A Proposed Objective Version of the Ideological Square Theory in Critical Discourse Analysis

By

Asst. Prof. Firas Abdul-Munim Jawad

hum.firas.abd@uobabylon.edu.iq

Department of English - College of Education for Human Sciences - University of Babylon

نموذج موضوعي مقترح لنظرية المربع الفكري في التحليل النقدي للخطاب

الأستاذ المساعد فراس عبد المنعم جواد

قسم اللغة الإنكليزية ـ كلية التربية للعلوم الإنسانية ـ جامعة بابل

Abstract

Critical discourse analysis indicates considering the linguistic tools critically when analyzing a discourse to make a social change to solve some problems of social inequality. It has been approached by van Dijk (1998) through the ideological square theory subjectively resulting in the problem to which the present study aims to offer a solution through proposing some modifications to that theory. This could be done by reconsidering the cornerstone of van Dijk's (ibid.) approach, i.e., ideology which is interest-oriented adopted by the in-group participants. Adopting such an ideology paves the way to subjectivity which makes a recognized shortcoming. The proposed model tries to deal with this shortcoming by claiming that CDA is not limited to the interest orientation. The basis on which the ideological square theory is built could be different ideologies such as the truth-oriented ideology where discourse participants apply criticality to make their targeted aim by recognizing the truth concerning the subject matter of the discourse rather than (re)shaping the atmosphere according to their interest. It is suggested that the discourse participants are not necessarily direct and limited to in- and out-group participants. There could be indirect participants involved neutrally in the critical consideration to the discourse under investigation . Objectivity is claimed to be achieved by the proposed

model by offering a comprehensive rather than selective consideration of the positive and negative sides of both the in- and out-group participants. The theoretical proposal has been applied successfully to two well-known cases, i.e., the speech of Kennedy in 1962 concerning the Cuba Missile Crisis and Putin concerning Ukraine in 2022.

Key Words:

1- Critical Discourse Analysis
2- van Dijk's (1998) Ideological Square model
3- Criticism   : selectivity, subjectivity, objectivity
4- Ideology   : interest-orientation, truth-orientation
5- Polarization: in-group, out-group
6- Neutrality   : neutral group
7- Treatment directionality: single- and binary-directional treatment.

المستخلص:

التحليل النقدي للخطاب يتضمن التوظيف النقدي للأدوات اللغوية لإحداث تغيير في المجتمع من خلال معالجة بعض مشـــاكل اللامســاواة. تمت مقاربة التحليل النقدي للخطاب من خلال نظرية المربع الفكري ل فان دايك (١٩٩٨) بشكل ذاتي مما أدى الى مشكلة الذاتية التي تحاول الدراسة الحالية معالجتها بواسطة أقتراح بعض التعديلات على النظرية. حاولت الدراسة التعامل مع نقطة الانتقاد هذه باقتراح موديل لتطوير لنظرية المربع الفكري لمراجعة أســــاس نظرية فان دايك (١٩٩٨) وهي الايديولوجيا. يمكن وصـــفها بانها ايديولوجية الاتجاه المصـــلحي المعتمد من قبل مشــــاركي المجموعة الداخلية في الخطاب .تختزل نظرية المربع الفكري لفان دايك (١٩٩٨) الايديولوجيات البشـرية بالأيديولوجيا الغربية الموجهة مصـلحيا. يعاني هذا النوع من التعامل من الانتقائية المؤدية الى الذاتية. يحاول الموديل المقترح التعامل مع هذه الســـلبية بالافتراض ان التحليل النقدي للخطاب غير منحصـر بالاتجاه المصـلحي لان الايديولوجيا هي خاصـة وليست عامة . يمكن للأســـاس الذي بنيت عليه نظرية المربع الفكري ان تكون ايديولوجيا مختلفة مثل ايديولوجيا الاتجاه الحقيقي. يدعي الموديل المقترح تقديم طريقة موضـــوعية لتحليل الخطاب نقديا

من خلال تبني اجراءات تحليلية تتبنى تغطية كل اطراف الخطاب بموضـــوعية و تحافظ على تسـليط الضـوء على الجانبين السـلبي والايجابي للطرفين الداخلي والخارجي. يفترض الموديل المقترح أن أعضـاء التحليل النقدي للخطاب لا يشـترط بهم أن تكون عضويتهم مباشرة ووظيفتهم منحصرة بالسعي وراء مصالحهم، بل يمكن أن تكون غير مباشرة ومحايدة ووظيفة الاعضـاء هنا هي الوصـــول الى هدف أخر غير المصـــلحة مثل الحقيقة. تفترض الدراســة الحالية أن الموديل المقترح يوفر موضـوعية بسـبب التغطية الشـاملة بدل الانتقائية. تم تطبيق الموديل النظري عمليا على حالتين معروفتين هما خطاب كندي ١٩٦٢ رئيس اميركا بخصـوص أزمة الصواريخ الكوبية و بوتين الرئيس الروســي بخصـــوص غزو أوكرانيا في ٢٠٢٢. أثبت التطبيق العملي للموديل المقترح نجاحه النقدي بمحاولته تحقيق تغيير اجتماعي بواسـطة تقديم رؤى موضـــوعية للحالتين اللتين تم تناولهما سابقا بانتقائية وذاتية.

الكلمات المفتاحية:

١– التحليل النقدي للخطاب – موديل فان دايك (١٩٩٨) للمربع الفكري –

٢– النقد   : الانتقائية – الذاتية – الموضوعية

٣– الايديولوجيا   : توجه المصلحة – توجه الحقيقة

٤– الاستقطاب   : المجموعة الداخلية – المجموعة الخارجية – المجموعة المحايدة

٥– اتجاه المعاملة : معاملة احادية الاتجاه – معاملة مزدوجة الاتجاه.

Introduction:

The cornerstone of the present study is the need for objectivity in Critical Discourse Analysis when adopting van Dijk's (1998) ideological square in his socio-cognitive approach to CDA. This need makes the **problem** to which the present study aims to meet. A number of shortcomings have been recognized in CDA such as subjectivity, selectivity, methodology among others as claimed in Widdowson (2007). CDA focuses on the negative side of issues especially when applying van Dijk's (1998) ideological square. As an attempt to shed light on the positive side of the discourse under study

when making a critical analysis, Martin (2004) focuses on the positive side. Needless to say that this treatment suffers from the same shortcoming of CDA which is selectivity which leads to subjectivity. Ideology makes the cornerstone of CDA since it decides the discourse producer's stance. The Western ideology, though it is not limited to the West, is interest-oriented. The major concern of the holders of that ideology is to achieve their critical goal through analyzing discourse critically to try to make the targeted social change. However, this critical consideration is not the only one available. CDA analysts who do not follow that ideology could hardly be content with the outcomes of CDA based on that ideology. Interest-oriented ideology holders who adopt van Dijk's ideological square (1998) intend to make their targeted social change through considering the communication of the in- and out-groups inequally and unjustly, as will be shown later. This kind of treatment lacks objectivity since it is single- rather than binary-sided. To consider objectivity for those who are truth-oriented ideology holders, there is a need for a new objective approach for the critical analysis. The present study **aims** to offer an attempt in this regard.

It is **hypothesized** that the needed approach could be proposed if the ideological square suggested by van Dijk (1998) is reconsidered and the gaps there are filled. Those gaps are represented by ignoring the negative side of the in-group as well as positive side of the out-group.

The **methodology** followed for the present study is to analyze two discourses critically according to van Dijk's (ibid.) ideological square first to identify the shortcoming concerning objectivity and the disability of the ideological square to apply criticality in an objective way. Then, a modified model is suggested to fill in that gap to try to make a social change through trying to offer a comprehensive and objective coverage for the subject matter of the discourse under critical analysis.

The present study intends to be of some **value** by offering some theoretical and practical contributions to CDA. **Theoretically**, it offers an attempt to make an objective version of CDA through establishing a theoretical framework for CDA that is not limited to the interest-oriented strategy

adopted in van Dijk's (ibid.) ideological square. It tries to consolidate the critical analysis for discourse to include even discourses adopting some other ideologies , as will be shown later. **Practically**, the present study introduces an example of CDA that is made objectively. It gives CDA practitioners a chance to analyze discourse critically in an objective way.

CDA is the field of the present study where criticality is tried to be applied to discourse analysis (DA, henceforth). Principally, DA is supposed to be neutrally descriptive whereas criticality tries to apply the critical theory to DA to result in CDA. Critical theory has two versions where the traditional one was meant simply to understand and explain social acts deeply and thoroughly whereas the second one is meant to critique modern capitalist society as referred to by Bhatia (2017:22). The targeted aim of that recent form of the critical theory is to make a social change through CDA.

When dealing with CDA there should be some consideration to a number of basics, such as principles, basic problems to be solved, aims, major approaches and criticism. CDA has been defined by a number of its practitioners like Fairclough (1989, 1992, 1995) , Wodak (1996) and van Dijk (1998, 2015) among others; however, the operational definition adopted for the present study is van Dijk's (2015) as will be stated and discussed later. CDA has been defined differently since the approaches are different. Fairclough (1989,1992,1995)has adopted the dialectical-reasoning in his dialectical-relational approach whereas Wodak (2001) has taken history into consideration when proposing her CDA approach. Van Dijk (1998, 2015) has highlighted the social as well as cognitive sides in a symmetrical approach to CDA. The details will be given later.

CDA Principles:

Although CDA has been approached differently by different CDA practitioners, a number of principles have been considered highly by them as proposed in Fairclough and Wodak (1997:467) , as quoted in Mazid (2014:17) and shown below:

1- CDA addresses social problems , 2- power relations are discursive,3- discourse constitutes society and culture, 4- discourse does ideological

work, 5- discourse is historical, 6- the link between text and society is mediated,7- discourse analysis is interpretive and explanatory and finally 8- discourse is a form of social action.

The critical analysis of discourse has been proposed to be an influential tool to achieve a number of goals. Various political and social issues made by misusing power and dominance to produce social inequalities like racism, feminism, anti-racism etc. in some societies.

CDA Aims:

Some **aims** of CDA have been proposed by some practitioners as the following:

1- van Dijk (1993:250) thinks that CDA tries to criticize and expose social inequality which leads to dominance that gives advantage to the elite groups to practice their social powers.

2- A main aim of CDA is to investigate the ways in which change in language results in making social and cultural changes, as put in Fairclough (1992:1)

3-Exposing deception that may not be recognized easily in discourses to ordinary discourse receivers. CDA transfers them into the critical consciousness and shows how language is used for one party rather than another, as put in Fairclough (1992:6).

Beside the general aims of CDA, the present study targets a specific aim. It aims to re-evaluate van Dijk's ideological square concerning the points of criticism offering a new perspective of CDA.

CDA Approaches:

CDA has been approached differently by some practitioners. These approaches are going to be presented in some details as follows:

Fairclough (1989, 1992 and 1995) has proposed his dialectical-relational approach which is a three-dimensional way of description, interpretation and explanation. These three stages function to observe the social changes

and linguistic manifestations found in discourses of resistance and difference as claimed in Fairclough (1992:71). It is believed by Fairclough (ibid.) that the first stage of his model, namely, description represents the "whatness" through describing the formal properties of the discourse investigation. The second stage of the model is the 'interpretation' one where the analysis deals with "howness" of the discourse or the way it is produced through interpreting it. The final stage of the model is the "explanation" which focuses on "whyness" or the reason behind the way of constructing the discourse it has been constructed according to.

Ruth Wodak (2001)has proposed an approach considering history critically in her Discourse Historical Approach which contains four stages. The linguistic stages is the first one focusing on grammar whereas the other three stages deal with the social theories and contexts. There are four levels in this approach, namely, co-text, intertextual, extra linguistic social/sociological and a broader socioplolitical and historical levels.

Van Dijk's (1998) approach is called socio-cognitive since CDA is joined with cognition to reveal ideological structures. CDA is defined by van Dijk (2015:466) as follows:

> discourse analytical research that primarily studies the way social-power abuse and inequality are enacted, reproduced, legitimated, and resisted by text and talk in the social and political context. With such dissident research, critical discourse analysis take an explicit position and thus want to understand, expose, ultimately challenge social inequality.

CDA in the definition above has identified the problem to be solved by applying criticality when doing a discourse analysis is the social inequality. To let the socio-cognitive approach work it adopts three major levels of analysis, namely, macro and micro in addition to the cognitive one. The first level of analysis is the micro one which deals with language use including syntactic fields like transitivity and passivation as well as semantic level dealing with modality and lexicalization among others in addition to some discursive strategies such as norm and value violation, negative lexicalization, hyperbole among others. The second level which is the subject matter of the present study is the ideological square theory

being the cornerstone of the macro level analysis. The ideological square (IS, henceforth) categorizes discourse participants ideologically into two groups, **Us**, i.e. in-group and **Them**, i.e., out-group.

The in-group participants are connected with what is good whereas out-group participants are connected with what is bad. (van Dijk: 1998:33). The IS ,as proposed by van Dijk (ibid.:267) could be put as follows,

1- express/ emphasize information that is positive about 'US'.

2- express/ emphasize information that is negative about 'Them'.

3- Suppress/de-emphasize information that is positive about 'Them'.

4- Suppress/ de-emphasize information that is negative about 'US'.

Discourse structures are influenced by the ideological categorization of the participants. The first category of participants called in-group are considered positively through emphasizing the positive side and de-emphasizing the negative side they may have. The participants called out-group are considered negatively through emphasizing the negative side and de-emphasizing the positive side they may have. This selectivity leads to subjectivity when trying to present both positive and negative sides of the in- and out-groups. Figure (1) below is illustrative:

In-group Members		Out-group Members	
Positive side	Negative side	Positive side	Negative side
✓	✗	✗	✓

Figure (1): Polarization according to van Dijk's (1998) IS

CDA Criticism:

A number of points of criticism to CDA have been recorded; however, the present study limits itself to a few points of criticism to CDA as follows:

a - Subjectivity:

It is claimed to be a major shortcoming of CDA. Although the analyses of the linguistic tools where at the micro or macro levels are supposed to be objectively descriptive in the first stage of CDA the second stage, namely, interpretive is claimed to be subjective. Blommaert J. (2005:31) points out that Widdowson (1995, 1996, 1998) argues that "in its actual analyses, and despite its theoretical claims to the contrary, CDA provides biased interpretation of discourse under the guise of critical analysis." Widdowson (2007:71) states that " CDA is committed to a cause and puts its own ideological agenda up front. Its proponents are not simply analysts but activists." Thus, it seems that the ultimate ideological goal targeted by CDA practitioners require a subjective way of discourse analysis.

b - Social and cultural Limitedness:

The principal CDA practitioners like Fairclough , Wodak and van Dijk have done their studies in CDA in the Western societies and cultures of the 1st world. There is an obvious avoidance for doing CDA in the 3rd world societies and cultures. This preference of CDA practitioners let their studies be limited to the west ignoring other parts of the world. This in-equal treatment has been a subject matter of criticism. It could be claimed that CDA has been proposed basically as a means to apply language critically to deal with the problem of social inequality; some CDA prominent practitioners like Fairclough, Wodak and van Dijk have dealt with the western and non-western societies inequally. This point of criticism could be responded to by saying that whereas dealing with inequality issues in the west is the responsibility of the western CDA practitioners, doing the same thing in the non-western societies is the responsibility of the non-western practitioners. The critical application of CDA in the west societies and cultures is not necessarily successful everywhere else since different cultures may have different ideologies and ways of life. Blommaert (2005:3) states that "it would be very unwise to

assume universal validity for our ways of life." Every society has its own ways of life based on the different ideologies adopted where they live which leads to inappropriateness of claiming the universality of the Western CDA. Critical analysis is influenced highly by context and since non-Western contexts are different from Western ones the critical analyses are expected to lead to different results.

C - Morality:

CDA has been proposed to uncover hidden ideologies and try to make a social change, as referred to in Dijk (2015:466). It tries to highlight the social dimensions of language use. These dimensions, as put in Blommaert (2005:25) are the "object of moral and political evaluation, and analyzing them should have effects in society: empowering the powerless, giving voice to the voiceless, exposing power abuse, and mobilizing people to remedy social wrongs." These dimensions of CDA do not go with van Dijk's (1998) IS which adopts the strategy of polarization instead. According to this strategy, deciding the empowered and supported members is not governed by morality; it is rather decided by membership to the in- or out-groups regardless of the truth , justice or even equality. Van Dijk(ibid.) has taken the moral dimensions previously mentioned into consideration when adopting IS to deal with the in-group members of the powerless or voiceless people solely of the powerless or voiceless people. The out-group members are completely and deliberately ignored by van Dijk (ibid.). The ideology followed by van Dijk on which the inequal treatment of the in- and out-group members has been practiced is interest-oriented rather than truth-oriented or equality-oriented as claimed in van Dijk's (2015:466) definition for CDA, as will be shown later.

d - Circularity:

The starting point of a discourse could be of different kinds such as presenting a problem that requires a solution or a giving a cause that requires an effect. The relationship between problem and solution as well as the relationship between cause and effect should be linear, i.e., it starts in the point of the problem or cause and movies until arriving at the end

point, i.e., solution or effect. That starting point could not be the end point ,lest circularity should take place. Circularity is limited here to circular reasoning which is defined in Cambridge Dictionary (2022) as "the fact of constantly returning to the same point or situation." This case of unproductivity offers no success in argumentation. That is why circularity is defined in Macmillan Dictionary (2022) as " a situation in which a series of causes and effects leads you to the original cause, producing an argument that does not mean anything." Circularity indicates that a problem of a given issue could be the solution which could move ahead to get back to the starting point and becomes a problem once again. This kind of development is not linear; it is rather circular which cannot be adopted to have a successful result since it is not productive. Van Dijk's (1998) IS offers the two group participants inequal treatment, i.e., one-sided treatment .The positive side of the in-group and negative one of the out-group are emphasized whereas the positive side of the out-group and negative side of the in-group are de-emphasized. This is a contradiction with van Dijk's (1998) definition of CDA where the social inequality has been declared to be the problem that is targeted to be solved by CDA. This contradiction makes a shortcoming that is tried to be dealt with by the present study. To preserve equality, as claimed by CDA and justice, as suggested by the researcher of the present study, there is a need to offer the two groups of participants an equal treatment. This binary-sided perspective offers a balanced and objective consideration to the two groups of participants. In addition to balance and for the sake of more objectivity and comprehensiveness there is a need to reconsider participant categorization. There is a need to suggest a third group, i.e., neutral group which can be categorized as neither in- nor- out-group. In certain cases it cannot be ignored if there is an insistence on preserving objectivity. In order to analyze a discourse critically, there is a need to recognize the addresser's stance which is based on his/her ideology that must be hidden in the discourse. Ideology is defined by Kress and Hodge (1979:6), as quoted in Catalano and Waugh (2020:39), a "a systematic body of ideas organized from a particular point of view which underlies our everyday perceptions of the world."

Ideology:

Ideology is an essential element in deciding the discourse affiliation since it is claimed by Kress and Hodge (1979), as cited in Catalano and Waugh (Ibid.) that "no linguistic form is neutral." It is a serious motive to take a stance in various debatable issues that are intended to be dealt with critically. It could be truth-oriented for those who are truth seeking or it could , as could be inferred in van Dijk's (1998) interest-oriented where the discourse producer's targeted end is to overcome the out-group members regardless of everything except interest. The discourse producer or analyst in such a case thinks that he , as an in-group member should be right and everything should go with his interest whereas the other side should be wrong regardless to the possibility of being wrong. Furthermore, the treatment in this case will be opportunistic where the need justifies the means since the goal is the interest even though achieving the goal or interest includes selectivity in choosing the sample or designing the methodology mistakenly to produce the needed results. In fact, the Western CDA seeks interest rather than equality or justice, as seen in van Dijk's (ibid.) definition of CDA. The ideology adopted by this kind of CDA is that in which interest rather than justice is the essential aim. It is not intended to claim that the Western ideology is interest-oriented whereas others' ideologies differ. Interest-orientation could be adopted worldwide; however, other ideologies like justice or truth-orientation need to be recognized since ideologies are culture-specific rather than universal.

Methodology: below is a brief presentation for the methodology adopted for the present study. Two discourses of a similar nature are going to be analyzed critically according to van Dijk's (1998) IS. The claimed shortcoming of subjectivity in the model is intended to be recognized first. A developed model will be proposed as an attempt to deal with the shortcoming of subjectivity successfully. Then, the same two discourses are going to be analyzed critically but according to the proposed form of the model in which the IS is reconsidered. The first discourse is the political speech of the American President John Kennedy to his people in 1962 about the Cuban Crisis. The second sample is taken from discourses made

by the Russian President Vladimir Putin when invading Ukraine in 2022, the neighboring country of Russia when the Ukrainian President declared his intention to join the NATO which could result in a serious threat to Russia, as claimed by Putin.

The First Sample:

In 1962 the USA discovered that the CCCP was trying to deploy a number of nuclear missiles in Cuba which is dangerously close to the USA. The American president then, John Kennedy made a historical speech on that occasion addressing the Americans to inform them about the situation and the CCCP to start dealing with the situation. To Kennedy, CCCP and Cuba made the out-group whereas his country, i.e., the USA made the in-group. His speech concentrated on the national security of the USA; however, he completely ignored the sovereignty of Cuba and its right to cooperate with whoever the Cubans wanted since that cooperation would be solely on the Cuban soil even if the cooperation included deploying CCCP nuclear missiles. Figure (2) below presents the way of presenting /ignoring the positive/negative sides of both the in-and out-groups in the speech of the American president Kennedy in 1962. The symbol $(+)$ means '**presence**' whereas $(-)$ means '**absence**'.

Parameters	USA	Cuba
Security	+	–
Sovereignty	+	–

Figure (2): Polarization according to van Dijk's (1998) Ideological Square Concerning Cuba Crisis in 1962 as Considered by Kennedy

Considering figure (2) above reveals the following points:

1-a : America's security is considered

1-b : Cuba's security is ignored

2-a : America's sovereignty is considered

2-b : Cuba's sovereignty is ignored

Selectivity is applied obviously when considering and ignoring the positive and negative points of both sides which means subjectivity. The kind of presenting information about the participants does not offer a chance for objectivity which has not been targeted by the discourse producer because of his Western interest-oriented ideology.

The Second Sample

Ukraine is a big, important neighboring country of Russia which claims that the West continues ceaselessly trying to surround it in various ways. The NATO keeps trying to expand eastward by having a number of the former Soviet Union countries like Lithuania, Lativia and Estonia as new members in the NATO. When the turn becomes of Ukraine, Russia declares that it is intolerable for the NATO to be next door since this makes a threat to the Russian 'security'. Putin, the Russian president believes that the Ukrainian intention to join the NATO would let the NATO forces be unacceptably dangerous to Russia since Ukraine is a neighboring country to Russia. Putin says that " We put it straight: there must be no further expansion of NATO eastward. Was it us who deployed missiles near the borders of the United States? No. It's the United States who came with their missiles to the doorstep of our house." (Web. Source: 2).That happens when Ukraine declares its intention to join the NATO as well as European Union and possess the nuclear weapons . Zelensky, the Ukrainian president told an emergency session of the European Parliament that " We are fighting to be equal members of Europe"(Web. Source:3). He also told the Europeans that "We are de facto allies. This has already been achieved. De facto, we have already completed our path to NATO…we trust each other ,we help each other, and we protect each other"(Web.Source:4).

The Ukrainian efforts in this regard have started since 2014. Russia believes, as Putin always says that Ukraine is not solely a neighboring

country. It is rather an original part of Russia having mutual history and culture. Vladimir Zelelnisky has come to power since 2014 in Ukraine which lets the Western troops be near Russia. When Germany reunited in 1989 the American and Russian presidents then agreed for the Western troops not to extend Eastwards towards the former Soviet states; however, the NATO accepts Lativia, Lithuania and Estonia as new members against Ronald Regan- Gorbatcheve agreement. Ukrainian president Zelenisky declares that his country plans to develop nuclear weapons. Thus, Russia accuses Ukraine of being a source of a threat. That is why Russia started war against Ukraine, to preserve national security as well as sovereignty, as Putin claims.

Figure (3) below presents the way of presenting/ignoring the positive as well as negative sides of both in- and out-groups in the Russian invasion to Ukraine in 2022. The Russian side has highlighted the security and sovereignty of Russia ignoring the same rights for Ukraine.

	Russia	Ukraine
Security	+	–
Sovereignty	+	–

Figure (3): Polarization according to van Dijk's (1998) Ideological Square Concerning the Ukrainian Issue in 2022 as Considered by Putin

Considering figure (3) above reveals the following:

1- a : Russia's security is considered

1- b : Ukraine's security is ignored

2- a : Russia's sovereignty is considered

2- b : Ukraine's sovereignty is ignored

Selectivity is applied obviously when considering and ignoring the positive and negative points of both sides which means subjectivity. This kind of presenting information about the participants does not offer a chance for objectivity which has not been targeted by the discourse producer because

of his interest-oriented ideology. That is why there is a need for a model that could offer some objectivity.

Modifying the IS Model

CDA is based on a number of concepts among which ideology is one. Ideology is culture-specific rather than universal since it represents different sets of beliefs adopted by different groups of people within different cultures. It is claimed in the CDA's definition by van Dijk (2015) that the problem is the 'social inequality' which means that the solution needs to be 'social equality'. However, the IS goes in one direction, i.e., the in-group participants direction by emphasizing the positive side of the in-group neglecting their negative side and doing the opposite with the out-group participants. This single-sidedness makes CDA as defined by van Dijk (2015)questionable since it goes in one direction ignoring the fact that communication has two sides rather than one. Thus, objectivity could be hardly claimed for CDA.

Some ideologies seek ends regardless to the means, following the well-known saying (the end justifies the means). These ideologies could be classified as interest-oriented. Human ideologies cannot be totally classified as interest-oriented. Some other ideologies may seek reality or truth regardless of interest. Such ideologies could be labeled as truth-oriented. Having a truth-oriented participants of an argument is unrealistic only if the participants considered by the analyst are the direct ones, whether in- or out-group participants. The proposed model is not intended to be idealistic. It claims that some participants could participate indirectly in the critical consideration of the discourse under analysis. They make a third group, a neutral group who have no direct interest in the subject matter of the discourse.

 Choosing ideologies by cultures or even individuals for adoption is determined by their preferences which are different from each other. Van Dijk (1998) has applied ideology to CDA by adopting the IS which is a specific way of structuring a discourse determined by the discourse producer's intention and ideology. The shortcoming above makes a

problem that needs a solution which could be offered by a modified version of the IS. The modified version needs to be based on established criteria that can offer some solutions to the shortcoming above. The starting point of the proposed model of IS is the concept of ideology. Van Dijk's (ibid.) IS adopts an ideology having the following characteristics: **Western**, **interest-oriented** and **single-directionality**. Certain points need to be highlighted in this stage when trying to re-construct the proposed model of IS as follows:

1- since **ideology** is culture-specific rather than universal, the suggested IS version needs **not** to be limited to the **Western** ideology. It seems obvious that van Dijk's (ibid.) model of IS suffers from a number of problems which require a reconsideration. To offer such reconsideration there is a need for a theoretical establishment beginning with identifying the motive that determines the problem which CDA tries to solve, namely, ideology. Ideology in van Dijk's (ibid.) model is Western and principally limited to the first world countries and societies. It is culture-specific rather than universal. Blommaert (2005:36) claims that Foucault, Bourdiet, Giddens, Habermas, Zizek, Badrillare : "all of them scholars who have described developments and features of First-World societies,…We shall look in vain, however, for social theory that addresses north-south relations or the structure and development of the world stem." It is not a must for the suggested model of IS to be limited to the first world countries or Western cultures. It is possible to deal with an ideology that is neither Western nor belonging to the first world countries. Thus, identifying the problem and suggesting a solution could differ from the ideology adopted in van Dijk's (1998) model which identifies the problem as the 'social inequality' and the solution as making a social change. The suggested IS model could adopt another ideology that recognizes the problem and suggests a solution differently that is free from the problems from which van Dijk (ibid.) IS suffers. The suggested solution is ' making a social change' but to achieve what goal? And how? That is what will be dealt with later in the present study.

2- The **interest-orientation** adopted in the Western ideology could be replaced by a substitution like **truth-orientation** as will be illustrated below. This model tries to cure 'circularity' by being binary- rather than single-sided. The reason behind that is that the modified model is truth- rather than interest-oriented. The ideology here determines the goal of making 'social change' not through overcoming the out-group members regardless of anything. The goal could be something new like knowing the historical truth just because it is the truth to have an objective evaluation for the subject matter of the discourse under critical analysis, as will be highlighted later on. That could be done through applying the modified IS model which deals with the in- and out-groups, i.e., covering the positive as well as negative sides avoiding the single-sided way proposed in van Dijk's (ibid.).

3- Single-directionality is not a must since there may be other participants ,i.e., why should we be limited to solely in- and out-groups? What about other possible participants? We need **bi-directionality** when dealing with the in- and out-group participants in some cases. Thus, the modified model of the IS could be claimed to be able to offer a new critical consideration adopting a new ideology, identifying a different problem and suggesting a new solution in order to offer a social change, as will be shown later.

Applying Criticality

CDA is a political and social application of language. It is based on the fact that the discourse producer when producing or discourse receiver when receiving has a specific **ideology** to serve when communicating about a given debatable topic. This ideology governs the **stance** whether or against the subject matter topic. This stance is supported through establishing the **critique** when investigating the relationships between the discourse participants. The ideology, stance and critique are established to make the targeted social change through making **reproduction.** The discourse producer establishes his stance on his ideology and considers the relationships between the participants when establishing the critique

arriving at persuading the discourse receiver, i.e., addressee to give up his previous stance which does not go with that adopted by the discourse producer, i.e., addresser. That is how CDA makes a production to make a social change.

Concerning the discourse receiver, he has his ideology concerning the topic subject matter. That ideology makes the basis on which the discourse producer establishes his stance and decides the relationships between the discourse participants through the critique arriving at identifying the discourse producer's intention which can be against the discourse receiver. That could enable the discourse receiver identify the ideology and stance of the discourse producer in order not to be misled by it and prevent the discourse producer from using power to support his stance. This case makes a critical success for the discourse receiver ,i.e., addressee who will offer a reproduction to the discourse producer's stance and converts it from the form needed by the discourse producer to that one needed by the discourse receiver.

Group Participation:

This critical analysis of the discourse made according to van Dijk (1998) polarization is based on classifying the participants into in- and out-group members only. However, CDA ignores the possibility of having a third group which is neither an in- nor out-group, i.e., a **neutral group**. This neutral group is not a direct participant in the discourse in which the in-group works against the out-group. It has its own ideology which could be completely different from the ideologies of the in- and out-groups. The stance of the **neutral group** members is governed by their own ideology which could be different from those of the in- and out-group members. The relation system could also be considered in a way that does not necessarily correspond to those of the in- and out-groups. Finally, the reproduction of the **neutral group** is expected to be different from those targeted by the in- and out-groups. Van Dijk's IS does not cover the case of the **neutral group** since it supposes that the participants are solely in- and out-groups. The lack of this supposition makes one problem to which the present study tries to offer a solution.

Filling the Information Gaps:

Filling the information gaps of the negative side of the discourse producer as well as positive side of the discourse receiver is not made by the discourse producer. The proposed model does not intend to offer an unrealistic cure for the subjectivity shortcoming identified in van Dijk's (1998) IS model. Considering and shedding light on the information gaps mentioned above is the task of the discourse analyst rather than producer.

The Proposed Model:

The proposed model is an attempt to meet the needs that have not been met by van Dijk's (1998) IS as shown above. The ideology of the proposed model is truth- rather than interest-oriented. What is needed is to know the truth of both conflicting sides to be able to have an objective evaluation of them. To avoid circularity, the ignored areas of information on both sides, i.e., the negative side of the in-group and positive side of the out-group are going to be recognized and considered with the positive side of the in-group and negative side of the out-group equally. This kind of treatment will offer justice and then objectivity as intended by the proposed model.

	In-group		**Out-group**	
Van Dijk IS	+	-	+	-
Modified IS	+	+	+	+

Figure (4): Polarization in van Dijk's (1998) Model and the Modified One

To offer an objective and comprehensive coverage analysis, the positive as well as negative sides of the in- and out-groups are covered equally. To test the proposed model on the first discourse, national **security** from the USA perspective as well as Cuban one have been considered to see that **both countries** have the right to defend their national security. **Sovereignty** in its turn is a right of equal value for both sides rather than one. Although the Soviet nuclear missiles in Cuba made a threat to the security of the USA, the American nuclear weapons on their side made a similar threat to Cuba. The proposed model preserves equal rights to present the intentionally

hidden areas of knowledge of both sides in order to preserve justice for all the participants concerning security and sovereignty. This kind of treatment is based on a truth- rather than interest-oriented ideology that is adopted by a neutral group which is neither an in- nor out-group. **Circularity** has also been cured here since the relationship between the problem and solution is corrected. The solution, which is the IS that deals with the participant groups neither equally nor justly, no longer presents the problem that is inequality. Thus, the proposed model has succeeded in dealing with the issues of inequality, ideology, circularity and single-sidedness since both sides rather than one of them have been considered. Applying the proposed model is intended to be applied to the discourses under study adopting the perspective of the neutral group that is trying to consider the negative as well as positive side of the in- as well as out-groups as follows:

The First Sample:

The first sample deals with the critical analysis of the discourse made by the American president Kennedy about the Cuba crisis in 1962.

A: Security: concerning **'security'** , the right of the USA to preserve its security is highlighted as a positive point of the in- and out-groups. Concerning '**security**', the American president in 1962, Kennedy highlighted the right of his country to consider the nuclear threat coming from Cuba, the neighboring island. Kennedy wrote that " this urgent transformation of Cuba into an important strategic base—by the presence of these large, long range, and clearly offensive weapons of sudden mass destruction—constitutes an explicit threat to the peace and security of all the Americas." An explicit reference for security is made here (Web source.1). However, the negative side of the in-group is not ignored since it is referred to that the USA should preserve its security by preventing Cuba, the out-group member from preserving its security through deploying the missiles in Cuba.

Concerning Cuba when considering '**security**', the right of Cuba to preserve its security is highlighted as a positive point of the in-group

according to the proposed model on the one hand. The negative side of the out-group, on the other hand is not ignored since it is referred to that Cuba should not preserve security in a way that could make a threat to the USA.

B: Sovereignty: concerning **'sovereignty'**, the right of the USA to preserve its sovereignty is highlighted as a positive point of the in- and out-groups.

Concerning **'sovereignty',** Kennedy declared a plan consisting of a number of points to deal with the Russian nuclear threat coming from Cuba. He explained that his goal of that plan was to preserve both 'security' as well as 'sovereignty'. He wrote that "our goal is not the victory of might, but the vindication of right—not peace at the expense of freedom, but both **peace** and **freedom**" Web Source (1). It is obvious that '**peace**' refers to '**security**' whereas '**freedom**' refers to '**sovereignty**." However, the negative side of the in-group is not ignored since it is referred to that the USA should preserve its sovereignty by preventing Cuba, the out-group from preserving its sovereignty through deploying the nuclear missiles.

Concerning Cuba when considering '**sovereignty**', the right of Cuba to preserve its sovereignty is highlighted as a positive point of the in-group. However, the negative side of the out-group is not ignored since it is referred to that Cuba should not preserve sovereignty in such a way that it could make a threat to the USA. Figure (5) is illustrative:

	USA		Cuba	
Parameters	**Positive points consideration**	**Negative points consideration**	**Positive points consideration**	**Negative points consideration**
Security	+	+	+	+
Sovereignty	+	+	+	+

Figure (5):Objective Polarization according to the Proposed Model of the IS concerning the Cuba Nuclear Crisis in 1962

Figure (5) above reveals the following:

1- America's security is considered

2- Cuba's security is considered

مجلة كلية التربية الأساسية للعلوم التربوية والإنسانية

مجلة علمية محكمة تصدر عن كلية التربية الأساسية – جامعة بابل

3- America's sovereignty is considered

4- Cuba's sovereignty is considered

The Second Sample: The analysis of the second example could lead to a similar results as below. Putin declares (Web.5) that "we will take appropriate retaliatory military- technical measures, reacting firmly to unfriendly actions. And I would like to emphasize, we have the right to do so, we have every right to act to ensure Russia's security and sovereignty." An explicit reference to security and sovereignty is made here. Concerning 'security', the right of Russia to preserve its security highlighted as a positive point of the in-group. However, the negative side of the in-group is not ignored since it is referred to that Russia should not preserve its security by violating the Ukrainian sovereignty and preventing Ukraine, the out-group from preserving its security through joining the NATO and becoming an ally to the Western armies.

Concerning Ukraine when considering 'security' the right of Ukraine to preserve its security is highlighted as a positive point of the in-group. However, the negative side of the out-group is not ignored since it is referred to that Ukraine should not preserve security in such a way that it could make a threat to Russia.

Concerning 'sovereignty':

Concerning '**sovereignty**', the right of Russia to preserve its sovereignty' is highlighted as a positive point of the in-group. However, the negative side of the in-group is not ignored since it is referred to that Russia should not preserve its sovereignty by preventing Ukraine, the out-group from preserving its sovereignty through joining the NATO and becoming an ally to the Western armies.

Concerning Ukraine when considering '**sovereignty**' the right of Ukraine to preserve its sovereignty is highlighted as a positive point of the in-group. However, the negative side of the out-group is not ignored since it is referred to that Ukraine should not preserve sovereignty in such a way that it could make a threat to Russia. Figure (6) below is illustrative:

Parameters	Russia		Ukraine	
	Positive points consideration	Negative points consideration	Positive points consideration	Negative points consideration
Security	+	+	+	+
Sovereignty	+	+	+	+

Figure (6): Objective Polarization according to the Proposed Model of the IS Concerning the Ukraine's Issue in 2022

Figure (6) above reveals the following:

1- Russia's security is considered

2- Ukraine's security is considered

3- Russia's sovereignty is considered

4- Ukraine's sovereignty is considered

The proposed model offers an objective critical analysis for the discourses under study for both in- and out-group members without ignoring any part of the participants. This model has not designed the analysis in such a way that the goal of the in-group should be achieved and that one of the out-group should be nullified. However, the goal of the third group ,i.e., neutral one   adopting the truth-oriented ideology has been achieved. The third group targets achieving the goal of making a social change by disclosing the case under debate through covering all the sides for all participants without selectivity. The proposed model has been proved to be workable to open a new window for objectivity when applying IS in CDA.

Conclusion

A number of shortcomings in the socio-cognitive approach proposed by van Dijk (1998) have been recognized. They include subjectivity, selectivity, circularity and ideological orientation, among other points of criticism. A modified model for the IS has been proposed reconsidering the IS adopted in van Dijk (١٩٩٨.). The IS model offers an established way for

structuring information. It is applied critically in van Dijk's (ibid.) socio-cognitive approach to CDA. The following points are **obligatory** in van Dijk (ibid.):

1 - the ideology is **interest-oriented**.

2 - the participant groups are two, namely, **in-** and **out-groups** through overcoming the out-group. The IS version above is not exhaustive. There is an opportunity for other designs for the IS that could be based on the following considerations:

a - the ideology could be **truth-oriented.**

b - in addition to the in- and out-groups, the participants could include a third group which is **neutral**.

c- the critical goal of the **neutral group** is to make a **social change** through disclosing the facts **objectively** on both sides of the in-and out-groups. Thus, the proposed version of van Dijk's (ibid.) IS model has been proved objective.

References

Bhatia, V.K .(2017). *Critical Genre Analysis: Investigating Interdiscursive Performance in Professional Practice.* New York: Routledge.

Blommaert, J. (2005).*Discourse: A Critical Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cambridge Dictionary. (2022).

https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictinary/english/circulatory

Catalano, T. and Linda Waugh.(2020). *Critical Discourse Studies and Beyond*. Cham: Springer Nature Switzerland AG.

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

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

------------------ (1995). *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language.* London: Longman.

Macmillan Dictionary. (2022)

https:www.macmillandictionary.com/dictionary/british/circulatory

Martin, James R. (2004). Positive Discourse Analysis: Solodarity and Change. Revista Canaria de Estudios Ingleses, 49, 179-200.

Mazid, Bahaa-Eddin. (2014).*CDA and PDA Made Simple: Language, Ideology and Power in Politics and Media.* Newcastle upon Tyne: Cabridge Scholars Publishing.

van Dijk (1998). *Ideology: A Multidisciplinary Approach.* London: Sage Publications Ltd.

------------------------(2015a).Critical Discourse Analysis. In Deborah Tannen, Heidi E. Hamilton, and Deborah Schiffrin (eds.), *Handbook of Discourse Analysis* (vol.1,466-485).Second Edition. Bloomsbury Publishing Plc.

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

Wodak ,R. and Meyer M. (2001). *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis.* London: Sage Publications Limited.

Widdowson H.G.(2007).*Discourse Analysis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Web Sources:

Web Source (1):

You Tube. 2022. *Radio and television address to the American people on the Soviet arms build-up in Cuba, 22 October 1962.*

https://www.jfklibrary.org/learn/about-jfk/historic-speeches/address-during-the-cuban-missile-crisis

Web Source (2)

You Tube. 2021. *Putin Loses His Cool Over Ukraine In Annual Press Conference But Wants January Talks With US and NATO.*

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v= YMi23zozM2s

Web Source (3)

ALJAZEERA.2022. Ukraine's Zelenskyy tells EU: 'Prove you are with us'

https://www.aljazeera.com/news/2022/3/1/prove-you-are-with-us-ukraine-president-urges-eu

Web Source (4)

You Tube. 2022. Zelensky Announces Ukraine's ApplicationFor 'Accelerated' NATO Admission.

https://www. Youtube.com/watch?v=iT9ExSiTtg

Web Source (5)

You Tube. 2021. Putin Warns US and NATO Over Ukraine.

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dhTnpWz9iY