin, Labor, Morgan, Reesman and Willingham (1999, p. 340) see that both structuralism and deconstruction are similar in the sense that both of them "identify textual features", while the difference between the two approaches lies in the fact that deconstruction theory "concentrates on the rhetorical rather than the grammatical" (Guerin et al., p. 340). Guerin et al. maintain that the term 'deconstruction' comes to mean that "texts are found to deconstruct themselves rather than to provide a stable, identifiable meaning" (Guerin et al., p. 340).

Meyer (1983, pp. 112-113) argues that deconstructionists insist that literary works do not have one single meaning. They believe that language can never say what we intend it to mean because anything we write conveys meanings we did not intend to express. Consequently, deconstructionists emphasize that "there can be no absolute knowledge about anything...language is not a precise instrument but a power whose meanings are caught in an endless web of possibilities that cannot be limited or reduced to a single strand of meaning". Accordingly, any idea or statement which is said to be understood separately "can be deconstructed to reveal its relations and connections to contradictory and opposite meanings" (Meyer, p. 113). A deconstructive analysis of any text, thus, aims ultimately to prove that any text is subject to a variety of possible readings.

According to Allan (2000, p. 44), Discourse does not have a self-contained meaning, but its meaning is taken on its context. He points out that the meaning of discourse "has historical as well as sociocultural qualities built into it. Language acquires its meaning in relation to outside forces and factors: context, previous text and culture". Thus, there are certain elements that have a great influence on the process of interpreting a text. These elements are integrated with each other in order to create harmony between the meaning of Discourse and its history and context. Gadavani (2002, p. 36) sees this harmonious relation between different factors within a text as a "quality of discourse that prevents it from being interpreted literally".

Deconstruction theory and discourse analysis, then, are closely related to each other because both approaches depend on the reader's response to a text and his/her political, social, economic or religious background. Consequently, a CDA of one particular text by, for example, a British or American reader is expected to be completely different from a CDA of an Egyptian reader of the same text.

2.2.2. Reception Theory

Reception theory or reader-response movement, according to Norris (1982), emerged in the 1960s in reaction to the formalism of the new criticism movement that dominated and shaped the literary atmosphere during the 30s, 40s, and 50s. The new criticism movement called for the separation between the text and the reader, ignoring the role played by the reader in creating new interpretations within a text. Reception theory came to an end with such an approach and establishing a new one that aims to create a close relationship between a text and a reader. This theory highlights the process of reading as essential in understanding the meaning of a literary text. Leitch (1988, p. 214) emphasizes the importance of involving the reader in interpreting a literary text and points out that "the experience of literature involved a continuous re-adjustment of perceptions, ideas and evaluations. The meaning of a work, therefore, was to be encountered in the experience of it, not in the detritus left after the experience".

Newton (1997, p. 187) states that the difference between recent literary theory and earlier critical approaches such as Russian formalism, the new criticism, and the first phase of French structuralism is that "there has been a shift of emphasis towards the reader in much recent theory". Newton argues that in both reception theory and reader-response criticism, "the role of the reader is seen as particularly crucial" (Newton, p. 187). Reception theory, according to its leading figure, Hans Robert Jauss, tries to make a fusion "between the past experiences that are embodied in the text and the interests of its present-day readers" (qtd. in Newton, p. 187). He discusses "the relation

between the original reception of a literary text and how it is perceived at different stages in history up until the present" (qtd. in Newton, p. 187).

Reception theory rejects both the complete authority of the writer and the complete autonomy of the text and paves the way to a greater role for the reader. The reader is no longer that person who perceives passively or "follows the directions in the text in order to distinguish the [literary] form or discover the [literary] procedures" (Jauss, 1997, p. 190). Yet, the reader becomes an active element in the process of producing more meanings to a text. Jauss maintains that "the historical life of a literary work is unthinkable without the active participation of its addressees" (Jauss, p. 190). Thus, a triadic relation becomes clearly apparent between the author, the text, and the reader. The three elements interact to produce the meaning of a given text. Landy (1988, p. 9) believes that literature is a form of communication through which authors can be able to "share their ideas and visions with their readers".

The reader's background, thus, is the criterion upon which different interpretations of one text are to be proposed, be it historical, political, social, cultural, religious, etc. Fish (1976, p. 314), a leading figure of reader-response movement, emphasizes that it is "the structure of the reader's experience rather than any structures available on the page that should be the object of description". Iser (1997, p. 195) sees that texts are not supposed to have only one meaning because when a text carry only the meaning brought to light by interpretation, then there would remain very little else for the reader. He maintains that "a text can only come to life when it is read, and if it is to be examined, it must therefore be studied through the eyes of the reader". Summarizing the characteristics of the reader-response criticism, Meyer (1995, p. 111) states that this movement calls attention to how we read and what influences our readings. It does not attempt to define what a literary work means on the page but rather what it does to an informed reader, a reader who understands the language and conversations used in a given work.

Given that the reader dominates the greatest part in the process of producing different meanings of a text, and given the fact that CDA is also a reception/reading approach, one can claim that there is also a close relationship between reception theory and CDA. Both approaches give priority for the reader to be the source from which texts come to life, and new meanings arise. The process of reading, then, contributes to the understanding of the explicit and implicit meaning of a given text. During the process of reading, "the unsaid comes to life in the reader's imagination, so the said expands to take on greater significance than might have been supposed" (Iser, 1978, p. 111). A CDA of a text, thus, is not confined to one particular meaning, for it is the reader who has the upper hand over a text, and readers, in turn, differ according to their culture, race and religion. Any interpretation or meaning suggested by a CDA of a text cannot be considered final or determinate.

3. CDA and Indeterminacy

Based on the previous general assessment of the literary and linguistic origin of CDA, which shows a close relationship between CDA and deconstruction theory, reception theory, critical linguistics, and linguistic criticism, it becomes apparent that indeterminacy is a characteristic of CDA. This characteristic emanates from the duality that is created, during the process of reading, from the interaction between what is said or written and the unsaid or the unwritten. Given that CDA aims at "revealing the mediated connection between properties of text on the one hand, and socio-political or sociocultural structures and processes on the other hand" (Schaffner, 2004, p. 14), and admitting that social, political and cultural structures differ from one community/culture to another and even from one person to another, it follows that a text undergoes many interpretations which differ according to the social, political and cultural experiences of the reader. CDA, then, shows "different implications of different readings for social action" (Fairclough & Wodak, 1997, p. 279), which, in turn, makes us claim that a CDA of any text is indeterminate. Indeterminacy allows us to "use our imagination" (Iser, 1972, p.218), the thing which makes any analysis of a text indeterminate since it is ultimately based on the experience and imagination of the reader and his/her understanding or contemplation of the text which depends on certain social, political, economic or religious status. The reader tends to subjugate the text to his/her thought in order to attain the meaning he wants, which, of course, copes with his/her background. Iser (1997, p. 196) states that:

Indeterminacy can be counterbalanced at any given time in terms of the individual experience of the reader. He (the reader) can reduce a text to the level of his own experiences, provided that he projects his own standards onto the text in order to grasp its specific meaning.

Thus, the reader's own world of experience plays a vital role in the process of interpreting a text. The act of reading is, therefore, "a process of seeking to pin down the oscillating structure of the text to some specific meaning" (Iser, 1997, p. 197).

Every literary text then invites some sort of participation on the part of the reader because indeterminacy is "the fundamental precondition for reader participation" (Iser, 1997, p. 198). The indeterminate element of any literary text that undergoes CDA represents the link between text and reader. This indeterminacy "is the switch that activates the reader in using his own ideas in order to fulfil the intention of the text" (Iser, p. 198). A literary text has its reality in the imagination of its reader, and because "a literary text presents no real objects" (Iser, p. 196), "it opens

up the freedom that everyone can interpret in his own way" (Iser, p. 199). A CDA of a text is no longer determinate but undergoes different interpretations.

4. CDA: Goals & Principles

The goals that critical discourse analysis seeks to achieve have been studied by some linguists, including Van Dijk (1993), Fairclough and Wodak (1997), Wodak (2001) and Weiss and Wodak (2003). Van Dijk (1993, p. 252) mentions some objectives that CDA attempts to achieve. They are the following:

(i) CDA aims to discuss the discourse dimension of power abuse and the injustice and inequality that result from it. Power abuse here means "dominance" (Van Dijk, 1993, p. 255) in order to distinguish it from other forms of power that are legitimate and acceptable such as the power of the parents over their children and the power of the teachers over their students.

(ii) CDA is interested and motivated by pressing social issues, which it hopes to better understand through discourse analysis. In this regard, CDA concentrates on a fundamental understanding of social problems such as dominance and inequality.

(iii) Critical discourse analysts take an explicit sociopolitical stance. That is to say; they should spell out their point of view, perspective, principles and aims, both within their discipline and within society at large.

(iv) The work of critical discourse analysts is admittedly and ultimately political. Their hope is to change through a critical understanding of the issues surrounding them.

(v) The perspective of critical discourse analysts is those who suffer most from dominance and inequality. The problems they address are the serious ones that threaten the lives of many.

(vi) The critical targets of critical discourse analysts are the power elites that enact, sustain, legitimate, condone or ignore social inequality and injustice.

Wodak and Meyer (2001, p. 2) state that the main concern of CDA is "to investigate critically social inequality as it is expressed, signalled, constituted, legitimized and so on by language use". They maintain that the 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" (Wodak & Meyer, p.11). Fairclough and Wodak (1997, p. 258) stress one major aim of CDA as to make the "ideological loading of particular ways of using language and the relations of power which underlie them more visible"—summing up the goals of CDA, Weiss and Wodak (2003, p. 15) state that CDA is fundamentally interested in "analyzing opaque as well as transparent structural relationships of dominance, discrimination, power and control as manifested in language".

The main principles of CDA have been discussed by Fairclough and Wodak (1997, pp. 271-280), who summarize the main tenets of this approach as follows: (i) CDA addresses social problems; (ii) power relations are discursive; (iii) discourse constitutes society and culture; (iv) discourse does ideological work; (v) discourse is historical; (vi) the link between text and society is mediated; (vii) discourse analysis is interpretative and explanatory, and (viii) discourse is a form of social action.

5. CDA and Power

One fundamental element in studying Discourse in general and CDA is power because it is considered one of the "cornerstones of CDA" (Weiss & Wodak, 2003, p. 11). Power has been discussed by many linguists, such as Fairclough (1989), Stark (1996), Van Dijk (1989, 1993, 1996, 1997b, 2001a, 2001b), Pardo (2001), Partington (2003), Bloor and Bloor (1995). All emphasize the close relationship between CDA and power in the sense that CDA tries to reveal hidden power relations in Discourse.

Pardo (2001, p. 91) points out that CDA "studies discourse reflecting power abuse of any kind", whereas Fairclough (1989, p. 43) argues that the relationship between power and language is realized in two aspects: "power in discourse" and "power behind discourse". Fairclough clarifies that power in discourse "is concerned with discourse as a place where relations of power are actually exercised and enacted". In contrast, the power behind discourse "shifts the focus to how orders of discourse, as dimensions of the social orders of social institutions or societies, are themselves shaped and constituted by relations of power" (Fairclough, p. 43). He emphasizes that whether power is realized in Discourse or behind Discourse, "power is won, held and lost in social struggles" (Fairclough, p. 74). Van Dijk (2001b, p. 22) states that identifying the relationship between participants in Discourse is "vital for the definition of the context". These relations vary from "the overall categories such as formal and informal, to such relations as those of power and authority" (Van Dijk, p. 22). He clarifies that:

The representation of such relations in context models controls virtually all levels of Discourse, and not only the typical properties of formal or informal speech or politeness forms. Power or dominance may be expressed or enacted virtually everywhere in intonation, syntax, lexicalization, semantics, pragmatics (like commands), and many aspects of conversational interactions. (Van Dijk, 2001b, pp. 22-23)

The relationship between language and power is also emphasized by Bloor and Bloor (1995, p. 233), who states that "political or national power can be reflected in the language and the language, in turn, can reinforce such power". They clarify that "the exertion of power by individuals with certain social roles in particular social situations is often revealed in the form of the language" (Bloor & Bloor, p. 234) that is because the language "is both a site of and a stake in class struggle and those who exercise power through language must constantly be involved in a struggle with others to defend (or lose) their position" (Fairclough, 1989, p. 35).

Different definitions have been suggested by linguists for word power. Max Weber defines it as "the capacity of an individual to realize his will, even against the opposition of others" (qtd. in Stark, 1996, pp. 34-35). For Stark (1996, p. 36), power is "a rhetorical capacity to change political reality through inducing others to act". Within the framework of CDA, Van Dijk (1996, pp. 84-85) proposes a framework for the study of power by laying down the following definitions of the word:

- (i) Power is a property of relations between social groups, institutions or organizations. Hence, only social power, and not individual power, is considered.
- (ii) Social power is defined in terms of the control exercised by one group or organization (or its members) over the actions and/or the minds of (the members of) another group, thus limiting the freedom of action of others or influencing their knowledge, attitudes or ideologies.
- (iii) Dominance is understood as a form of social power abuse; that is, as a legally or morally illegitimate exercise of control over others in one's own interests, often resulting in social inequality.
- (iv) Power is based on privileged access to valued social resources, such as wealth, jobs or status.
- (v) Social power and dominance are often organized and institutionalized so as to allow more effective control and to enable routine forms of power reproduction.
- (vi) Dominance is seldom absolute; it is often gradual and may be met by more or less resistance or counter-power by dominated groups.

For Partington (2003, p. 127), power is one of the most confusing terms in Linguistics. He relates the notion of power to the opposing term of "solidarity" to describe the pronouns system of many European languages. The concept of power, for him, is interpreted in many cases as being "in control of the situation". Partington argues that in Linguistics, power is used in "the description of how some, the empowered, use language as an instrument of control as well as communication in relation to the powerless" (Partington, p. 128).

Van Dijk (1993, p. 254) argues that one characteristic of CDA is to clarify how language is used to confirm, reproduce, or challenge existing power relations of individuals and institutions. Stating the intimate relationship between CDA and power, Van Dijk maintains that "one crucial presupposition of adequate critical discourse analysis understands the nature of social power and dominance" (Van Dijk, p. 254). Van Dijk (1989, p. 221) states that "for power to be exercised, legitimized and reproduced, it must also be expressed and persuasively conveyed in discourse and communication".

The importance of the notion of power to the study of Discourse lies in Van Dijk's words that "if we want to understand some of the fundamental functions of discourse in interaction and society, further insights into the nature of power is needed" (Van Dijk, 1997b, p. 16). He suggests that the kind of power relevant to the study of Discourse is "social power", which he defines as "a specific relation between social groups or institutions" (Van Dijk, p. 17). One major concept of social power is "control". According to Van Dijk, "one group has power over another group if it has some form of control over the other group...we control others if we can make them act as we wish (or prevent them from acting against us)" (Van Dijk, p. 17).

The act of controlling other's actions and minds requires another important element that should go side by side with power in order to achieve control and dominance; it is *access* which is necessary for the analysis of power since power "is generally based on special access to valued social resources" (Van Dijk, 1995b, p. 11). Access may be represented in "money, force, status, fame, knowledge or information" (Van Dijk, 2001a, p. 354). Those who can control the most influential Discourse also have more chances to control the minds and actions of others. Both power and dominance, thus, should be based on the element of access.

6. CDA and Ideology

Within linguistic studies, ideology has been the main area of concern for critical discourse analysts, such as Fairclough (1989); Fowler (1991b); Van Dijk (1997, 2001b, 2004); Pardo (2001); and others. All these studies have emphasized the connection between language, power and ideology. They point out that ideology is enacted through language and helps to legitimate domination. Fowler (1991b, p. 67) states that any aspect of structure could be ideologically significant, or as he puts it, "any aspect of linguistic structure, whether phonological, syntactic, lexical, semantic, pragmatic or textual, can carry ideological significance". Fairclough (1989, p. 4) sees ideologies as "commonsense assumptions that contribute to sustaining unequal relations of power". From the perspective of critical discourse analysis, Van Dijk (2001b, p. 12) defines ideology as "a special form of social cognition shared by social groups". Ideologies then form the basis of the social representations and practices of

group members, including their Discourse which, in turn, functions as the means of ideological production. Van Dijk argues that "ideologies consist of a specific kind of 'ideas' which are called 'belief systems' or 'social representations' of some kind". These ideas "are not personal beliefs, but beliefs shared by groups" (Van Dijk, p. 12). Following Van Dijk's perspective of ideology, Sotillo (2004, p. 465) proposes that ideology is considered to be "a system of ideas, beliefs or culturally shared knowledge and discourses of a social group". For Pardo (2001, p. 100), ideology is "a belief system shared by a group". He clarifies that:

In the Marxist tradition, ideologies have been associated with the notion of class and described as "social formation". They have been attributed to the dominated class, whose power they would serve to hide or legitimate. They could also legitimate stability or the status quo. (Pardo, 2001, p. 101)

Ideology is a fundamental element that "establishes a link between discourse and society" (Van Dijk, 1997b, p.25). Ideologies are developed by dominant groups in order to "reproduce and legitimate their domination" (Van Dijk, p. 25). Van Dijk demonstrates that some strategies are used to accomplish such legitimization of domination. Among these strategies are: (a) to present domination as God-given, and (b) to persuade the dominated group to simply take such a social relation for granted (Van Dijk, p. 25). Discourse in this approach "essentially serves as the medium by which ideologies are persuasively communicated in society, and thereby helps reproduce power and domination of specific groups or classes" (Van Dijk, p. 25). Van Dijk argues that:

Ideologies serve to manage the problem of the coordination of the acts or practices of individual social members of a group. Once shared, ideologies make sure that members of a group will generally act in similar ways in similar situations, cooperate in joint tasks, and thus contribute to group cohesion, solidarity (Van Dijk, 1997b, p. 26)

Van Dijk, Aertselaer and Putz (2004, p. xv) stress that the notion of ideology is relevant to all disciplines of humanities and the social sciences. Ideologies are important in linguistic and Discourse studies in order to examine how they are "verbally expressed, formulated and reproduced in processes of interaction and communication among ideological ingroup members, or between ingroup members and ideological outgroup members". Van Dijk (2004, p. 16) argues that ideologies are close to what he has called "socially shared group knowledge, such as the specific knowledge shared by students, linguists, feminists, stamp collectors or the citizens of Barcelona". Weiss and Wodak (2003, p. 14) point out that ideology, for CDA, "is seen as an important means of establishing and maintaining unequal power relations". They maintain that CDA "takes a particular interest in the ways in which language mediates ideology in a variety of social institutions" (Weiss & Wodak, 2003, p. 14). The following figure (1) summarizes the main elements discussed in the previous part concerning CDA.

7. Conclusion

This study provided a general overview of the linguistic and literary origins of critical discourse analysis. It demonstrated that CDA could be traced back to specific linguistic approaches, such as linguistic criticism and critical linguistics, as well as to particular literary theories, including the deconstruction theory and the reception theory. The study shows that CDA offers a deconstructive reading and interpretation of texts. It depends entirely on the reader's background, be it political, social, cultural or religious. This approach does not offer a determinate, absolute or final meaning to texts, but it is an indeterminate way of analysis; it allows a variety of interpretations to texts depending on the notion of readership. This study further showed that the idea of discovering other meanings in texts/discourses is the core concern of CDA since it perceives any text as a source that can be analyzed in relation to the current and surrounding circumstances or the context of situation wherein Discourse is produced, reproduced and received. CDA, therefore, is said to be a culturally, socially and religiously specific approach to analyzing language. It deals with any text as a document ready to be deconstructed in order to address issues relevant to our own times. As a deconstructive approach, CDA attempts to end the sanctity of texts.

Acknowledgement

This publication was supported by the Deanship of Scientific Research at Prince Sattam Bin Abdulaziz University, KSA.

References

- Allan, G. (2000). *Intertextuality: The new critical idiom*. London: Routledge.
- Billig, M. (2003). Critical discourse analysis and the rhetoric of critique. In Weiss, G. & Wodak, R. (Eds.), *Critical discourse analysis: Theory and interdisciplinarity* (pp. 35-46). Palgrave Macmillan Ltd.
- Bloor, T. & Bloor, M. (1995). *The functional analysis of English: A Hallidayan approach*. London & New York: Arnold.
- Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and power*. London & New York: Longman
- Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. London & New York: Longman.
- Fairclough, N. & Wodak, R. (1997). Critical discourse analysis. In T. Van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse as social interaction: Discourse studies: A multidisciplinary introduction* (pp. 258-284). Vol. 2, Sage Publications.

- Fairclough, N., Pardo, S. & Szerszynski, B. (2003). Critical discourse analysis and citizenship. In Bora, A. & Hausendorf, H. (Eds.), *constructing citizenship* (pp. 1-17). John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Fish, S. (1976). Interpreting the variorum. In David Lodge (Ed.), *Modern criticism and theory: A reader* (pp. 310-329). London & New York: Longman.
- Fowler, R. (1986). *Linguistic criticism*. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press.
- Fowler, R. (1991a). Critical linguistics. In Kirsten Malmkjar (Ed.), *The linguistic encyclopedia*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Fowler, R. (1991b). *Language in the News: Discourse and ideology in the press*. London: Routledge.
- Fowler, R. (1995). *The language of George Orwell*. Macmillan Press Ltd.
- Fowler, R. (1996). On critical linguistics. In Carmen Rosa Caldas- Coulthard & Malcolm Coulthard (Eds.), *Texts and Practices: Readings in critical discourse analysis* (pp. 15-31). London & New York: Routledge.
- Fowler, R. & Kress, G. (1979). Critical linguistics. In R. Fowler, R. Hodge, G. Kress & T. Trew (Eds.) *Language and control* (pp. 185- 213). London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Gadavani, S. (2002). Intertextuality as discourse strategy: The case of no-confidence debates in Thailand. In Nelson, D. (Ed.), *Leeds working papers in linguistics and phonetics*. 9, 35-55.
- Guerin, W., Earle Labour, Lee Morgan, Jeanne Reesman & John Willingham (1999). *A handbook of critical approaches to literature*. New York & Oxford. Oxford University Press.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1973). *Explorations in the functions of language*. London: Edward Arnold
- Iser, W. (1972). The reading process: A phenomenological approach. In David Lodge (Ed.), *Modern criticism and theory: A reader* (pp.212-228). London & New York: Longman.
- Iser, W. (1978). Interaction between text and reader. In Susan R. Suleiman & Inge Crossman (Eds.), *The reader in the text: Essays on audience and interpretation* (pp. 106-119). Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Iser, W. (1997). Indeterminacy and the reader's response. In Newton, K. M. (Ed.), *Twentieth-century literary theory* (2nd edition) (pp.195- 199). London: Macmillan Press Ltd.
- Jauss, R. H. (1997). Literary history as a challenge to literary theory. In Newton, K. M. (Ed.), *Twentieth-century literary theory* (2nd edition) (pp.189-194). London: Macmillan Press Ltd.
- Kress, G. (1996). Representational resources and the production of subjectivity: Questions for the theoretical development of critical discourse analysis in a multicultural society. In Carmen Rosa Caldas-Coulthard & Malcolm Coulthard (Eds.), *Texts and Practices: Readings in critical discourse analysis* (pp. 15-31). London and New York: Routledge.
- Landy, A. S. (1988). *The heath introduction to literature*. D.C. Heath and company, U.S.A.
- Leitch, V. (1988). *American literary criticism from the 30's to the 80's*. New York: Colombia University Press.
- Meyer, M. (1995). *Thinking and writing about literature*. Boston: Bedford Books of ST. Martin's Press.
- Newton, K. M. (Ed.) (1997) *Twentieth-century literary theory*. London: Macmillan Press Ltd.
- Norris, C. (1982). *Deconstruction: Theory and practice*. (Revised Edition). London: Routledge.
- Pardo, M. L. (2001). Linguistic persuasion as an essential factor in current democracies: Critical analysis of the globalization discourse in Argentina at the turn and the end of the century. *Discourse & Society*, 12 (1), 91-118. London: Sage Publications.
- Partington, A. (2003). *The linguistics of political argument: The spin-doctor and the wolf-park at the White House*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Schaffner, C. (2004). Political discourse analysis from the point of view of translation studies. *Journal of Language and Politics*, 3:1, 117- 150. John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Sotillo, S. M. (2004). Political Discourse in cyberspace and outcomes in real times. In Martin P., JoAnne N. A. & Teun A. Van Dijk (Eds.) *Communicating ideologies: Multidisciplinary perspectives on language, Discourse, and social practice* (pp. 465-502). New York & Oxford: Peter Lang.
- Stark, F. M. (1996). *Communicative interaction, power and the state: A method*. University of Toronto Press.
- Teo, P. (2000). Racism in the news: A critical discourse analysis of news reporting in two Australian newspapers. *Discourse & Society*, 11, 7-49. London: Sage Publications.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1989). Structures of Discourse and structures of power. In J. A. Anderson (Ed.), *Communication yearbook* (pp. 18-59). Vol. 12. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1993). Principles of critical discourse analysis. *Discourse & Society*, 4 (2), 249-283. London: Sage.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1995b). Power and the news media. In D. Paletz (Ed.), *Political communication and action* (pp. 9-36). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1996). Discourse, power and access. In Carmen Rosa Caldas-Coulthard & Malcolm Coulthard (Eds.), *Texts and Practices: Readings in critical discourse analysis* (pp. 84-104). London & New York.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (Ed.) (1997b). Discourse as interaction in society. In *Discourse as Social Interaction: Discourse studies: A multidisciplinary introduction*. Vol. 2, (pp. 1-37). Sage publications.

- Van Dijk, T. A. (2000). On the analysis of parliamentary debates on immigration. In M. Reisigl & R. Wodak (Eds.), *The semiotics of racism: Approaches to critical discourse analysis* (pp. 85-103). Vienna: Passagen Verlag.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2001a) Critical discourse analysis. In Deborah Schiffrin, Deborah Tannen & Heidi E. Hamilton (Eds.), *The handbook of discourse analysis* (pp. 352-392). Blackwell.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2001b). Discourse, ideology and context. *Folia Linguistica*, xxx/1-2, 11-40. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2004). Discourse, knowledge and ideology: Reformulating old questions and proposing some new solutions. In Martin P. JoAnne N. A. & Teun A. Van Dijk (Eds.), *Communicating ideologies: Multidisciplinary perspectives on language, discourse, and social practice* (pp. 5-38). New York & Oxford: Peter Lang.
- Van Dijk, T. A., Aertselaer, J. & Putz, M. (Eds.). (2004) Introduction: Language, Discourse and ideology. In *Communicating ideologies: Multidisciplinary perspectives on language, Discourse, and social practice* (pp. xiii-xxx). New York & Oxford: Peter Lang.
- Weiss, G. & Wodak, R. (Eds.) (2003) *Critical discourse analysis: Theory and interdisciplinarity*. Palgrave Macmillan Ltd.
- Widdowson, H. G. (2007) *Discourse analysis*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Wodak, R. (Ed.) (1989). *Language, power and ideology: Studies in Political Discourse*. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Wodak, R. & M. Meyer (Eds.) (2001). *Methods of critical discourse analysis*. London: Sage.