The Validity Of CDA As A Means Of "Uncovering" The Ideologies Implicit In Discourse.

Mustafa Khalid Saleh Al-Rawi
MA English Language And Applied Linguistics (ELAL)
Assistant Lecturer At The Department Of English Language Cihan University – Sulaimanyah – Iraq

AbstractL:- The Aim Of This Study Was To Briefly Discuss A Number Of Views In Regard To The Validity Of CDA As An Approach Of Uncovering Ideologies And Provided Some Examples Of Hegemony And Of The Relationship Between CDA And Language Cognition. CDA Offered An Approach Of Analysis That Could Identify The Language Change And Its Reasons As Well As A System To Interpret The Language Of Discourses With Regard To Social, Power And Political Ideologies.CDA Could Be Considered The Most Effective Approach In Revealing Implicit And Deceptive Ideologies, Presenting Deeper Analysis Without Any Evasion Of Social And Political Aspects.

Key Words:- *Discourse Analysis,   Critical Discourse Analysis,   Ideology,   Social, Political And Cultural Aspects*

I.   INTRODUCTION

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) As A Language Model Is An Approach Of Textual Commentary That Developed In The 1990s And Became More Important, After That, In A Large Number Of Researches, And Plenty Of CDA's Research Observations Tend To Be Legitimate (Stubbs, 1997). The Most Significant Argumentation Regarding CDA Is That, There Are Relations Between Language And Power And Ideology And Between 'Ways Of Speaking' And 'Ways Of Seeing' (Thinking) (Fairclough, 2010). The Critical Discourse Analysts Analyse The Discourses In Terms Of Their Relations To Social Power And Ideology 'Sociocultural Practise' Not Just In Terms Of 'Discourse Practise', As Fairclough (1992 Cited In Fairclough, 2010) Stated, In The Late Modern World, Language Functions Have Been Developed. Therefore, Analysing Any Discourse In Terms Of Only Discourse Practise May, To A Large Extent, Exclude A Number Of Aspects That Already Exists In The Discourse And As A Result It Would Influence The Understanding Of That Discourse. Fairclough And Wodak (1997 Cited In O'Halloran, 2003: 12) Shows The Main Aspects That CDA Encompasses, Which Are: Social Problems Are What CDA Handles, The Relations Of Power Are Discursive, Discourse Frames Culture And Society, So It Has Relations With History And Serve Ideological Purposes, Discourse Analysis Could Be Interpretative As Well As Explanatory, And Discourse Organises A Social Action. Thus, The Benefit Of CDA Is Not Only To Interpret Discourses Of The World But Also To Reveal An Explanation That The Discourses, Through Their Ideology, Might Be Aimed To Obtain Social Power. Ideologies Are Located In Both The Structures Of The Discourses As Well As The Events Described In These Discourses (Fairclough, 2010). When They Are In The Structures, They Are A System Of Codes Used In Certain Semantic Relations; They Show Events In A Way Being Restricted By Social Habits And Norms. Although Ideologies Could Be The Property Of Events, They Appear To Be Merged With Structures Because Structures Are The Representatives Of The Events, But These Ideologies Might Be Difficult To 'Read Off' Discourses Because Their Processes Attach To Discourses As Social Events That Are Accessible To A Large Number Of Interpretations (Ibid, 2010). It Is Important To Understand The Effectiveness Of CDA As A Means Of Revealing The Implicit Ideologies In Discourses, Though There Are Different Views Considering CDA. This Essay Will Briefly Discuss A Number Of Views In Regard To The Validity Of CDA As An Approach Of Uncovering Ideologies And Provide Some Examples Of Hegemony And Of The Relationship Between CDA And Language Cognition.

II.   VIEWS REGARDING THE CDA'S VALIDITY IN REVEALING IDEOLOGIES

Ideologies Could Be Existed Explicitly And/Or Implicitly In Discourses; It Has Been Established That CDA Has The Legitimacy To Interpret These Implicit Ideologies, Though Explicit Ones Would Be Obviously Described. However, There Are Different Views Considering The Ability Of CDA As A Means Of Revealing The Implicit Ideologies. Understanding The Type Of Relations Which Links Ideologies With Discourses And The Reason Of The Use Of Ideologies (Especially The Implicit Ones) In The First Place Would Acknowledge

Ways Of Analysing These Discourses. CDA Takes Into Consideration: Whorf (1956) Hypothesis Which Is The Use Of Language As A Social Tool That Shapes How People See The World, Foucault Claim That There Is No Reality In Discourses, People Who Creates The Reality And The Discourses Place People According To Their Social Status (Fairclough, 2010). Stubbs (1997) Argued That CDA Did Not Make Clear Evidence Of How Language Could Influence Thought. However, There Is A Number Of Researches Demonstrated That Language Affects Thinking, Moreover, The Fact That A Number Of Ideas Tend To Be 'Naturalized' (Common Sense) In One Context (May Be Language) But Not The Other (Fairclough, 1995; 2010). Widdowson (1995) Claimed That CDA Is Not Obviously On Linguistic Analysis Basis But Depends Mostly On Political Agenda. CDA's Main Interest, However, Is To Provide An Analysis Without Evading From Any Possible Aspects That Could Affect The Meanings (Goals) Of Discourses. A Number Of These Goals Are 'Non-Explanatory' (Explicitly Mentioned Or Described In Discourses) Need 'Micro' Structures Representing/Reproducing, Whilst Other Goals Are 'Local/General- Explanatory' Which Seems To Be Implicit In Discourses And Need 'Macro' Structures Representing/Reproducing (Local- Explanatory Is The Interpretation According To Specific Institutions Or Organisations, While General- Explanatory Is The Interpretation Regarding The Whole Effects Of Discourses) (Fairclough, 2010: 45). Therefore, In CDA's Both Micro And Macro Structures Reproduction, Linguistic Analysis Would, To A Significant Extent, Be Taken Into Account, But In Macro Structures, There Is A Use Of 'Transdisciplinary' System Of Analysis To Provide Deeper Insights Of The Relationship Between Discourses And Other Social Elements.   Stubbs (1997) Supposed That CDA's Methods Are 'Circular' (Fallacious And Deceptive) That Their Analysis Is Inexplicable Regarding Only Fragments Of Discourses, And There Is No Relation (Or Even It Is Paradoxical) Between The Official Features Of Discourses And CDA's Interpretations. Fairclough (1989; 2010), On The Other Hand, Points Out That One Of The Significant Goals Of CDA Is To Reveal Evasion Or Deception (If There Is) From Discourses Providing Clear Interpretation; CDA Tends Not Only To Give Descriptions Or Commentary Of Discourses, It Involves A 'Systematic' Analysis Of Discourses. It Seems That CDA, Occasionally, Concerns With Fragments Of Discourses; It Would Not Serve Mystifying The Truth, But In Terms Of "[…] Address[Ing] Social Wrongs In […] Discursive Aspects And [Providing] Possible Ways Of Righting Or Mitigating Them" (Fairclough, 2010: 11). Thus, The Function Of CDA Would Not Be Simply Just Analysing Discourses In Terms Of Linguistic Structures Analysis, But To Relate These Structures With Social Aspects In Order To Gain Understanding Of Meanings (Ideologies) Behind These Discourses And What The Purposes Of Acquiring Such Ideologies As Well As The Procedure Discursive Practices' Producers Use To Merge These Ideologies With Linguistic Structures, Consequently, CD Analysts (With The Use Of Transdisciplinary Or Interdisciplinary Approach Of Analysis) Would Be Able To Interpret These Discourses. Stubbs (1997: 4) Suggested That "If It Is Not Possible To Read The Ideology Off The Texts [Discourses], Then The Analysts Themselves Are Reading Meanings Into Texts On The Basis Of Their Own Unexplicated Knowledge"; Stubbs Claimed That CD Analysts Create Something Which Is Not Actually Existed In Discourses. However, As Mentioned Before, CDA Obtains Interdisciplinary Principle Of Analysis. The (Descriptive) Linguistic Analysis Depends On Three Aspects (Fairclough, 1989; 2010): The First Is The 'Background Knowledge' Which Is The Transparent Facts Explicitly Known In Interaction Such As: Beliefs, General Knowledge And (Explicit) Values And Ideologies. The Second Is 'Goals' Which Are Either 'Speaker Goals' Representing The Interactional Processes Used Consciously By Speakers, Or 'Activity Goals' That Represent The Type Of Activity I.E. The Action Done Or Need To Be Done. The Last Aspect Is 'Power And Status' Which Is Related To 'Activity Goal' (The Explicit Policy/ Ideology Done Or Maybe Coerced By Discursive Practices Of Dominant Institutions Or Organisations). Therefore, The Procedure Of (Descriptively) Analysing These Three Aspects Seems To Be Straightforward. Whereas CDA Would Be Nominated To Analyse These Aspects Thoroughly (Because Of The Use Of Transdisciplinary Approach) Or When There Is Insufficiency Of Descriptive Analysis, Because, In A Number Of Instances, Discourses Might Be Complicated (When Goals, Ideologies, Social Power/Status As Well As Values And Beliefs Are Implicit Or Deceptive). Furthermore, As Language In The 'Modern World' Are 'Usagebased' (Halliday's Functional Grammar), There Would Be A Strong Relationship Between 'Ways Of Talking' And 'Ways Of Seeing (Thinking)'. Thus, CD Analysts Might 'Read Meaning Into' Discourses Unconsciously, Apart From The Sake Of Deception (Fairclough, 1989). The Reason Behind Reading Meaning Into Discourses Is That Certain Discourses, Such As: Persuasive And Propaganda, Provide Textual 'Cues' That Position The Readers (Consumers/Interpreters) Within Discourses; Readers Might Not Agree To Be Positioned By Text (Discourses) Producers. Additionally, It Might Be Possible That Neither Producers Nor Readers Are Conscious About 'Imposing Assumptions' (Ibid, 1989). However, Discourses Producers Tend, Intentionally And Implicitly, To Place Reader Into Certain Positions Or Impose Assumptions To Deceive Readers By Presenting The World In A Specific Way, Which Drive Interpreters Also To Use Certain Perspective In Interpreting The Discourses. Fairclough (1989; 2010) Pointed Out That Ideologies Of Power Inequality Would Be Effective If They Work Implicitly, But If They Work Explicitly, They Either Turn To Be Common Sense (Naturalised) And Lose Its Ideological Function, Or It Became Vulnerable To People/Interpreters; Conversely, If The Common Sense Promotes Power Inequality, It

Would Function Ideologically. So, The Reproducing/Representing Of Discourses Would Either Be 'Automatic' By The Process Of 'Gap-Filling' When The Ideologies Are Explicit, Or Be Obtained Via The Process Of 'Inferencing' When The Ideologies Are Implicit (Ibid, 1989). Moreover, Gee (2011: 9) Argued That The Supporters Of Descriptive Linguistic Analysis, Overwhelmingly, Regard Critical Linguistic Analysis To Be "Unscientific" Because They "…Swayed By [Their] Interest Of Passion For Intervening In Some Problem In The World", While Critical Linguistic Analysis Supporters Consider The "…Purely Descriptive Approach [As] An Evasion Of Social And Political Responsibility". It Is Possible To Say That Descriptive Analysis Supporters Look At CDA From The Perspective Of Descriptive Approach, Which Tends To Be Organised (According To Rules) And That Is Why CDA Is Unscientific (To Them), However, If Descriptive Analysis Supporters Look At CDA From Other Perspectives (Considering It As An Interdisciplinary Approach) They Would Found Out That CDA Is The Development Of Descriptive Analysis I.E. CDA Would Be The Next Stage Of Analysis After The Descriptive One, And As Mentioned Before, Discourses Producers (Consciously Or Unconsciously) May Lead Interpreters To Use Certain Perspective While Interpreting Discourses, They Would Not Be 'Swayed' Intentionally, But If So, They Would Have Another Purposes Of Analysis. Certain Discourses Would Not Be Fully Understood (Analysed) Without Social/Political Aspects, Therefore, Descriptive Analysis Alone Would Be An 'Evasion' Of Aspects That Could Influence Discourses Analysis (Meanings). As Gee (2011: 10) Indicated, If The Language Is Usage-Based, "[…] It Is Our Responsibility As Discourse Analysts To Study It […] [And] [I]N This Sense, All Discourse Analysis Is Critical Discourse Analysis". The Next Parts Of This Essay Will Discuss And Provide Examples Of Discourse Hegemony And Coercion As Well As The Relationship Between CDA And Cognitive Linguistics, Because These Concepts Would Provide An Evidence Of The Validity Of CDA In Revealing The Social/Power Ideologies.

III. COERCION AND HEGEMONY

Before Starting With These Aspects, It Is Worth To Mention Jones (2007: 358-9) Examples Regarding CDA's Relations To Social Changes. Considering That Social Changes Do Not Relate To Discourses (As It Takes Place Outside The Discourses), He Claimed That This Relation Is 'Peculiar' And 'Radical' In Two Examples: "Shopping [Does Not Exist] As A Discourse As Well As The Process Of Choosing And Buying Goods I Want", "[…] Activity Of Building My Fence [Does Not Exist] As A Sketch As Well As The Real [Action] In The Garden", He Argued That They Exist In The Discourse Only Once But Not Twice. However, For The First Example, It (Shopping) Exists Twice, Once As Concept, And Other As An Activity Which Both Tend To Be Strongly Related (As One Is The Reason Of The Other), For The Second Example, Logically, The Fence Existed Three Times: The First As An Idea Or Notion, The Second As A Plan (On Paper), And Finally (After Being Built) As Actually In The Garden. The Point Is That Stages Are Related And Can Shape Each Other, So, Social Changes Might, To A Significant Extent, Influence Discourses And It Would Be Important For Analysts (Interpreters) To Know This Type Of Influence (Fairclough, 1989; 1995; 2010). This Type Of Influence (Relation) Can Be Related To Discourse Coercion And Hegemony. By Returning To The Aspects Of Coercion And Hegemony, It Is Known That The Social Inequality Happens When People Lack The Ability To Access The Various Activities And Identities Which Are Linked To Social And Power Status, Moreover, The Fact That "[D]Iscourses Always Involve More Than Language" (Gee, 1999: 25), Would Allow The Assumption That Discourses Might, To An Extent, Have The Concept Of 'Hegemony' In Order To Obtain Dominance. Hegemony Is A Concept Initiated By Gramsci Related To His Theory Of Power. Fairclough (1995) Indicates That, In Institutions' Discursive Practices, The Installation Of Hegemony And 'Hegemonic Struggle' Might Be Postulated; If These Institutions Or Organisations Nominate 'Naturalized' Ideologies, (For Them) Obtaining Discourse Dominance (Hegemony) Would Be Reinforced. However, There Might Be Conflicts Regarding The Hegemonic Acquisition Because Of The Number Of Institutions Demanding Dominance, And Also The Concept Of Inequality Would Be Agitated Whenever There Is A Prolonged Gap Between Contestants (Groups/Institutions' Discursive Practices) Considering Power Status. Fairclough (2010: 61) Pointed Out That "[H]Egemony Is Leadership As Well As Domination Across The Economic, Political, Cultural And Ideological Domains Of A Society". Therefore, This Concept Is Beneficial While Analysing Particular Ideology As Well As The Whole Discourse In General. In Addition, This Concept Is Not Stable (Temporal And/Or Partial) I.E. There Would Be (Always) 'Anti-Power' Or Hegemony Resistance (Opposition) From Other Discourse Practices In Order To Magnetize (Achieving) Hegemony (Ibid, 2010). Achieving Hegemony Needs Discursive Practices' 'Strategic' Reshaping To An Extent That Effect Both The Dominant Discursive Practices (In Gaining Its Dominance) As Well As The Other (Struggling) Discursive Practices To Accept The New Hegemony, And Fairclough Called This Reshaping As 'Technologization Of Discourse' (1995). As For Coercion, This Aspect Is A Strategy Used In Discourses Especially Political Ones, Which Is Include 'Positive Presentation' From The Eyes Of Discourses Producers And Allies; It Is Usually, However, Involve 'Negative Presentation' From The Perspectives Of Other Discourses (Groups Whose Not Belong To The Coercive Discourses) (Chilton, 2004 Cited In Hart, 2010). Coercion Is "[…] An Intention To Affect The Beliefs, Emotions And Behaviours Of

Others In Such A Way That Suits One's Own Interests" (Hart, 2010: 63). Emotive Coercion Might Be One Of The Effective Ways Of Revealing Power Status, Because It Depends Mostly On Power Status, The More Emotive Coercion Used In Discourses The More Socially Powerful Producers. Alternatively, The More Emotive Coercion Used In Discourses Might Agitate (Non-Belonging) Discourses Consumers, Which In Turn, Involves In Increasing Hegemonic Struggle (Ibid, 2010). The Use Of Coercion Would Be An Evidence Of The Relationship Between Saying And Thinking Which Is Related To The Functions Of Language (Being Usage-Based) As Well As To Evidence That Discourses Involve More Than Language (Social/Power Ideologies) (Which Evidence The Validity Of CDA In Revealing Ideologies). An Example Of Hegemony And Coercion Is In The Study Of Behnam And Mahmoudy (2013); They Critically Analysed 38 Reports Of The International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) Regarding Iran's Nuclear Program. The Reports Have Been Interpreted In All Fairclough's Levels Of Analysis (Micro, Meso, Macro), And They Found Out That There Is A Functional Use Of The Textual Features Of 'Negation' And 'Repetition' And Interpersonal Features Of 'Persuasion' And 'Argumentation'. The Aspects Of Ideological Hegemony As Well As Coercion Have Been Found, For Instance (Ibid, 2013: 2199-2200) "Undeclared, Uncertainties, Unresolved" Which Showed Hegemony In Terms That The Agency Is The Judge And Have To Know Everything, As Well As The Use Of These Negative Terms Would Create 'Unsafe/Unsecure' View Of Iran's Program. "Must, Should, Is Required, Iran Has Failed…, It Is Essential That Iran Also Provide Without Further Delay…, [The Agency] Continues To Urge Iran…",These Examples Do Not Only Show Hegemony But To Show Coercion As Well. Therefore, CDA Would Be The Approach That Provides The Implicit Meaning Of Such Type Of Discourses.

IV. CDA WITH COGNITION REVEAL IDEOLOGY

In The Study Of Revealing Ideologies From Discourses, There Is A Significant Method Which Is The Cooperation Between CDA And Cognitive Linguistics; As Ideological Researches Are The Main Focus In CDA, Cognitive Linguistics, In These Researches, Has Specifically Concentrated On How The Dominant Ideologies Or The 'Racist' Ideologies Are Created And Provoked By Virtue Of Discourses (Nunez -Perucha, 2011). Van Dijk (1998) Demonstrated That There Is A 'Resistance' Because Dominant Ideologies' Opponents Might, To An Extent, Also Have Ideologies (Which Are Apparently Against The Dominant Ideologies), And This Resistance Is Because Of The Sociocognitive Aspects In Terms Of Culture, Principles And Values. Ideologies Could Be Interpreted, From The Cognitive Linguistics Perspective, Through The Roles Of 'Metaphors' Used In Discourses That Constitute The Political Stand Or Framing Specific Policy For Instance: The Use Of The Words 'War' And 'Terror' (Lakoff, 2004 Cited In Nunez -Perucha, 2011). These Metaphors Considered As, From The CDA's Perspective, Having Two Roles In Discourses: 'Conceptual' And 'Pragmatic', As For The Conceptual (Interpersonal) Role, Nunez –Perucha (2011: 98) Pointed Out That "[T]His View Of Metaphor As A Linguistic Choice Used Not Only For Expressing Attitudes And Believes But Also For Influencing Them Becomes Central To The Analysis Of Political Discourse", Therefore, There Is An Ideological (Persuasive) Function Which Sets A Mutual Understanding Between Interlocutors. Similarly, The Roles Of Pragmatic Metaphors Are Used To Establish Persuasive Purposes. In Discursive Practices, Ideologies Participate In Forming, (Re)Producing, (Re)Presenting, Or Transforming Meanings, And This Participation Is An Important Aspect Which Organise Ideologies In A Type Of Systemised Ideas Belong To "The Fundamental Social Cognition" (Van Dijk, 1993a Cited In Nunez -Perucha, 2011: 100). According To Van Dijk (1998), Ideologies Are Formed By Six Categories: 'Membership' Which States The Group's Identity, 'Task' Which Represents The Type Of Activity That The Group Do, 'Goals' Which Are The Aims That The Group Wants To Achieve, 'Norms And Values' Which Shows The Groups Beliefs, 'Resources' Which Represents The Status In Terms Of 'Having And Not Having', And Finally 'Position' Which Also Shows The Status But In Terms Of Relations To Other Groups. By These Categories, It Seems That Ideologies Are Extremely Intervening In Discourses, And This Intervening Is Parallel To The Number Of Groups Those Want To Be Dominant I.E. When The 'Fighting' Groups To Gaining Power Increase, Their Concept Of 'Inequality' (In Accessing Social Status) Might Be Actually Or Unconsciously (Cognitively, May Be Just A Feeling Of Inequality) Increase; Therefore, Ideologies Used In Their Discourses Would Increase Too In Order To Obtain Dominance.

The Ideologies Used In Discourses Serve The Manipulation Of Communication, And This Manipulation Could Serve Both The Discourses Producers As Well As Its Interpreters. Discourses Producers Would Try To Make Their Discourses Maintain Its Interest For A Long Time, Though 'Consumers'' (Interpreters') Thinking Might Change According To The Social Effects, Because The Society Changes Might Influence The Interpretation Of Discourses (Hart, 2010). Discourses Consumers, On The Other Hand, Would Only Accept The Discourses That Suit Their Interests And Refuse To Perceive Discourses That Are Against Their Interests, So Both Producers And Consumers Are Seeking For An Advantage Through Their Producing And Their Interpreting, Respectively, But The Advantage Of One Of Them Is At The Expense Of The Other, If The Discourses Are Beneficial To Producers Then They Are At The Cost Of Consumers And Vice Versa (Ibid, 2010). It Appears

That There Is A Relationship Between Producers And Consumers In The Sense That The Dominance Or The Power Of Discourses (The Producers' Goal) Could Be Achieved If There Is A Cognitive Understanding Between Interlocutors. However, Discourses Producers May Not Understand Their Consumers, But (As Mentioned Above) They May Use Strategies (Which Are Also Related To Human Cognition) That Manipulate And Deceive The Consumers' Thinking In Order To Achieve Their Goal. O'Halloran (2003) Pointed Out That There Are Certain Circumstances Which The Manipulative (Mystification) Analyses Do Not Cooperate With The Socio-Cognitive Analyses, Which Are: It Is Assumed That, In Socio-Cognitive Analyses, Part Of The Discourses Manipulation Is Accessed Directly And The Other Part Require Consumers' Work. However, There Are A Number Of Manipulative Discourses Which Are Written/Spoken To 'Gist Consumers' (Those Who Are 'Non-Energetic' Or 'Non-Cognitive'), So, They Would Not Know That They Are Manipulated, Manipulative Analyses Are 'Weak Representation' In Regard To Socio-Cognitive Analyses, Because The Latter Reproduce Ideology, And Discourses Consumers Are More Explicit In Sociocognitive Analyses Than In Manipulative Analyses, Whose Interpreters Do Not 'Consume' But Gradually Interpret The Discourses. It Has Been Claimed That Because Of These Limitations Between The Two Analyses, The Cooperation Between CDA And Cognition Causes Problems Within The Discourses Interpretation (O'Halloran, 2003). However, CDA Tends Not To Encounter Or Misinterpret Cognitive Analysis, The Aim Of CDA, As An Interdisciplinary Approach, Is To Provide A Deeper Perspective Of The Relationship Between Cognition And Ideology (Social/Discursive Practises). The Relationship Between Cognition And Ideology Will Be Shown In These Two Examples: The First Example Is The Study Established By Nunez -Perucha (2011) Regarding The Critical Analysis Of Four Speeches Of Three Different Waves Of Feminism. It Has Been Found That Metaphors Are Used In Framing Political Issues And The Use Of 'Image Schemas' Considering The Dominance (Power) Relations Especially: "CONTAINER; FORCE" Schemas (Ibid, 2011: 101). For Instance: 'He Has Oppressed Her', '...She Is Compelled To Promise Obedience To Her Husband…', 'She Alone Is Punished…', '…She Walks Into An Office…', And '…We Are Moving A Barrier' (These Examples Are Picked Chronologically) In These Five Examples The Producers Have Different Ideologies Regarding To Three Waves And Represent Them Through The Use Of Image Schemas, In The First Three Examples Men Are The Actors (Force) And 'She' Seems To Be The' Victim' (The Goal Of Negative Actions) And 'Contained' In A Position Beneath Men, In The Fourth, She Is The Actor And Apparently Being With Men At The Same Status 'Job Container' And Finally 'We' Not Just 'She' (Actors) Shows Unity And Strength 'A Barrier' Is A Metaphoric Use That Represents The Periods Where Women Were Oppressed And Also The Oppressor (Men) And Their Status Seemed Strongly Independent. It Is Possible To Mention That The First Wave's Goal (Ideology) Was To Achieve The Position Of The Second, And The Second's Was To Achieve The Third's. The Second Example Is The Study Of Lu And Ahrens (2008) In Representing The Influence Of Taiwanese Presidential Speeches' Ideologies On The Use Of 'BUILDING Metaphors'. Using Corpora, The Authors Critically Analysed The Speeches Of Four Presidents (Chiang K., Chiang C., Lee, And Chen), Briefly, There Were Two Kinds Of Metaphors In Their Speeches: 'Retrospective BUILDING Metaphors' And 'RECONSTRUCTION Metaphors' And They Were Mostly Used By The First President, Chiang K. (Who Is Socialist 'China And Taiwan Are One'), Less Used By The Other Two And Rarely Or Never Used By The Last One, Chen (Who Is A Communist 'Taiwan Is Not Part Of China'). The Retrospective Metaphors Referred To The Glorious Past Of China And The RECONSTRUCTION Ones Referred To Communism As Separator (Destroyer); These Metaphors Seemed To Be Against Chen's Interests, So He Tried To Avoid Them And Used Substitutional Ones For Instance: 'JOURNEY' And 'BUSINESS' Metaphors (Ibid, 2008: 397;398). The Point Is That Their Cultural And Societal Stands (Ideologies) Affect Their Use Of Cognition (Metaphors), So They Are Framing Their Speeches By The Motivation Of Their Ideologies And It Might Be Possible, These (Ideological) Metaphors Would Not Be Deliberately Used Due To The 'Naturalized' Notion Of Ideology (Fairclough, 1995). Mentioning These Examples In This Essay Is Used To Support The Idea That CDA (With The Cooperation Of Cognition) Would Reveal The Discourse Power And Ideology.

V. CONCLUSION

To Sum Up, CDA Could Be Considered As The Development The Descriptive Analysis, Figuratively, If Descriptive Analysis Would Be Regarded As The Micro Analysis, Then CDA Is The Macro One. Ideologies Are Always Existed Whenever There Are Social, Cultural And Political Notions And These Notions Are Related To Power In One Way Or Another. As Discourses Involve More Than Language, These Notions Then Would Be Found In Association With Language In Discourses; As Language Is Usage-Based, The Involvement Of These Notions Would Be Easier, But The Elimination Of Them Would Be Difficult, Because These Notions Make Changes In Language. Therefore, There Must Be A System That Could Understand That Change And Its Reasons; CDA (As Transdisciplinary/Interdisciplinary Model Cooperated With Social/Political Studies, Functional Grammar As Well As Cognitive Linguistics) Offers An Approach Of Analysis That Could Understand The Language Change And Its Reasons As Well As A System To Interpret The Language Of

Discourses With Regard To Social, Power And Political Ideologies. Regardless Its Limitations, CDA Appears To Be The Most Effective Approach In Revealing Implicit, Hegemonic, Coercive, And Deceptive Ideologies, Presenting Deeper Analysis Without Any Evasion Of Social And Political Aspects.

REFERENCE LIST

[1]   Behnam, B. And Mahmoudy, B. (2013) A Critical Discourse Analysis Of The Reports
[2]   Issued By The International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) Director General On Iran's Nuclear Program During The Last Decade: *Theory And Practice In Language Studies*, 3
[3]   (12) : 2196-2201.
[4]   Fairclough, N. (1989) *Language And Power,* London: Longman.
[5]   Fairclough, N. (1995) *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study Of Language,* London: Longman.
[6]   Fairclough, N. (2010) *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study Of Language,* (2nd Ed.), Harlow: Longman.
[7]   Gee, J.P. (1999) *An Introduction To Discourse Analysis: Theory And Method,* London:
[8]   Routledge.
[9]   Gee, J. P. (2011) *An Introduction To Discourse Analysis: Theory And Method,* (3rd Ed.), New York: Routledge. Ebook, Accessed At The 30th Of December 2016.
[10]   Hart, C. (2010) *Critical Discourse Analysis And Cognitive Science: New Perspectives On Immigration Discourse,* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
[11]   Jones, P.E. (2007) Why There Is No Such Thing As "Critical Discourse Analysis". *LANGUAGE & COMMUNICATION,* 27 (4): 337-368.
[12]   Lu, L. And Ahrens, K. (2008) Ideological Influence On BUILDING Metaphors In Taiwanese Presidential Speeches. *DISCOURSE & SOCIETY,* 19 (3): 383-408.
[13]   Nunez -Perucha, B. (2011) Critical Discourse Analysis And Cognitive Linguistics As Tools For Ideological Research: A Diachronic Analysis Of Feminism, In Hart, C. (Ed.)
[14]   *Critical Discourse Studies In Context And Cognition,* Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
[15]   O'Halloran, K. (2003) *Critical Discourse Analysis And Language Cognition,* Edinburgh:
[16]   Edinburgh University Press.
[17]   Stubbs, M. (1997) WHORF'S CHILDREN: CRITICAL COMMENTS ON
[18]   CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS (CDA), In Ryan, A. And Wray, A.(Eds.)
[19]   *Evolving Models Of Language*: Papers From The Annual Meeting Of The British Association For Applied Linguistics Held At The University Of Wales, Swansea, September 1996, Clevedon : Multilingual Matters.
[20]   Van Dijk, T.A. (1998) *Ideology: A Multidisciplinary Approach*, London: SAGE.
[21]   Whorf, B.L. (1956) 'The Relation Of Habitual Thought And Behaviour To Language' In Carroll, J.B. (Ed.) *Language, Thought, And Reality: Selected Writing Of Benjamin Lee Whorf*. MIT Press.
[22]   Widdowson, H.G. (1995) Discourse Analysis: A Critical View. *Language And Literature*, 4 (3): 157-172.