CRITICAL APPROACH IN SOCIAL RESEARCH: FAIRCLOUGH'S CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS

Assist. Prof. Dr. Şükran Gölbaşı
Haliç Üniversitesi, Osmanağa mah. Süleymanpaşa sok.72/10 Kadıköy-İstanbul
sgolbasi@gmail.com; sukrangolbasi@halic.edu.tr

ABSTRACT
Modern society has highly integrated institutions and discourse order to maintain its current order. When we refer to the order of society, we refer to the construction of the discourses of the various institutions that make up it.It is the capacity of control of the order of the power and ideology to determine the structure of the given discourse, the construction of the discourses, and the change over time.In this sense, the examination of institutions through their discourse can provide us with very different information on other research approaches to institutions.The methodologies of the positivist and interpretive/social constructive episteme has already inadequate and insufficient in questioning institutions through their discourse due to the status quo nature of the assumptions of these paradigms. For this reason, organizations need new methodologies that work with different logic instead of questioning them with classical methods. The methodologies that work with the assumptions of critical paradigm offer significant expansions in analyzing today's institutions. Fairclough's critical discourse analysis of these is a rather comprehensive model that allows micro-, meso- and macro-level research in accordance with the multi-layered nature of social research as compared to the other discourse analysis. The purpose of this work is to explore the implications of the methods of critical realistic episteme, and specially to discuss the Fairclough's critical discourse analysis to investigate the areas of social research, which is one of the significant methodology and measures to be taken to implement the method in a proper way.
Keywords: Critical realism, critical discourse analysis, Fairclough, quality in discursive analysis, sociology of radical change.

INTRODUCTION

In the modern society in which human life is encircled by many large and small institutions, the power is generally operated by producing consent through discourses due to its disseminated structure over institutions. In such an operation of power, the fact that unequal power relations seem to be a natural order on which reconciliation is established renders the effect of power and ideology on the creation of a meaning implicit (Wodak, 2002: 12). For this reason, in modern societies, there has always been a struggle between dominant powers and their opponents to seize the interpretation system of language. Fairclough defined the power of prolonging current status quo through public institutions or the attempts to change discourse practices as *technologizing discourse* with the terms he picked from Foucault and Gramsci (Fairclough, 1995: 3, 87, 91).

Despite the central role of discourse in social life, it is propounded that there are various reasons for social scientists to disregard the analyses made on discourses. One of the most significant reasons of this is his attempt to question the legality of administration (Oswick, Keenoy, Grant, 1997). While, on the one hand, methodological unity principle serves to defend the legality of social sciences (Cooper and Burrely, 1998), on the other hand, it has also become dominant in social researches for the last century since it provided a comfort zone without questioning the legality of researcher.

However, in social sciences, it is known that there are many ways of maintaining an attitude for a researcher according to its own stance, the subject it chooses, its conceptualizing of society and human, and its target group for the information obtained through a research, and it is also known that each stance guides a researcher to different methodologies (Burrell, G. and G. Morgan, 1979 quoted by Gölbaşı, 2008). According to the theoretical background of which they share the fundamental assumptions, these methodologies can take place on various positions of the matrix formed by two axes which extend from unique to universal and from sociology of regulation to radical change. Henwood and Pidgeon (1994) mention on three general epistemic positions for qualitative researches. These are "positivist", "interpretivist/constructivist" and "critical realist" scientific approaches. In order to find a compromise for the dilemmas of "positivist" and "interpretivist/constructivist" scientific approaches, social scientists suggested critical social sciences and the *critical realist* approach pioneered by Bashkar et al. as a golden mean (Neuman, 2006: 94-103; Parker, 1999).

This study is conducted in order to draw attention to the distinguishedness of *Critical Discourse Analysis* of Fairclough among other significant research programs of *critical realist* episteme, and to the superior characteristics of it compared to other analyses in order to ensure that it is used in social researches more frequently and more efficiently. In this context, unlike other methods, it aims to draw attention to the questioning method which attempts to reveal the hegemonic intentions, to the characteristic which guides praxis, to the contribution to research program of social scientists thanks to the new usages it opened, to certain clues engaged in the usage method of language which may be of help for social scientists who are not knowledgeable enough as socio-linguists in relation to grammatical and structural elements of language to uncover the deeply processing ideological structure of social sciences, and to the shrinkage of use as a result of the fact that meso and macro levels of the method are frequently disregarded in current studies and handled as a micro analysis.

The documents to be analyzed in this study are compiled by use of a non-systematical database review focusing on the principles of Fairclough's critical discourse analysis philosophy, purpose and operational use, and on the quality of discourse researches. "Fairclough", "critical discourse analysis" and "qualitative research quality" keywords were searched on EBSCHOT, Business Source Premier, JSTOR, Ulakbim, ASOS index databases, and in the review made through Google Scholar these keywords were checked whether they match with any of abstracts, main texts or keywords.

In this study, respectively, the emphasises include subject depth the method provides for social researchers, the convenience for questioning the fields other researchers avoid or disregard, the research programs they are successful in, and the clues to facilitate the operational use; and lastly, the discussion is on the precautions to be taken for a sound implementation of the method. A considerable part of the study is dedicated to comments about the operational use of the model which requires a great linguistic competence and intellectual knowledge. In this kind of researches, the analysis questions are the guides which encircle only the information to be extracted, and the fundamental question is how a researcher evaluates the information compiled. What a researcher requires in this matter is the place and philosophical background of research paradigm in social theory through which it observes a phenomenon. Intellectual knowledge is the only thing to guide a researcher in relation to what it will look for in texts, what are significant, how the links among micro, meso and macro contexts are to be established, and how these are to be interpreted.

CERTAIN WEAK AND EMINENT ASPECTS OF POSITIVIST, INTERPRETIVIST/CONSTRUCTIVIST AND CRITICAL APPROACHES

The positivist view which dominated modern science for long years has been criticized for serving the prolongation of status quo by assuming current social order as an unalterable order defined by laws, degrading social relationships to numbers, pursuing abstract formulas and laws which are incomprehensible for humans, slubbering social context, and for rendering generalizations purged of standards of judgment. Interpretivist/constructivist tradition is criticized for rejecting social realism as an ontological phenomenon beyond text and for eliminating the ground for political struggle advocating that no realism is superior to another, while it also rendered all presuppositions questioned by demonstrating that positivist science is a narrative (Neuman, 2006:70-81, 95).

Critical tradition assumes that the effect of values on research and social realism is contextual and multi-layered (Neuman, 2006: 96) and advocates that there is a distinction among "empirical", "realist" and "factual" levels in terms of analyzing social realism. It is premediated that the layer of realism which we can analyze as empirical on surface is a consequence of invisible real structures and mechanisms which operate deep down, that the fact that we cannot observe them is not because they do not exist, and that evidences can be found for their existence in case one considers the analysis results of the visible surface layer. Also, the mobilization of the structures and mechanisms subject to analysis is defined as factual level (Sayer, 2000: 11-12, 27).

Discourse researchers who adopt critical approach remarked that they are different than other discourse analysts regarding their research subject and research aims. In critical discourse researches, especially two main themes sprang as important research areas: one of them is organizational power, and the other is the establishment of organizational meaning. As a method of critical paradigm, critical discourse analysis both played a complementary role for other methods and also provided an alternative point of view for the familiar subjects of the management and organization. Having stressed that social realism is layered and changeable, critical realism does not offer ready-made templates and this helps it to use more diverse research methods compared to positivist and interpretivist/constructivist social sciences (Sayer, 2000: 19).

PHILOSOPHICAL AND SOCIOLOGICAL FOUNDATIONS OF CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSES

Three views that Saussure's *structuralist linguistics*, *post positivism* which draws on Wittgenstein's philosophy of language and *hermeneutics* which came up with linguistic philosophers Gadamer and Ricceur are pointed out to contribute to the construction of discourse theory and to the development of discourse analysis. Taking into account that the studies which traditional linguistics conducts on a structuralist ground are abstracted from social realities, ideological and political matters and do not produce solution to social issues (Wodak, 2004a), the subjects such as the use of language in public institutions and the relation between language and power have become applied (Blommaert and Bulcaen, 2000). Gunter Kress in 1970s being in the first place, CDA which was established by a group of critical linguists of East Anglia University of England is not a method but the title of a common approach which shares the fundamental assumptions of diverse methods that take its roots from social theory. Western Marxism is the concept which created the main framework of the approach. In the early 1990s, a group which consisted of critical linguists such as Kress, can Dijk, Fairclough, van Leeuwen and Wodak named the method as CDA and defined its fundamental principles (Wodak, 2004a).

CDA is a multi-disciplinary approach which benefits from diverse sciences such as human sciences, social sciences and critical linguistics. This adopts realist ontology which is developed by Bhaskar and of which the roots dates back to Kantian view and to Marxism. Its fundamental assumption is that realism consists of layers. In this concept, language does not directly represent social realism. Together with other components, language is just an element which makes up social realism (Fairclough, 1989:37; Fairclough, 1992; Chouliaraki and Fairclough, 1999:4). According to critical realism, language constructs social realism only within the boundaries of the restrictions imposed by material conditions and of possibilities; and material practices take place ontologically and independently from discursive practices (Willig, 2007). However, we know these through language. Realism is beyond language but are known through it; whatever we know and whatever we say are produced in discursive field and by discourse. Without language, outer world is incomprehensible.

The fact that critical realists conceptualized material conditions as realistic issues which cannot be reduced to discourse made them distinguished among other social theorists since it created a theoretical opportunity to trigger change (Willig, 2007). According to Fairclough (1989:37), who adopted the approach of critical theorists, though discourse and practice are defined by social structure, discourse has a potential to cause an impact on social structure, to ensure its continuity, and to change it. This means that the relation between them is dialectical. Social world is a product made by humans and with social practices. Social structure does not only define discourse but is also a product of discourse (of social practices). One of the elements which ensure institutional or public power holders to prolong their powers is to establish control on the order of discourse.

The discipline, inclination and the school and paradigms it belongs to demonstrates that the roots of this developmental line dates back to enlightened philosophers, Karl Marx, Frankfurt School and to Habermas, who is one of the followers of this school after 1960s (Geuss, 2002). Neo-Marxist line of impact reaches out to Gramsci and his followers in France and England, and to Stuart Hall and Cultural Studies Center. Althusser, Foucault and Pêcheux are among the philosophers who affected the recent studies of CDA analysts (Van Dijk, 1993). Pêcheux, Bakhtin, Voloshinov, Vygotsky and Foucault, all of who are the first ones to analyze the CDA's critical ground and the relation between language and social processes, greatly contributed to today's condition of it (Wodak & Meyer, 2009; Van Dijk, 2008: 822 quoted by Büyükkantarcıoğlu, 2006). The most important contribution of linguists to this field is to develop a research point of view based on linguistic theories and methods, and thus to lead the way to the analysis of social and political phenomenons in terms of linguistics.

MAIN SCHOOLS IN THE ANALYSIS OF CRITICAL DISCOURSE

CDA is not an analysis carried out depending on only a single method. The attempts of diverse researchers to handle various analysis methods and different discourse types led to the birth of research groups known as schools (Van Dijk, 2008:822 quoted by Büyükkantarcıoğlu, 2006). Though these schools have different epistemological stance and different methodologies, they agree on a few fundamental principles such as revealing latent power structures, fighting against discrimination and unequality and clarifying a researcher's own stance and point of view (Wodak and Meyer, 2009; Büyükkantarcıoğlu, 2006).

The leading representatives of the English School, one of four main schools, are Norman Fairclough, Robert Hodge, Gunther Kress, Roger Fowler and Theo van Leeuwen. They based their studies on *systemic-functional linguistics* method. This model demonstrates that word or syntactic structures which are used in discourse are not coincidental but reflect the underlying ideologies and are conscious choices in terms of the conveyance of meaning (Büyükkantarcıoğlu, 2006).

Represented by Ruth Wodak, Rudolf de Cilia, Martin Reisigl, Karin Liebhart and, with the participation of his later studies, Norman Fairclough, the Vienna School is based on the *social linguistics approach* of Bernstein and the concepts of critical theory (Wodak et al., 1999:7-9). The Vienna School advocates that the best way to comprehend prejudiced, political and discriminative ideologies is to analyze historical events and discourses and this school is also named as *the historical approach to discourse* (Wodak, 2004b: 63-94).

The Dutch School represented by Teun van Dijk is known as *the cognitive approach to discourse* (Büyükkantarcıoğlu, 2006). According to Van dijk, social practices and institutions play a key role in the statement and re-production of ideology. Van Dijk specializes his own CDA method in a way to analyze media discourses.

The German School represented by theorists such as Utz Maaş, Siegfried Jâger and Jurgen Link focuses on how the dynamism which continuously changes between an individual and truth can be realized. This school is based on Foucault's *discourse theory* but it also criticizes it (Meyer 2004: 20-21).

Norman Fairclough, Teun van Dijk and Ruth Wodak, the scientists from these four schools which have different approaches, are known as the pioneering theorists who had great contributions in the development of CDA approach (Sheyholislami, 2001), and as the theorists who paved the way for the proliferation of the method with their unique researches and for the its use in social researches (Wodak and Meyer, 2004).

FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES OF CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS
- CDA is the analysis of linguistic and semiotic appearances of social processes and problems.
- The relation among discourse, social structures and culture is dialectical.
- Discourse is a social practice and the creator of social practices.
- Power relations are produced, applied and re-produced by discourse.
- The relation between the representations of the world and people and identities are established discoursively.
- Linguistic characteristics are not coincidental but are intentional choices. They contain deletion and inclusion mechanisms which defend a speaker's own interests and purposes.
- Discourse is historical and cannot be produced out of context. The context of discourse is the context of *language games* which is conceptualized by Wittgenstein and which reflects a life style.
- CDA establishes links between macro and micro.
- CDA aims to reveal the discursive nature of social power relations.
- Discourse operates ideologically.
- CDA is interpretative and explanatory. It is a dynamic process in which different studies lead to different interpretations (Wodak, 1996; Fairclough and Wodak, 1997: 271-279; Hodge and Kress, 1993; Van Dijk, 1993; Chouliaraki and Fairclough,1999).

RESEARCH SUBJECTS FOCUSED BY CRITICAL DISCOURSE STUDIES
CDA chooses its analysis fields and subjects from the intersection of language and social structure. It is observed that the mostly used subjects are (Blommaert and Bulcaen, 2000); ideology and political discourse, racism and nationalism, immigration, economic discourse, globalization, neoliberalism, transition economies and information society, the language of media and advertisement, the representation of gender and women in media, the discourse of institutions, social studies, bureaucracy, education, anthropological and socio-linguistic analyses, literature, the language of judicial authorities, police investigations and offensive language, the formation of identities, the formation of institutions, the process of power relations, political and ideological inducements, therapy, self-help, the organization of working environment and equipment, parliament speeches.
As it is obvious CDA has a distinguished and a wide range of subjects compared to other analysis methods.

THE PURPOSE OF CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSES
CDA analyzes the field which take place on the intersection of language and social structure in order to reveal the asymmetrical use of power, exploitation, manipulation and structural inequalities (Blommaert and Bulcaen, 2000). Some discourse analyses re-produce power relations and analyze discourse thanks to its characteristic which helps to prolong existing status quo while others analyze discourse for it is a means of struggle against power (Willig, 2008).

According to Fairclough (1993: 135), the purpose of CDA is to systematically question the open or latent mutual determination relations between discursive practices and social structure, and between process and relations. It attempts to reveal how such practices, events and texts appear, how these are shaped ideologically by power

relations and power struggles, and how non-transparent relations between discourse and society operate as a factor which serves to prolong power and hegemony.

CDA analyzes discourse as a means of act and interaction in order to comprehend what people do with language (Sözen 1999: 86). It shows how dominant ideology seizes and re-builds the interpretation system of language, and how also attempts to ensure and increase the audibility of alternative discourses muted under pressure by interpretation system (Arkonaç, 2014).

FAIRCLOUGH'S CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS

Fairclough (1989:1), who at first was a part of the group who founded the English School, then continued in his later work following the line of the Vienna school, described the purpose of his own discourse analysis approach as contributing to raising awareness of abused social relationships by focusing on the language. While developing the analytical framework of his method, Fairclough (1989, 1992, 1995) benefited from Halliday's *systematic functional linguistics,* Foucault's *order of discourse*, Gramsci's *hegemony* and Habermas' *colonization of discourses*. Fairclough's approach has been central to critical discourse analysis work for the last 20 years and it is argued that his approach is one of the most comprehensive frameworks in critical discourse analysis. Fairclough's method combines social sciences and linguistics in one theoretical and analytical framework (Sheyholislami, 2001).

Critical discourse analysis (Fairclough, 1989:109), is a three-step analysis that consists of textual analysis, the production, consumption and distribution of the text called interaction, and the interpretation of text in its social context which is called contextual analysis. During analysis, discourse under inspection is examined in a very general way to find answers to the questions shown in Appendix 1 (Fairclough, 1989:110-111). Micro, meso and macro level analyzes are utilized to reveal different levels of connectivity from the same set of questions. According to Fairclough, who uses the discourse term to refer to the entire social interaction process, the text is only a part of it.

In the first phase of the analysis (micro analysis level) which is called description, micro analyzes are performed to examine the stylistic/formal features of the text. In the interpretation (meso analysis level) stage, the same question sets and clues on intertextual relations and situational contextualization could be used to derive explicit and implicit references in the discourse to these contexts. In the last stage of what is called explanation (macro analysis level), it is attempted to reveal what the discourse relates to the social context and what it wants to do with language. With the same question set, it is tried to be understood that whether the language is used to maintain or fight the status quo by looking at the macro context.

Mumby (1987) states that three things should be looked into in ideological analysis; the presentation of socially constructed things as natural (and only) facts; that the contradictions should be ignored or overridden and that the interests of a group being presented as everybody else's interests (universal). During the analysis, the traces of these three elements are mainly sought after in the word selection, in the structural elements of the text, in the preliminary assumptions taken from other texts, to reveal the underlying meanings in the expressions on the surface.

Description Level (Micro Level Analysis)

At this stage Fairclough (1989: 112-138) examines text, vocabulary, grammar and structure. In the examination regarding vocabulary; word choices in the text, the way words are used together, whether ideologically controversial words are used or not, positive/negative expressions, which topics are repeated with synonyms, whether the expressions are softened or not, where formel and non-formel the re-formulations of expressions and the use of metaphors are looked at (Fairclough, 1989: 113-120).

Sentence structures are queried in the examination about grammar and structure. During examination; whether the sentences are active or passive, how the cause-effect relationship is established, whether the perpetrator is exposed, the way of using pronouns and modal, the way allegations, likelihoods and certainties are specified, the way differences are reflected, whether the sentences are positive/negative, how the sentences are connected, preliminary assumptions, implications and emphasizes are looked at (Fairclough, 1989:111,120-132). With these queries, the intention under the surface that is the expression of the text, the underlied/true meaning, is tried to be understood. In order to properly perform such queries, it is a minimum requirement to be a master of semantic, syntactic, and grammatical elements of language, to have a grasp of social theory and to have enough intellectual accumulation.

Fairclough (1989: 112) examined the formal features of the text and stated that we could distinguish three types of values that the text could have, namely *experiential value*, *interactional value* and *expressive value*, and added to the analysis, *connection value*. In essence, the *connection value* is a quality criterion that allows to evaluate the analysis. In accordance with the assumptions of critical tradition, it shows that Fairclough acts in a reflexive manner, critically approaching his own processes.

Experiential value, is to capture and trace the clues to the representation of the natural or social world experiences of the creator of the text in the stylistic features and contents of the text. The way the person or institution from which the text comes out of positions itself and its ideological stance is tried to be understood through querying in the 5th question.

Interactional value, aims to catch clues of social relations through text in discourse, to analyze relations with social groups that are formed through the discourse. With the queries in the 6th question, it is understood who the text moves with, and who it excludes.

Expressive value, is a hint or a trail to the evaluation of the piece of reality the creator of the text is related to. Formulated in the 7th question, it relates to social identity. In relation to expression/meaning value, structural feature is to find clues concerning the link with social integrity to which the creator of a text is a part. Which society do they put themselves in, who are we, where do we stand compared to others.

Connection value, relates to the consistency of the text based on its internal connections, its plausibility and through the 8th, 9th, and 10th questions the examination of the text's compatibility with external connections.

Interpretation Level (Meso Level Analysis)
Interpretation process is a dialectic process alternating between "what is in the interpreter" and "what is in the text. Relations between the text and social structures are established via meditation of discourse and its context. The values of textual features are socially functional as a part of the struggles of institutional and social processes only when they are in a part of social interaction. In that common sense assumptions in discourse contain ideologies that are coherent with power relations. Text is produced and interpreted in this social interaction process which its background is built upon those common sense assumptions.

In the interpretation process, discourse process and its relation with background assumptions is studied. (Fairclough,1989:140). The comment is generated with the combination of the content of the text and the past personal experiences of the interpreter. The formal features of the text are hints provoking the interpreter's personal experiences. The comment is a product of interaction between text's formal features and the experiences that create the Member's Resources (Fairclough, 1989:141). In this reading, the Member's Resources (MR from now on) people use to generate a meaning in their minds. MR are individual's presuppositions and frames of meaning for the world (Fairclough, 1989: 11). Table 1 demonstrates the process of interpretation. The two rows on top of the table are about the context, while the flow process at the bottom is about the interpretation of the text. Statement at the bottom row is about macro level analysis.

Table 1: Interpretation Process

Interpretation of the Context	
Interpretation procedures (ÜK)	**Interpretation**
Social order	Situational context
Interactional History	Intertextual context
Interpretation of the Text	
Interpretation procedures (ÜK)	**Interpretation**
Phonology, grammar, vocabulary	Surface enunciation (utterance) (see question 5)
Semantics	Meaning of the utterance, Questions 6,7
Coherence	Local Coherence (Internal and external consistency of text) Questions 8, 9
Design (schemata)	Structure and subject of the text. (Global coherence) Question 10

Source: Fairclough, 1989:142

In the stage of interpretation, the analyst inquires about the interpratation of participants related to situational and intertextual content, regarding the existence of internal coherence and used discourse types (Fairclough, 1989:162).

Interpretation of the surface utterance, In order to see the visible state of expressions, it is necessary to read the text under the guidance of question 5 and its sub-questions (see att. 1). To infer meaning, coherence is searched for between parts of the text and between text and the social world. For this, we rely on various background information and anticipations, however, with the existence of common sense knowledge and anticipations the text can be comprehended (Fairclough, 1989: 78, 141). The greater the coherence between the text's own parts and previous texts, more the text seems natural and harder it is to realize the ideology (Fairclough, 1989: 85). Inconsistencies, contradicting statements, consecution of propositions should be interpreted as an indicator of something that's wanted to be overlooked or glossed over.

Interpretation of underlying meaning, In order for naming expressions, analyst should interpret the text by taking questions 6 and 7 into consideration via using his/her own MR (see att. 1). Interpretation not only depends on the conditions of the people facing with the text but also depends on some other certain attributes. Fairclough (1995: 133; 1989: 83) states that text authors asserted cues on their texts to lead people during the interpretation process and expect a reading done in line with these assumption. The cues that lead the interpretation their authors placed in the text, leads the way of interpretation in order to stimulate the MR readers have in their minds (Fairclough, 1989: 152, 159). However, it must be taken into consideration that the MR leading the interpretation might consist of ideological factors which gained a status of common sense at the disposal of the power.

Interpretation of situational context, In interpretation of situational context, partially external cues such as features of physical situation, qualities of participants, things that are previously said/done and sometimes, the individual's own experiences which will interpret these cues are referred to. Representations of institutional and societal order which allow addressing certain situation types are especially relied on. Interpretation of the situational context provides a determination regarding the nature of interpretation process by helping selection of discourse type to be chosen (Fairclough, 1989:144). To reveal the components of the situational context, we search for answers to the following questions (Fairclough, 1989:146-48): The question "What is going on?" in a certain societal order and under certain institutional and situational regulations, leads us into the discourse's contents of action, topic and purpose. "Who is involved?" Question leads us to discourse's social participants; "What kind of relations are they in?" Question leads us to relations, distances, power relations between discourses (subjects); and the question "What is its role of language?" leads us to connections. Connections may be about situational context the text is created within as well as they can be intratextual. It also depends on the type of discourse. Discourse types create the potential of the meaning; they are certain limited configurations of heuristic, expressive, phatic and conjunctive meanings; they control the MR during the interaction of creation and interpretation (Fairclough, 1989:146-49).

Whether it is institutional or societal, an aspect of social order is the order of the discourse. Typifying a situation in the meaning of ascribed social order is, at the same time, typifying a type of discourse (Fairclough, 1989:150). Social order is related with certain ideologies and power relations. This means that situations can be interpreted differently on various societal orders, differentiating from culture to culture and between various ideological positions within the same culture. In other words, context is not a transparent thing that interpreters and discourse makers can address without examination. Underlying power relations influence the generation and interpretation of discourses. It should always be taken into consideration that a powerful interpreter can impose his/her comments to others. In an interpretation of text, values of certain attributes depends on how the interpreter symbolizes the situational context (Fairclough, 1989:151)

Interpretation of intertextual context, Intertextual context possesses a central position in critical discourse analysis and requires a historical approach (Fairclough, 1995:188-189). Discourses function over the assumptions of relatied previous discourses. Comments of previous discourses make up a portion of the individual's personal experience and interpretation. (Fairclough, 1989:145) Knowing which historical period discourse belongs to provides a common ground for the interpretation and the participants of the discourse. Presuppositions which contain cues within the text's certain formal features are actually related with text author's interpretation of intertextual context. Thus, the text which enters into a dialogue with assumptions of previous discourses is partially created by interdiscoursal history (Fairclough, 1989:152).

Presuppositions which can be naïve, manipulative or ideological, function ideologically when it serves the power or assumes things with common sense quality. Author of the text may accept as well as reject the presuppositions of intertextual context, a phenomenon of this is negative statements found on the text (Fairclough, 1989:154)

Discourse Coherence

Local Coherence/Internal Consistency, Fairclough (1989:78) uses the word coherence for two types of connections, coherence of text's internal parts and coherence of parts of text with the world; This is a process conducted with combination of text's and interpreter's instances. By "interpreter's instances" Fairclough means the interpreter's expectations, presuppositions regarding the world and its knowledge of the world, named MR. By "text's instances" it's meant that which elements are to be looked for in the text, and the analysis' eight question guides the interpreter trough this subject.

If the sequence of the propositions in text is related with reciprocal events, actions and situations, the text is considered locally coherent. In the case that the propositions generalize, ensample, liberate each other or establish a relation of contrast with each other, we may consider about *functional coherence*. In a formal aspect, existence of a model for a string of discourses, or the ability of the discourses' to give sense that it can be valid, means that it's coherent. With regards to facts that are referenced to, this is called *referential coherency*. If it is impossible for discourse structures to change under the influence of context, it is assumed that the ideology of the speaker can't be changed as well, in other words. it is stated that ideological preferences which speaker possesses in regards to his/her management of coherence are limited (Van Dijk, 2003:64).

Text's local coherency can be understood by examining what logical connectives are used between the text's parts, the way of connection of complex sentences, which methods/tools are used when making references inside and outside the text (Fairclough, 1989: 111). Integrity between text's parts is related to the text's ability of inducement . Even if there aren't any cues regarding formal coherency, the interpreter can derive coherence between expressions by implicit assumptions (Fairclough, 1989: 143-44). Coherence of text with the world is related to the extent of how much the interpreter's experience of the world and the world constructed in the text matching (Fairclough, 1989:78).

Global Coherence/General Consistency, A discourse is considered as consistent if it possesses a topic (Van Dijk, 2003:64). Large scaled structural analyses focus on texts' topic structure and categorical scheme. A text's title and introduction part is where the topic is most distinctively presented. An information presented as the most important one in a text is assumed to be received as presented by the reader on condition that the information is the most important in the presenter's mindset, and that the reader does not possess any contrary information or belief (Van Dijk, 1988:248). Studies show that readers remember the information on title, summary and introduction parts the most (Van Dijk, 1988:14-16).

Van Dijk, expresses coherence/consistency as the text's schematic, thematic, categorical editing and reconstruction of text by removing redundant information. With the help of interpreter's own knowledge of the world, and by adding information, generalizing, constructing by processing complex information, explanation of discourse by means of reproducing, and discourse's memorability and control is ensured. Information edited by textual and schematic means help the reader establish a new model or update the current situation's model in his/her mind (Ülkü; 2004; 382–383).

If we don't generally recognize the action (scheme), the subject (frame) or the text type (script), it can be hard for us to give meaning to what we have read or heard. Schemes, frames and scripts are about what was thematized in what activity and which behavior patterns are expected from the speakers. Frames and typifications generated in people's minds concerning certain identities, causes the creation of expectations about certain behavior and discourse styles for certain situations. Schemes are about activities speakers are dealing with while expressing something. Frames are related to mental representations carrying information regarding the culture propositions belong to and knowledge of the world about the thing thematized in the text. Scripts are about mental expectations in regards to certain social identities demonstrating certain behavior patterns in various situations (Fairclough, 1989:159):

Explanation (Macro level analysis)

Explanation process consists of two aspects according to the emphasis on power struggles (process) or power relations (structure). We can see discourses as a part of social struggles, and conceptualize them in the meaning of broader struggles and effects of these struggles on structures. This type of analysis stresses the creativity of the discourse and its social effects in future, or we can demonstrate which power relations identify the discourse, these relations are the result of these struggles and forcefully placed (naturalized). This analysis focuses on the discourse's social decisiveness, and the history and the result of its past struggles. While social structures demonstrate power relations, social progress and practices represent power struggles. As a conclusion, it can be said that discourses are a part of processes of social struggle within matrix of relation of power (Fairclough,1989:162).

The aim of Explanation stage is that to define the discourse as a social practice as part of the social process, by demonstrating how the discourse is determined by the social structure and how cumulative reproductive forces influence it in the way of sustaining or changing them. "Social determinations and effects are 'mediated' by MR. Thus social structures shape MR, in turn MR shapes discourses and discourses sustain or change MR which in turn MR sustains or changes the structures." (Fairclough, 1989: 163).

Social effects and determinants of discourse must be investigated in 3 levels of social organization: Any discourse has social level, institutional level and situational level determinants and influences. It is possible to see the same discourse differently when looked from a different level. In this situation, a discourse is determined by institutional and societal power relations or contributes to the societal and institutional struggles. We can subject the discourse to some certain questions for investigating the meaning of those contributions (Fairclough, 1989:162): At situational, institutional and societal level which power relations help shaping of the discourse?; Which factors of the PR are ideological characters?; How does the discourse take place at the situational, institutional and societal level in relation to the struggle?; Are these struggles explicit or implicit?; Is the discourse normative or creative regarding the MR?; Does it contribute to sustaining or changing of current power relations?

QUALITY CRITERIA IN CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS

The subject of reliable and objective knowledge production in social sciences is on the agenda of methodologists for so long. It is impossible to independently think about the subject of at which criteria the quality of research will be provided in CDA, in legitimacy based discussions ongoing on the qualitative research tradition. Being different from quantitative and certain qualitative studies, CDA should be based on Social Theory and be conducted with the appropriate methodology of its epistemology, and should be referred to different criteria when evaluating the quality of research. However, because of the lack of consensus on any evaluation criteria in relation discourse analysis, the attempt of the quantitative tradition evaluating these studies by referencing of its own evaluation criteria has lead to a crisis.

Research based on critical realistic assumptions are mostly divergent with qualitative research conducted with methodologies in the realist tradition and research on discourses from radical foundational tradition, with some quality criteria in common. The analysis scale developed by Fairclough is designed to make its own quality inquiry for the principle of reflexivity of the critical paradigm. However, we thought it would be beneficial to summarize evaluation criteria exclusively, in this study.

In qualitative research, the data collection process is one of the most important processes. Because that a process going from data to theory is followed, the research program is flexible. Sometimes, it is possible to approach the same participant for many times, and participants, research questions and methodology can be changed with more suitable ones during the research process, if needed. Data gathering follows a cyclic course that the process started over and reviewed again as details are revealed in the research process. Researcher must explain the process and changes made during in detail with their causes, in the report. Reflexivity stresses the point that the data cannot be handled independently from the researcher and the data is built in the participant-researcher relationship. While gathering data, it is highly advised to avoid and limiting efforts such as coding, grouping, summarizing or digitizing, and not handling the data as it is (Willig, 2008).

Qualitative researches are usually conducted with small sampling because of the detailed and in-depth analysis of the data. The representation capacity of the sample concerns not the size but the appropriateness of the selection of participants. Purpose focused selection means reaching people who are important and meaningful for the research purpose (Tanyaş, 2014). CDA has a limited capacity in that it is an in-depth and detailed analysis conducted over the discourse and it does not possess any importance to work with too much data for the value of results or the quality of the research.

Contextual constructivist epistemology rejects the direct transfer of objectivity and reliability criteria to its own work because in this understanding the universal of reality to be derived by applying the correct methodology is invalid (Madill et al., 2000) In this tradition, the concept of permeability is suggested instead of objectivity, which means that the theory or interpretation may change according to observation (Madill et al., 2000's cit. from Stiles, 1993). Contextual position suggests that all of our knowledge is local, temporary and circumstantial. It claims that the results may vary according to the context in which the data are collected and analyzed (Madill et al., 2000).

Pidgeon and Henwood (1997:250) defined four dimensions that could influence knowledge production, including the participant's conception, the researcher's interpretation and the cultural interpretation system which influences the interpretation of the researcher and the participant. He argued that these dimensions must be defined in detail by the researcher in order for the scientific community to validate certain interpretations.

The data generated at the end of research is just an interpretation created by the result of identities of researchers and participants and interaction of their positions and resources. The statement claiming that resulting knowledge is created independently from all of these factors, and claiming its neutrality, renders the data "biased" in this tradition.

Knowledge is not objective and isn't claim to be objectivist because it is a construct which built with the interaction of the context, conditions, participants and the researcher, and it can change depending on context. Fundamentally, it is suggested that this context should be considered broadly to cover academic advisors, other actors concerning the research such as groups and individuals that will be presented of the results of research (Tanyaş, 2014's cit. from Riessman, 2008; Willig, 2008).

Because the critical realistic stance rejects the concept of value-free research, our research questions are loaded with values and theories. Critical stance rejects the idea that the results of the research will reveal an objective knowledge/truth independent of the values of the investigator and the participants. Instead of objectivity or neutrality, the concept of reflexivity is preferred in the sense that the researcher is critical of himself and his research (Atkinson, 1990). Reflexivity encourages the researcher to focus the process to affecting and shaping aspects and encourages him to think that (s)he can reveal certain findings/subjects while covering up the others (Tanyaş, 2014's cit. from Riessman, 2008).

In the course of interpreting and explaining, while the analyst examines the process of discourse, the analyst sets his own intellectual capacity and personal resources to understand how participants use their own resources. In the discourse, the participants' localized common sense assumptions should be looked for. The analyst's position can easily be distinguished from that of the participant, since the resources the critical analyst's assumptions are derived from social theory (Fairclough, 1989).

In qualitative studies, legitimacy leaves its place to credibility criterion and it is suggested that should be assured with methods such as triangulation (Lincoln and Guba, 2000). The meaning of triangulation in contextual approach is to find explanations that not resemble but complete each other. It does not function by alternative statements removing the validity of the others. In this concept, the objective of triangulation is not to ensure objectiveness but to complete the picture. It may be possible to find an explanation as more credible and more relevant with research questions than the other explanation (testimonial validity) (Madill et al., 2000's cit. from Fielding and Fielding 1986). It should be emphasized that using an external control mechanism, such as expert examination and participant approval in discursive analysis can lead to a setting very much different result from testing the legitimacy. It should be underlined that the external control mechanism's interaction with research can lead to a totally different contruction.

In qualitative researches, instead of using the concept of generalization of research results, it is preferred to use terms such as "transferability", "conformity" (Guba, and Lincoln, 1982), "accumulation" (Tanyaş, 2014) and "practicality" (Seale and Silverman, 1997:380).
The concept of accumulation is used to mean that generation of enough knowledge about a phenomenon, regarding how the same phenomenon is experienced by different groups and in varying contexts (Tanyaş, 2014). It is stated that generalization for discourse researches can be defined as identifying patterns and common features that continuously repeat itself (Arkonaç, 2014).

According to Goldman (Tanyaş, 2014's cit. from 2008), only partnerships between groups can determine at which proportion the transfer to different contexts can take place. Detailed description makes it possible to give sufficient information about the content, transferring of raw data to reader redesigned in accordance with revealed concepts and themes, making it possible for the reader to recreate the setting in his mind and to conclude on some possible consequences regarding his own setting by giving references. The research process helps researchers who will be conducting similar studies know whether they can transfer the results from this group or environment to different groups or environments by clearly defining the theoretical frame of the study, features of participants, situation and the setting.

In discourse researches, it is discussed about two quality factors in formal level; these are coherency and functionality (practicality). The term practicality is used to mean that the ability of the research to create new

theories and hypotheses (Seale and Silverman, 1997:380), and ability to provide new and unique explanations for other settings (Potter and Wetherell, 1987:171).

Coherency is tried to be met with local and global consistency criteria. Fairclough's analysis has taken several measures to meet its own quality criteria. Text's internal coherency, its coherency with macro structures, situational and intertextual context, and with historical and cultural context is the result of analyst's and participants' examination of their stance, relations, resources, relied presuppositions during the analysis and the result of analyst's investigation of origins of the research and questioning of oneself as a requirement of reflexivity criterion.

Another claim that can be brought forward is the extent to which the research data and the research are authentic. This is considered to be related to the formation of the research data or project as the whole. This means that there existed a connection between the subject of the research and a commonly accepted social matter or a political event. This claim is a cogent and accepted feature of text style demonstrated in the introduction or conclusion part of an academic publishing of analyses (Taylor, 2001).

In discourse analysis, deductions are not presented as a report, finding or data, but the conclusion is evaluated as a interpretation. In the research report of discourse analysis, it is suggested that how the analysis is conducted, all steps of data analysis, the creation of macro structures should be explained in detail and at the end of the study, documents and raw data should be submitted as appendix (Sözen, 1999).

Willig (2008:156) claims that the quality of a discourse analysis is closely related to the cogency of its story. It is important to prepare the story in a coherent, satisfying, original, detailed, cogent, clear enough way which should be able to create a new way of comprehension for the reader. In this type of analysis, intellectual accumulation of the researcher who is a part of the research and the researcher's command of the subject and the possession of knowledge of the context the researcher addresses are the most important factors that affect the cogency of the story.

COMMON MISTAKES IN DISCOURSE ANALYSIS

The most common subject mistaken in discourse based studies is the subject of conceptualization of research questions that are appropriate for the research methods (Potter, 1988). The confusion in evaluation of discourse based studies still continues to occur. The risk of journal reviewers and editors evaluation of discourse researchers' questions and conclusions which have the purpose of reaching different objectives through different paradigms, by utilizing other types of paradigms damage the value of the study (Barker et al. 2002). Another common mistake is that the analyst's selection of citations for the purpose of supporting his own prejudices (Potter, 1988).

In studies where values are involved, it is unsatisfactory by alone for the researcher to describe the processes in detail and to set the boundaries of the research in order to meet the quality conditions. While doing this, not giving an explanation for the reason which documents, methods, which participants and what setting were preferred than the others is a damaging factor that compromises the legitimacy of the research (Yıldırım and Şimşek, 2006).

REFERENCES
Arkonaç, S.A. (2014). "Psikoloji ve Söylem Çalışmaları", *Eleştirel Psikoloji Bülteni*, Psikolojide Araştırma ve Yöntem Tartışmaları Sayısı, 39-54.

Atkinson, P. (1990). *The Ethnographic Imagination*, London: Routledge.

Blommaert, J. and C. Bulcaen, (2000). "Critical Discourse Analysis", *Annual Review of Anthropology,* Vol. 29: 447-466.

Barker, C., N. Pistrang ve R. Elliott, (2002*). Research Methods in Clinical Psychology, An Introduction for Students and Practitioners*, England: John Wiley and Sons Ltd

Büyükkantarcıoğlu, N. (2006). *Toplumsal Gerçeklik ve Dil*, İstanbul: Multilingual.

Cooper, R. ve G. Burrell, (1988). " Organizational Analysis 2: The Contribution of Michel Foucault", *Organization Studies*, January 1(9): 221-235.

Chouliaraki, L and N. Fairclough, (1999). *Discourse in Late Modernity: Re-Thinking Critical Discourse Analysis*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Fairclough, N. (1995), *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language*, London & New York: Longman.

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

Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and Social Change*, Cambridge: Polity Press.

Fairclough, N. ve R. Wodak, (1997). ”Critical Discourse Analysis:Discourse as Social Interaction”(258-284), Teun Adrianus van Dijk (Der.) *Discourse as Social Interactions* içinde, London: SAGE.

Fairclough, N. (1993). "Critical Discourse Analysis and the Marketization of Public Discourse: The Universities", *Discourse & Society*, 4(2):133-168.

Geuss, R. (2002). "Genealogy as Critique", European Journal of Philosophy, 10(2): 209-215.

Gölbaşı, Ş. (2008). *TÜSİAD'ın Toplumu İnşa Girişimleri,* İstanbul Kültür Üniversitesi Yayınları, Yayın No: 83, İstanbul: Gamze Yayıncılık.

Guba, E.G. and Y.S. Lincoln (1982). "Epistemological and Methodological Bases of Naturalistic İnquiry", *Educational Communication and Technology Journal*, 30(4): 233-252.

Hassard, J. (1991). "Multiple Paradigms and Organizational Analysis: A Case Study", *Organization Studies*, 12(2): 275

Henwood, K. ve N. Pidgeon, (1994). " Beyond the Qualitative Paradigm: A Framework for Introducing Diversity within Qualitative Psychology", *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, 4(4): 225–238.

Hodge R, Kress G. (1993), Language as Ideology. London: Routledge.

Lincoln, Y. S. ve Guba, E. G. (2000). "Paradigmatic Controversies, Contradictions and Emerging Confluences". N.K. Denzin ve Y.S. Lincoln (Ed.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (2.baskı) içinde (163-188), International: Sage.

Mumby D. K. (1987). "The political function of narrative in organizations", *Communication Monographs*, 54 (2): 113-127.

Meyer, M. (2004). "Between Theory, Method and Politics: Positioning of the Approaches to CDA", (14-31), R.Wodak ve M.Meyer, (Eds.), *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis.* London: Sage Publications.

Madill, A., A. Jordan ve C. Shirley (2000). "Ojectivity and Reliability in Qualitatative Analysis: Realist, Contextualist and Radical Constructionist Epistemologies", *British Journal of Psyhology*, 91: 1-20.

Neuman, W. L. (2006). *Social Research Methods; Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*, Boston: Pearson.

Oswick, C., T. Keenoy, ve D. Grant, (1997). "Managerial Discourses: Words Speak Louder Than Actions?", *Journal of Applied Management Studies*, 6 (1): 5-12.

Parker, I (1999). "Critical Psychology: Critical Links", *Annual Review of Critical Psychology*, Vol. 1, 3-18.

Pidgeon,N. ve K. Henwood, (1997). "Using Grounded Theory in Psychological Research", in N. Hayes (Ed.), *Doing Qualitative Analysis in Psychology* (245-273), Hove: Psychology Press.

Potter, J. (1988). "What is reflexive about dicourse analysis: The case of reading readings", in S. Woolgar (Ed.), *Knowledge and Reflexivity: New Frontiers in the Sociology of Knowldge* (37-54), London: Sage.

Potter, J. ve M. Wetherell (1987). *Discourse ans Social Psychology: Beyond Attitudes and Behaviour,* London: Sage.

Sayer, A. (2000), Realism and Social Science, London: Sage.

Seale, C. ve D. Silverman, (1997). "Ensuring Rigour in Qualitative Research", *European Journal of Public Health*, vol.7: 379-84.

Sözen, E. (1999). *Söylem, Belirsizlik, Mübadele, Bilgi/Güç ve Refleksivite*, İstanbul: Paradigma Yayınları.

Sheyholislami, J. (2001). "Yesterday's "Separatists" are Today's "Resistance Fighters": A Critical Discourse Analysis of the Representations of the Iraqi Kurds in the New York Times and The Globe and Mail", *MA Thesis*, Carleton University,Ottawa.

Tanyaş, B. (2014). "Nitel Araştırma Yöntemlerine Giriş: Genel İlkeler ve Psikolojideki Uygulamaları", *Eleştirel Psikoloji Bülteni*, Sayı 5, Nisan.

Taylor, S. (2001). "Evaluating and Applying Discourse Analytic Research", M.Wetherell, S.Taylor ve S.Yates (Eds.) *Discourse as Data: A Guide for Analysis*, (311-330), London: Sage Publication in Association with Open University Press.

Ülkü, G.(2004) "Söylem Çözümlemesinde Yöntem Sorunu ve Van Dijk Yöntemi", Dursun, Ç. (Der.), *Haber Hakikat ve İktidar İlişkisi*, Ankara: Elips Yayınları

Van Dijk, T.A. (1988). *News as Discourse*, Hillsdale, New Jersey, London: Lawrance Erlbaum, Associates Publishers.

Van Dijk, T. A. (2003). " Söylem ve İdeoloji Çok Alanlı Bir Yaklaşım", (13-109), Ed. Çoban ve Özarslan, *Söylem ve İdeoloji* içinde, İstanbul: Su Yayınları.

Van Dijk,T.(1993). "Principles of Critical Discourse Analysis", *Discourse and Society*, 4(2): 249-83.

Willig, C. (2007). "Critical Realism in Discourse Analysis: A Presentation of a Systematic Method of Analysis Using Women's Talk of Motherhood, Child Care and Female Employment as an Example", *Theory & Psychology,* 17 (1):101-124.

Willig, C. (2008). Introducing Qualitative Research in Psychology, London: Open University Press.

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

Wodak, R. ve M. Meyer (2004) (Ed.), *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*, London: Sage Publications.

Wodak, R., R. deCilia, R. Reisigl and K. Liebhart (1999). *The Discursive Construction of National Identity*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Wodak, R.,& Meyer, M. (2009). "Critical Discourse Analysis: History, agenda, theory and methodology". In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*, 2nd ed., (1-33), London: Sage Publications

Wodak, R. (2002). "Aspects of Critical Discourse Analysis.", *Zeitschrift for Angewandte Linguistik*, 3(6): 5-3

Wodak, R. (2004b). "The Discourse- Historical Approach.", (63-94), In Wodak, R. ve Meyer, M. (Ed.) *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*, London: Sage Publications,

Wodak, R. (2004a). "What CDA is About: A Summary of Its History, Important Concepts and Its Developments.", (1-13), In Wodak, R. ve Meyer, M. (Ed.) *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*, London: Sage Publications

Yıldırım, A. ve Şimşek H. (2006), *Sosyal Bilimlerde Nitel Araştırma Yöntemleri*, Ankara: Seçkin Yayıncılık

Appendix 1: Fairclough's Critical Discourse Analysis, question list

A. VOCABULARY

1. What experiential values do words have?
- What classification schemes are drawn upon?
- Are there words which are ideologically contested?
- Is there rewording or overwording?
- What ideologically significant meaning relations (synonymy,
- hyponymy, antonymy) are there between words?

2. What relational values do words have?
- Are there euphemistic expressions?
- Are there markedly formal or informal words?

3. What expressive values do words have?

4. What metaphors are used?

B. GRAMMAR

5. What experiential values do grammatical features have?
- What types of process and participant predominate?
- Is agency unclear?
- Are processes what they seem?
- Are nominalizations used?
- Are sentences active or passive?
- Are sentences positive or negative?

6. Wha't relational values do grammatical features have?
- What modes (declarative, grammatical question, imperative) are
- used?
- Are there important features of relational modality?
- Are the pronouns we and you used, and if so, how?

7. What expressive values do grammatical features have?
- Are there important features of expressive modality?

8. How are (simple) sentences linked together?
- What logical connectors are used?
- Are complex sentences characterized by coordination or/
- subordination?
- What means are used for referring inside and outside the
- text?

C. TEXTUAL STRUCTURES

9. What interactional conventions are used?
- Are there ways in which one participant controls the turns of others?

10. What larger-scale structures does the text have?