A STUDY OF THE DIRECTIONS IN DISCOURSE ANALYSIS: THEORY AND METHODS

Mohammad Reza Khodareza[1] and *Gholamhossein Shabani[2]
[1]Department of English, Tonekabon Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tonekabon, Iran
[2]Department of English, Roudsar and Amlash Branch, Islamic Azad University, Roudsar, Iran
*Author for Correspondence

ABSTRACT

All languages in the world are used as means for communicating and transferring ideas or information from one source to another. The current study was an attempt to investigate the directions in discourse analysis by a focus on the concept of metadiscourse and its sub-features, genre analysis from ESP and contrastive rhetoric perspectives, corpus linguistics, and critical discourse analysis. As an interdisciplinary field of inquiry, discourse analysis (DA) tries to study language use and its role in human society. It follows that language, which is beyond the level of sentence, and that language is not merely an abstract set of rules, rather it is a means of social action. Essentially, it is argued that metadiscourse offers a method of understanding the interpersonal resources writers use to present propositional material and, and a result, provides a means of uncovering the rhetorically and socially distinctive features of disciplinary communities. It is based on a view of creating social engagement and in academic contexts and situations offers the approaches and mechanisms through which individuals (i.e., speakers and writers) project them into their discourse to manifest their attitude towards both the propositional content and the audience of the text.

Keywords: Corpus-based Linguistics, Critical Discourse Analysis, Genre Analysis, Metadiscourse

INTRODUCTION

As Bhatia *et al.,* (2008) put it, DA has been an appealing field of linguists, applied linguists, sociologists, anthropologists, communication experts, organizational theorists, computer experts, business and legal specialists, and socio-political theorists. There are generally various views toward DA which can be classified as Textual-oriented view which focuses on language patterns in the text, and the Socially-oriented view focusing on the purposes a text serves in the socio-cultural setting in which it occurs. Discourse Analysis (DA) is the study of language in use- the relationship between language and the context in which it is used. Applied Linguistics views DA as the study of language in action within the social contexts in which it is used. Thus, discourse, in fact, can be considered "to spread between two poles, giving more or less emphasis to concrete texts or to institutional practices, to either particular cases of talk or to how social structures are formed by it" (Hyland and Paltridge, 2011). DA should describe the language in use in terms of 1) its components, 2) the order of components, and 3) the ways to combine the components into larger constructs.

Harris tried to provide a way for describing "how language features are distributed within texts and the ways in which they are combined in particular kinds and styles of texts" (Paltridge, 2008). In the 1960s, Hymes (1964 as cited in Bhatia *et al.,* 2008) studied speech in social setting so as to provide a sociological perspective on discourse. Austin (1962), Searle (1969) and Grice (1975) interested in the study of language as a social action. Halliday (1973) functional approach had profound influence on British DA. Sinclair and Coulthard's (1975) model of Classroom Discourse Analysis or the Initiation, Response, Feedback (IRF) model based on a hierarchy of DA.

American discourse trends namely Pike and other "linguists associated with the Summer Institute of Linguistics" develop a way of understanding sentences and discourse structures based on function, which they called tagmemic grammar.

The emergence of variations sociolinguistics brings DA into the purview of students of language change. In France, Marxist linguistics began to explore how ideology is constructed in and revealed through

Research Article

discourse. Linguists influenced by the *Birmingham-school social theory* brought forth a critical approach to discourse. Text Internal Elements constitute the text (linguistic material with a verbal channel, the stable semantic meaning of words, expressions and sentences), while Text External Elements constitute the context. Schiffrin (1994) points out that "context is a world filled with people producing utterances: people who have social, cultural, and personal identities, knowledge, beliefs, goals, and wants, who interact with one another in various socially and culturally defined situations" (p.363). Discourse analysts are interested in how people organize what they say in the sense of what they typically say first, and what follows next and so on in a conversation or in a piece of writing.

According to Halliday (1994), theme is the element which serves as the point of departure of the message; it is that with which the clause is concerned. The remainder of the message- the part in which theme is developed- is called rheme.

Review of the Literature
The Concept of Metadiscourse and its Sub-features
The term metadiscourse was initially coined by Zellig (1959) to propose a means to represent a writer or speaker's efforts to guide a reader or listener's understanding of language in use (Hyland, 2005). Williams (1981) defined it as "… writing that guides the reader, distinguished from, writing that informs the reader about primary topics … **discourse about discourse**" (p. 47).

Metadiscourse is an attractive concept since it seems to afford a way of collecting under one heading the range of linguistic devices writers employ to explicitly organize their ideas, relate to their readers and indicate their stance towards both the propositions and the audience (Hyland and Tse, 2004).

Metadiscourse and Audience
The audience awareness helps writers/speakers gain a better understanding of what they can assume their reader or hearer knows and also enables them to present their attitudes perspectives, and positions more convincingly and appropriately. The use of metadiscourse is among the means, by which this awareness may be achieved.

Grabe and Kaplan (1996) enumerated five main parameters of audience, namely, the number of readers, the degree of closeness to the reader, the relative status of participants, the extent of shared background knowledge, and the degree of shared specific topical knowledge that influence writing.

Propositional Versus Metadiscoursal Meanings
Vande (1985) argued that on one level we provide information about the subject and expand propositional content, whereas, on the level of metadiscourse, we help our receivers with the organization, classification, interpretation, evaluation, and reaction to the propositional material. In fact, metadiscoursal elements complement propositional elements.

Metadiscourse Taxonomies
Williams' (1981) early model of metadiscourse categorized written metadiscourse into three general types:
1- Hedges (possibly) and emphatics (certainly);
2- Sequencers (in the next section) and topicalizers (with regard to);
3- Narrators and attributors (according to X (2007)).

Crismore (1993) classified written metadiscourse into two general categories: informational and attitudinal. The first category includes *goals* (the purpose of this study), *pre-plans* (this chapter is about), *post plans* (in the previous section), and *topicalizers*. The second category includes *saliency* (still more important), *emphatics*, *hedges*, and evaluatives (unfortunately).

Interpersonal Model of Metadiscourse (Hyland, 2005)
The focus of Hyland's framework is on the interpersonal meaning which translates into the building of the reader-writer relationship.

The framework is explained in terms of Interactive resources and Interactional resources. Interactive resources guide the reader through the text by using transition markers (express relations between main clauses) frame markers (refer to discourse acts, sequence or stage), endophoric markers (refer to information in other parts of the text), evidentials (refer to information from other texts) and code glosses

Research Article

(elaborate propositional meanings). Interactional resources, on the other hand, convey the writer's emotions or reactions to the propositional content and attempt to build a personal rapport with the reader. These resources are the use of hedges (withhold commitment), boosters (emphasize certainty or close dialogue), attitude markers (express writer's attitude to proposition), engagement markers (explicitly build relationship with reader) and self-mentions (explicit reference to author(s)).

Metadiscourse and Genre
Genre is defined as communicative events which are specified by a series of communicative purposes and features recognized by the members of the community (Swales, 1990).

In order to establish genre classification, identifying various rhetorical and linguistic elements of particular genres is essential. In genre analysis studies, these specific rhetorical characteristics help writers in distinguishing different genres. Metadiscourse can be considered as one of these rhetorical devices since it helps writers show their purposes, perspectives, and assumptions regarding their audience. According to Hyland (2005), the pattern and frequency of metadiscoursal markers differ across different genres.

Metadiscourse Investigations in Academic Genres: Metadiscourse and Genre
The use of metadiscourse was explored in two corpora —textbooks and research articles— in three disciplines of Biology, Applied Linguistics and Marketing (Hyland, 1999).

Similarly, another study investigated two kinds of metadiscourse (locational and rhetorical metatext) in three fields (Linguistics, Economics, and Medicine) within three languages (English, Norwegian, and French) (Dahl, 2004).

Hedges and boosters, amongst the subcategories of metadiscourse markers, have been extensively investigated in research articles across disciplines and cultures (e.g., Abdollahzadeh, 2011; Atai and Sadr, 2006; Behnam and Mirzapour, 2012; Behnam *et al.,* 2012; Bonyadi *et al.,* 2012; Jalilifar, 2007a, 2007b, 2011; Tahririan and Shahzamani, 2009).

Metadiscourse Use in Political Discourse
The exploitation of attitudinal markers including hedges and boosters by politicians in political contexts has been recently investigated in the Iranian context (Alavi-nia & Jalilifar, 2013; Jalilifar & Alavi-nia, 2011, 2012).

Jalilifar and Alavi-nia (2011) in their study on the use of hedging devices in political interviews conducted with four prominent political figures, namely George W. Bush, Jimmy Carter, David Coultardt and Sarah Palin found an inverse relationship between the frequency of hedges exploited by a politician and the degree of political power.

Metadiscourse and Discourse Community
It is argued that each discourse community possesses its own features, including "a set of common public goals", "mechanism of intercommunication among its members", and "one or more genres in the communicative furtherance of its aims" (Swales, 1990).

Metadiscourse, accordingly, entails the fact that writers need to take into account their intended receivers' norms, expectations and responses, shared assumptions, as well as the interpersonal and intertextual relationship between them to construct a persuasive and convincing piece of writing (Hyland, 2005).

Metadiscourse and Culture
The field of contrastive rhetoric utilizes the concept of culture to account for similarities and differences in writing across languages and cultures. Cultural values are carried by language and provide us with taken-for-granted ways of engaging others in writing. They can affect perception, language, learning, communication and, particularly, the use of metadiscourse (Hyland, 2005).

A growing body of research has sought to identify metadiscourse use in texts written in English by writers from different cultural backgrounds (e.g., Althnberg, 1995; Granger & Tyson, 1996; Hinkel, 2002; Mauranen, 1993; Milton, 1999; Milton & Tsang, 1993; Scollon & Scollon, 1995; Vassileva, 2001).

A few studies have examined metadiscourse in research articles or sections of research articles written by people from different language backgrounds (e.g., Abdollahzade, 2001, 2011; Bahrami, 2012; Faghih & Rahimpour, 2009; Rahimpor, 2006; Shokouhi & Talati, 2009).

Research Article

Metadiscourse and the Classroom: Metadiscourse and Reading
Awareness of metadiscoursal elements in texts helps learners interpret connections between arguments, recognize the author's viewpoints, stance and presuppositions, understand the reliability and importance of the writer's assertions, process the flow of information easily, etc. (Camiciottoli, 2003; Crismore, 1989; Hyland, 1998). In L2 instructional settings, some studies (e.g., Intaraprawat & Steffensen, 1995; Vande, 1985) suggest that the existence of metadiscourse elements in a text improves reading comprehension.
Several studies have examined the effect of metadiscourse presence in texts and its explicit instruction on students' reading comprehension in the Iranian context (e.g., Jalilifar & Alipour, 2007; Daftary, 2002; Dastgoshadeh, 2001; Khorvash, 2008; Parvaresh, 2008; Tavakoli *et al.,* 2010). Dastgoshadeh (2001) investigated the impact of metadiscourse use on reading comprehension and found that metadiscoursal markers helped students comprehend the passage more easily and effectively.
To sum up, explicit instruction of metadiscourse elements as well as sensitizing learners to these rhetorical devices seems to have a significant impact on the learners' reading comprehension ability.
Metadiscourse and Writing
Explicit knowledge of the grammar and the application of rules are just part of writing and the other part is accommodating the ideas within the expectations and understandings of the relevant readers through the appropriate use of metadiscourse (Hyland, 2005). It is, therefore, essential that learners become familiar with metadiscourse markers to learn how to filter their ideas through a concern with the way their readers will take them. Several studies acknowledge the usefulness of teaching metadiscourse strategies in improving learners' writing. Cheng and Steffensen (1996), for example, discovered that the group that received instructions on the functions and use of metadiscourse got higher grades in their essays.

Genre Analysis: Perspectives from ESP and Contrastive Rhetoric
A Principled Approach to Genre Analysis
Eggins and Slade (1997) suggested six steps for a principled genre analysis. The first step is the recognition of a "chunk" of language, which can be identified when a participant takes the floor for an extended period of time and/or when a stretch of text moves through predictable stages. The second step is the identification of the goals that are achieved by that "chunk", and naming the genre accordingly.
It is in the third step that functional labels are given to the stages the genre moves through which express "how each stage contributes towards achieving the overall social purpose of the genre" (Eggins & Slade, 1997). The fourth step is to recognize which of these stages are obligatory and which are optional. The fifth step is to list the genre as a structural formula showing the order of the stages and whether any stages are recursive. Finally, these stages can then be analyzed for their linguistic features.
Move Analysis
Genre analysis is a description of the language used as well as an explanation of why language is used differently within specific cultures.
A move is a text segment that includes a package of various linguistic features such as lexicon, syntax, and illocutionary propositions which are responsible for providing a uniform orientation for the given segment, and for signaling the content of the discourse. These moves can be inferred through context, but they are mainly examined based on their linguistic clues (Swales, 1981).
Optional vs. Obligatory Move
While the addition of optional moves may enhance the effectiveness of a particular instance of a genre, the inclusion of all the obligatory moves in an acceptable order is essential to achieving the communicative purposes of the genre.
The ESP Approach in Genre Analysis
Since the 1980s genre analysis has become an important approach to text analysis, especially in the field of ESP. The assumption is that a genre is a "means of achieving a communicative goal that has evolved in response to particular rhetorical needs" and that "it would change and evolve in response to changes in those needs" (Abdollahzadeh, 2011). Therefore, rather than emphasizing the establishment of a system for the classification of genres, the emphasis is on the means by which a text realizes its communicative purpose.

Research Article

The notion of language patterns (genres), which discourse communities use for effective mutual communication makes it possible to pursue needs analyses to determine these genres and examine their characteristics. Corpora- databases of such genres- can be analyzed using concordancing software to identify recurring patterns for teaching and learning.

ESP is English language education based on the needs of the discourse community to which language learners belong or are expected to join. This means that for those learners who intend to pursue academic careers, EAP (English for Academic Purpose) would be needed, while for those expecting to enter business, it would be EOP (English for Occupation Purpose).

The Concept of Contrastive Rhetoric

Contrastive rhetoric (CR) is mainly a theory of second language writing that identifies problems in compositions encountered by L2 writers, and explains those problems by referring to the rhetorical strategies of the first language. Initiated by Kaplan (1966), contrastive rhetoric maintains that language and writing are cultural phenomena. The most serious problem lies in the fact that there is no universal theoretical model for contrast; it is regrettably the case that the findings of various scholars cannot easily be compared because results were often derived from different research paradigms and from different empiricalbases. These problems constrained the usefulness of contrastive rhetoric both as a research base, and a base from which to make pedagogical decisions.

Contrastive rhetoric, which aims to compare written academic discourses among different languages, has already become an important field of enquiry. The inclusion of culture as a cognitive category to explain writing is a defining characteristic of contrastive rhetoric (Li, 2008)

Genre-specific Studies in Contrastive Rhetoric

Since 1960s upward, CR has mainly analyzed the following domains (genres):

Students writing (school writing and contrastive essay studies); academic writing (research articles and grant proposals); and professional writing (professional writing, business writing, and editorials).

Genre-based Instruction

The main purpose in a genre approach to language teaching is to use contextual knowledge in order to provide learners with access to the linguistic resources shared by a particular community which are drawn on to achieve specific goals (Hyland, 2003).

Hyland (2007) proposed a number of principles which underpin all genre-based teaching issues, such as setting syllabus goals and deciding on teaching methodologies:

- Writing is a social activity
- Learning to write is needs oriented
- Learning to write requires explicit outcomes and expectations
- Learning to write is a social activity
- Learning to write involves learning to use language

Advantages of Genre Pedagogy (Based on Hyland, 2007)

Hyland (2007) describes the advantages of genre pedagogy as being Explicit, Systematic, Needs-based, Supportive**,** Empowering, Consciousness-raising, and Critical.

The ESP Approach to Genre Teaching

In ESP, genre analysis aims to identify the core structure of a text (Legg, 2007), the social purposes and the contexts of genres (Martin, 2001; Eggins & Slade, 1997), and the moves that perform specific purposes in information organization (Bhatia, 1993; Swales, 1981, 1990). The main purpose of genre analysis in ESP is to recognize which moves are obligatory, which are optional, and in which order these moves may appear; and to identify the linguistic features commonly found in the moves and to present these features in a meaningful way (Henry, 2007).

Move Register and Strategy

Thanks to the tools developed in corpus linguistics, genre analysts are now able to recognize the lists of lexico-grammatical features, known as move *registers* commonly found in individual moves. Any particular move can be realized in a number of ways; each of these ways is called a *'strategy'* (Bhatia, 1993).

Research Article

ESP genre teachers should avoid providing ESP learners with an overly simplistic picture of the realization of genre functions. In a language learning context, they provide learners with "strategies" along with their associated lexico-grammatical patterns.

Key Elements in Implementing ESP in Genre Pedagogies

Hyland (2007) proposed some of the key elements in implementing ESP in genre pedagogies:

- Planning learning
- Sequencing learning
- Supporting learning
- Assessing learning

What Is Corpus-based Linguistics?

A corpus is "a collection of texts or parts of texts upon which some general linguistic analysis can be conducted" (Meyer, 2002). There are two types of corpora that meet this definition: pre-electronic and electronic corpora. Pre--electronic corpora were created prior to the computer era, consisting of a text or texts that served as the basis of a particular project and had to be analyzed through often time-consuming and tedious manual analysis. Electronic corpora, on the other hand, are the mainstay of the modern era and are a consequence of the computer revolution, beginning with the first computer corpora in the 1960s, such as the Brown Corpus.

Six Types of Corpora

*Generalized corpora***:** The broadest type of corpus is a generalized corpus. Such a corpus is assembled to make available a resource for general linguistic research. General corpora contain a body of texts which linguists examine to find answers to questions about the vocabulary, grammar or discourse structure of a particular language (Kennedy, 1998). The British National Corpus (BNC) and the American National Corpus (ANC) are examples of large, generalized corpora (Bennett, 2010).

*Specialized corpora***:** A specialized corpus, contains texts of a certain type such as newspaper editorials, geography textbooks, lectures, academic papers in a particular discipline, etc. and aims to be representative of this type of language (Hunston, 2002). An example of a specialized corpus is the Michigan Corpus of Academic Spoken English (MICASE).

*Parallel corpora***:** These corpora consist of original texts and their translations; for example, a novel along with its translation in another language (O'Keeffe *et al.,* 2007).

*Synchronic versus diachronic corpora***:** Kennedy (1998) identifies a synchronic corpus as a language or a type of text at a particular point in time. The Brown Corpus, for instance, includes written texts of American English all published in 1961. On the other hand, he maintains that a diachronic corpus consists of texts from different periods of time.

*Pedagogic corpora***:** A pedagogic corpus is a corpus that contains language used in classroom settings (Bennett, 2010). Pedagogic corpora can include academic textbooks, transcripts of classroom interactions or any other written text or spoken transcripts that learners encounter in an educational setting.

*Monolingual versus multilingual corpora***:** McEnery and Hardie (2012) define monolingual corpora in the sense that, while they may represent a range of varieties and genres of a particular language, they are nonetheless limited to that one language. So the International Corpus of English (ICE), for example, is a large monolingual corpus - it represents the English language. They further argue that we use the term multilingual when a corpus involves more than one language.

What Can We Do With Corpora?

Strictly speaking, nothing can be done with a corpus alone, since it is nothing other than a store of texts. For this reason, we need corpus access software, which helps us rearrange that store so that observations of various kinds can be made. A corpus is just the source, the text which is to be analyzed. In order to work with a corpus, a specific tool that looks for the words or particular patterns you are looking for is required. Undoubtedly the single most important tool available to the corpus linguist is the concordancer (McEnery & Hardie, 2012). A concordancer allows us to search the corpus for the word or pattern which we are looking for and list all the instances in the middle of the computer screen with some context before and after each example.

Research Article

Corpus-based Linguistics
Corpus-based linguists study the same aspects of language as other linguists (grammar, sociolinguistic variation, discourse phenomena, etc.); the banks of computerized text and certain computer techniques are used and the focus of attention is on the language itself, not the corpora.

Data Collection Approaches in Corpus Linguistics
Two broad approaches to the issue of choosing what data to collect have emerged: 1) The monitor corpus approach (Sinclair, 1991), where the corpus continually expands to include more and more texts over time, and 2) the balanced corpus or sample corpus approach (Biber, 1993; Leech, 2007): where a careful sample corpus, reflecting the language as it exists at a given point in time, is constructed according to a specific sampling frame.

Basic Corpus Linguistic Techniques
Some of the basic techniques that can be used on a corpus using standard software are as follows:

- *Concordancing*: It is a means of accessing a corpus of text to show how any given word or phrase in the text is used in the immediate contexts in which it appears.

- *Word frequency counts or wordlists*: Another common corpus technique which software can perform is the extremely rapid calculation of word frequency lists (or wordlists) for any batch of texts.

- *Key word analysis*: This function allows us to identify the key words in one or more texts. Key words are those whose frequency is unusually high in comparison with some norms. They are not usually the most frequent words in a text (or collection of texts); rather, they are the more unusually frequent (Scott, 2006)

- *Cluster analysis*: The analysis of how language systematically clusters into combinations of words -or chunks (e.g., I mean this, this shows that, it would be interesting to) can give insights into how we describe the vocabulary of a language. It also has implications for what we teach in our vocabulary lessons and how learners approach the task of acquiring vocabulary and developing fluency.

Applications of Corpus-based Studies in ESL/EFL Teaching
Corpus linguistics provides a more objective view of language than that of introspection, intuition and anecdotes. It has helped us gain a better understanding of how language is actually used rather than how language is perceived to be used.

The results obtained from corpus-based explorations can provide linguistic descriptions and serve as input for language learning (Barlow, 1996). Thus, course design and teaching materials may be greatly affected by corpora and the evidence derived from them (Hunston, 2002). One of the first developments in the design of a corpus driven teaching syllabus is the Collins COBUILD English Course (CCEC; Willis & Willis, 1989). The contents of this "lexical syllabus" are "the commonest words and phrases in English and their meanings".

Corpora and Language Learning
In recent years, the focus on corpora and teaching has increasingly shifted to corpora and learning. In fact, many empirical studies in corpus linguistics have contributed to the understanding of the value and benefits language corpora can bring to language pedagogy, particularly with respect to whether corpora can capture reality and whether corpora can provide valid models for learners (Gavioli & Aston, 2001).

Corpus Linguistics and Teacher Education
The constant use of corpus evidence in addressing teachers' questions helps teachers reflect on their knowledge of the language as well as critically examines grammar rules and patterns that they have always taken for granted. They begin to look at corpus evidence for answers instead of just relying on dictionaries and reference grammars (Tsui, 2004).

Discourse Analysis and Corpora
Another area which, corpus linguistics addresses is analyzing discourse for looking at language patterns over much larger datasets. Corpora and discourse have had a close relationship and this can be seen from the use of corpus linguistics in above-sentence analysis models such as Conversation Analysis, Discourse Analysis and Critical Discourse Analysis. Corpus linguistics can provide researchers with the means for analysis, such as the use of wordlists, concordances and key word searches. Corpus tools allow

Research Article

researchers to track, tally, and plot the surface features of discourse – such as its linking devices, discourse markers and instances of lexical repetition.

Forensic Linguistics and Corpora

Forensic linguistics is another area which is increasingly using language corpora as a tool. This area is concerned with the use of language in law and crime investigations. In this regard, corpora have many applications which include the analysis of the genuineness of documents from confessions to suicide notes, authorship identification in academic settings (e.g. issues of plagiarism), ransom notes, threat letters, readability/comprehensibility of legal language, forensic phonetics (e.g. speaker identification), police interview and interrogation data, the language rights of ethnic minorities, as well as the discourse of the courtroom setting. Corpora can be used to compare, language patterns.

Critical Discourse Analysis

Politicolinguistics/CDA: Politicolinguistics explores linguistic behaviors and attitudes in terms of power relations in their social context of occurrences (Penalosa, 1981). "Politico" is not limited to "governmental"; it covers all strategies of power exercises such as declaring, controlling, or challenging power relationships (Abrams, 1993). Political linguistics aims to explore the tactics in which language is manipulated to "advance ideology of one group o get, maintain, or resist power over other groups" (Joseph & Taylor, 1990). Politicolinguistics places more emphasis on the indivisibility and the inseparability of language from power, control, and ideology. Politicolinguistics destroys all the bridges between language, power, and ideology to make them as unitary bound issues. Such theoretical background joins politicolinguistics to CDA and makes them interchangeable (Mazid, 1999; Hassan, 2003). CDA is regarded to be a multidisciplinary discourse analytical tool which scrutinizes the manifestation of power abuse, dominance, and inequality in written or spoken political context in order to comprehend, reveal, and finally resist social inequality (Van, 2001).

Among many disciplines in language study whose major aim is investigating discourse, CDA links three notions: *language*, *power*, and *ideology*.

CDA and Language

CDA treats language as a social practice used for representation and signification. Any language product is produced by a socially situated language producer (user). The associations of language producers in discourse producing are not equal: There would be a range of thorough solidarity to thorough inequality. Meanings in discourse are the result of interactions between producers and receivers. Linguistic features are the result of not arbitrary social processes. CDA also does not forget history which is ideologically and politically "inflected time". Such default settings direct CDA to describe and examine "*materiality of language*".

CDA and Ideology

Ideology occupies a fundamental position in CDA. Ideology and discourse are not separated from each other; however, they are two interlocked and interwoven elements of social sciences. Ideology as a way of thinking, speaking, and experiencing is engraved in discourse; it is not a detached element which exists freely and independently in some free-floating domain of ideas (Belsey, 1980).

In CDA point of view, ideology bridges discourse to society. Ideologies create views, attitudes, normalities, abnormalities, legalities, illegalities, rationalities, irrationalities and values in society (Galindo, 1997).

Ideological Square shows how discourse participants use language as a "shield" and as a "weapon". Those who are involved in power relations exploit language as a shield to de-emphasize negative things about self and to de-emphasize positive things about other. In other words, legitimization of self is the main function of using language as a shield. On the other hand, exploiting language as a weapon is equivalent with emphasizing positive things about self and emphasizing negative things about other. Delegitimization of other is the main function of using language as a weapon (Van Dijk, 2000a).

CDA and Power

Language without its power dimensions is a void and meaningless assumption (Stam, 1989). Power is not merely in hands of politicians, nor is exclusively a political phenomenon. Power is bold in every language

Research Article

practice. Language users show their agreement, disagreement, hostility, or friendship through power-charged statements.CDA believes that discourses are distorted by power (Wodak, 1996). Those who are involved in power change the straightforward orders of representation, or as Kress (1990) argued, power warps communication. CDA tries to scan such disordered representation in discourse and return communication in its state of order.

Political Discourse Analysis (PDA)

Political discourse analysis: Chilton and Schaffner (1997) defined political discourse as "a complex from of human activity" (p. 207). One of the main purposes of political discourse analysis is to look for the ways in which language choice is manipulated for specific political effect. Chilton and Schaffner (1997) described the task of Political Discourse Analysis (PDA) as to relate the linguistic behavior to politics or political behavior. Discourse as a social practice encodes and decodes power and ideology; thus, all discourse is political. Van Dijk (1998) declares that PDA is not only about political discourse; it is a "*critical enterprise*" which is concerned with basic notions in power relations like production of political power, power abuse, and domination. PDA is also concerned with resistance, counter-power, and opposition against dominance and discursive hegemonic relations. In other words, PDA is involved in discursive power abuse and socio-political inequality; and consequently, in resistance and movement which are the results of power abusing hegemony.

PDA, mostly, deals with political dialogic processes which have a direct functional role in the political process like those of professional politicians such as presidents and prime ministers and other members of government, parliament, or political parties (Van, 1997). PDA chooses such communications to reveal hidden power relations which operate in society. The goal in PDA is to shed light on manipulation network in society.

Strategic Functions of PDA: Persuasive Fallacies, Propaganda, and Doublespeak

A fallacy is a flaw in the rational properties of an argument to persuade hearer. A fallacious message has persuasive effect on audience by providing poor reasoning in support of its conclusion. Fallacies differ from other bad arguments in that many audiences find them psychologically persuasive. Use of fallacy is not restricted to politicians and advertisers; in fact, "persuasive fallacies are being extensively used on almost a daily basis to achieve persuasive goals in today's world. One of the notorious examples of exploiting fallacious strategies is propaganda. Blake and Haroldsen (1975) defined propaganda as an attempt to make a view accepted not on its own values but by appealing to other incentives. Propagandists use persuasive fallacies to promote their goals. The main difference between propaganda and fallacy is that propaganda, contrary to fallacy, is generally an appeal to emotion, not intellect. A propagandist uses many techniques to persuade people. Propaganda like fallacy assigns labels to groups and ideas in order to make them accepted or rejected in a given context. Corrupting the language by people who wield power is the mechanism of doublespeak to enable the dominant group to fool others about their activities and evade responsibility and accountability (pp. 1-2). Doublespeak is a (governmental) propaganda tactic and rampant use of euphemisms and half-truths, as Lynch (2006) suggests, which government officials routinely use to broaden, or at least keep and sustain, their power.

Here are some examples of commonly used phrases that are regarded as doublespeak, and the phrase that people actually mean.

- *Using the facilities* instead of going to the bathroom
- *Downsizing* instead of firing people
- *Reducing costs* as opposed to cutting peoples' salaries or the amount of supplies going into work
- *Preowned* as opposed to used and possibly beaten up
- *Well-loved* as opposed to old and raggedy
- *Senior citizen* in place of an old person
- *Experienced or well experienced* in place of old

Conclusion

There are several different ways of thinking about language; which way you think about it depends on which aspect of language you are interested in. One of the obvious ways of thinking about language is a

---

Research Article

systematic way of combining smaller units into larger units for the purpose of communication. For example, we combine the sounds of our language (phonemes) to form words (lexical items) according to the 'rules' of the language(s) we speak. Those lexical items can be combined to make grammatical structures, again according to the syntactic 'rules' of our language(s). Language is essentially a rule-governed system of this kind, but there are other ways of thinking about how language works and what we do with it. We usually assume that we use language to say what we mean. However, the processes by which we create 'meaning' are actually very complicated indeed, so we're going to begin with some 'models' of meaning. Language plays an important role in the creation of the reality that surrounds us. As an interdisciplinary field of inquiry, DA tries to study language use and its role in human society. It follows that language which is beyond the level of sentence, and that language is not merely an abstract set of rules, rather it is a means of social action. This study aimed at investigating the concepts of metadiscourse, genre analysis from ESP and contrastive rhetoric perspectives, corpus linguistics, and critical discourse analysis as directions in discourse analysis.

REFERENCES
Abdollahzadeh E (2001). *Native and Non-native use of Textual Metadiscourse in ELT Papers*. Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Tehran, Tehran, Iran.
Atai MR and Sadr L (2006). A cross-cultural genre on hedging devices in discussion section of Applied linguistics research articles. *Proceedings of the Conference of Pan-Pacific, Association of Applied Linguistics* 42-57.
Alavi-Nia M and Jalilifar AR (2013). We believe the Iranian nation can: The manifestation of power in Iranian televised presidential debates. *Language and Communication* **33** 8-25.
Amiri M (2007). Effects of teaching practical metadiscourse use on Persian EFL university students' writing. Unpublished Master's thesis, Iran University of Science and Technology, Tehran, Iran.
Abrams MH (1993). *A Glossary of Literary Terms,* 6th edition (New York: Harcourt Brace College Publishers).
Belsey C (1980). *Critical Practice* (London: Methuen).
Bahrami L (2012). Investigating frequency and distribution of transition markers in English and Persian research articles in applied linguistics: Focusing on their production sections. *Theory and practice in Language Studies* **2** 2139-21145.
Blake RH and Haroldsen EO (1975). *A Taxonomy of Concepts in Communication* (New York: Hastings House Publishers).
Bonyadi A, Gholami J and Nasiri S (2012). A contrastive analysis of hedging in environmental sciences research articles. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research* **3** 1186-1193.
Barlow M (1996). Corpora for theory and practice. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics* **1** 1-37.
Bennet GR (2010). Using corpora in the language learning classroom: Corpus linguistics for teachers.
Biber D (1993). Representativeness in corpus design. *Literary and Computing* **8** 243-57.
Bhatia VK (1993). *Analyzing Genre: Language Use in Professional Settings* (London: Longman).
Eggins S and Slade D (1997). *Analyzing Casual Conversation* (London: Cassell).
Cheng X and Steffensen M (1996). Metadiscourse: A technique for improving student writing. *Research in the Teaching of English* **30** 149-81.
Crismore A (1989). *Talking with Readers: Metadiscourse as Rhetorical Act* (New York: Peter Lang).
Chilton P and Schaffner C (1997). Discourse and politics. In: *Discourse and Social Interaction,* edited by Van Dijk TA (New York: Sage) 206-230.
Daftary Fard P (2002). Scalability of reading comprehension skill constructs: Metadiscourse connection. Unpublished Master's thesis, Iran University of Science and Technology. Tehran, Iran.
Dahl T (2004). Textual metadiscourse in research articles: A maker of national culture or of academic discipline? *Journal of Pragmatics* **36** 1807-1825.
Dastghoshadeh A (2001). Reading comprehension of EFL students using metadiscourse. Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Tehran, Tehran, Iran.

Research Article

Faghih E and Rahimpour S (2009). Contrastive rhetoric of English and Persian written texts: Metadiscourse in applied linguistics research articles. *Rice Working Paper in Linguistics* **1** 92-107, *Studies in lexis: Proceedings of a Seminar on Lexis Organized by the Language Center of the HKUST,* edited by Pemberton R and Tsang ES, Hong Jong, *Language Center, HKUST, Hong Kong*), Hong Kong: Hong Kong University of Science and Technology 215-46.

Gavioli L and Aston G (2001). Enriching reality: Language corpora in language pedagogy. *ELT Journal* **55** 238-46.

Grabe W and Kaplan R (1990). *Theory and Practice of Writing* (Harlow: Longman).

Gailindo R (1997). Language wars: The ideological dimensions of the debates on bilingual education. *Bilingual Research Journal* **21**(2-3) 103-141.

Hassan FF (2003). Ideology and power in some American newspaper texts: A pragmatic analysis.

Henry A (2007). Evaluating language learners' response to web-based, data-driven, genre teaching materials. *English for Specific Purpose* **26** 462-484.

Hyland K (2003a). Genre-based pedagogies: A social response to process. *Journal of Second Language Writing* **12**(1) 17-29.

Hyland K (2007). Genre pedagogy: Language, literacy and L2 writing instructions. *Journal of Second Language Writing* **16** 148-164.

Hyland K (1999). Talking to students: Metadiscourse in introductory course books. *English for Specific Purpose* **18** 3-26.

Intaraprawat P and Steffersen M (1995). The use of metadiscourse in good and poor ESL essays. *Journal of Second Language Writing* **4** 253-7.

Jalilifar AR and Soleimani N (2011). Communicative move in a research article introductions: Variations in applied linguistics. In: *Academic Research Genre in an Asian Context,* edited by Jalilifar AR and Abdollahzadeh E, Ahvaz: Shahid Chamran University of Ahvaz 447-477.

Joseph JE and Taylor TJ (1990). *Ideology of Language* (London: Routledge).

Khorvash Z (2008). The effect of metadiscourse awareness on EFL learners' reading comprehension. Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Isfahan, Isfahan, Iran.

Kaplan RB (1966). Cultural thought pattern in intercultural communication. *Journal of Language Learning* **1** 1-20.

Kennedy G (1998). *An Introduction in Corpus Linguistics* (Harlow: Longman).

Leech G (2007). New resources, or just better old ones? In: *Corpus Linguistics and the Web,* edited by Hundt M, Nesselhauf N and Biewer C (Amsterdam: Rodopi) 134-49.

Lynch T (2006). Doublespeak and the war on terrorism. Retrieved February 11, 2009 from http:// www. Cato.org/ pub_display.php?pub_id=6654.

Li X (2015). From contrastive rhetoric to intercultural rhetoric: A search for collective identity. In: *Contrastive Rhetoric: Reading to Intercultural Rhetoric,* edited by Connor U, Nagelhout E and Rozyecki WV (Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins) 11-24.

Mauranen A (1993). *Cultural Differences in Academic Rhetoric* (Frankfurt: Peter Lang).

Mackey A and Gas S (2012). *Research Methods in Second Language Acquisition: A Practical Guide* (Malden MA: Blackwell Publishing).

Mazid BM (1999). Ideology and control in some speech and newspaper genres: A politicolinguistics approach to discourse analysis. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ain Shams University, Cairo, Egypt.

McEnery T and Hardie A (2012). *Corpus Linguistic Method: Method, Theory and Practice* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Meyer C (2002). *English Corpus Linguistics: An Introduction* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

O'keeffe A, McCarthy M and Carter P (2007). From corpus to classroom. *Language Use and Language Teaching* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Penalosa F (1981). *Introduction to the Sociology of Language* (Rowley: Newbury).

Research Article

Sinclair J (1991). *Corpus, Concordance* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Rahimpour R (2006). Contrastive rhetoric of English and Persian texts; Metadiscourse in applied linguistics research articles. Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Mashhad, Mashhad, Iran.

Sinclair (2003). *How to Use Corpora in Language Teaching* (Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins).

Scollon R and Scollon S (1995). *Intercultural Communication* (Oxford: Blackwell).

Shaw P and Liu E (1998). What develops in the development of second language writing? *Applied Linguistics* **19** 225-254.

Shokouhi H and Talati Baghsiahi A (2009). Metadiscourse functions in English and Persian sociology articles: A study in sociology rhetoric. *Poznan Studies in Contemporary Linguistics* **45** 549-568.

Swales J (1990). *Genre Analysis: English in Academic and Research Settings* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Tsui ABM (2004). What teachers have always wanted to know and how corpora can help. In J. M.

Tahririan MH and Shahzamani M (2009). Hedging in English and Persian editorials: A contrastive study. *Iranian Journal of Applied Linguistics* **12** 199-221.

Tavakoli M, Dabaghi A and Khorvash Z (2010). The effect of metadiscourse awareness on L2 reading comprehension: a case of Iranian EFL learners. *Ccsenet: English Language Teaching Journal* **3** 92-102.

Vande Kopple W (1985). Some exploratory discourse on metadiscourse. *College Composition and Communication* **36** 82-93.

Van Dijk TA (1997). *Discourse as Social Interaction,* 4th edition (London: sage).

Van Dijk TA (1998). What is political discourse analysis? In: *Political Linguistics,* edited by Blommeart J and Bulcean C (Amsterdam: Benjamins) 11-52.

Van Dijk TA (2000a). Ideology and discourse: A multidisciplinary introduction. Retrieved February 04, 2009 from: http://www.discourses.org/UnpublishedArticles/Ideology%20and%21discourse.pdf.

Van Dijk TA (2001). Critical discourse analysis. In: *Handbook of Discourse Analysis,* Tannan D, Schiffrin D and Hamilton H (Oxford: Blackwell) 352-371.

Wodak R (1996). *Orders of Discourse* (London: Longman).

Vassileva I (2001). Commitment and detachment in English and Bulgarian academic writing. *English for Specific Purpose* **20** 83-102.

Williams JM (1981). *Style: Ten Lessons in Clarity and Grace* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press).

Wilson J (2003). Discourse marking and accounts of violence in Northern Ireland. *Text* **13**(3) 455-75.

Wills D and Wills J (1989). *Collins Cobuild English Course* (London: HarperCollins).