Power in Critical Discourse–Analysis Studies

on Political and Religious Discourse

القوة في دراسات التحليل النقدي للخطاب الديني والسياسي

A Research Submitted by:

Safaa Saleh Abdullah

Faculty of Arts and Humanities

English Department, **Suez Canal University**

المستخلص العربى

يقدم البحث استعراضا للدراسات السابقة في التحليل النقدي للخطاب والتي تتناول جوانب إظهار القوة في الخطاب الديني والخطاب السياسي. ينقسم هذا البحث إلى قسمين يتناول الأول الإطار النظري للبحث والذي يناقش أهم المفاهيم والنظريات المتعلقة بالخطاب والتحليل النقدي للخطاب والقوة. أما القسم الآخر من البحث فهو يستعرض الدراسات السابقة المتعلقة بالتحليل النقدي للخطاب وجوانب إظهار القوة في الخطاب.

Abstract:

The research presents a review of literature for critical discourse analysis (hereafter CDA) studies that tackle aspects of power manifestation in both political and religious discourse. This research paper consists of two main sections, the first of which tackles the theoretical background of discourse, CDA and power. The second section, on the other hand, addresses a review of the previous literature concerning CDA, and power.

Introduction:

Language has always been the most influential means of communication. That's why it is used as an instrument to deliver messages. Doing so, language has the ability to establish and change ideologies, conducts and social relations as a whole. Moreover, it can start revolutions and acting as a mechanism for innumerous

social struggles (Cipriani, 2002). That's to say, language is extremely powerful through which specific ideologies, identities and cultures become dominated, changed or even marginalised. Such power holds infinite important influence on people's lives. Thus, power can be described as the force in a society that gets things done.

By its proper meaning, the concept of 'power' is accustomed to be of greater relevance to political discourse that always has something to do with hegemony, domination and manipulation. Consequently, it might seem unusual to associate the term of 'power' with religious discourse which usually calls for spreading notions of equality and brotherhood. However, exercising power can be detected in any social context since CDA sees power as a central condition in social life. Even when two people are engaged in casual conversation, each participant is concerned with how to make his/her viewpoint dominate the other's (Ezeifeka, 2013). The current research is to discuss different perspectives of power as elaborated in various studies conducted on both genres of political as well as religious discourse.

Theoretical background:

Discourse:

The concept of 'discourse' has many definitions and includes various perspectives of study. The term itself is derived from the Latin word "*dis- curses*", meaning "running to and from", but from the linguistic perspective, it refers to "the speech patterns and usage of language, dialects, and acceptable statements within a community." Simply speaking, discourse is conversation or information (Pitsoe and Letseka, 2013, p. 24). For Foucault (1972),

"Discourses are knowledge systems of the human sciences that inform the social and governmental 'technologies' which constitute power in modern society" (Fairclough & Wodak, 1997, p. 261). Nevertheless, the idea of discourse as merely a means of delivering and receiving pieces of information is no longer sufficient. Language is much more than that; as it allows different interlocutors to do things and to be things, as well.

Gee (2011) presents the notion of discourse from two different but related domains. Such an interesting dichotomy distinguishes big "D" Discourse and little "d" discourse. Big "D" Discourse means "ways of combining and integrating language, actions, interactions, ways of thinking, believing, valuing, and using various symbols, tools, and objects to enact a particular sort of socially recognizable identity" (p. 29). On the other hand, little "d" discourse means "any instance of language-in-use or any stretch of spoken and written language (often called a "text" in the expanded sense where texts can be oral or written)" (Gee, 2011, p. 205).

Similarly, Fairclough (2001) tackles the notion of discourse from a social perspective as a form of social practice that has three implications. First, language is is rather part and parcel of society. Second, language can be tackled as a social process. Third, language is determined by other (non-linguistic) parts of society. Hence, there is a reciprocal relation between discourse and society. These varying views of discourse significantly affect the approaches used to analyze discourse (Fairclough, 2001, pp. 20-21).

In each society, discourse and power are found out to be so related to each other. Discourse, as Fairclough (2001) states, carries ideological meanings which come from chains of social power

relations that work as regulations of social activities. Discourse, from the social perspective, is realized by people in power or who possess different means to communicate with others (Pitsoe and Letseka, 2013). For instance, those who are in control decide others' identity by determining what is discussed. Foucault (1972) considers discourses as ways of constituting knowledge, together with the social practices, forms of subjectivity and power relations. Discourse transmits and produces power; it undermines and exposes it, renders it fragile and makes it possible to thwart it. For Foucault (1972), discourses are not only about what can be said and thought, but also about who can speak, when, and with what authority.

Critical discourse analysis:

CDA is developed from the school of critical linguistics by Kress, Hodge and Fowler in the late ninetieth, which draws upon Halliday's (1978, 2004) systemic functional linguistics and theories of ideologies (Fairclough, 1993; Rogers, 2004). CDA has indeed begun as a new domain of discourse analysis in the mid-1980s by such works of a group of linguists, such as Fairclough, van Dijk, and Wodak. It aims at tackling the relationship between discourse and society and it is developed as a movement, at a meeting in Amsterdam with participations by the same group. Such a group of linguists has profoundly contributed to the development of CDA.

There has been a certain set of principles for CDA developed by Fairclough & Wodak (1997). Such a group of distinctive features includes the following principles: (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; (viii) discourse is a form of social action.

Wodak (2001), depending on those features, argues that CDA aims at investigating critically social inequality as it is revealed, signaled, constituted, legitimized and so on as language is used. According to Meyer (2001), CDA seeks to uncover the discursive aspects of societal disparities and inequalities. Similarly, Fairclough (1992) shows the aim of CDA as clarifying the social function of language, tackling linguistic processes from the social perspective, and pointing out the ideological and political investments.

Based on the previously-mentioned aims, Fairclough (2001), defines CDA as "a form of critical social science geared to illuminating the problems which people are confronted with by particular forms of social life, and to contributing resources which people may be able to draw upon in tackling and overcoming those problems" (p.125). van Dijk (2003, 2015), on the other hand, considers CDA as a sort of discourse analytical research that mainly studies the way social power abuse, dominance and inequality are enacted, reproduced, and resisted by text and talk in the social and political context. Thus, the reciprocal relationship between discourse and power, in addition to their impact on society are manifested clearly within van Dijk's definition of CDA. Van Dijk also determines a certain set of characteristics for CDA:

- "It focuses primarily on social problems and political issues rather than the mere study of discourse structures outside their social and political contexts.

- This critical analysis of social problems is usually multidisciplinary.

- Rather than merely describe discourse structures, it tries to explain them in terms of properties of social interaction and especially social structure.

- More specifically, CDA focuses on the ways discourse structures enact, confirm, legitimate, reproduce, or challenge relations of power abuse (dominance) in society." (van Dijk, 2015, p. 467)

Similarly, Kazemian & Hashemi (2014) regards CDA as a multidisciplinary analytical viewpoint which seeks investigating the relationship between power and discourse, and especially exploring the way how authority, dominance and social inequality are established, sustained, reproduced and resisted in the discourse of written texts and spoken words. Wetherell et al. (2001) also describe CDA as:

"…the study of talk and texts. It is a set of methods and theories for investigating language in use and language in social contexts. Discourse research offers routs into the study of meanings, a way of investigating the back-and-forth dialogues which constitute social action, along with the patterns of signification and representation which constitute culture" (Wetherell et al., 2001, p. i).

Fairclough (1995) rather provides a quite lengthy definition to the concept as:

> "analysis which aims to systematically explore often opaque relationships of causality and determination between (a) discursive practices, events and texts, and (b) wider social and cultural structures, relations and processes; to investigate how such practices, events and texts arise out of and are ideologically shaped by relations of power and struggles over power, and to explore how the opacity of these relationships between discourse and society is itself a factor securing power and hegemony" (p.132–133).

Unlike van Dijk (2015) who presents five-itemed set of properties for CDA, Fairclough (1992) argues that the theoretical basics and methodological implications of CDA are embodied in only two properties of discourse. It is both *constitutive* and *functional*. Discourse is constitutive as it does not simply reflect or represent things 'out there', but constructs or constitutes things (Fairclough, 1992). According to Fairclough (1992), the three things that are constituted in discourse are social identities, social relationships, and systems of knowledge and belief. In addition to being constitutive, discourse is also *functional*. Discourse itself is seen as a form of social practice, contributing both to the reproduction of society and to social change. Fairclough (1992) talks about the 'action orientation' of discourse, that is, how things are done with discourse.

In contrast to the preceding kinds of scientific investigation that follow clear-cut methods, CDA has an interdisciplinary

feature. It is carried out from a widely different perspective. According to Fairclough (2001), each of the many existing approaches to language has something to contribute to CDA. It depends partly on the nature of the social problem and partly on the disciplinary background of the analyst. It is clear from the foregoing that CDA does not have a unitary theoretical framework or methodology. It is best grasped as a shared perspective encompassing a range of approaches.

Central Approaches to CDA:

Despite the fact that CDA is sometimes thought to represent a 'method' of DA, any apparent method of studying discourse, humanities and social sciences can be implemented in a CDA research, as long as it is able to appropriately and relevantly produce insights into the way discourse reproduces (or resists) social and political inequality, power abuse or domination. That is to say, CDA is not restricted to analysis of specific structures of text but systematically relates these to structures of the social context (Hussain et al., 2017). There is a range of approaches to CDA. This section tackles four of these approaches developed by the prominent scholars of CDA, Fairclough, Van Dijk, Wodak and Halliday.

Fairclough's Socio–Cultural Approach:

Fairclough (2001) develops an approach to study discourse, consisting of three perspectives of analysis: analysis of language texts, analysis of discourse practice (i.e., processes of text production, distribution and consumption) and analysis of discursive events as instances of socio–cultural practice. Doing so,

he combines micro, meso and macro-level interpretation. As for the micro-level, the analyst tackles the syntax, metaphors and rhetorical devices within texts. In the stage of meso-level, the researcher is concerned with studying the production and consumption of the text, focusing on how power relations are achieved. The macro-level involves intertextual understanding, trying to understand the broad, societal currents that are affecting the text being studied.

Intertextuality and interdiscurvity are two essential aspects of analysis within Fairclough's approach of CDA. Intertextualiy refers to the insertion of history (society) into a text and of this text into history (Fairclough, 2001). Fairclough (1993) points out the fact that texts are inherently intertextual, which means that they are constituted by elements of other texts. Besides, Fairclough concentrates on the correlation between discourse, power and ideology. In addition, Fairclough refers to the notion of interdiscursivity of a text as a part of its intertextuality, a question of which genres, discourses and styles it draws upon, and how it works them into particular articulations" (p. 124).

Van Dijk's Socio-Cognitive Approach:

Like Fairclough's approach of CDA, the socio-cognitive approach applied by van Dijk identifies discourse as a form of social practice. Nevertheless, it does not focus on discursive practice. Instead, van Dijk concentrates on social cognition as the mediating part between text and society. According to this approach, CDA pays attention to different aspects of social cognitions which are shared by the social collectivities (groups, organizations and institutions) (van Dijk, 2001). Social cognitions, he states, are

"socially shared representations of societal arrangements, groups and relations, as well as mental operations such as interpretation, thinking and arguing, inferencing and learning" (van Dijk, 1993, p.257). Furthermore, van Dijk distinguishes between two levels of (discourse) analysis: macro vs. micro. Concerning such a distinction, the micro level of social order refers to language use, discourse, verbal interaction and communication, whereas power, dominance and inequality between social groups characterize the macro level (van Dijk, 2003). Moreover, van Dijk's approach of CDA focuses on understanding ideological structures and social relations of power embedded in discourse. He tackles social power in terms of control and considers ideologies as the base of the social representations of groups (van Dijk, 2006). He, therefore, claims that each group has (more or less) power if they have the ability to (more or less) control the behaviors and mentalities of (members of) other groups. In addition, he asserts that ideological discourse is normally organized by a general strategy of positive self-presentation (boasting) and negative other-presentation (derogation) (van Dijk, 2003). Besides, it is so apparent in most studies of van Dijk that CDA prefers clarifying the ideological perspective of "Us" versus "Them", as well as manifesting the discursive structures and strategies used in exercising power (Jahedi et al, 2014). To conclude, van Dijk argues that CDA is not restricted to demonstrating the relationship between discourse and social structure, but it also includes studying the intermediate mental models, goals and normal social representations (knowledge, attitudes, ideologies, norms, values) of the interlocutors.

Wodak's Discourse–Historical Approach (DHA):

Ruth Wodak develops a parallel interdisciplinary circular model of analyzing discourse in a certain context. Each circle of this model has a certain kind of analysis and represents a certain level of context. According to Wodak's approach, the smallest circle of CDA is the micro–analysis of the text itself. The second circle of analysis tackles the interlocutors' personality characteristics, biographies and social roles. The next context level represents the setting of discourse, (i.e. the time, location and the description of the discourse situation). Then, the next circle involves the institution or even the society in which the event occurs. When all these levels of analysis interact, the result would be such a discourse–historical approach (hereafter, DHA) (Wodak 1996; Wodak, 2001; Wodak, 2009).

Like Fairclough's and van Dijk's approaches, Wodak's DHA views discourse as a form of social practice. Depending on this interdisciplinary and eclectic model of CDA, Wodak claims "that all discourses are historical and can therefore only be understood with reference to their context" (Wodak, 2009; Meyer, 2001). That's due to the fact that the notion of context is crucial for CDA. Thus, such an approach includes analyzing, understanding and explaining the relationship between correlated historical processes, hegemonic narratives and CDA approaches (Wodak, 2001).

Halliday's Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG):

Systemic Functional Linguistics (hereafter: SFL) is primarily developed by Michael Halliday. It examines language from a

functional–semantic approach (Eggins, 2004; Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014). The primary aim of this theory is to understand the nature of texts through the analysis of texts in their cultural and social context. There four main theoretical claims of SFL are (1) language is functional, (2) its function is to make meanings (semantic), (3) these meanings are influenced by social and cultural contexts, and (4) the process of using language is semiotic (Eggins, 2004).

Through this model of CDA, Halliday asserts the notion that language principally seeks communication by means of its *systemic* and *functional* perspectives. *Systemic* involves the fact that language is a network of systems, correlated sets of options for making meaning, and *functional* refers to Halliday's perspective about language whose main function is to achieve communication (Koussouhon & Dossoumou, 2015). That's to say, grammatical systems function as resources of making meanings. This is the basis of Halliday's claim that language is metafunctionally organized. Consequently, such a framework of SFL deals with meaning from the view point of meta–function of language. According to Halliday, any discourse is provided with three meta–functions (Halliday, 2004).

Halliday's SFL has always been used as the most important basis for DA. It particularly suits CDA because of its essential dependence on context, that is, situational, generic and ideological. Furthermore, its three–dimensional functional approach to language provides CDA with a broad range of grammatical tools for analysis as well as a theoretical framework. They allow the CDA researcher

to reveal the ideologically loaded as well as constructed nature of discourses. SFG is also able to elaborate on the specific ways of using language to achieve purposes of social domination (Van Leeuwen, 2006). The three major metafunctions of language proposed by Halliday are ideational, interpersonal and textual (Halliday, 2004).

The ideational metafunction deals with the content of the discourse. In other words, it refers to the 'real world' and how people represent experience in language (Eggins, 2004). It also involves the various choices used to express such contents, such as transitive system, voice, modal meaning, etc. The choice of vocabulary is to show the main aspects of hidden opinions and ideologies. The transitivity system is used to represent a certain relationship between people participating in a certain communication activity and the relationship between the activities, status or environment of the participants (Halliday, 2004).

The term transitivity is probably familiar as a way of distinguishing between verbs according to whether they have an object or not. It is a characteristic of verb that relates to whether a verb can take direct object and how many such objects a verb can take. It also refers to a system for describing the whole clause, rather than just the verb and its object (Marbun, 2016). In such a system of transitivity, the structure of a process' clause includes three basic elements: participants, process and circumstances. According to Halliday (2004) "transitivity is a system that construes the world of experience into a manageable set of process types".

The interpersonal metafunction, on the other hand, involves expressing the writer's or speaker's social and personal relationships

with others and people's attitudes toward each other (Eggins, 2004). Interpersonal function is particularly reflected in modality and mood. Halliday's modality refers to judgmental adverbs and expressions, which express the speaker's judgment and foresight. His modality system can be summarized into four types: probability, frequency, obligation and tendency. Probability refers to the degree of possibility; frequency refers to the number of times; obligation refers to an order; and tendency refers to willingness. Each type can be further divided into three assignments: high, medium and low (Jiang, 2021).

Textual function refers to how to make the components of the language related to each other. It asserts the perspective of unity and coherence needed for the organization of information. Theme structure, information structure and cohesion system are three components of textual function (Halliday, 2004).

Power:

As always, when "power" is spoken of, the first association is that of the power of man over man, of power as suppression of the free will by command and obedience. In his book, Language and power, Norman Fairclough made a broad distinction between the exercise of power through coercion of various sorts including physical violence, and the exercise of power through the manufacture of consent to or at least acquiescence towards it. Power relations depend on both but in varying proportions. Ideology is the prime means of manufacturing consent and practicing coercion, as well (Fairclough, 1989).

Fairclough discusses the phenomenon of power in terms of means of 'common sense' notions. These 'common sense' assumptions, Fairclough argues, are the ideologies embedded in language, the commonest form of social behaviour and in their recurrent, every day, familiar, taken-for-granted, discoursal nature, they legitimize the existing different social relations with their power differentials (Morley, 2004).

The contemporary discursive conception of ideology sees power as increasingly exercised through the use of persuasive language instead of coercion (Hjelm, 2013). When 'proper' ways of thinking about and doing things give a one-sided account that ignores the variety of practices, discourse is said to function ideologically. Hegemonic discourse, for example, is the peak of ideology, the point when all alternative constructions are suppressed in favour of one dominating view (Chouliaraki and Fairclough, 1999).

Power is defined by van Dijk as "a property of relations between social groups, institutions or organizations"(van Dijk, 1996). In 1998, he further stresses that "if we are able to influence people's minds, e.g. their knowledge or opinions, we indirectly may control (some of) their actions" (p.355). More specifically, social power, is defined as "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 the others, or influencing their knowledge, attitudes or ideologies"(van Dijk, 1996, p.20). In addition, van Dijk (1989) identifies the major properties of social power. He summarizes these characteristics as follows:

(1) Social power is a property of the relationship between groups, classes, or other social formations, or between persons as social members.

(2) Social power relationships are manifested in interaction.

(3) Power of A over B's actual or possible actions presupposes that A must has control over the cognitive conditions of actions of B, such as desires, wishes, plans, and beliefs.

(4) A's power needs a basis which consists of socially relevant resources that socially enable the exercise of power, or the application of sanctions in case of noncompliance.

(5) For A to exert mental control over B, B must know about A's wishes, wants, preferences, or intentions.

(6) Social control in contemporary societies is further limited by the field and the scope of power agents.

(7) The exercise and maintenance of social power presupposes an ideological framework e.g. socially shared interest-related fundamental cognitions of a group and its members, is mainly acquired, confirmed, or changed through communication and discourse.

Tackling the phenomenon of power from a different perspective, Norman Fairclough, in his book, *Power and Language* (1989), explores the various dimensions of the relations of power and language. For this purpose, he focuses upon two main aspects of the power/language relationship, namely; power in discourse, and power behind discourse. In addition, he adds that discourse is a context where relations of power are actually exercised and enacted. He also highlights different fields of power, power in face-

to–face spoken discourse, power in cross–cultural discourse where participants belong to different ethnic groupings, and the hidden power of the discourse of the mass media. For Foucault, power is identified to be an essential component of all genres of discourse and that discourses produce power but they can also expose it and weakens it. Similarly, in Foucault's view, power is a relationship between two individuals, a relationship through which one can direct the behavior of another, or determine the behavior of another (Foucault, 1996).

Although the strong relation between ideology, discourse and power relation might seem clear, it is not noticed by a great number of people, and CDA thus seeks "to make more visible these opaque aspects of discourse" (Fairclough & Wodak, 1997, p. 258). CDA stands as a prosperous field which allows the identification of ideological dominations, as well as power relations within discourse, searching for evidence in various texts and areas.

The following section offers a comprehensive review of numeroius studies that tackle CDA, in general, and then those of power, in particular, as manifested in political and religious discourse.

Review of literature:

Previous CDA studies on political discourse:

There has recently been a resurgence of the application of CDA from different perspectives of study and within various genres of data. Most CDA studies are concerned with analyzing political discourse. Other research papers, on the other hand, tackle conducting CDA studies on data derived from different fields of discourse, some of which are on religious discourse. However,

those specific CDA studies tackling religious discourse are addressed in the following section.

A prominent example of CDA studies that tackle political discourse is that of Abdel Fattah (2015). The study is a comparative CDA of three recent Egyptian presidents' speeches at the time of crisis: Hosni Mubarak's "2011 revolution speech" on January 28th, Mohamed Morsi's 2013 "One Year Accountability" on June 26th, and Abdel Fattah El Sisi's 2015 "Sinai attacks" on January 31st. The study's main purpose is to point out the discourse strategies used by Egyptian presidents during periods of crisis. The study also compares the similarities and differences between different presidents' discourse strategies. The model used for analyzing the data is that of Bayram's two levels of CDA that are similar to Fairclough's approach. The first level is a macro level, which is concerned with studying the political context when the crisis took place whereas the second level tackles the linguistic micro level, including person deixis, themes, code-switching, and repetition. In spite of their different political contexts and times, it is found that the three speeches have common strategies: "inclusion", "invoking conspiracy", "foreign intervention", "commemorating the president's achievements", and "emotional approaches". In addition, Both Mubarak and Morsi shared very similar discourse strategies, such as demonizing the "other." Both Morsi and Sisi used religious references and code-switching between colloquial and Modern Standard Arabic (MSA) to guarantee the maxim efficiency of their speeches, and to keep public attention. In return, Mubarak's speech relied on the usage of MSA.

Another significant CDA study that is concerned with political discourse in presidential speeches is that of Awaad (2016). This research provides analysis of persuasive strategies implemented in selected political speeches of three former presidents, namely; Zine El Abidine Ben Ali, Mohammed Hosni Mubarak and Muammar Gaddafi during 2010 and 2011 in response to the most critical demonstrations against them in their countries. The study attempts to point out how the three ex-presidents tried to convince people of their patriotism and their intention of reform as desperate attempts to stay as presidents. To conduct such a comparative analysis, the researcher adopts an eclectic model from Aristotle's theory of persuasion, Halliyday's SFG, van Dijk's socio-cgnitive model of CDA, and Yule's theory of presupposition and pronouns. The study finds out that both Mubarak and Ben Ali initiates the speeches using rigid strategies but eventually moved to conciliatory ones which results in raising their ethos and the pathos of their audience. In addition, Mubarak is proved to be the president with the highest employment of persuasive strategies. On the contrary, the study asserts that Gaddafi remains aggressive and challenging throughout his whole speech, which results in underestimation of the Libyan demonstrators.

Being frequently correlated with religious discourse, political discourse includes various references to it in many political leaders' speeches and argumentative discussions. Abdul-Latif (2011) examines the relationship between interdiscursivity of political and religious discourses and the addressees' response in a speech by the late Egyptian president Sadat. Combining CDA and addressee rhetoric as means of data analysis, it shows how potential and actual

responses could be controlled by creating intertextual links with the Qur'an and adopting the genre of Islamic religious sermons. The study suggests that such a kind of interdiscursivity imposes hard restrictions on the responses of Muslim addressees since disagreement with divine texts is considered as some kind of heresy.

Similarly, Coy et al. (2008) finds out that George W. Bush made use of religious discourse in the post 9/11 and Iraq War era, asserting the idea of the "demonizing largely religious enemy". This study examines printed statements, editorials and public calls from 15 US peace movement organizations after 9/11. However, unlike the favourable impact of Sadat's intertextuality of religious terms in his political speeches, the US peace movement organizations showed their disagreement with their president's religiously based discourse in support of war. Moreover, some of these US peace movement organizations harnessed the president religious discourse to turn it against him and his policies whereas others constructed oppositional knowledge, providing corrective information about Islam.

Another CDA study that deals with political data is carried out by Li and Zhang (2019). This paper tackles the interpersonal function of Donald Trump's and the British Prime Minister, Teresa May's speeches from the perspective of CDA using SFL. The study reveals that political speakers tend to employ far more modal operators of medium value to realize interpersonal functions for political and power needs. Unlike other political leaders who rarely use the first person singular, Trump uses it most frequently, seeking the support of more people to stand in line with America and also

to shorten the distance between him and the audience, which is a craft way to persuade the audience to accept his opinions. On the contrary, in May's speech, "we" is used most recurrently to shorten the relationship between Britain and other countries, so as to establish a good image of UK and leave a positive impression on other countries.

One more study that tackles CDA with regard to political discourse is that of Donno (2018). This study seeks to illustrate how Donald Trump's Inauguration Address incorporates elements of power which are embedded in various forms of American exceptionalism. The theoretical framework of this study is built on Foucault's writing on power and van Dijk's concept of ideology. In addition, this study introduces the idea of legitimising myths in the context of Social Dominance Theory to highlight the effect ideologies have on societies. The study finds that Trump's call for social cohesion, his allusions to predestination, his image of civilization and his language on American labor bear close resemblance to Puritan discourses. Further, the theme of nationalism and limited government runs through his speech, both of which are integral to American history and the myth of exceptionalism. In line with the general goals of CDA, this study exemplifies how ideologically charged language needs to be contextualized socio-historically to expose its relationship with power.

There is also another CDA study that tackles political discourse by Koussouhon & Dossoumou (2015). This study aims at making use of analyzing SFL's interpersonal metafunction as a means to conduct a CDA of the Nigerian President Muhammad

Buhari's inaugural speech. The researchers focus on mood, epistemic and deontic modality choices, as well as recoverable references through personal pronouns used throughout the political discourse under consideration. The analysis points out the preponderant use of declarative clauses (97.45%) in the political discourse under study along with their potential of being exclusively information–oriented. Imperative clauses, on the other hand, ranked second (02.54%) to get the populations' full support on board. It was observed that the Inaugural speech in question is devoid of interrogative clauses, which definitely set the audience at the listening edge. The study demonstrates how political leaders' discourses unearth a sort of harmony with ideologies that tally and commensurate the domestic, sub–regional and international realities. Furthermore, it provides sufficient evidence that the grammar of speech is not merely a combinational tool of creating correct constructions, but a method of structuring information and transferring ideology.

Another earlier CDA study on political discourse is that of Kazemian and Hashemi (2014). The major objectives of this study are to investigate and analyze Barack Obama's 2012 five speeches from the point of frequency and functions of nominalization, rhetorical strategies, passivation and modality. Analytical methodologies concerning this study are Ideational Grammatical Metaphor within SFL, Fairclough's CDA as well as rhetorical strategies. The results represent that nominalization, parallelism; unification strategies and modality have dominated in his speeches. The results also point out excessive use of material processes which

is quite dramatic in terms of power relations. That's because it is effectual to deploy it within the domain of doing rather than other processes. Besides, rhetorical devices are used as persuasiveness properties to improve the effectiveness, clarity, and beauty of the speeches. In addition, conveying personal ideologies serves to emphasize inter-relatedness of delivered messages, to signify differentiation, and to demonstrate orator's solidarity with the audience.

It is evident from the sample of CDA studies mentioned above that such analysis can be carried out using different frameworks and within various fields of discourse. In addition CDA studies prove to be beneficial for the linguistic as well as social fields of study. Having chosen religious discourse to be the target of the current study, more instances of CDA studies conducted on religious data are presented in the following section.

Previous CDA studies on religious discourse:

In addition to different studies that tackle CDA of political discourse, there has recently been a group of CDA studies on religious discourse. One of CDA studies that discuss analysis of religious discourse is that of Sharaf El-Din (2014). This study investigates the Islamic discourse in Amr Khalid's sermons, tackling the perspectives of modes of ideology, persuasion and modality. Doing so, this paper tries to show how language of Khalid's sermons reflects the common conceptual structures and interrelationships between him and his audience. The findings point out the specific techniques Khalid used for convincing his audience. First, Khalid shared a specific charisma which helps break down barriers and stress between him and his audience. He also

shares them common dreams and values, and keeps paying attention to other shared aspects of life. Secondly, using the three traditional elements of persuasion (ethos, pathos and logos) is employed, as well as using logical structure of his speeches. He also used presentational persuasion by using repetition, paraphrasing, and metaphors. Khalid uses modality as it reveals a relative power status between the participants in the speech situation. In addition, modals have a significant role in exposing the ideology of the speaker and his degree of commitment to truth. In a nutshell, Khalid's skillful use of linguistic and ideological techniques help him in achieving his goals and in controlling the minds of his audience.

Persuasion strategies, especially in religious discourse, have recently been the target of many researchers. One of them is conducted by Adam (2017). The research explores the persuasive strategies adopted in 43 scripted sermons in English. It focuses on analyzing sermon titles and openings, attempting to identify and categorize the rhetorical strategies and linguistic realizations of persuasion. The paper also examines how credibility is enhanced in the corpus and in what ways it is made prominent in the rhetoric of sermons. To fulfill such an aim, the researcher utilizes the analytical framework and methods of discourse and genre analyses (e.g. van Dijk). In terms of the quantitative examination, selected tools of corpus analysis are used, the primary software being *Sketch Engine*. It is found that the data examined have a number of features in common. The opening passages of sermons seem to enhance their persuasive power, through certain strategies (e.g. introducing the

necessary coordinates for the audience, employing intertextual features as a means of supporting facts of different kinds, the emotional appeal to the audience, the emphasis placed on the authority of the Bible). Finally, the findings prove that to present ideology, increase credibility and subsequently persuade the audience, various linguistic realizations are employed; the resulting persuasive appeal (uniquely encompassing the Aristotelian concepts of ethos, pathos and logos) then helps to legitimize the set of Christian values via language.

On the other hand, there have been some contrastive studies that discuss the religious discourse of different preachers, different religious groups or different languages. Hoigilt (2008) analyzes the language of Yusuf Al-Qaradawi and Amr Khalid in order to identify differences in their rhetoric and to ask what they mean in social and religious terms. SFG is applied for conducting such an analysis. Two metafunctions are addressed: the interpersonal and the experiential ones. The two preachers share the common goal of reviving Islam in contemporary but they apply this task in different ways and on different levels. The linguistic differences between them can be summed up in three points. First, Amr Khalid's texts construct his readers as active, individual spiritual entrepreneurs. Yusuf Al-Qaradawi's texts, on the other hand, construct his readers as a collective in need of guidance from above for their politico religious task of reviving Islam. Second, Amr Khalid's language is oriented towards concrete action with focus on the individual Muslim as agent, while Yusuf Al-Qaradawi's exhibits a concern to establish principles on which to base Islamic revival and to assert his and his colleagues' authority to do so first and foremost. Third,

Yusuf Al-Qaradawi's language shows him to encourage a revival that is firmly rooted within a rich religious tradition, while Amr Khalid makes a clean break with the language of this tradition and builds a revival outside of it.

Similarly, Holíčková (2019) presents a contrastive discourse analysis study of persuasion strategies in Catholic and Protestant scripted sermons. The analysis is carried out on the basis of the three Aristotelian types of appeal to the audience. The analysis focuses specifically on four selected persuasive strategies relevant for the genre of sermons: intertextuality, figurative language (specifically conceptual metaphors), sharing the personal preacher's experience, direct appeal to the audience, and the use of speech acts (namely; interrogative, imperative, and exclamatory speech acts). The results prove that Protestant sermons seem to contain a stronger persuasive potential than Catholic sermons. This finding is due to the greater importance of sermons in Protestant environments compared to the Catholic ones. The only strategy that occurs equally in the language of the two groups of sermons is that of figurative language, specifically conceptual metaphors. The difference detected is related to the approach of preaching and perception of sermons explained in the theoretical part.

CDA studies on religious discourse tackle analyzing certain topics both textually and ideologically. The study of Dabbous-Sensenig (2006) is an example. It analyzes the characteristics of religious discourses on the *hijab* from Al Jazeera's religious talk show, *A-Shari'a wal Hayat*. Between 1998 and 2003, several episodes dealt with the Turkish and French ban and the 'issue' of

the headscarf, most of them hosting prominent religious scholar Youssef Qaradawi. Drawing mostly on Fairclough's CDA approach and Halliday's SFG, the researcher examines the main linguistic strategies and rhetorical arguments deployed by participants ⟨hosts and viewers⟩. This analysis aims also at detecting any differences in the range of opinions covered by the examined episodes. It also seeks to know how various positions are manifested at the local/global levels of analysis. Most importantly, it sheds light on Al-Jazeera's ideology concerning one of the most controversial religious topics for Muslims. It is found that the show is meant to promote 'the opinion and the same opinion' of orthodox Sunni Islam, at least as far as the hijab is concerned. Unlike other anti-rationalist and authoritarian trends of religious discourse, these episodes go to the extent of tackling some commonsensical definitions that amounts to questioning the word of God, an unthinkable deed to pious Muslims. *A-Sharia wal Hayat*, generically, as a programme type, is making it possible, however unwillingly or indirectly, to expose the non-universal, temporal nature of dominant religious discourses.

One more study conducted by El Naggar ⟨2017⟩ tackles CDA on spoken religious discourse by the American Muslim televangelist Baba Ali who gained popularity through a series of videos on YouTube. The research makes use of the DHA and the Framework of Visual Grammar. Four key aspects of Ali's videos discussed within this study include religious invocation, video-edition and self-representation, use of humour and interactivity. It is found that Ali's videos represent a novel genre that embeds features of the sermon, video-blogs and YouTube culture.

Furthermore, Baba Ali is found to represent a new type of a religious figure whose authority appears to emanate from his ordinariness as he presents himself as one of his audience; and from his playfulness.

There is also another contrastive study conducted by El Naggar (2017). It investigates YouTube sermons of two American Muslim televangelists, Hamza Yusuf and Baba Ali. Self-presentation strategies of the two case studies are examined using DHA and the theory of Visual Grammar. Despite the fact that both Hamza Yusuf and Baba Ali are contemporary Muslim televangelists who grew up in the USA, they differ in their style of preaching. Hamza Yusuf, for example, usually gives relatively long sermons addressed to co-present audiences in mosques or Islamic conferences. His sermons are aired on TV and/or are posted to YouTube. Unlike Hamza Yusuf, Baba Ali's sermons don't exceed 10 minutes. They are broadcast on YouTube. The two case studies are found to be different in their self-presentation strategies in terms of the expression of their authority and the degree of formality. Baba Ali and Hamza Yusuf prove to represent two different types of religious celebrities. On the one hand, Hamza Yusuf's authority emanates from representing himself as being different from his audiences, appearing as not only a preacher but also as an intellectual who talks about different issues of religion and politics. He has a formal look in his suit and tie. Baba Ali's authority, however, is based on representing himself as being one of his addressees, wearing his informal T-shirt. On the discursive level, Baba Ali's ordinariness is evident in the data by using

colloquialisms, conversational interjections and informal address terms. He also uses other means to create a rapport with his audience, for example, through creating dialogues with an imagined viewer.

Another study by El Naggar (2012) aims to explore intertextuality and interdiscursivity as means of persuasion in one speech by the Muslim televangelist Hamza Yusuf. Like the study mentioned above, the DHA is also applied in this study. The use of dramatized personal stories and recontextualizing religious terms help tie Yusuf's speech to the religious realm. The discursive construction of religion as a dynamic force of change is found to help presenting religion as an alternative approach to life and as a solution to some global problems.

Another CDA study is conducted by El Naggar (2019), tackling a speech by the American Muslim televangelist, Hamza Yusuf as a case study. The data investigated is Yusuf's speech "a message to humanity" given in Chicago in 2004, coinciding with George Bush's "war on terror". The study discusses a different perspective of televangelism that is the construction of Muslim identities as televangelists instruct their audiences on who they are, to whom they belong, and invoke particular historical references, rather than others, to create a particular distinct representation for Islam/Muslims. The study also pays attention to Hamza Yusuf's use of argumentation strategies. DHA is drawn on for doing the analysis. It is found that Hamza Yusuf responds positively to the anti-Muslim discourse in the post 9/11 context, aiming at constructing an identity in which US Muslims generate two essential beliefs, i.e., being Muslim and Western/American, and

dismissing the binary opposition between Islam and the West. Strategies of self–legitimization; and delegitimisation of anti–Muslim discourse are also implemented. Another important topic in Yusuf's discourses that of Muslim civilization which acts both as a strategy for positive self–representation and as an evidence that Muslims have contributed to Western civilization. That's why they should not be abused or discriminated against.

One more study is done by El Naggar (2014) for analyzing televangelised videos. It tackles strategies of self–presentation and construction of identities by three popular American Muslim televangelists that belong to three different generations, namely; Yusuf Estes, Hamza Yusuf and Ali Ardekani. Using a selected sample of their websites and YouTube videos, an eclectic approach of multi–modality (e.g. Kress and van Leeuwen 2001) and the Wodak's DHA is implemented to deconstruct images, dress codes, colour schemes; and the discursive strategies used by televangelists to present themselves as 'media celebrities', while constructing identities for their audiences. In many different ways, these televangelists are found to have addressed the complexities of the socio–historical context of Muslims in the post 9–11 era.

The studies mentioned above show various perspectives of discussing religious discourse. The previous review of literature carried out on religious discourse analysis sheds light on different frameworks adopted for data analysis. Besides, it asserts the importance of analyzing religious discourse critically. Such a sort of analysis acts as a means of uncovering different strategies and ideologies manifested in religious discourse. These studies are also

vital for the process of increasing the addressees' awareness as for the discourse they encounter and the preachers they prefer.

Previous studies on power:

Most CDA studies that deal with power patterns are concerned with political discourse as it witnesses most cases of power struggle within different societies. One of these political-discourse analysis studies is that of Shayegh and Nabifar (2012). It discusses Obama's methods used to hint the degree of power to his addresses. The analysis of interviews with regard to ideology is confined to identification of transitivity and modality. Analyzing hesitation, persuasion, threat, religious statement and illusive speech in each clause on the base of Fairclough's model is also done. It is found that the speaker uses "I" and "we" pronouns, more religious statements, more persuasion, and longer turns in his interviews. He also uses threats, future plans, imperatives and rhetorical questions to indicate power. At the end, it is concluded that Obama as a dominant character who manifested power in his discourse by using more material process mostly.

There is also another CDA study that tackles power relations in political discourse. Ezeifeka (2013) discusses interpersonal meaning in two inaugural political speeches of two Nigerian post-leaders. The data is analyzed using Halliday's SFG beside insights from CDA. The findings show a deliberate oscillation between the use of singular subject (I) and the plural one (we); rhetoric that in turns seems to take credit for positive achievement and divest responsibility for negative representations. The vocatives are also positioned to assert solidarity with the addressees and to legitimize the power of the hegemonic regime. The findings also show how

choices in the lexicogrammar can become effective instruments of the power elite in manipulation, propaganda, deceit and denial of the basic sustenance of the less dominant.

Another recent study that examines power abuse in political discourse is carried out by Qaiwer (2020). It aims to investigate Trump's representation of social groups which may involve positive presentation in one context and negative representation in another. This study provides qualitative analyses of Trump's speeches related to Islam. The researcher draws upon van Dijk's two theories of epistemic DA and that of discourse and manipulation in addition to van Lewueen's frameworks of social actor's representation and of legitimating strategies. The results reveal how Islam and Muslims are named, and how the naming is legitimised and relate to the dichotomies of US and THEM. As for, naming and nominalisation, the findings show that noun modification can involve dense ideological propositions. In referring to Radical Islam , for example, the study shows that predicates in assertive expressions reflects acts attributed to the named entity and further intensify the existence of the relationship among them. Therefore, we can say that the text producer is exercising power abuse for manipulating the audience's mental models. Additionally, power abuse is employed through manipulating pronoun reference in discourse especially with the use of *We* inclusively and /or exclusively. The study has shown that quoting others out of context or recontextualising other's speech in a context where it is attached to a different proposition or speech is a kind of power abuse.

One of the few studies that discuss aspects of power in religious discourse is that of Cipriani (2002). It addresses the phenomenon of power in the genre of sermons by analyzing two written texts, one in English and the other is in Portuguese. The model used for conducting the CDA of religious written discourse in this study relies on the social dimension of discourse (Fairclough, 1989, 1992) and organized according to the components of hortatory texts (Longacre, 1992) which are: establishment of authority and author's credentials; presentation of the problem and solution; issuing commands and resort to motivation. The use of the biblical references, religious narratives, using metaphors, evoking the importance of the position of the bishops as spiritual leaders, appealing to threats as well as to the readers' feelings such as love for God are also proved to be strong means of establishing power. Results show that a great amount of ideological power is presented in the sermons as they depict social values and employ them as common sense notions in an attempt to influence the readers' conduct. It is found that one aspect of power manifestation, the establishment of authority, was first represented by the position of bishop holds in the church. It is also manifested by the presence of biblical references that according to the church's convictions are the model from which opinions and conducts must be followed.

Conclusion:

Looking through the previously reviewed studies on power manifestation, it is evident that most studies of power relations have addressed political contexts. In addition, only one study is found to tackle manifestation of power in religious discourse despite the fact that it includes analysis of written discourse. Hence, there is a bad

need to fill the gap in such an area of linguistic study of examining power manifestation, especially in religious discourse.

Religious discourse not only gets different participants to think about doing their rituals and makes them obey their religion's instructtions but also exerts power over their minds. Addressees of such a genre should constantly be reminded of the influence of language in action. It becomes necessary to realize that if the addressees are victimized by a discourse, then, they are in need of a new discourse and that it is their own responsibility to create a liberating (Degenaar, 1997). One of the main genres of discourse needed to be renewed is that of religion. That's why tackling religious discourse from the perspective of CDA becomes an interesting area of study. Many challenges of political struggle, extremists, defaming western accusations of terrorism and ignorance are to be faced by renewing religious discourse. Thus, more detailed analyses of its linguistic features and embedded ideologies can be the first step towards the understanding of religious discourse and consequently its renewal.

References

Abdel Fattah, D. (2015). *Egyptian presidents' speeches in times of crisis: Comparative analysis.* [Master's Thesis, the American University in Cairo]. AUC Knowledge Fountain.

https://fount.aucegypt.edu/etds/1330

Abdul Latif, E. (2011). Interdiscursivity between political and religious discourses in a speech by Sadat: Combining CDA and addressee rhetoric. *Journal of Language and Politics.* 10:1 (2011), 50–67.

https://scholar.cu.edu.eg/?q=social_sector/files/03_1.pdf

Adam, M. (2017). Persuasion in religious discourse: enhancing credibility in sermon titles and openings. *Discourse and Interaction.* pp. 5-25.

https://journals.muni.cz/discourse-and-
interaction/article/view/11502

Awaad, I. (2016). Persuasive strategies in selected speeches of Zine El Abidine Ben Ali, Hosni Mubarak and Muammar Gaddafi. *Journal of Scientific Research in Arts.*Vol. 2016, no. 17, pp.505–548.
https://search.emarefa.net/detail/BIM-873023

Chouliaraki, L. and Fairclough, N. (1999) Discourse in Late Modernity. *Journal of English Linguistics*(Sage).

https://discovery.ucl.ac.uk/id/eprint/10084998/1/O%27Regan2001
Discourse151.pdf

Cipriani, A. C. (2002). Power in religious discourse: a discourse analysis of two sermons from the Universal Church of the Kingdom of God. [Master's thesis. Santa Catarina, Florianópolis: Universidade Federal de].

https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/30364257.pdf

Coy, P., Maney, G. Woehrle, L. (2008). Blessing war and blessing peace: religious discourses in the US during major conflict periods, 1990–2005

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/242348515_Blessing_war_and_blessing_peace_Religious_discourses_in_the_US_during_major_conflict_periods_1990-2005

Dabbous–Sensenig, D. (2006). To Veil or Not to Veil: Gender and Religion on Al–Jazeera's Islamic Law and Life. *Westminster Papers in Communication and Culture. (University of Westminster, London)*, Vol. 3(2):60–85.

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/238495643_To_Veil_or_Not_to_Veil_Gender_and_Religion_on_Al-Jazeera's_Islamic_Law_and_Life

Degenaar, J.(1997). Religious discourse, power and the public. *Neotestamentica.* 31(1).

https://www.jstor.org/stable/i40118254

Donno, J. (2018). Make America exceptional again: Critical Discourse Analysis. [A thesis submitted for the degree of Master. Malmö University, Faculty of Culture and Society].

Eggins, S. (2004). *An Introduction to Systemic Functional Linguistics* (second ed.). New York: Continuum.

El Naggar, S. (2012). Intertextuality and interdiscursivity in the discourse of Muslim televangelists: the case study of Hamza Yusuf. *Critical Approaches to Discourse Analysis Across Disciplines.* 6(1), 76–95

http://cadaad.net/journal

El Naggar, S. (2014). The impact of digitization on the religious sphere: televangelism as an example. *IJIMS, Indonesian Journal of Islam and Muslim Societies*, Volume 4, Number 2, December 2014: 189–211

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/285029580_El_Naggar_S_2014_The_impact_of_digitization_on_the_religious_sphere_Televangelism_as_an_example_Indonesian_Journal_of_Islam_and_Muslim_Societies_4_2_189-211

El Naggar, S. (2017). 'But I did not do anything!' – analysing the YouTube videos of the American Muslim televangelist Baba Ali: delineating the complexity of a novel genre, *Critical Discourse Studies*.

https://doi.org/10.1080/17405904.2017.1408477

El Naggar, S. (2017). American Muslim Televangelists as Religious Celebrities: The Changing 'Face' of Religious Discourse. In Rosowsky, Andrey (ed.) *Faith and Language Practices in Digital Spaces*.

https://doi.org/10.21832/9781783099283-012

El Naggar, S. (2019) "The eyes of history are looking upon as a community": The representation of Islam and Muslims by the televangelist Hamza Yusuf. In Rosowsky, Andrey (ed.) *Aspects of performance in faith settings: Heavenly Acts*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing, pp. 151–167.

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/341322528_El_Naggar_Shaimaa_2019_The_eyes_of_history_are_looking_upon_as_a_community_The_representation_of_Islam_and_Muslims_by_the_televangelist_Hamza_Yusuf_In_Rosowsky_Andrey_e

d_Aspects_of_performance_in_fait/link/5ebab263299bf1c09a
b5312a/download

Ezeifeka, Chinwe R. (2013). Critical Discourse Analysis of
Interpersonal Meaning and Power Relations in Selected
Inaugural Political Speeches in Nigeria. Unizik Journal of
Arts and Humanities Vol. 14.

http://www.ajol.info/index.php/ujah/article/view/101194.

Fairclough, N., & Wodak, R. (1997). Critical Discourse Analysis.
In T. A. Van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse as Social Interaction:
Discourse Studies (A Multidisciplinary Introduction)* (pp.
258–284). London: Sage.

Fairclough, N. (1992). Discourse and text: linguistic and
intertextual analysis within discourse analysis.Discourse and
Society, Vol.3(2). 193–217

https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926592003002004

Fairclough, N. (1993). Critical Discourse Analysis and the
Marketization of Public Discourse: The Universities.
Discourse and Society, 4, 133–168.
https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926593004002002

Fairclough, N. (1995). Critical discourse analysis: The Critical
Study of Language. London: Longman.

https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315834368

Fairclough, N. (2001). Critical discourse analysis. In A. McHoul,
& M. Rapley (Eds.), *How to analyse talk in institutional
settings : a casebook of methods* (pp. 25–38). Continuum.

Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and Power*. Longman. New
York.

Fontaine, L. (2013) *Analyzing English Grammar: A systemic-functional introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Foucault, M. (1972). *The archaeology of knowledge and the discourse on language*. New York: Pantheon.

Foucault, M. (1996). Foucault Live: Interviews, 1961–1984, Sylvère Lotringer (ed), Lysa Hochroth & John Johnson (trans), New York: Semiotext(e).

Gee, J. P. (2011). *An introduction to discourse analysis: theory and method* (3rd ed). New York: Routledge.

Halliday, M.A.K. (1978). *Language as Social Semiotic: The Social Interpretation of Language and Meaning*. London: Edward Arnold.

Halliday, M. K. A.(2004). An Introduction to Functional Grammar. London: Arnold Publishers.

Halliday, M. A. K., & Matthiessen, C. (2014). *Halliday's Introduction to Functional Grammar* (4th ed.). Oxon: Routledge.

Hjelm, T. (2013). Religion, Discourse and Power: A Contribution towards a Critical Sociology of Religion. Critical Sociology. Vol. 40(6) 855–872.

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/270638611_Religion_Discourse_and_Power_A_Contribution_towards_a_Critical_Sociology_of_Religion

Hoigilt, J.(2008). Varieties of Persuasion in Modern Forms of Islamic Proselytizing in Egypt, Revue des mondes musulmans et de la Mediterranee (124): 243–263

https://doi.org/10.4000/remmm.6032

Holíčková, Z.(2019). Persuasive strategies in religious discourse: A contrastive analysis of scripted sermons. [A Master thesis submitted to the Department of English Language and Literature, Faculty of Education, Masaryk University].

https://is.muni.cz/th/glnnh/Master_s_Diploma_Thesis.pdf

Hussain, S., Jote, A., Sajid, S.(2017). Critical Discourse Analysis: Demystifying the Fuzziness. *The International Journal Of Humanities & Social Studies.* Vol. 242.

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/314898880_Critical_Discourse_Analysis_Demystifying_the_Fuzziness

Jahedi, M., Abdllah, F., Mukundan, J.(2014). An Overview of Focal Approaches of Critical Discourse Analysis. *International Journal of Education & Literacy Studies.* Vol. 2 No. 4; October 2014

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/293652413_An_Overview_of_Focal_Approaches_of_Critical_Discourse_Analysis

Jiang, W.(2021). Application of Systemic-Functional Grammar in Critical Discourse Analysis-Taking Bbc Reports on the Belt and Road as an Example. *International Conference on Information Technology, Education and Development (ICITED2021).* Francis Academic Press, UK.

https://webofproceedings.org/proceedings_series/ESSP/ICITED%202021/WHCP21A010.pdf

Kazemian, B. & Hashemi, S. (2014). Critical Discourse Analysis of Barack Obama's 2012 Speeches: Views from SFL and Rhetoric. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies,* 4 (6)

https://www.academypublication.com/issues/past/tpls/vol04/06/11.p
df

Koussouhon, L & Dossoumou, A (2015). Political and Ideological
Commitments: A Systemic Functional Linguistic and Critical
Discourse Analysis of President Buhari's Inaugural Speech.
International Journal of Linguistics and Communication.
Vol. 3, No. 2, pp. 24–34.

http://ijlcnet.com/journals/ijlc/Vol_3_No_2_December_2015/3.pdf

Kress, G., & Van Leeuwen, T. (2001). Multimodal discourse: The
modes and media of contemporary communication.
Language in society.

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/231817483_Gunther_Kr
ess_Theo_van_Leeuwen_Multimodal_discourse_The_mode
s_and_media_of_contemporary_communication_London_A
rnold_2001_Pp_vii_142_Hb_7200_Pb_2495_-

Li, T., Zhang, Y. (2019). Language and Power: A Critical
Discourse Analysis of the Political Speech. *International
Journal of Languages, Literature and Linguistics*, Vol. 5(4)

http://www.ijlll.org/vol5/238-AU0021.pdf

Marbun, L.A.Yanti. (2016). Process Types of Transitivity System in
the National Geographic's Articles. *The Episteme Journal of
Linguistic.*

https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Process-Types-of-
Transitivity-System-in-the-Marbun-
Yanti/8604b432dca3feafaf8754ed107c37333768c1d1

Meyer, M. (2001). Between Theory, Method, and Politics:
Positioning of the Approaches of CDA. In R. Wodak, & M. Meyer

(Eds.), *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis* (pp. 14–32). London: Sage Publications.

Moll, Y. (2012). Storytelling, Sincerity, and Islamic Televangelism in Egypt. In: Thomas, P.N., Lee, P. (eds) *Global and Local Televangelism*. Palgrave Macmillan, London. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137264817_2

Morley, T.(2004). Power and Ideology in Everyday Discourse: The Relevance of Critical Discourse Analysis in Pragmatic Linguistics Today. *Journal of health and sports science, Juntendo University* (8), 20–25.

http://doingmodernity.blogspot.com/2012/04/power-and-ideology-in-everyday.html

Mustapha, M. & Abdul Razak, M.(2019). A Critical Appraisal of Zakir Naik's Islamic Evangelism. *International Journal of Islamic Thought.* Vol. 15.

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/333757853_A_Critical_Appraisal_of_Zakir_Naik's_Islamic_Evangelism

Pitsoe, V. & Letseka, M.(2013). Foucault's Discourse and Power: Implications for Instructionist Classroom Management. *Open Journal of Philosophy 2013.* Vol.3, No.1, 23–28.

https://www.scirp.org/pdf/OJPP_2013020811451567.pdf

Qaiwer, S.(2020). Power Abuse in Political Discourse: a Critical Discourse Analysis of Trump's Discourse. *Journal of Arts, Literature, Humanities and Social Science.* Vol. 50.

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/341357988_Power_Abuse_in_Political_discourse

Rogers, R. (2004). *An Introduction to Critical Discourse Analysis in Education*. London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Sharaf Eldin, A. (2014). Critical Discourse Analysis of Religious Sermons in Egypt; Case Study of Amr Khalid's Sermons'' *International Education Journal*. Vol. 7, No. 11.

https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/aa8f/9110c9339628e93a684386f1d46017ff9ff6.pdf

Shayegh, K., Nabifar, N. (2012). Power in Political Discourse of Barak Obama. Journal of Basic and Applied Scientific Research. 2(4)3481–3491

https://www.textroad.com/pdf/JBASR/J.%20Basic.%20Appl.%20Sci.%20Res.,%202(4)3481–3491,%202012.pdf

van Dijk, T. A. (1989) Structures of Discourse and Structures of Power, *Annuals of the International Communication Association*, 12:1, 18–59.

https://doi.org/10.1080/23808985.1989.11678711

van Dijk, T. A. (1993). Principles of critical discourse analysis. *Discourse & society*. 4 (2), 249–283 https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926593004002006

van Dijk, T. A.(1996).Discourse, power and accent. In C. R. Caldas–Coulthard and M. Coulthard, eds., *Texts and Practices: Readings in Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Routledge, pp.84–104.

van Dijk, T.A. (1998). *Ideology*. London: Sage.

van Dijk, T. A. (2001). Critical discourse analysis. In D. Tannen, D. Schiffrin, & H. Hamilton (Eds.), *Handbook of discourse analysis* (pp. 352–371). Oxford: Blackwell.

van Dijk, T. (2003). The Discourse-Knowledge Interface. In G. Weiss, & R. Wodak (Eds.), *Critical Discourse Analysis* (pp. 85-109). Hampshire: Palgrave MacMillan.

van Dijk, T.A. (2015). Critical Discourse Analysis. Introduction : What Is Critical Discourse Analysis? *Sociology*.

https://discourses.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/07/Teun-A.-van-Dijk-2015-Critical-discourse-Analysis.pdf

Van Leeuwen, T. (2006). Critical Discourse Analysis and Multimodality. Keith Brown, ed. *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*, Vol. 3. Oxford: Elsevier. 290-94.

Wetherell, M., Talor, S., & Yates, S. J. (Eds.). (2001). *Discourse as Data: A Guide for Analysis*. London: Sage.

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

Wodak, R. (1997). *Gender and Discourse*. London: Sage.

Wodak, R. (2001). What Critical Discourse Analysis is about-a summary of its history, important concepts and its developments. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (eds.), *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis* (pp. 1-13). London: Sage.

Wodak, R. (2009). *The Discourse of Politics in Action: Politics as Usual*, Basingstoke: Palgrave