People's Democratic Republic of Algeria

Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research

University of Mostaganem

Faculty of Foreign Languages

Department of English

Brexit between EU-Remainers and Pro-Brexiteers' Communities on Social Media: a Socio-cognitive Approach of Facebook and Twitter Discourses

A Dissertation Submitted to the Department of English in Candidacy for a Doctorate en Sciences in English

Submitted by: Belgaid Nazim   Supervised by: Prof. Abdelhay Bakhta

Board of Examiners

Prof. Abdeldjalil Larbi Youcef	University of Mostaganem	Chair
Prof. Abdelhay Bakhta	University of Mostaganem	Supervisor
Prof. Kara Mostefa Leila	University of Chlef	External Examiner
Prof. Boukreris Louafia	University of Ahmed Ben Ahmed, Oran 2	External Examiner

Academic year 2021-2022

Abstract

This research project deals with the way Brexit is perceived in the UK by both the pro-Brexit proponents and partisans of the European Union (EU) via discourse. What emerges anew is the discursive controversy on line. In fact, virtual communities have become an intrinsic feature in this digital age. With the rapid rise of SNSs worldwide, a novel form of representing shared knowledge about the world and determining relations of power and dominance between online communities has arrested attention across a myriad of disciplines, notably DA. In the study, we set forth with the very aim of applying Van Dijk's CDA-oriented theory of social cognition (SC) in analytically approaching the respective discourses of some selected pro-Brexiteers alongside, EU-remainers' communities on both Facebook and Twitter. We refer to such theoretical terms as discourse, cognition, social cognition, social representations (SRs), structures of power, ideology, and domination; we deploy them in the analytical process as well. The results have revealed that the discourse of the pro-Brexiteers communities is dominant on both platforms with their ideological implications having concrete effects in that the UK is being pushed toward complete Brexit. At once, the EU-remainers resist discursively trying to make their shared schemata of ideologies favorable to the EU heard on the national scene. Thus, power and domination/struggle and resistance/status quo/subversion are at work on the virtual space.

 Key words: social cognition, discourse, pro-Brexiteers and EU-remainers communities, Facebook, and Twitter.

Dedications

This humble work is dedicated to my large family especially my parents and my wife who have been constantly standing by my side throughout the life's ups and downs imbuing me with inspiration and encouragements. Thanks a lot straight from the heart. Also, I cannot forget our teacher and supervisor, Dr Neddar Bel Abess May the Almighty God have pity on his poor soul. The image of this man of unique kindness and devotion is still glaring in our minds forever and ever.

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my supervisor, Prof. Abdelhay Bathta, whose dedication to this research project has been remarkably total. Actually, without her endless academically valuable advice and humanly motivating stimulation I would not have reached my final destination and brought this work into full fruition ultimately. Special thanks go to members of the jury Prof. Abdeldjalil Larbi Youcef, Prof. Kara Mostefa Leila, and Prof. Boukreris Louafia for their precious time and likely constructive advice. I am, also, thankful to Dr. Souhali Hicham for his practical help and advice in the course of this work.

Contents

Brexit between EU-Remainers and Pro-Brexiteers' Communities

Chapter four: Methodology and analytical work of pro-Brexiteers and Eu-remainers' discourses on Facebook and Twitter

Brexit between EU-Remainers and Pro-Brexiteers' Communities

List of Tables

Brexit between EU-Remainers and Pro-Brexiteers' Communities

List of Abbreviations

Brexit between EU-Remainers and Pro-Brexiteers' Communities

BGK: background knowledge

CL: critical linguistics

CDA: critical discourse analysis

CA: conversation analysis

CDS: critical discourse studies

CMC: computer mediated communication

DA: discourse analysis

DSPS: discursive social psychology

EU: European Union

ERASMUS: European Community Action Scheme for the Mobility of University Students

FCs: felicity conditions

IDF: Ideological Discursive Formations

ICTs: information and communication technologies

LTM: long term memory

MP: member of Parliament

DF: Participatory framework

PM: Prime Minister

SFG: systemic functional grammar

SAT: speech act theory

SNSs: social networking sites

SM: social media

SRs: social representations

SCMC: synchronous computer-mediated communication

SC: social cognition

TV: television

UK: the United Kingdom

US: the United States

UGT: uses and gratifications theory

General Introduction

On June 23rd, 2016, Britain (more than 30 million people) voted for leaving the European Union (EU). In fact, the referendum outcome was 51.9 % in favor of leaving and 48.1% for maintaining its membership within the EU (Hunt and Wheeler, BBC News, 2017). This date, actually, was a milestone in Britain's modern history; however, the divide and controversy in the UK at all levels (political, economic, immigration, and cultural) has been something of lingering importance ever since. That is, the political entities making up the kingdom were at variance over the Brexit issue. On the one hand, England as well as Wales were for ending all forms of ties with the EU (53.4% to 46.6% in England voted "Brexit" while 52.5% to 47.5% were for leave in Wales). On the other hand, Scotland alongside Northern Ireland stood in support of remaining in the EU (62% to 38% for Scotland; 55.8% to 44.2% for Northern Ireland (Hunt and Wheeler, BBC News, 2017). According to the Lisbon Treaty, which stipulates the exiting procedure for any country wishing to quit the EU, the UK would supposedly engage in a two-year period of negotiations with the European council to achieve its definitive exit. In terms of political activism, thanks to the interactive social networking sites (SNSs) like Facebook, Twitter, LinkedIn, MySpace, Bebo, YouTube, and multiple blogging services, "pro-Brexiteers" as well as "UE-remainers" communities seem to have found the way to make their ideological stances on Brexit known publicly. With regard to this, the major aim of the pro-Brexiteers has been the "retrieval" of their national sovereignty with regaining the country's management of its own political, economic, legal, and cultural matters away from the supposedly restrictive "bureaucracy" of Brussels. In fact, after decades of EU membership, they have been avidly striving on social media for the maintenance of British identity; this seems constitutive of their typical discourses about different issues

related to Brexit, such as immigrants' flow into the UK. Comparatively, the EU-remainers have constantly shown their deep concerns over an eventual retreat from the EU as this would, according to their account result in devastating repercussions on the country. Thereby, these have been enthusiastically strengthening their online-communities by attracting more activists and developing a discourse counter to that of the pro-Bexiteers'.

As is traditionally assumed in critical discourse analysis (CDA), discourse is often the bearer of messages and underlying ideologies underpinning the socio-cognitive organization of social groups' daily communicative events involving interactions between speakers/writers and /recipients/readers as well as interface between various media producers (mainstream and new media, including social media) and their audiences. Hence, the foremost concern of this work turns around Brexit and the way it is perceived by Facebook and Twitter communities in the UK. Indeed, both social media networking sites are the locus of opposing discursive attitudes to Britain's abrupt decision to quit the EU. In effect, the pro-Brexit communities on their Facebook as well as Twitter pages have greatly hailed Brexit as a historic achievement for the kingdom which would help regain its cultural uniqueness and strengthen its economic strategies worldwide. This could be noticeable in their discourses either in the form of comments, videos, images, and statuses posted all day round following the Brexit Referendum and even the official retreat of the UK from the EU–January 31st, 2020. One can mention, by way of illustration, such groups as: "Britons against the EU", "Brexit needs to Happen ASAP", "Leave Means Leave", "Brexit Central", "Change Britain", "LEAVE.EU GB", etc. On the other side, the EU-remain groups' opposition to the afore-mentioned referendum and the wish to remain European would be discerned in their counter discourses likewise. For example, we can mention some groups with a seemingly pro-European trend–"the very

Brexit Problems Clubs", "Pro Jeremy Corbyn" (Labor party leader) "Anti Brexit Alliance", "Brighton Hove for EU", "Stratfor4Europe", and "EU is our Future".

Critical analyses of the discourses constructed by both communities on SNSs are of essence in this work. In effect, this process consists in selecting the most representative corpora–those from the communities whose stances are far from being flexible on the Brexit issue. Moreover, since discourse analysis (DA) relies on semiotics in approaching discourse as a set of socially functional signs, our focus is gatherings' publications (profile up-dates). The approach adopted is that of "Social Cognition" introduced and developed by Van Dijk throughout his different academic contributions (books, both personal and co-written, articles in journals, and conferences). Indeed, from his viewpoint (1990, 2009, 2014a,), discourse can be considered as particular language uses within particular social spaces (contexts). That is to say, communicative events performed in their relevant "social containers" (Van Dijk, 1990). Additionally, communicative events and their outcome (discursive sense-making and pragmatic effects), according to him, must be grounded in "cognitive representations": these are in the form of particular perceptions of reality that are uniformly adopted among social groups–generic knowledge. Besides, Van Dijk uses the concept of "social cognitive representations" ("SRs"), which encompasses the basis of his own theoretical framework (Van Dijk, 1990, 2014a). Discourse is, in turn, charged with the role of disseminating socially shared knowledge through the production, mediation, as well as reception of SRs in interactional events (Van Dijk, 1990, 2009, 2014a, 2014b). From a theoretical perspective, such a deed seems workable; nevertheless, once one tackles the practical level, there emerges the hardship of applying this approach to cope with the above mentioned communities'

discourses. Importantly, it would be worthy of remark to assume that online communities are just virtual spaces, so it is not easy for one to put in use any approach in the analytical process with the aim of obtaining thoroughly solid findings. This is, indeed, primarily due the abstract nature of the context in which such communities interact discursively, in comparison with authentically social communities. Therefore, key elements of the context might be beyond reach, which might render the whole task very challenging. At this point, the research on how to make inter-group interactions online accessible relying on social cognition and the power relations between them represents a real challenge for us. Thus, the confirmation of the hypotheses is at stake.

The reasons underpinning the choice of such a topic are diverse. To start, one would say that the freshness and the importance of the issue have weighed a great deal in targeting then ultimately deciding on it. Brexit has been, in reality, one of the most marking events in Britain and Europe recently. Not only at the politico-economic level, but also at the media dimension (both mainstream as well as new media, including social media), this issue has stood at the foreground of discursive exchanges, meetings, news reports, and press columns since the referendum. Significantly, Brexit would spur a much heated controversy on SNSs over the political, economic, and cultural upheavals that have been expected to provoke in the UK in the aftermath of the leave-Europe vote. This dramatic state of affairs can be discerned through the pro-and-anti-Brexit communities' discussions, comments, videos, images, caricatures, and criticisms shared daily on Facebook and Twitter. Equally, the powerful nature of these new media has proved much decisive in the choice of this subject of research. Indeed, Facebook and Twitter are some of the most influential social-networking sites; according to Facebook and Compete.com's statistics (as cited in Junco & Chickering, 2010) these have witnessed an exponential rise of respectively 660% and 202% regarding monthly visitors. Moreover they

have been remarkably suitable for online-communal activism in addition to the usual facilities of socializing locally as well as worldwide.

Ultimately, the practical contribution which Van Dijk's approach yields in association with discourse, context, and socio-cognitive organization constitutes another choice motif. It, like other approaches relying on CDA, offers a new perspective in dealing with language use in its broader social environment. The latter is the source of production, mediation, and reception when interacting socially; that is to say, meta-linguistic clues are created by given social groups' cognitive conceptualizations as well as experiences of reality. Interestingly, social cognition, as an orientation, can be extended to cover social media discourses, in particular those built on Facebook and Twitter. This consists in tackling the way different online communities conceive of their discourses on a variety of matters (Brexit as a case study in this work) and the way common attitudes toward social, political, economic, and cultural affairs may interfere in the shaping of them.

In the light of what has been mentioned above regarding the pro-and-anti Brexit communities' perceptions encapsulated via discourses on social media, the following questions need to be dealt with:

- To what extent can social cognition prove fruitful in addressing two forms of discourse that tend to be representative of ideological clash and struggle for domination between social communities online?

- Can SNSs be considered the arena for opposing perceptions as ideologies typical of online groups? If they are so, how do supposedly shared socio-cultural structures operate in terms of discursive construction, mediation and reception (triangulation model: discourse, cognition, and social cognition)?

- How are relations of power and domination expressed and maintained or resisted as well via discursive practices in the age of SNSs?

- What are the socio-cultural as well as the political implications of Facebook and Twitter use for the UK?

By applying the theoretical mechanism relevant to social cognition, it would be shown how it cautiously and, henceforth, effectively deals with interaction in the virtual space. The latter is the basis of discursive conception, mediation, and reception (meaning negotiation) in everyday interactions online. This paradigm, can, actually, establish the overlap between discourse, cognition, and knowledge (shared social cognition). Thus, this approach is, by and large, fruitful regarding its contribution to inter-and-intra groups' communications on social media notably Facebook and Twitter. Being integral parts of our lives, Facebook and Twitter are decisively influential as media; they can draw a large number of active users. Such SNSs constitute the culminating point where people from diverse socio-cultural backgrounds and ideological tendencies can express their stances on crucial matters and struggle to maintain or resist the status quo–the relations of power as well. Therefore, social media, including Facebook and Twitter, are seen as the symbol of democratization of perceptions and actions, leading most of the time to controversies. This was not possible with the mainstream media whose output was just for audiences' passive consumption. When it comes to the role of SNSs in mobilizing the public in the UK, we can state that they have been worth their reputation of being effective tools in the hands of different communities to reinforce their respective campaigns toward Brexit.

The literature that has been produced previously on the subjects of social media as well as social cognition is considerably informative to both scholars and researchers given the vast

and valuable content it encompasses. Starting with social media, Junco and chickering (2010), evoke the emergence of new communication technologies. In effect, these have paved the way for social interaction through the internet web. Henceforth, people can get in touch with each other regardless of their location and group belonging in society. Moreover, those technologies have been the locus of civil discourse and stances over issues of great interest. The two scholars draw attention to the pros and cons relevant to social media, in addition. On the one hand, social media might be thoughtlessly used especially by college students: the repercussions for them are often psychological with higher stress levels resulting from illegal online acts like "cyber bullying". Further, online interaction may equally lead to stereotypical views being unfairly directed at certain people, things, or situations out of absence of indicative clues relating to context (gestures, tone, eye contact, etc) in comparison with authentic, daily communication. The latter offers the possibility of exploring context as a major source of information accompanying language use. Indeed, language, being the only bearer of the message, necessitates the interference of context for decipherment and formation of true impressions. Junco and chickering, besides, assume that "the Net Generation" is utterly dependent on the internet as a reliable source of knowledge. Nevertheless, the credibility of this medium may be sometimes brought into question-not any information obtained from social media or blogs can be trustworthy. All this unreasonable use of the internet technology, furthermore, undermines the spirit of community as users spend long hours acting individually on SNSs away from "social collaboration". On the other hand, social media can prove advantageous provided it is used in a responsible way by students in particular to develop learning and competence. Therefore, students need practical advice to enable them to develop intellectually online.

Korpijaakko (2015), another expert in technology-based communication online, sheds light on Facebook as a new brand of technology devised for "identity performance". In this respect, users of SNSs by posting favorite videos, information about their own interests and hobbies, and audio tracks, provide adequate data about who they actually are. In other words, they can practice identity reinforcement and dissemination at once via social media. Besides, the same scholar accentuates the growing number of Facebook active users, reaching a peak of more than 1 billion with 82% of users outside North America, while 618 millions constitute the estimated number of daily users. The socio-cultural implications relative to the technology of social media (digital technology) are equally given room in her study. In effect, she shows the significant divide between generations when it comes to social relationships and communication: all pre-SNSs-generations are seen as immigrants to this "hyperreal" digital world, whereas those "Digital Natives" are totally absorbed by the virtual life of social media.

Twitter is also one of the latest developments in social media, with the tremendous echoes it has been receiving at the social level. In this field of research, Gruzd, Takhteyev, and Wellman (2011) direct their focus on Twitter. They try to establish a close connection between "community" in its broadest sense and Twitter specifically. With regard to this, they trace the evolution of the notion of community historically speaking. In the 1970s, community was seen as a set of local relationships in the neighborhood. In the following decades, scholars had to widen the range of this notion to cover ties beyond the traditional boundaries of neighborhood with the emergence of "long-distance relationships" among people whatever their locations. In fact, this implies that the initial perception of community has been restricted to a limited space contrary to the one that does by no means recognize space as primordial to build interpersonal ties. Significantly, the massive rise of the internet technology has been a turning point for community-induced research: one can interact socially with someone else

online with no need to meet in reality. Into this mix comes the question of whether to consider interpersonal ties built-up on the internet as constituents of community or not. Nowadays, the "virtual community" is widely recognized as an intrinsic feature of the rising social media. While computer scientists assume that online interaction does not allow authentic encounters (real-life contacts), sociologists, they state, stress the fact that it is possible: People making up virtual communities can get in touch frequently. For community sociologists, communal interaction on social media and interpersonal contact are complementary; in other words, the former encourages the latter. Facebook, e.mails, MySpace, Linkedin, etc are exemplars of this state of affairs, the researchers reveal. In short, the virtual environment has irrevocably transformed interpersonal communication by initiating SNSs users to a novel pattern for exchange (Holmes, 2005; Jones and Hafner, 2012).

Concerning Brexit and the ensuing controversy in the UK, most of what has been produced so far centers on historical as well as expository contributions covering the likely political, economic, and cultural outcomes of the EU-quitting process. Indeed, Hunt and Wheeler (2017); Glencross (2016), Theresa May (n.d.), Boris Johnson (n.d.) elaborate on the reasons underlying UK's split with the EU following a referendum on June 23rd, 2016. Besides, they tackle Brexit itself, saying what it means and adapting its appellation to the UK context for more clarity.These go on further in their analyses, providing the final figures of the referendum alongside the voters' turn-out. The governmental change (the coming to office of the Conservatives led by Mr. James Cameron, Mrs. Theresa May, and later Mr. Boris Johnson) is put under scrutiny given the pro-Brexit positions adopted by the successive PMs in opposition to the Labors' pro-Europe stances, in addition. Ultimately, they refer to the expected economic consequences relative to this withdrawal from the viewpoint of scholars well versed in the field of economics. In the same line, but in more details, Dunt (2017)

delves inside the Brexit referendum in order to make things more accessible. He begins his work with the significant question that would have been asked by many UK citizens in the aftermath of the voting day-"what did we vote for?". He carries on his study, focusing on "Article 50", additionally. It is the legal procedure any country must commit to in case it decides to leave the EU. Furthermore, he presents in full the types of Brexit that the UK and the EU must negotiate: "Legal Brexit", "Administrative Brexit", and "Trade Brexit". The "European Project", the "Politics of the European Union", "Freedom of Movement", and the "Economy" are also crucial points Dunt elaborates on.

Facebook communities are at the heart of opinion polls and fieldwork study to do with their attitudes to the Brexit referendum. To begin with, Taylor (2017), a member of the BBC Trending project, attempts to bring about some evidence of the role Facebook communities have played in influencing the final result of the referendum by going over their respective points of view. The BBC refers to these groups as "Filter Bubbles"– Facebook groups with uniform political stances. He remarks, for instance, the hostility the pro-Brexiteers openly express toward the "remainers" (anti-Brexit communities), accusing them of blocking the way for a complete Brexit. Moreover, those Facebook communities are clearly very active; this is noticeable in their daily debates. The pro-Brexiteers tend to focus so much on the British identity as the core of nationalism which they believe it must be kept untouchable. This accounts for their re-orientation to the Conservative side for the general elections. A recent opinion poll has been conducted on "Brexit HQ", one of the most prominent pro-Bexit Facebook communities in the UK, over the forthcoming general elections. The findings suggested that, out of 500 participants, 85% were for the pro-Brexit Conservatives, showing that their trust toward the pro-remain Labor Party has been ebbing away dramatically.

When it comes to CDA as an approach, it can be said that discourse, text, context, cognition, as well as social cognition are at the core of research. Van Dijk (1990, 2008a, 2009, 2014a, 2014b) has said much, though more investigation is still underway, about discursive practices in our daily interactions. According to his theoretical framework, Van Dijk suggests that social cognition converges with the "social psychology of language" to form a new area of research which addresses discourse (language uses and structures) and informative items from social psychology as well. These can be of considerable importance for DA, too. Historically, he traces the evolution of the disciplines to do with discourse in its broadest sense. He evokes the 1960s to be the outset of DA as a multi-disciplinary field of study, involving semiotics, pragmatics, and even socio-linguistics. The 1970s were marked by the emergence of "cognitive psychology"; it was recognized as a field that would possibly well overlap with DA. Subsequently, the social psychology of discourse followed in a line during the 1980s. In contrast to social psychology, which is devoid of clear reference to "text" and "discourse", Van Dijk takes the initiative to uncover the intricacies of discursive practices and any hint to structures by bridging the gap between DA and the social psychology of discourse, fostering further research, henceforth.

Van Dijk (1989, 1990, 1991, 1993a, 2009, 2008a, 2014a, 2014b, Van Dijk as cited in Aini & Widodo, 2018) claims in the "Theory of Context" that context encompasses anything away from text (structure). I.e., it relates to any useful information beyond the structural level when text is put in contextual use. In his new project about discourse, Van Dijk establishes a close link between "discourse", "knowledge", "power", and "politics". He insists that the concept of power is quite central in CDA with the introduction of the notion of knowledge as a new project to work on, simultaneously. For him, knowledge is one of the many elements making up context. It is primordial in daily communications to have enough "knowledge of

participants…"; "What they know already…" (Van Dijk, 2008a, 0:13-4:41). In other words, people must have a grasp of what their interlocutors in interaction have in mind in terms of the social representations mentioned earlier (SRs). Hence, the complexity at the level of relationship between discourse and knowledge lies in the way people access knowledge in everyday interactions: How the strategies adopted by people to cope with knowledge work, not only in common communicative events, but also in all the domains of life (scientific conferences, journals, lectures, etc). The vast fields of discourse and knowledge are the target for Van Dijk, whose major priority is to find out how they overlap; this implies resort to other relative fields, such as: "psychology and knowledge"; "social psychology and knowledge"; and "epistemology and knowledge".

On considering the afore-mentioned contributions to the respective areas of DA and social media, on the one hand, and the Brexit issue, on the other, one can observe that their works have been carried out descriptively but remarkably separately with nearly no empirical bases in performing CDA. In short, they have elaborated politically, economically, socially, psychologically, and theoretically on discourse, social media, and Brexit each from what is seen as a relevant perspective. Social media, for instance, have been addressed from the viewpoint of their pros and cons among audiences and users in general. Besides, their great impact and popularity have been markedly discussed by scholars who have focused on the growing feature of the virtual community on social media and how these operate. For Brexit, experts have covered this issue historically referring to the first one held in the mid-1970s and saying what it means exactly, and presenting the reasons underlying its enactment. They have demonstrated the types of Brexit the UK is supposed to negotiate with the EU and the expected consequences of its withdrawal, in addition. When it comes to Van Dijk's theory of context (social cognition), notions relevant to the study of discourse have been evoked and

explained according to his theoretical framework: Discourse, knowledge, social cognition, social psychology of discourse, power and politics among others. If we take the matter the other way round, it turns out that no clear reference, as far as we know, has been made to the broader convergence between online communities' shared cognition, discursive practices, meaning negotiation, as well as Brexit. Most importantly, Van Dijk's approach has been widely concerned with politics in general covering such controversial issues to do with "racism", "ethnicism" and discrimination disseminated by mainstream media, notably the press via discourse (Van Dijk 1991).

This work , by being practically and hopefully innovatively oriented toward the practice of CDA, offers to study how online communities' members in the UK construct, mediate, and receive each other's discourses about Brexit. Also, it attempts to uncover how both pro-Brexiteers and EU-remainers perceive each other as social groups with archetypical experiences of the world epitomized via their respective discourses. All this takes place on two of the most influential networking sites of this new "information and communication age": Facebook and Twitter. The approach underpinning this work is that of Van Dijk's social cognition and the theory of context. This stretches discourse outside the bounds of the physical context (place, time, participants, tones, goals, social status, etc) and invokes reference to the abstract set of knowledge required for successful communication as well as pragmatic action in society. The notion of community on social media is dealt with as an active group of users with uniform political, economic, social, and cultural stances forming the essence of their visions (knowledge) of reality. These can be conveyed through various discourses on social media. Equally, relations of power, domination, and resistance are assumingly at their utmost regarding discursive constructions and responses to matters of great importance which is the very case of the pro-Brexiteers versus the EU-remainers on

Facebook and Twitter. Thus, the main objectives of this work turn around bringing in a fresh perspective toward social media; they should not just be seen as media to get in touch and socialize, but as a large space for jointly ideological expressions and communal action with goals to be realized politically speaking. We live in the age of the speedy information, and the ability of the audience to discursively react to it positively or negatively; individually or collectively through interface with the medium and from particular socio-cultural standpoints is what we attempt to cover in the course of this work. That is to say, we are committed to demonstrating how research on social media can overlap with such multi-disciplinary fields as DA to culminate in a contribution that would be helpful to students as well as researchers actively versed in conducting CDA in connection with media studies both in Algeria and elsewhere.

It is important to draw attention to the series of upheavals that have swept the Arab world (Tunisia, Egypt, and Syria) and the role social media played in accelerating debates and controversy; as a matter of effect, social media are social and cultural tools that can be exploited ideologically to formulate and mediate different discourses alongside to express attitudes toward a variety of issues. In the end, although this work intends to shed some light on the reality of groups' campaigning on social media in the UK in the aftermath of the Brexit Referendum, it should not be taken as a locally-based study, but a microcosm of the socio-cultural implications relative to discursive exchanges, power relations, and the ensuing political effects across digital platforms.

In the course of studying the discursive practices undertaken online, we intend to empirically examine the discourses created and mediated by the Brexiteers and Eu-remainers communities campaigning on Facebook and Twitter. As it will be indicated later

(methodology chapter), we rely on corpora as data representative of the groups' respective discourses on Brexit; also, we sample the most active gatherings whose publications encapsulate forcefully their actual attitudes to this issue.

Given the practical nature of this work, which engages in a purely discursive approach to social media communities in the UK, we adopt a mixed-method approach (qualitative, quantitative) in the course of applying Van Dijk's CDA model. The project Van Dijk has been working on in recent years seems valuable in terms of the useful notions and perspectives introduced and elaborated so far: Discourse, knowledge, strategies, social psychology, and social cognition. We, actually, resort to the qualitative/quantitative method to analyze the pro-Brexiteers and pro-remains' corpora (discourses) over the Brexit issue on Facebook and Twitter and to calculate the number of tweets as well as Facebook posts dealt with. Thus, the above approach has to be symmetrical with the initial objectives of this work that center primarily around establishing an overlap between discourse, cognition, socially shared cognition, power, and domination within and between groups on SNSs; these are, presently, the locus for the exercise of power for control as well as struggle for change. Furthermore, a sample of the most representative pro-and-anti-Brexit communities on Facebook and Twitter are selected to undertake a critical study of their respective discourses over Brexit. For this reason, their most pertinent corpora are cautiously excerpted, likewise.

The organization of this work corresponds to the overall topic components to be addressed and the methodological mechanism deployed in the analytical process. The first chapter represents the theoretical aspect relevant to CDA as a study approach with a focus on the different disciplines that converge in it to tackle discourse under social constraints and from different perspectives: Text linguistics, pragmatics, socio-linguistics, discourse analysis,

and discursive social psychology. The second chapter follows immediately with Van Dijk's social cognition as the theoretical CDA-based tool deployed in the analysis of the discourses adopted by the above-mentioned communities whose discursive byproducts form the corpora of study. At this stage, the approach of Van Dijk is further covered and its components explained in full: Discourse in connection to knowledge, as an abstract, complex notion. A close reference to the multi-disciplinarity of discourse and knowledge, as vast fields of research, is also featured along the way. In this respect, the social cognitive approach suggests that one must delve deep into the following fields: Psychology and knowledge; discourse and knowledge; social psychology and knowledge. Hence, ideology, unequal power relations, socio-cultural organizations, and politics are given their due rights in the discussion since these can usually determine the relations between groups and subgroups in society.

The first topic of the third chapter branches into mass media theorizing from Modernism to Hall's Encoding/Decoding paradigm. I.e., we elaborate on how such theorizations have switched their focus from passive audiences to active ones (participating in the decoding of media-coded output). After that, we tackle the transition from the first to the second media age where audiences are given the opportunity, thanks to the Internet to partake in the meaning-making process. The emergence as well as the increasingly rapid growth of social media is, then, covered with reference to the rise of virtual communities and online interaction as a new brand of intergroup communication. Actually, such modern technologies offer their users the opportunity to diffuse their own attitudes toward various world issues and also perform individual or collective identities via discourse as network communities.

After that, the second subject, the issue of Brexit in the UK is given its share of coverage from major angles: Political, social, and economic. As academic readers and researchers must

be in the clear over this highly controversial issue, an explanation of it marks the opening. It, actually, defines Brexit in technical and legal terms, giving a historical account of it. Then, it goes on to expose the main reasons that have led the UK citizens to vote for the Brexit. It, next, briefly presents the Brexit deal proposed by the successive Conservative Governments under "Article 50" of the European law that stipulates the terms and conditions of Brexit as well as forms of Brexit that the UK and the EU have had to negotiate before going through their Parliaments for ultimate ratifications. Finally, the second part closes with the revised version of the Withdrawal Agreement having being adopted by both legislative branches along with it legal stipulations.

Chapter four, then, introduces the methodological parameters and necessary tools for data gathering and analysis and goes on with the practical side of the study. In actuality, we perform CDA of the discursive practices of Facebook and Twitter's EU-remainers and pro-Brexiteers in connection with Brexit. This is, of course, followed by a discussion of the eventual findings. Finally, we end our dissertation with the general conclusion in which we show whether the hypotheses are confirmed or rejected followed with suggestions for further research.

Chapter One: A Broad Theoretical Background: The Interdisciplinary Quality of Approaching Discourse: from Text Linguistics to CDA

Introduction

During the last decades, scholars representing different trends in discourse analysis and other disciplines have perceived language as a social and cultural phenomenon. A turn that has proved revolutionary thanks to valuable theoretical and methodological contributions from prominent theorists. In this sense, mainstream linguistics is not the sole paradigm in the linguistic study. Nowadays, any piece of written text or speech can by no means be disassociated from the larger context surrounding its social operations. Despite the common ground guiding the orientation to language use, alongside underlying relations of power, control, and ideology regulating social communities, discourse has been viewed from different perspectives and across many disciplines, likewise. Thus, chapter one treats a broad but basic topic. This lends itself to the different fields of study with their respective theoretical frameworks; these range from− text linguistics, sociolinguistics, discourse analysis (DA), pragmatics, discursive and social psychology (DSPS) up to the rise of critical discourse analysis (CDA) as a revolutionary approach to critiquing discourse. The very aim of these fields' overview revolves around making insights into the functional nature of language in society from distinct, but complementary points of view.

1.1 The Emergence of Disciplines as Approaches to Language Study

1.1.1Text Linguistics: Basic Notions and Evolution

According to "Text Linguistics,"(n.d.), text linguistics saw the light to fill in the niche left by "traditional linguistics", which had granted little consideration to the way sentences interrelate as linguistic chains when used. To begin with, text linguistics can be viewed as a sub-discipline of linguistics, but with a broader scope of textual description. That is to say, perceiving texts as being grammatical systems with a communicative capacity is at the heart of focus. In addition, although this field has initially set out with the aim to study the grammar constitutive of texts, it has pushed its perspective further beyond the bounds of "the sentence as a self-contained system ". By implication, one would say that text cannot be disassociated from its natural environment where it operates functionally. In this sense, text linguistics, according to the same source, takes into account the immediate space of textual sequences; i.e., it considers their settings (places and times). Besides the physical space, participants come under consideration; their social positions can provide useful clues in communicative events, facilitating interaction. This has to do with their respective social statuses (occupation, age, marital status, sex, educational background, etc). Still, it must be observed that the description is limited to elements of the physical context, and no clear reference is made to the complex socio-cultural institutions ruling general attitudes to the world. Therefore, the very discipline of discourse analysis inevitably interferes in studying the negotiation of meaning among interlocutors. In short, the description of the linguistic system has been incomplete under the scope of text linguistics.

Dolnic and Bajzikova (as cited in "Text Linguistics," n.d.); Halliday and Hasan (1989) being more specific, assume that text linguistics is concerned with text as a "product" and as a "process". The former covers features relative to the structural constitution of text (text grammar): Coherence, cohesion, and function, while the latter deals with the interpretative process of text in use. In other words, the process of negotiation of meaning that involves the

participants in a given situationally communicative act. In this sense, text is seen as a situational case of language in use or, as often referred to by scholars, namely de Beaugrande and Dressler (as cited in "Text Linguistics" n.d.), "a communicative occurrence…an act of parole" (Para. 1). To be attributed such a status, text must adhere to the seven criteria of textuality, ultimately (de Beaugrande & Dressler, 2002). Dealing with text from a functional angle implies seeing it as a product as well as process.

It would be worth a mention to draw attention to the fact that traditional linguistics has been partial in its approach to language. It has, specifically, taken account of fragments of grammatical units (sentences) rather than chains of larger units (texts), stated by "Text Lingistics" (n.d.). In this register, Werlich (as cited in "Text Linguistics," n.d.) explains in defining text:

> A text is an extended structure of syntactic units [i.e. text as super-sentence] such as words, groups, and clauses, and textual units that is marked by both coherence among the elements and completion…[whereas] a non-text consists of random sequences of linguistic units such as sentences, paragraphs, or sections in any temporal and/ or spatial extension.

Text is, therefore, likely to remain a confusing concept and open to countless descriptions in text linguistics as long as scholars tend to differ considerably in establishing a definitive definition of it. This would eventually attribute text a solid status. Nevertheless, the same scholars are of like minds regarding text as being a logical realization of language (text is to do with language). What has been said above testifies to the diversity of perspectives toward text ("Text Linguistics," n.d.). Briefly, some scholars have overstated length in approaching

text; some stressed structure as the basis of in their description; while others concentrated essentially on contextual meaning.

De Beaugrande and Dressler (2002) have set forth in a scientific survey to expose those criteria inherent in dealing with text analytically. Indeed, they readily assert that text linguistics, as a field of its own, must endeavor to uncover common and unique attributes of texts, as these are primordial for the "textuality" of any chunk of related structures. Moreover, this respect of research, according to them, is supposed to widen its scope of analysis by going beyond the structural bounds; the whole process involving the production and reception of texts among interlocutors ought to be granted sufficient attention by scholars. It would be worthy of attention to remind that text linguistics has most often been neglectful of the socio-cultural space surrounding language use, besides. At this point, there emerges the necessity and, with it, the perspective to investigate such a matter from a discursive angle (Hutchings, 2004). In addition, de Beaugrande and Dressler (2002) assume that the core of this promising initiative rests on the aim underlying language use in various communicative situations. This testifies to the orientation which lies well beyond the textual structure while considering discourse. Henceforth, all that set of useful clues can prove crucial for text interpretation in communicative events. As a summation, the novel perspective of investigating text in use is of paramount importance.

In the same destination, considerations of the functional aspects of language have begun crystallizing. As starters, scholars in text linguistics, such as Hoey and Cook (as cited in Waller, 2015) among others, unanimously assume that language is regulated via "coherence" and "cohesion" relationships which make it unified and meaningful to its users. In reality, these must be familiar with such relationships, among other ones, especially in writing. As a

matter of fact, to gain the very status of a communicative occurrence, de Beaugrande and

Dressler (as cited in "Text Linguistics" n.d.) suggest seven criteria: (a) "coherence", (b)

"cohesion", (c) "intentionality", (d) "situationality", (e) "intertextuality", (f) "informativity",

and (g) "acceptability. These are "the seven standards of textuality" (de Beaugrande &

Dressler, 2002, "Basic notions" para.1). Moreover, they stress that such primordial criteria

cannot work on their own without the assistance of the three guiding rules for the validity of

text as being communicative, likewise: (a) "effectiveness", (b) "efficiency", and (c)

"appropriateness" ("Text Linguistics" n.d.). De Beaugrande and Dressler (2002) term them as

"constitutive vs regulative principles", ultimately. To earn its functionality, text needs the

assistance of the constitutive and regulative aspects.

1.1.1.1 Cohesion.

 Titsher, Meyer, Wodak, and Vetter (2000); Waller (2015) readily tackle cohesion from a

strictly structural perspective. When it comes to realization, cohesion can be said to operate

via special elements with the precise role of ensuring syntactic connection in sentences thus

between long chunks of texts; in fact, de Beaugrande and Dressler (2002) assert that cohesion

branches into ties holding together different items making up any text. In addition, there exists

a relationship of reciprocity in terms of dependence among such items (words). In clear terms,

each word requires the preceding one to have sense in accordance with the recommendations

of the grammatical norms. About this very point they assume, "The surface components

depend upon each other according to grammatical forms and conventions, such that cohesion

rests upon grammatical dependencies." (Para.3). Titscher et al. (2000), on their part, posit the

term "mutual dependencies" in order to accentuate the norms of grammar and reliance

regulating cohesion relationships within texts. Waller (2015) specifies the types of

cohesion: "Reference", "ellipsis", "conjunctions", "lexical cohesion", and "pragmatic cohesion".

1.1.1.1.1 Reference.

Concerning reference, Waller (2015) states that it can be to items outside texts (either spoken or written). This is ensured with elements like personal pronouns (subject and object), demonstratives (this/that; these/those), determiners (what? which? Whose?, etc), or even adverbs. The item referred to actually is precisely termed "denotate"; this can, correspondingly, contribute to meaning making in communicative situations. In addition, reference may be within text itself: The term that is common here is "endophoric reference". In fact, if reference is directed backwards, it is termed "anaphoric reference". The latter encompasses "direct anaphora" (personal pronouns or possessive adjectives referring directly to previous elements) and "indirect anaphora" (not pointing overtly to an item). For instance, "I enjoy the _song_, the _tune_ is very great"; here, tune refers to song. For forward reference, "cataphoric reference" is employed, and this might be expressed via the article "the". Also, reference to unique items in a situation is attributed the appellation "homophoric reference"; for example, in the sentence"put on the jacket" where there is only one jacket. Finally, pointing to the same anticedent is called "coreference reference". E.g., reflexive pronouns, such as "himself"/ "herself"/ themselves are very common.

1.1.1.1.2 Ellipsis.

Waller (2015) defines ellipsis as another way of referring to textual items. Indeed, one can delete previous in-text items by resorting to elliptical style in writing. For instance, in the sentence "help yourself to more…," one refers implicitly to some brand of food. Nonetheless,

Titsher et al. (2000) draw attention to a very crucial aspect of ellipsis: they assume that in interactions, this function can be misleading unless interlocutors resort to previously shared knowledge. The latter must be closely linked to its immediate context, actually. In other words, they have to succeed in co-building a set of mutual presuppositions, predicting forthcoming statements. To Titscher et al., either shorter or longer pieces of information may be removed from text, so they must be re-constituted by recipients through rhetorical procedures. These preserve the grammar of text, and its meaning.

1.1.1.1.3 Conjunctions.

Conjunctions, according to Thornbury (as cited in Waller, 2015), are represented by both syntactic as well as grammatical bonds. The former relate to adverbial forms, such as "conjuncts"; the latter to agreement or, more precisely, "concord"; for example, one makes sequential uses of tenses in a meaningful way along sentences. Hence, it can be said that conjunctions create structural links in text. In addition, Titscher et al. (2000) indicate how conjunctions differ in their primary roles of ensuring connectedness between textual components. Some relate structures that are identical in nature (independent clauses in compound sentences). Others relate structures dissimilar in nature within sentences (clauses expanded with phrases) that are termed "disjunctions", while some connect structures in subordination, including those with semantically illogical relationships (e.g., cause and effect incompatibility) referred to as "contra-junctions". Thus, such types of conjunctions have one aspect in common: they link situations in sentences, making them sound meaningful.

1.1.1.1.4 Lexical cohesion.

Cutting (2008); Waller (2015) also tackle "lexical cohesion", as an integral part of cohesion, with the aim of placing more focus on its function. In fact, it builds a kind of relationship between textual structures that base on meaning. This can be possible by repeating a particular set of lexis throughout text or using synonymous linguistic items, too. Here, the term "synonymy" seems to fit the context. Titscher et al. (2000), on the other hand, have devised the term "recurrence" to point to similar structural features; in fact, they explain how recurrent items can emerge all across chains of sentences in a systematic way. Besides, the aim underlying such repetitions lies centrally in facilitating cohesive processes among participants in interactions. Cutting (2008) agrees with Titscher et al.'s explication, but she rather uses the term "repetition" while referring to the same structural phenomenon. What this scholar adds in this issue is the centrality of this component in comparison with the other ones; also, she stresses the fact that it serves mainly stylistic effects in writing such as emphasis. She points to what both ellipsis and substitution suppress as textual effects which are integrated in lexical cohesion.

1.1.1.1.5 Pragmatic connection.

Waller (2015) demonstrates how the very constituent of cohesion links closely to inter-personal communication. Usually, when people interact with each other, they display an astonishing ability to predict what would come next in their respective conversations. Anticipating intention is at the core of such a notion. In addition, the ease with which interlocutors manage to make inferences out of dialogic activities testifies to the pragmatic nature underpinning daily interactions. People can spur some kind of concrete action through their interactions, actually. Widdowson (2004) places considerable emphasis on this joint effort between interlocutors in the process of making inferences from texts, and he calls for

further insights into this matter. Obviously, this exploratory step would shed light on the intricacies of human interaction in context, which has been much under the scientific eye of scholars in the field of discourse analysis for the last decades.

1.1.1.2 Coherence.

For long, coherence has not been clearly defined (Waller, 2015).In actuality, Neubauer and Yule (as cited in waller, 2015) respectively assume that this term branches into structures bonding properly with one another, generating meaning, and that it is, also, "everything fitting together well" (P. 32). On cautious consideration, it can be obvious that coherence does not simply adhere fully to cohesion in terms of formal links (Waller, 2015). Indeed, Yule (as cited in Waller, 2015) seems to have caught up with his earlier conception of coherence; he draws attention to the interpretative process a text undergoes when manipulated by its users (producers and receivers) in communicative situations. Coherence, it can be deduced, would contribute effectively to unity within texts, by allowing for symmetrical interpretations between interlocutors in speech or else writing. This is primarily based on a shared understanding of reality issues. Reasonably achieved interpretations are quite indicative of textual coherence, thus. He, further, goes on assuming that both readers and listeners get involved in meaning-making of texts by invoking all their grasp and knowledge and perceptions derived from life experiences. For instance, in an ordinary interaction, a text recipient could work the definite article out as standing for some item already referred to, so this renders meaning-making accessible.

In the same direction Mc Carthy (as cited in Waller, 2015) equates between coherence and inter-personal interaction. For him, full reception of a text's intended meaning suggests automatically a well performed interpretative approach to it. Additionally, he claims that

syntactic items (words) must be interpreted rather than be seen as mere cohesive devices: in Mc Carthy's own words "absolutes". In other words, interlocutors' roles revolve around making sense of texts by locating elements of unity and coherence in them. As well as easing the interpretative process, such elements remarkably lead to the assumption that cohesion contributes to coherence; that is to say, cohesion, with its syntactic connectedness in texts, enables coherence to occur amid the process of meaning-making. All in all, while establishing the status of coherence as being the outcome of people's interpretations of texts, one must give cohesion its fair dues as the facilitator of coherence.

De Beaugrande and Dressler (2002) assume that coherence/cohesion relations in texts transcend the strictly structural level in terms of emphasis (either spoken or written structures). What counts more is the cognitive process surfacing during interactions to make sense of texts. I.e., interlocutors must resort to a co-inferencing act to establish links between events and situations across stretches of texts. This can be achieved by their common knowledge of reality. Therefore, any coherent expression of events in texts helps making sense; conversely, texts are meaningless unless there is an inter-personal cooperation in liaising knowledge of textual ideas. What is potentially remarkable at this level is the correlation cohesion/coherence exhibited, in addition. As a matter of fact, the textual feature of cohesion, by combining with coherence, can provide communication participants with the useful clues needed for knowledge activation in the process of meaning-making. This seems to support Hoey and Cook's (as cited in Waller, 2015) assumption of the vital role cohesion/coherence relationship play in making lengths of texts comprehensible in interactive situations (ensuring unity and meaningfulness). One would refer back to Cook's assertion (as cited in Waller, 2015) which establishes that coherence is pivotal for successful meaning-making in reading out of unified texts.

For other scholars, nevertheless, such as Connor and Lee (as cited in Waller, 2015) coherence might lead to confusion; although it has previously been defined as the connection between structural components (realized via cohesion) to make them meaningful, it is possible for coherence to suggest divergent interpretations. Readers may, for instance, fail to derive intended senses out of obviously cohesive texts, and the converse is true: poorly cohesive structures can turn up to be thoroughly meaningful in written works. At this stage, the complexity of coherence emerges as a potential source of difficulty in attaining an intended meaning, especially in reading; henceforth, this has led to the assumption that cohesion is just an integral part of coherence, not a concept operating autonomously (Waller, 2015). Whatever the scholars' perceptions of the cohesion-coherence relationship within written or spoken texts, the process of meaning-making occurs among interlocutors (producers and recipients) with readers or listeners trying to decode the intended sense. However, this task of interpretation cannot disengage from the impulses of textual components: what they activate as knowledge of reality is limited within the overall structural composition. Unity throughout text realized via cohesion devices facilitates the extraction of meaning.

1.1.1.3 Intentionality and acceptability.

The interpersonal act of meaning negotiation makes the core of "intentionality"; this takes place well above the bounds of the formal level (de Beaugrande & Dressler, 2002; Linde, 1997). Cermak (as cited in"Text Linguistics," n.d.) observes that this term relates primarily to writers or speakers' intentions underlying any piece of language in use, actually. In different words, what they would like to achieve as pragmatic goals with the recipients of their discourses in communicative occurrences (Austin, 1962). For example, discourse producers,

in certain cases, attempt to force their interlocutors to apologize for something wrong or even agree to a point of view.

Central to intentionality is the previously mentioned cohesion/coherence relationship within texts. Indeed, de Beaugrande and Dressler (2002) assert that the interlocutors' ability to establish such a relationship while communicating is primordial for the expression of the pragmatic intention. Besides, intentionality, for them, rests on two major notions: "User-centered notions" and "operational goals". The former pertains to the meaning-making process, involving participants' conveyed meanings; the latter relates to realizing cohesion-coherence complementarity for effective interaction. Furthermore, both scholars assume that cohesion/coherence construction might be seen as a goal to achieve, in spite of being not as primordial as what interlocutors intend to say, relatively speaking. Thus, the construction of cohesion/coherence relations must be a sine qua non for the expression of intention in communication. There might emerge, nonetheless, certain occasions in which such connections are not fully established, but speakers/writers manage to get their intentions through to their recipients with ease, they go on explaining. The scholars exemplify with the casual form of interaction, where discourse producers' goals earn direct acceptance from their interlocutors. Cohesion/coherence building eases interpersonal co-extraction of sense.

"Acceptability", on the other hand, branches closely into the side involved in the receipt of discourse during the meaning negotiation act; in other words, the attitudes of receivers count considerably in determining the extent to which cohesion-coherence relationship is in parallel with their own conjectures of textuality (de Beaugrande & Dressler, 2002; Waller, 2015). "Text Linguistics" (n.d.), likewise, places much emphasis on receivers of texts in use (discourse) as they are the source of validation of textuality (cohesion/coherence realizations)

and the ensuing pragmatic harmony. Actually, ultimate acceptability of discursive goals depends on compatibility between interlocutors (discourse procucers and receivers) in terms of their respective perceptions of life in general (de Beaugrande & Dressler, 2002; Van Dijk, 2009). Such perceptions, one would assume, are representative of the socio-cultural sructures underpinning social groups and subgroups. Therefore, symmetry of expectations over a text and its relevant socio-cultural features of context can undoubtedly determine whether acceptability is achieved or not (de Beaugrande & Dressler, 2002; Fetzer & Aijmer, 2008). Intentionality and acceptability is not solely contingent on cohesion/coherence link, but also upon similarity of background knowledge.

De Beaugrande and Dressler (2002) focus on the stabilization of cohesion/coherence relationship as being an integral part of the meaning-making process. To add more to this, Hamidreza (2011) asserts that creators of texts must assume right from the outset the functionality underlying their textual output (the fact of texts carrying intentions within them); receivers, in turn, have to accept this as so. In simpler terms, communicators should agree over the text producer/receiver's respective roles of conveying and capturing intended messages through written or spoken language. Hence, the symbiotic connection involving intentionality and acceptability is a sine qua non for interaction as it enables it to occur. To testify to this, Hamidreza (2011) writes:

> A text must be intended to be a text and accepted as such in order to be utilized in communicative interaction, i.e. the author of the text should intend it to contribute towards some goal and the reader of it should accept that it is, in fact, satisfying some such objective. (P. 54)

Moreover, Neubert and Shreve (as cited in Hamidreza, 2011) observe, on the one hand, that intentionality is highly indicative of the overlap between textual constructions and what they carry within them in terms of intended messages. On the other hand, they draw attention to the close link involving intentionality and "relevance". That is, compatibility between text producers and receivers is primordial for efficient interaction. The accrued consideration that receivers give to uttered information is solid evidence of "…sender-receiver (translator-receiver) pairing" (Hamidreza, p.54). Symmetry between interlocutors is once again highlited in daily exchanges.

Hatim and Mason (as cited in Hamidreza, 2011) seem to tackle intentionality from a predominantly abstract frame of reference. Actually, intentionality, for them, can be realized by assuming that a textual output is both cohesive and coherent enough and it must be associated with the norms upholding socio-textual conventions. These are identifiable by virtue of being a member of given groups or sub-groups. Nonetheless, their perspective is in part concrete: this is manifest in the cooperative act of establishing intention in authentic communications. Besides, they remark that text producers, when communicating intentionality, need to conform to the socio-cultural institutions regulating the community to which they are supposed to belong; henceforth, relations of domination and control, solidarity and assistance, and dissimilarity of attitudes to world matters manifest themselves in every day discursive occasions. To bring things to an end, in spite of the seemingly abstract nature of intentionality cooperation as community subjects, it is by and large concrete.

Again, de Beaugrande and Dressler (as cited in Hamidreza, 2011, 2002), remind that intentionality may mismatch cohesion-coherence in texts. In such occasions, the speakers-writers' goals may easily correspond to their listeners-readers' interpretations despite the

failure to provide enough cohesive-coherent clues, and the converse is possible. Here, interlocutors could be at pains to make their respective messages accessible to each other; however, structural cohesion and coherence is well achieved. They, once more, evoke casual interaction to illustrate this particular case. Therefore, another parameter intervenes in order to ensure the continuity of communication (intentionality and acceptability); indeed, language users can resort to some form of tolerance with regard to cohesive-coherence deficiency as long as the intended meaning is discernible (de Beaugrande and Dressler as cited in Hamidreza, 2011). Last but not least, it would be noteworthy to stress the unmistakable role of cohesion-coherence stability for meaning negotiation regardless of possible lapses in doing so. At last, inferring coherence-based relations along texts relies heavily on their recipients' interpretative tasks which renders the latter's part in the communicative process crucial for the outcome of communication (de Beaugrande & Dressler, 2002). It would sound reasonable to accentuate the cohesion-coherence vitality across discursive occasions' management.

1.1.1.4 Informativity.

Text Linguistics (n.d.), de Beaugrande and Dressler (2002) tackle this notion on the grounds of probability and improbability when interpreted by recipients. To begin with, one needs to assume that text is logically loaded with messages in their different types while in use in context, but this does not exclude failure to anticipate intentions (de Beaugrande & Dressler, 2002). According to "Text Linguistics" (n.d.), recipients might succeed in expecting the right meaning from text (probability), or they can equally fail in extracting any intended message (improbability). This can lead to frustration and subsequent interruption of interaction, as such (de Beaugrande & Dressler, 2002). In short, informativity essentially revolves around

symmetry or asymmetry of recipients' guesses. The same scholars demonstrate how the interpretative process requires much effort despite the facility on the surface of it. In addition, "Text Linguistics" (n.d.) refers closely to Sperber and Wilson's "Relevance Theory" as a possible compensation for any eventual shortness of intention grasp. In fact, Sperber and Wilson (as cited in "Text Linguistics", n.d.) point out how the recipient in difficulty can resort to his/her cognitive luggage (knowledge) in trying to unravel the message behind discourse by launching what they coined in their theory "motivation search", which is exactly a whole cognitive process.

1.1.1.5 Situationality.

"Text Linguistics" (n.d.); Titscher et al. (2000) explain that this textuality criterion branches into the crucial relationship between discourse and communicative situations. Implicitly speaking, specific sets of structures must suitably correspond with both their immediate as well as larger socio-cultural contexts. To be able to perform such a process, not only text producers have to contextualize the texts they externalize, but also receivers need to be capable of placing them in their proper and appropriate situations, moreover. Titscher et al., additionally, advocate the perception of discourse as generic: scholars, in their various approaches to discourse across disciplines should assume that it is preliminarily "text in context".

1.1.1.6 Intertextuality.

"Text Linguistics" (n.d.), explicates how this textuality criterion entitles recipients to draw on both prior and following texts with the very purpose of interpreting current ones. That is to say, reception and conception of current text necessarily entails knowledge relevant to what

has been mentioned beforehand and what will be stated afterward in spoken or written text. Titscher et al. (2000), on their part, have extended the signification of intertexuality. For them, the first one centers around text bonding with concurrent of preceding discourses, whereas the second focuses on common structural features which bring text together within the scope of genre or variety; in other words, such formal features constitute the criteria determining or classifying texts' genres and varieties. Similarly, Wodak (as cited in Titscher et al., 2000) points to text genres that consist of formally linked texts using the terms "schemas" or "frames". By way of illustration, Titscher et al. (2000) present "narrative text varieties" alongside their varieties such as tales, novels, and short stories, which depend wholly on time sequencing in the course of their development. The above criteria work together to give texts their functionality.

1.1.2 Discourse Analysis: Important Concepts and Terms

1.1.2.1 Text (spoken and written) and discourse.

To start, it would be useful to draw attention to discourse as the analytical object of discourse analysis (DA) and to the controversy surrounding this broad term. In fact, Widowson (2004) states that scholars have been in disagreement over an appropriate signification of DA; though it has been the locus of extensive research for long years, it has mostly been defined as the study of language structure beyond the sentence. From the first glimpse, one can deduce the structural basis underlying this definition. Moreover, what is obvious, he remarks, is the fact that this perception is symmetrical with the one elaborated by Stubbs (as cited in Widdowson, 2004). The latter states, regarding discourse, "Roughly speaking, it refers to attempts to study the organization of language above the sentence or above the clause, and therefore to study larger linguistic units such as conversational exchanges or written texts" (p. 1). Nevertheless,

Stubb's definition is, still according to Widdowson, devoid of exactness. Firstly, it is unclear whether he means that sentence and the clause are similar or not. Secondly, any consideration beyond the clause implies complex sets of sentences. Thirdly, this form of analysis is by far limited to the syntactic dimension of the sentence. In conclusion, the study of discourse has from the outset revealed much controversy among scholars concerning its nature.

The afore-mentioned perception of DA seems perfectly compatible with the one that Harris developed in the 1950s. In reality, by drawing on the notion of "connected discourse", he has focused on whole lengths of similar structures. These not only constitute the formal construction of language, but also lay the foundations for more structures to follow successively in the same text as equivalents, actually (Widdowson, 2004; Linde, 1997; Lyons as cited in Linde, 1997). Besides, Yaktine (as cited in Abidi, trans.2016) asserts that researchers are unanimous over Harris being the one who has pioneered concentration on discourse (structures) beyond the mere sentence. In fact, he argues in favor of the extension of sentences study to involve larger texts; sequences of sentences connected with each other as discourse. Nonetheless, Widdowson (2004); Linde (as cited in Linde, 1997) critically show that Harris's conception of discourse analysis is basically centered on how language is built by way of identical structures; each set of equivalents provides the appropriate room for other ones to exist subsequently. Harris himself (as cited in Widdowson, 2004) elaborates on such so-called discourse analytical process:

> By the same process…expressions…are assigned equivalent status on the basis of their environment, which has already been established by the preceding analysis. And we proceed in a kind of chain reaction mode, with one set of equivalents providing the environmental conditions for another. (p. 2)

Analysis starts from the sentence to sequences of texts to discourse, in brief terms. Hence, from this very perspective, Harris, on the one hand, has not parted from the delimitations of formalism in dealing with the syntactic construction of the sentence as a whole. It would be quite unjust, for Widdowson, if one denied Harris his dues, on the other hand. In spite of setting out to define discourse as being chains of related sentences, he paved the way for further research into relations above sentence (lengths of sentences making up texts) (Yaktine as cited in Abidi, trans.2016). His work, evoking Abidi's comment (trans. 2016), has revolved essentially around displaying the syntactic organization of chains of texts as discourse

Even though the previously stated attempt has been widely acclaimed as pioneering, it has displayed limitations in the field. In actuality, Harris (as cited in Widdowson, 2004) suggests that the attribution of equivalence to textual patterns is ensured via transformational operations, but at the same time, acknowledges the absence of a key element in his study: the context. Remarkably, this comparison between equivalent structures in the text and those out of it was in the origin of the grammar elaborated by Chomsky in the late 1950s ("Transformational Generative Grammar"). Though Harris's structural achievement has been unanimously recognized, Stubbs (as cited in Widdowson, 2004), despite his firmness in confirming the discourse authenticity of Harris, observes that DA must delve deeper in the analysis of language (sequences of texts), taking account of its surrounding space. In otherwords, DA does not stop only at the linguistic organization, but it must stretch its scope to cover the contextual environment of texts. Similarly, Harris (as cited in Widdowson, 2004) ultimately admits the partiality of his endeavor: DA, from this seemingly structural viewpoint, is devoid of any reference to the interpretation of such texts occurring in chains. As well as

the semantic property within them, such forms are upheld by pragmatic intentions underlying their use. Evoking this limitation, he comments:

> All this, however, is still distinct from an *interpretation* of the findings, which must take the meaning of morphemes into consideration and ask what the author was about when he produced the text. Such interpretation is obviously quite separate from the formal findings, although it may follow closely in the directions which the formal findings indicate. (p. 3)

In spite of this illuminating observation, Harris has stood firm in his perception of DA, which is primarily concerned with the connection bonding the language constituents together as chains of equivalents, not solitary words, Widdowson reminds. To recapitulate, DA's structural basis is the core component of Hariss's theorizing.

At the same time, the terms text and discourse have been very arguable among scholars in and out of DA. Actually, Lihong (2012) claims there have been no convergence of perceptions with regard to a definitive consideration of text. Of course, the concept of discourse, equally, makes part of the debate, being a decisive element in situational interaction. Wodak (2008), in reinforcement of Lihong's remark, writes:

> The notions of text and discourse have been subject to a hugely proliferating number of usages in the social sciences. Almost no paper or article is to be found which does not revisit these notions while quoting Michel Foucault, Jurgen Habermas, Chantal Mouffe, Ernesto Laclau, or many others. (P.1)

She, in addition, can trace this to two main reasons: on the one hand, etymologically speaking, the term in Latin means the elaboration of a formal topic in written or spoken form; on the

other, it relates to the French discourse of philosophy. Richard et al. in their contribution about text included in the Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics (as cited in Lihong, 2012) go on saying, "text is ˙a general term for example of language use, i.e. language which has been produced as the result of an act of communication'" (p. 2667). Brown and Yule, for their part, (as cited in Lihong, 2012) define it as the material output of any communicative event. Halliday and Hasan's conception (as cited in Lihong, 2012, 1989), besides, revolves around text being a spoken or written structure that has unity in it; whatever its length, it is communicative by nature. They stress the functionality of language regardless of its size. Both, actually, seem to proceed counter to Harris's perception of discourse, which is based on considering discourse as a series of syntactically connected structures ranging from morphemes to texts. For them, a text cannot necessarily achieve it status as so via length, but via its functionality; indeed, the latter point testifies to situational interaction involving sometimes bits of language like morphemes, single letters, or sounds. Hence, it would initially sound fair to say that text and function have been equated with each other in such a way that it might be assumed they are the same. Yet some scholars in DA have clearly raised questions concerning this very point (Widdowson, 2004). In the end, the other dilemma arising among scholars has been the definition text/discourse.

The controversy surrounding text's definition has broadened to cover its relation to the term discourse in the communicative process. To start, Widdowson (2004) differentiates between language beyond the clause, which relates to intra-sentence syntactic components, and language beyond the sentence, which entails a study outside the bounds of the sentence structure namely syntax-related ties above the sentence. The latter involves distinct rules for connecting larger chunks (inter-sentence connection). Moreover, the debate has been further

complicated by Stubbs's term (as cited in Widdowson, 2004) "written text". This not only refers to the orthographic whole forming chains of sentences, but also indicates the intention an author encodes in them; this has not been mentioned by Harris beforehand. Besides, Stubbs, just like Harris, nearly does not discriminate text from discourse as he sees no significance in doing so. He is joined by Chafe, who cannot disengage from establishing a firm synonymy between both terms (as cited in Widdowson, 2004). Stubbs (as cited in Widdowson, 2004) remarks:

> One brief point about terminology. There is considerable variation in how terms such as *text* and *discourse* are used in linguistics. Sometimes this terminological variation signals important conceptual distinctions, but often it does not, and terminological debates are usually of little interest. These distinctions in terminology and concept will only occasionally be relevant for my argument, and when they are, I draw attention to them (e.g. in section 7.2). (P.5)

Chafe's quotation is another solid argument to prove such a conflation when he adds:

> The term 'discourse' is used in somewhat different ways by different scholars, but underlying the differences is a common concern for language beyond the boundaries of isolated sentences. The term TEXT is used in similar ways. Both terms may refer to a unit of language larger than the sentence: one may speak of a 'discourse' or a 'text'. (As cited in Widdowson, 2004, P. 6)

It would be important to signal that establishing a conceptual similarity between such terms can by no means exclude other assumptions, nor can it prevent them from perceiving those concepts from a different angle. The conflation between text and discourse has been a turn of the screw in the survey of language.

Hoey (as cited in Widdowson, 2004) raises some doubt over this scholarly lethargy toward drawing a credible distinction between text and discourse. It would sound, for him, unscientific to presuppose that both terms are facets of the same coin, rendering any eventual attempt to deal with them separately useless. As a matter of fact, backing up his suspicion, he affirms, "And yet the distinction continues to be made. It is as if some basic differentiation is felt to exist that people cannot quite agree on but cannot leave alone" (P. 6). Hence, going analytically over this quotation should imply a call for a re-consideration of such concepts in terms of not only operational definitions, but also the complementary relationship between them. Nevertheless, before engaging in definitions, it must be relevant to this topic to remind that Widdowson (2004) sets forth to tackle structures longer than sentences. He remarks that language in use is not only limited to lengthy forms (connected sentences); it can well apply to shorter forms, for example: separate sentences, phrases, words, or even individual letters and sounds. Thus, such autonomous items logically take on a textual status; they can represent interaction in particular social situations. For instance, road signs are communicatively functional with– motorists, cyclists, and pedestrians likewise. This is what Hymes (as cited in Widdowson, 2004) would call "separate speech events". One would extrapolate that textualityis not only the property of lengthy texts, but also of smaller bits of language as these can be meaningful socially.

The latter point suggests an urgent need to delve into the distinction between text and discourse on more scientific bases, taking account of the socio-cultural space where texts operate functionally. In the first place, Wodak & Bush (2004) remark that scholars have differently viewed discourse depending on their academic orientations; they have fragmented the text-discourse pair under the theoretical recommendations of text linguistics and rhetoric. On the other hand, discourse itself is considered relevant to both verbal and written texts.

Therefore, by implication, one must regard text and discourse as facets of the same coin while other experts point to the degree of abstractness in connection with both terms. Indeed, text, as assumed by Wodak and Bush; Fairclough and Hasan (1989), is the material representation of the abstract knowledge institutions depicted via discourse in actual interactions. At this level, discourse takes on the definition of being a linguistic activity performed socially with the very purpose of producing a myriad of meanings (Wodak & Bush, 2004; Van Dijk, 1990, 2014a). In other words, one can refer to discourse as the social performance that people undertake with language within particular situations (settings; places and times) and under given socio-cultural insitutions. Furthermore, still according to wodak and Bush; Linde, 1997, in each communicative act, text conveys a given meaning: meaning relevant to the communicative situation in which the speaker takes part–discourse realizing social acts. While text specifies the setting of the communicative act, discourse ensures the overlap between text and the larger socio-cultural context in the form of shared knowledge being a set of situational clues. In other words, discourse means particular uses of language within given social spaces; social communications in their appropriately relevant social containers. Discourse, therefore, consists of verbal as well as non-verbal texts: Socially communicative events; and their corresponding effects on participants in interactions. Further, participants in such communicative events can draw on their knowledge based on socially shared cognitive representations: social "cognitive representations" ("SRs") to make sense of discursive structures (Lemke as cited in Mazid, 2014; Van Dijk, 1990, 2008a, 2008b, 2014a, 2014b; Fairclough, 1995b; Fetzer & Aijmer, 2008). Discourse is the enactment of language across a wide range of social situations while invoking communicative keys signaling socio-cultural structures which are embodied in texts.

Lihong (2012) studies both concepts from a comparative standpoint drawing on different approaches to the text-discourse dichotomy. She, initially, directs attention to the Chinese School's position on text; in this sense, Hu Zhuang (as cited in Lihong, 2012) argues in favour of an equation of status between text and language function in the social context (discourse). This theorization is obviously divergent from the one characterizing the essence of the Anglo-American approach to discourse and text, which readily distinguishes between the two terms, noticeably. Even experts of the latter school itself seem divided over the text-discourse issue, any way. In fact, most scholars remark that discourse relates to spoken interaction and text pertains to written one (Lihong, 2012; Titscher, Meyer, Wodak, and Vetter, 2000). Lihong refers to this as the reason why certain scholars have often viewed discourse the object of study for DA. In contrast with this view, Leech (as cited in Lihong, 2012) focuses on written text as language in contextual use. However, the difference in this case solely links to form (either spoken or written language in use). With cautious consideration of this matter, it turns out that text in use must fall under the general term discourse since the latter signifies language use in social context. As such, it automatically determines the functions attributable to text within its appropriate socio-cultural space; indeed, we construct our language in connection with social occasions: these contribute to both forms and mainly values (functions) (Lihong, 2012; Gee, 2005; Linde, 1997). Brown and Yule (as cited in Lihong, 2012); Lihong (2012); Wodak and Bush (2004); Widdowson (2004); and Halliday and Hasan (1989) explain that text undertakes the realization of the discursive process; i.e. they assert that text is the concrete part of interaction whichever the form it may take on. To conclude one would stress the functional nature of language under social institutions in all of its forms; also, one must not deviate from the fact that discourse and text are inextricable terms despite their different roles. In other words, they cannot exist in a vacuum.

Titscher et al. (2000), on their part, focus on text. They observe that the concept of text itself has captivated the interest of scholars in the divergent fields of text linguistics as well as DA. In accordance with their assumption, text (written) cannot work without length; this is primordial to achieve the textual status. Wodak and Wittgenstein (as cited in Tischer et al., 2000); Linde (1997), equally, note that text must not link solely to written form, but it extends to cover speech; moreover, they perceive language as a means of communication. Wittgenstein has put in place the notion of the "language game" to explicate the matter clearly. The latter points to the role language undertakes when deployed in daily, authentic situations. This communicative aspect of language implies necessarily the semiotic nature of the different systems of signs including language; such signs are meaningful primarily within socially conventional constraints (Kress as cited in Titscher et al., 2000; Linde, 1997; Fairclough, 1995a, 1995b). At this point, more theoretical output about the interactional process becomes a necessity (Graber as cited in Titscher et al. 2000). Barker and Galasinki (2001), in fact, readily draw on findings from critical discourse analysis (CDA) in order to reinforce the fact that language is "relational" in nature. I.e., linguistic signs are functional in connection with others, not in isolation. Additionally, such signs are structured in syntagmatic and paradigmatic order as codes. In the same direction, Barthes (as cited in Barker & Galasinki, 2001) stresses that cultural codes must be subjected to the same study course. Text is functional by nature.

Apart from the text-discourse relationship, it would be quite valuable to shed some light on both the spoken and written forms of language in use to expose their main features. First, Widdowson (2004) directs attention to verbal interaction (mainly dialogues), and he points to texts as the instant materialization of such communicative events. He, simultaneously, remarks that such verbally interactional exchanges are negotiated on spot or concurrently by

the participants. Additionally, this act seems the most appropriate type of interaction due to the interpersonal interpretation carried with speed and efficiency. However, selecting verbal texts to carry out analytical work would prove incomplete; this is because of, in Widdowson's own words, the "fugitive" and "partial record of discourse" (P.9), except when recording it (transcription). He elaborates on how recorded forms of verbal interactions can be elusive, too. Actually, scholars can have the opportunity to transcribe instances of verbal interaction for analysis. However, such transcriptions are usually devoid of the "extra-linguistic features" successful interaction is contingent on as these are constitutive elements of context. I.e., they cannot capture them entirely. These can range from– posture, facial expressions (like eye contact and movements of lips), nearby objects and events with their respective arrangements. Language users deploy such"para-linguistic cues" to make their utterances accessible in terms of intention, moreover (Brown & Yule, 1983; Gee, 2005). Indeed, speakers include the afore-mentioned accompanying para-linguistic cues during interactions, and they carefully verify them, and they equally ensure that their statements display a parallelism of intentions with their recipients'. Simultaneously, they must watch over their interlocutors' meaning-making process, in the relative absence of any past material reminder (Brown & Yule, 1983). To summarize, to fulfill interpersonal exchanges, it is often incumbent upon participants to cooperate in the creation of meanings.

Widdowson (2004) concludes that what is under discursive analysis, as transcription, cannot be equal to authentic representations of interactions. The former tends to fix verbal communication in that it loses its originality in terms of the contextual clues present and normally coordinated during the meaning-making process. Therefore, the findings arrived at by analysts rest on their own perspectives; there might arise a large gap between the authentically situational version and the recorded one, in spite of the efforts to capture and

insert the useful extra-linguistic clues of context. Articulating on this restrictive fact, he writes, "making sense of a spoken interaction from the insider point of view of the participants is very different from making sense of it as an outsider third person transcribing it" (P.10). Nevertheless, this does by no means completely reduce the contribution of interaction-based transcriptions. Widdowson remarks, on the other hand, how such forms can unravel certain linguistic features which may help interlocutors make useful inferences in the course of interaction. For instance, we would refer to elements of syntax or phonology. As a recapitulation, even though undertaking analyses on transcribed discourse may seem feasible from a theoretical standpoint, performing it practically is much demanding in terms of capturing para-linguistic keys.

Focusing on written text, Brown and Yule (1983) assume that it is the material representation of writers' thoughts and intentions, which must be kept intact in editing tasks. In effect, different presentations of texts cannot deprive them of their originality concerning overall structure and diction, except when inserting remarks and corrections by editorial boards or suggesting divergent interpretations by critics. In both scholars' point of view, as well as acquiescing to form, any re-production of texts, in all their genres, must not deviate from the intention developed by their authors; otherwise, the intentionality underpinning such structures would fade into vagueness. Furthermore, in the course of the production of texts, writers can enjoy the advantages of reviewing earlier compositions in order to either re-arrange or re-check the diction. Besides, they are able to re-adjust or even alter their intentions altogether. That is, writers are not supposed to stick to what they have already uttered if they do not really intend it. Speakers, on the contrary, cannot "repair" possible lapses of meaning, but they could seize any opportunity, by noticing their recipients' responses, and act to deal

with them accordingly ; it is incumbent on them to express feelings compatible with their recipients' in the course of the discursive reception. Finally, Ekman and Friesen (as cited in Brown & Yule, 1983) have coined the term "leakage" to indicate this act of adaptation. Written text, in comparison to spoken one, can be manipulated differently.

On review of the above material, Wodak (2006) seems optimistic as to an eclectic approach to discourse. To start, despite the intrinsic hardship preventing an articulate, self-contained vision of discourse, she has been pushing for DA bringing about a myriad of theorizing from various areas whose generic target is discourse at large. In clear terms, for the scholar, texts in use (discourse) nowadays have tended to be more and more accessible to experts with their methodological insights and analytical tools for exploration as social practices ("phenomena"). In association with this point, Mazid (2014); Van Dijk (2000, 2008a, 2014a, 2014b) assert that the multi-disciplinary perspective that has characterized the survey of language especially during the last decades can be ascribed to the close link between text and socio-cultural context and the underlying power-based relations governing social communities' experiences of the world. To say things otherwise, the social nature of language has spurred scholars to opt for a range of disciplines to exhaust analytical tools from; for example, we would refer to Gibbs (2015) who shows how conversation analysis (CA) models can be accommodated in the analysis of discursive exchanges. As a matter of effect, the experts in CA view discourse as language immersed in social milieu–a kind of social activity undertaken by people. Briefly, DA relies substantially on the theoretical and analytical contributions emanating from other respects.

1.1.2.2 The persisting complexity of discourse.

Being versed in the study of discourse seems really challenging as a task. To start, Mills (2004); Mayr (2000) point to the complexity of discourse as a broad term to be comprehensible in simple ways. It has been a hard task to reach a unanimous definition across various disciplines ranging from critical theory, philosophy, linguistics, sociology, and social psychology. Wodak (2006), in reinforcement of Mills's claim, writes:

> The notions of text and discourse have been subject to a hugely proliferating number of usages in the social sciences. Almost no paper or article is to be found which does not revisit these notions while quoting Michel Foucault, Jurgen Habermas, Chantal Mouffe, Ernesto Laclau, or many others. (P.1)

She can trace this to two main reasons: on the one hand, etymologically speaking, the term in Latin means the elaboration of a formal topic in written or spoken form; on the other, it relates to the French discourse of philosophy. However, the 1960s saw the relative inception of deviation from the common perception of discourse toward new theoretical frameworks regarding it. Still, the problem of fixing a compelling definition has been persistent, in her view. It would, besides, be advantageous to place the term in a multi-disciplinary context with the purpose of unraveling the range of meanings relevant to discourse. In fact, this seems in line with Djamaan's (trans. 2016) reference to specialist books of DA as they form a source of evidence concerning the differences emanating from the relatively large scope of discourse definitions. These, he insists, can primarily be traced to the theoretical orientations guiding scholar's respective works. The complexity of discourse stems from the multiplicity of its presentations.

Some prominent definitions can be listed by way of illustration. In the first place, the Penguin Dictionary of Critical Theory's definition (as cited in Djamaan trans. 2016), which

appears in harmony with Wodak's assumption of discourse, presents discourse as having been traditionally a kind of discussion of any topic for educative as well as methodological purposes. The same source, in addition, by placing discourse in linguistics, defines it as a unit of text available for study. Nevertheless, with the evolution of this field, discourse has taken on a communicative quality; therefore, special terms like "advertising discourse" have emerged signaling various types of discourse. These have become synonymous with ideology. One can even deduce that such types are the mirror of certain ideologies characterizing societies. Moreover, this source shows how the newly discursive orientation has transcended the bounds of systemic structure of signs to include the producer of discourse as an object of study; all this has been under the influential theorization on discourse in France led by Benveniste, one of the most prominent figures in the humanities. His work rests essentially on assuming discourse as a meta-linguistic phenomenon, actually. It would be logical to conclude that, in the course of discursive analysis, the scholar must take account of the information accompanying language in use. Benveniste's approach to discourse has long marked the dividing line between the French perspective and the traditional English one: While the former has focused on the environment of the discourse producer, the latter was still conceptualizing it as equal to speech or talk.

In the same context, Djamaan (trans. 2016) refers to the synthetic approach endorsed by Baker and Ellec regarding discourse. In fact, their definition (as cited in Djamaan trans.2016) encapsulates the foremost conceptions that make it up as follows:

- Discourse is language put into use: natural language contextualized. They remark that this is the most accepted specification of discourse,

- Discourse is particularly oral in nature, while text is written; this attributes the intrinsic quality of interaction to it, not to text,

- Discourse extends beyond the sentence; it is a sequence of sentences forming chains of texts,

- Discourse is necessarily context-based in that it operates in specific social environments. Thus, there surface different discursive types. For example, political discourse in the context of politics, media discourse, and literary discourse in their respective contexts.

- Actually, scholars even tend more and more to relate discourse with certain sensitive issues and topics; by illustration, they have introduced the discourse of environment, racism, sexism, anti-colonialism, and colonialism.

In this register, but with much focus on the interactional aspect of language in use, Foucault (as cited in Djamaan trans. 2016, 1980) sees discourse as primarily a set of meaningful practices categorized into different subjects; besides, they can have specific expression modes–distinct semantic units, or metaphors, or images, or pieces of news. These need to be relevant to particular occurrences or people. More importantly, all those modes work together, by means of certain media, in order to communicate various attitudes toward worldly matters. The scholar, henceforth, evokes a variety of discourses and their underlying perceptions. Most significantly, he highlights the consequential dimension of discourse; it may provoke some impressions of racism, sexism, feminism, etc. We can conclude that for Foucault any type of sign expressing meaning and influence is discourse.

In the same vein connecting to discourse, Gee (2005, as cited in Djamaan trans. 2016) differentiates between "Discourse" with big "D" and "discourse" with small "d". The first, according to him, extends beyond language in use to include the broad communicative act and what accompany it in terms of relevant– social values, spatio-temporal settings, aims, conceptions, and speaking/writing styles. Moreover, Discourse implies non-linguistic symbols (meta-linguistic indicators of identity); these may encompass–ways of dressing, standing, walking, posture, eating habits and the like. He puts much emphasis on those accompanying clues since they actively contribute to the establishment of the discourse identity. The second, on the other hand, links to language in use in all its types– conversations, written texts, etc. One would talk of social interaction and identity performance through meta-linguistic key symbols. Carrying out successfully negotiated communication necessitates full adherence to the afore-mentioned constituents as the basis of social organizational institutions, in addition. This very fact, ultimately, enables discourse analysts to identify individuals as being subjects of given semantic communities (Gee, 2005; Bernstein, 1971/2003; Van Dijk, 2014a, 2016). Gee's assumption of discourse rests essentially upon severing it into two distinct but complementary segments.

Still addressing discourse, Maingueneau (as cited in Djamaan trans.2016) assumes that it relates exactly to approaching language within its broader environment; in actuality, he insists on the necessity to regard discourse as a perspective of tackling language, not a field of its own right. Consequently, this accounts for why discourse must not be considered a purely linguistic enterprise. The scholar, additionally, explains how discourse has taken prominence as a study object with the rise of structuralism of pragmatics as well as DA as new trends; the latter field has, of course, deviated from the work of Harris on discourse (as cited in Djamaan trans.2016; Widdowson, 2004; Sinclair& Coulthard, 1992), which sees it as units beyond

single sentences. Furthermore, for Djamaan (trans. 2016) the formal orientation of the above-mentioned assumption has subsequently led it to become an integral part of text linguistics. Despite the initially promising approach to discourse as language in use, one would remark that it could not disengage thoroughly from the formal constraints.

1.1.2.2.1 Discourse through the Faucouldian Social lens.

Before tackling Foucault's stimulating contribution to the study of discourse, it would sound just to give broad sociology and other disciplines their dues for the significant role they have played in giving discourse a new dimension. Mayr (2000); Bernstein (1971/2003) explain how social theory has offered an insightful account of the social dimension of language; actually, it has precisely expounded on the leading role of language in regulating the human social conduct, by conforming to social institutions in communicative events. The former scholar refers mainly to what is known as "symbolic interactionism". Moreover, Ethno methodology, as indicated by Garfinkel and Cicourel's respective works (as cited in Mayr, 2000), has lent its perception to regarding discourse as a social phenomenon, and it has advocated more attention to the way interlocutors collaborate in sustaining and experiencing social realities via discourse. In line with this standpoint, Van Dijk's assumption (as cited in Mayr, 2000, 1990), likewise, accentuates the social dimension by introducing discourse as particular social events operating in given situational contexts. Sacks et al.; Goffman; Atkinson and Heritage (as cited in Mayr, 2000) show, on their part, that conversation analysis, as part of ethno methodology, sheds light on interactional occasions as cases of establishing social identities and relations of power. The latter point, for them, can make up a fertile research ground for ethno methodology. Social theory has had an undeniable role in embracing the social trend in language study.

Mayr (2000); Wodak (2006) evoke the earlier endeavors of Foucault, Habermars, and Althusser as these have given a fresh impetus to the inextricable link between language, power, and ideology. Subsequently, linguists have attempted to merge the social orientations of such scholars with the previous assumptions relative to textual approaches. In fact, they have adhered to the fact that language (discourse) is expressive of ideology; in other words, they must perceive it as performing the very function of establishing, perpetuating, and even resisting against dominant social institutions. This perception is at the heart of critical discourse analysis (CDA) scope of research as an emergent approach since it tries to unveil the intricacies of the connection between language, society, culture, and politics ; hence, a multitude of disciplines need to interfere in the investigation of power and ideology (Ahmadvand, 2019). Mills (2003, 2004) claims, likewise, that Foucault's initial coverage of discourse has greatly contributed to extensive studies of it from distinct theoretical perspectives; this state of affairs falls under the overall scope of "Discourse Theory". Indeed, this theorist's perception of discourse stands as simultaneously complex and contradictory; it is this iconoclasm pervading Foucault's work that appeals much to researchers as well as scholars at once. She argues:

> Nevertheless, it is this quality of always surpassing and pushing against the traditional disciplinary boundaries which makes Foucault's work interesting to a wide number of people who feel constrained by the notion of working strictly within the frameworks of their own subject area. (2003, P. 4)

 Foucault himself (as cited in Mills, 2004), in fact, considers discourse as being made up of truth, power, and knowledge. Once more, this would be sufficiently evident to state that his enterprise derives from a myriad of disciplines to be limited to one specialty, Mills reminds.

She, thus, notes that this is why his work is very hard to grasp easily– due to the complexity of his discursive perspective. The latter treats discourse in relation with diverse subjects; in other words, Foucault undoubtedly opts for an eclectic construct. Nevertheless, she reminds how this synthesis of approaches can prove beneficial for scholars because these can fruitfully apply in the account of aspects of social reality and its relevant phenomena. Also, Mills (2003) adds in:

> In critical theory, there is often a sense that one has to adopt or align oneself with a particular theorist and, in the process of drawing on their work, one defines oneself as a particular type of person. Thus, using someone's theoretical work is not just a question of being interested in their ideas but also about representing oneself to others. (P. 6)

In brief, what Foucault advances on discourse entails the convergence of many disciplines' findings and notions when addressing social issues surrounding its realizations. The interrelation between discourse, truth, knowledge, and power has been a unifying trait among scholars in tackling the social dimension of language.

Drawing on Foucault's theoretical frame work, Mills (2004) defines discourse not in terms of the direct meanings conveyed, but, more essentially, she describes it in connection with what it generates in the broader social context. In actuality, this can be in the form of–perceptions and attitudes, ideas, and the intended effect exerted on discourse recipients. This would constitute the general backdrop where Foucault sets out to tie up discourse with society in the development of his theoretical framework. For Mayr (2000), similarly, Foucault's insights into the relationship between discourse and society shows clearly in his social-oriented approach to discourse. The latter has subsequently had a considerable

influence in DA. Therefore, discourse is currently perceived as a formation of social reality; it is, in other terms, considered as a type of knowledge toward world matters. The scholar readily testifies to Foucault's leading social perspective regarding discourse when she directs her attention to the beginnings of the Foucauldian distinction (as cited in Mayr, 2000, 1980) between various kinds of knowledge with the exact aim of explaining the norms regulating "areas of knowledge". That is to say, different spheres of knowledge should observe the recommendations issued by its ruling institutions. The bonding interrelation between discourse and society owes much to the Foucaudian theoretical framework.

Extending the analytical range of his social approach to discourse, Foucault (as cited Mayr, 2000; 1980) has eventually diverged toward establishing a close link between knowledge, power, and domination. After that, he juxtaposes discourse with power and domination. As a matter of fact, he demonstrates how discourse building must obey the regulatory norms underpinning social organization, for such norms manage both the production as well as dissemination of discourse. According to him, this paradigm is archetypically valid for each community, furthermore. Therefore, situational interactants are constantly under socio-cultural constraints being natural subjects of given social communities. For this reason, he disengages, though not entirely, from the preceding discursive assumption elaborated by Harris, which centers on perceiving discourse as anything longer than sentence and clause. Rather, he sees it as social practices: They create the topics relative to certain debates, and, then, convey some sorts of messages over them. Additionally, Foucault's theorization (as cited in Mayr, 2000) presents discourse as spawning particular utterances; this signals that any analysis should tackle not only the structural level, but essentially the functional, intentional,

and effectual aspects of them. Being of paramount significance for discursive production and reception and re-production within society, concepts of power, knowledge, domination, and discourse cannot operate in distance from one another; they display such an inextricable bond.

In continuation of his elaboration and delving into the causality characterizing the relationship between discourse and society, Foucault (as cited in Mayr, 2000) stresses how truth, knowledge, power, and domination can be primordial for discursive effects. With particular regard to this point, he states:

> Each society has its regime of truth, its 'general politics' of truth: that is the types of discourse it harbours and causes to function as true; the mechanisms and instances which enable one to distinguish true from false statements, the way in which each is sanctioned; the techniques and procedures which are valorised for obtaining truth: the status of those who are charged with saying what counts as true. (P. 6)

In simple terms, the sociologist remarkably details on how truth systems to do with world matters are unique to various social entities; societies differ tremendously in deeming what is judged and ratified as logically true and what is not. More than this, organized groups have, over time, set up inevitable standards whereby subjects routinely and successfully extrapolate truth from falsehood. As a result, this capacity entitles some power holders to exercise truth-based knowledge over the dominated (the subjected). In reality, in Foucault's sense (as cited in Mayr, 2000) truth needs to considered as a social by product; that is to say, it is society as a whole that creates, diffuses, or even spurns some form of knowledge as being the truth. Relating precisely to this point, Mills (2003) explains that Foucault's thinking revolves

around the closer link between social structures (institutions) and the individual (mainly

participants in discursive exchanges). Power is, indeed, at its height when such a relation is

put under analytical scrutiny; Mills (2003); Mayr (2000) point out that the Marxist thinker is

entangled in digging deeper into power since his theoretical paradigm foregrounds basically

social members' uncritical acquiescence to the ruling institutions of society or else their

refusal to comply with them (opposing them). For them, thereby, Foucault does not simply

present power as merely what those in positions of power possess to exert control on others

(devoid of power); instead, he tries to uncover how discourses come to be reinforced by social

institutions , notably governmental ones–legitimizing them. Likewise, such discourses enforce

reality conceptions– power must be at the heart of DA. At last, often dominant discourses

would likely act as a plea for elites to practice power over the powerless groups and to

sanction them in case they do not endorse common thinking (knowledge). In lucid terms, we

would utilize the Foucauldian term "disciplines", which embodies discourses of normalized,

naturalized rules. For example, we could mention when authorities penalize public drunkards

in most Muslim nations (Foucault as cited in Mayr, 2000, 1980). Discourse is the means

through which knowledge is reinforced and power can be exercised for domination.

1.1.2.3 Language as social semiotics: a system of meanings.

Before setting out to penetrate into the complex and inextricable relationship between

language and society, Halliday (2014) introduces some preliminary questions relative to the

issue; we can mention some:

- How do interlocutors decipher daily utterances charged with meanings by way of

  resorting to the social system?

- How do they (language users) elaborate the social environment in which such utterances can be meaningful?

- How do they bond the language system with the surrounding social context and implicate the "meaning potential" in the meaning-making process (reception of discourse)?

- By being members of groups or subgroups, how and why do interaction actors adhere to various language varieties?

In the light of the above questions forming the guidelines of any DA approach, Halliday (2003) assumes that scholars, including discourse analysts, must perceive language as a "system of meanings": He has coined the term "semiotic system" to refer to meaning in general. Besides, in his attempt to shed more light on the concept, the linguist subdivides the system into three further parts: the "physical system", the "biological system", and the "social system". On the one hand, the physical and the biological ones constitute the material facade of language (semiotic system); in other words, one could point to language as encompassing overall–syntactic, morphological, phonological, and semantic– rules; these further segment into sets of specific constructions. On the other hand, the social system relates particularly to the surrounding social environment in which the physical system operates in situational interactions. At this point, there emerges the social value as an intrinsic constituent of the social system. Interpersonal interaction deserves digging deep into its operational intricacies.

At this level, such elements underpinning Halliday's and, subsequently, most if not all of DA enterprises in their differing perspectives, necessitate in-depth consideration. In this

respect, Halliday and Hasan (1989) initiate their explanation by referring to "semiotic"; the term originates from "semiotics", which, in turn, signifies the sign. Historically and etymologically speaking, the concept has evolved from both the Greek terms: "semainon" and "semainomenon"; in effect, the former means "signifier" and the latter points to "signified". In the same historical register, Halliday and Hasan (1989); Chandler (2017); and Bouissac (as cited in Chandler, 2017) look back at the ancient Greek philosophers whose theories on signs have journeyed over time. They begin, for example, with Plato and his paradigm of convention-based words; also, they mention the Stoics who have pioneered in the elaboration of a signs' semiotic theory. Not only have Greeks been in advance in the course of sign studies, but also others have, subsequently, done so, notably Augustine Hippo–a philosopher and theologian from the middle ages. He, Chandler goes on explaining, has developed a theoretical model on signs of nature and culture. Thereby, they emphatically and overtly state that such a series of theorizing would eventually contribute much in inspiring forthcoming theories about signs. Ferdinand de Saussure constitutes a concrete illustration of that deep influence. In the light of what has been just evoked, one would logically conclude that semiotics specializes in the study of signs. With regard to this point, Chandler remarks how this definition can be potentially vague; Chandler (2017); Kress (as cited in Bezemer & Blommaert, 2013) justify this point by pointing to the endless range of everyday signs–uttered or written signs, images, paintings, advertisements, road signs, music, body movements, colors, etc. Instead, both opt for a unanimous definition. They present the sign as an element that signifies another thing; thus, to derive meaning from something implies viewing it as a sign. In addition, the human attitudes and experiences are encapsulated via signs upon which interaction is contingent. In this sense, semiotics covers every item supposed to be a sign (Eco, as cited in Chandler, 2017). Similarly, Fairclough (1995a); Hasan

and Halliday (1989) are of like minds with Chandler in stressing the variety of signs; for them, they can appear in multiple types including the linguistic one. Indeed, Fairclough utilizes the term "multi-semiotic" to illustrate this state of things. We would deduce that "sign-making" signals extracting meanings contained within signs (signifier and signified).

Considering signs from this angle gives the impression that they tend to work independently. Still according to Halliday and Hasan (1989), Halliday (2003), this perception seemingly places signs in isolation in that they arise separately; after that; they combine together. In this sense, the quality of isolation can, by no means, be reducible though Saussure (as cited in Halliday & Hasan, 1989) himself firmly claims that language constitutes a system of relationships in his theoretical framework. The pair of theorists, at this point, readily claims that semiotics needs to be broadly perceived as a meaning survey. If this suggests something, it would be the fact that the physical systems stated above have recourse to social meaning for their own organization; likewise, the intended messages necessitate the material properties to take form. I.e., semiotic signs operate functionally when combined together and used within society. Most importantly, their meanings are modeled by the system of social institutions regardless of their apparent variance ("multimodality" within the purview of social semiotics) (Bezemzer & Blommaert, 2013; Linde, 1997). Accordingly, most linguists especially Halliday (2003) have eventually re-positioned their reflections on how the linguistic system earns its nature in the socio-cultural sphere. For instance, Halliday addresses language as a social phenomenon and means ("tool"). Moreover, he has built his theoretical model on–text or discourse, social context, and function (Urban, 1981); the cited scholar puts it pithily, "Halliday is a "functionalist" insofar as he views language a device designed for accomplishing communicative ends, and insofar as function supplies the organizational basis

for his description of language" (P. 660). This statement lucidly stands as proof of the

interrelation bonding the systemic organization with the socially functional dimension of

language in a sort of complementary dependence. Indeed, this inextricable connection must

hold firmly for descriptive considerations on the part of scholars. Hodge's statement (as cited

in Bezemer & Blommaert, 2013) about discourse's usurpation of semiotics would probably

accredit the social claim propping language as a system of signs in particular.

1.1.2.3.1 Language within the social context.

1.1.2.3.*1.1 Context of situation and context of culture theoretical framework.*

To begin with, it would be worthy to highlight the remarkably significant move from the

structural limitations of earlier studies to the placement of language in its social environment.

In effect, one of the most prominent theoretical achievements, according to Urban (1981), is

Halliday's; the latter has built his analytical approach to language on the legacy left by Firth

and Malinowski. The researcher, nonetheless, does not hesitate to note that Halliday's initial

study has been much focused upon the structural aspect of language from a functional

viewpoint. In other words, he has merely dealt with function in connection with the

organizational layout with virtually little or no overt reference to the surrounding social

context–"system and structure perspective". Through time, Urban observes, Halliday has

diverted his theoretical scope toward how the linguistic system comes to assume its functional

nature within the broader socio-cultural surrounding space. His major interests, moreover,

specifically branch into such fields of research as: sociolinguistics, text linguistics, language

acquisition, etc. In this respect, scholars, for instance Kress; Wodak (as cited in Mazid, 2014);

Urban (1981); Fairclough and Wodak (as cited in Wodak & Busch, 2004) commonly

advocate that language is to be seen as a "social phenomenon" or "social practice" with

discourse, function, and social context as pivotal notions. Further, Halliday's fundamental postulate, as revealed by Urban (1981), rests precisely on the assumption that language is a socially interactional phenomenon; it serves as a tool for meaning negotiations among interlocutors partaking in social interchanges– "intersubjective phenomenon". As such, this makes of discursive investigation at length an imminent priority. This, ultimately, testifies to the fact that language is the most powerful of all semiotic systems with its capacity of encapsulating the meaning-making activities monitored and guided by the institutions of society (Halliday & Hasan, 1989; Bernestein, 1971/2003). In short, we would extrapolate that the Hallidayan theoretical construct is intended to unravel how language extends functionally under the set of socio-cultural constraints.

As a matter of fact, being actively involved in the pursuit of the above task, Halliday would pioneer, with other discourse analysts, the penetration into the realm of social context. In the course of this seemingly challenging research mission, the theorist, as indicated by Halliday and Hasan (1989), attempts to cover key clues emanating from the social context when language, whether written or spoken, is put into use in it. Actually, this shows how different is such a novel approach to discourse from the generally accepted assumption that one can utter anything in all languages; on the contrary, people's statements differ from one context to another. Furthermore, this variation relates not only to the structural compatibility, but also the contextual appropriateness of utterances strictly speaking (Urban, 1981). Besides, proceeding within the purview of the sociolinguistics of class, Urban puts accent on the new interest exhibited by Halliday in carrying out his theorizing. In effect, the researcher readily contrasts the earlier work of Labov (as cited in Urban, 1981), which relies exactly on form-based variances across various social classes, with that of Halliday (as cited in Urban, 1981), whose central claims link precisely to variety in terms of awareness relevant to "discourse

patterns". I.e., the linguist addresses distinct social forms of knowledge about language use in social situations; further, this, in turn, includes judgments of proper structural constructions. Additionally, the other crucial component of Halliday's theoretical paradigm of context of situation, it must be noted anew here, pertains to empirically studying text within the larger social context. The latter perspective, as Urban (1981); Widdowson (2004); Linde (1997); Lyons (as cited in Linde, 1997) point out, signals that discourse does not stick solely to lengths beyond sentences as had been long assumed by prior scholars, notably Harris as well as the structuralist perspective reticent of expanding its attention beyond such items. The consideration of series of sentences and their constant extensions across society make up the foundations of Halliday's analytical work.

Eventually, what has enabled discourse analysts push their theorizations further revolves around exhausting from the anthropology-related literature. In this regard, Halliday and Hasan (1989), in the first place, refer to Bronislaw Malinowski, who has conducted empirical surveys on many ethnic groups' cultural organizations. For instance, the anthropologist has set forth to explore a local community living the Trobriand Islands amid the Pacific Ocean; indeed, he has been narrowly exposed to the natives' daily interactions with the aim of issuing analytical comments on them. What would, subsequently, arrest the researcher's attention has been the noticeably pragmatic nature of the Trobrianders' situational exchanges in Kiriwinian, their native language. Specifically, he has surveyed the way fishermen would manage to negotiate meanings pragmatically in their routine fishing deeds. Besides, Malinowski's ultimate findings (as cited in Halliday & Hasan, 1989) would reveal how cognizance of the on-spot indicators can enlighten participants about discursive intentions; thus, in order to draw attention to the very circumstances bounding produced texts, he has coined the term "context

of situation" –key linguistic and paralinguistic indicators accompanying speech. Remarkably, Halliday (2014) reminds that the basis of this concept can be traced to linguistics–the overall space where text earns its operational status. Significantly, the same term would serve a big deal in later studies by Malinowski, especially his work entitled *Ethnography of Language*. It would seem that language gains it functional nature once put in touch with the socio-cultural workings of context.

Despite the pioneering initiative undertaken by Malinowski in terms of exploring the context of situation, it has turned out that more efforts would be needed than the arrived-at findings then. In actual effect, though Firth himself (as cited in Halliday, 2014, as cited in Halliday & Hasan, 1989) has critically commented on Malinowski's work on context judging it as being inadequately approached, he would later subsume its basic principles within his theoretical enterprise in the attempt to further his predecessor's theory of context toward a more functional one of his own. Moreover, the main argument advanced by Firth has particularly relied on the fact that Malinowski's theorizing is outside the bounds of linguistic study to be generalized as a theory of its own right. In this respect, the scholar, assuming the centrality of function in performing linguistic study, has ultimately come up with a theoretical paradigm focused essentially on uncovering the contextual clues inevitably decisive for texts' reception:

- **Participants in the situation** it means agents involved in a specific communicative occurrence,

- **The action of the participants** it branches into what such individuals perform in the course of their exchanges; in other words, actions undertaken by them (audible and visible ones),

- **Other relevant features of the situation** this can take on the form of objects or happenings of whatever type for these can determine the course of interaction,

- **Effects of the verbal action** the linguist, at this level, points to the outgrowth following the interactional occasion.

What should be mentioned, evoking the evolutionary development of the context of situation theorizing, are the invaluable perspectives offered to scholars in a vast spectrum of research including DA.

Soon after, other approaches to context study would see the light. One of the most prominent ones are Hymes's "SPEAKING" framework (as cited in Lin, 2004, as cited in Mazid, 2014) as well as Van Dijk's Submodels (as cited in Mazid, 2014). As starters, by drawing closer on the in-depth guidelines of the communicative competence regarding language, Hymes adheres to the principle that linguistic competence does not solely branch to proper mastery of the grammatical components; rather, it is fundamentally to do with the capacity of deploying suitable language in the suitable context, "…the ability to use the right word in the right world, the right text in the right context" (Mazid, 2014, P. 92). Here, obviously stands solid evidence of the paramount status of textual use within context. In this respect, Hymes's model comprises the following contextual cues:

- **Setting and Scene** the spatio-temporal dimension (place and time and the environment of the communicative event,

- **Participants t**his relates to both discourse producers (speakers or writers) and recipient(s) (listeners or audience),

- **Ends** means targeted objectives and aimed results (material effects upon recipients),

- **Act sequence** type of happenings as well as their sequential arrangement during speech act (SA),

- **Key** information indicative of pervasive "tone" or "spirit" throughout SA,

- **Instrumentalities** relevant to the overall structure and style of SA,

- **Norms** connected with reigning socio-cultural institutions regulating at once interactional situations and interlocutors' actions/responses (intended actions)

- **Genre** this component features the type of discourse alongside it relevant form (eg. political, sexist, feminist, racist, anti-racist, religious discourse, etc) (Hymes as cited in Lin, 2004, as cited in Mazid, 2014).

Van Dijk, equally, centers on definite cues making up context in his paradigm (as cited in Mazid, 2014). In spite of the clearly cognitive orientation guiding his approach to the contextual study, his construct sounds quite convergent with that of Hymes in many basic points relative to the identification of clues governing the creation/reception of discourse:

- **Setting** time and place of discursive exchanges,

- **Participants** situational as well as social statuses and roles; this feature combines discursive relations between the participants with overall, "non-situational" ones

- **Social circumstances** the broad social background surrounding the same event plus occurrences prior to such an event,

- **Institutional environment** socio-cultural structures ruling interactions,

- **Purpose of communicative event**   intended effect (s) of "(inter)action" on recipients,

- **Group belonging of participants** "categories of participants" (age, sex, occupation, race, class, religion, sect, etc.

As mentioned above, both theorizing divide context into key clues whose presupposition among participants is so vital that discourse cannot be transmitted without their close consideration.

1.1.2.4 Hallidayan systemic functional grammar.

In the coverage of context of situation, Halliday's systemic functional grammar (SFG) interferes in first place. To start, Halliday (2014), Urban (1981) give paramount importance to specific concepts as these are sine qua nons for a thorough access to his theoretical perspective and interaction in general. Such notions fluctuate from–"text", "situation", "text variety" or "register", "code", "linguistic system", and "social structure".

1.1.2.4.1 Text.

Dealing with the notion of text, Halliday (2014); Halliday and Hasan (1989) define text as specific instances of linguistic interaction within the social context whatever its actual form (spoken or else written). At this point, he overtly discriminates between text in context and that fixed in books (away from social context); that is to say, his position sounds contrary to the earlier structure-incentivized theoretical material, which has long advocated that length must be taken into account when addressing text. Widdowson (2004), Halliday (2014), with respect to this, present the functional dimension as the core of textual operations. Indeed, earlier, text would be characterized as chains of words longer than a sentence ("super structure"). In clear terms, words combine to form longer groups of words (clauses) (Halliday

as cited in Sinclair & Coulthard, 1992; Sinclair & Coulthard, 1992). Nevertheless, in Halliday's (2014) sense and drawing on sociolinguistic perceptions, text is to be viewed in terms of social meanings or more exactly "encodings"–meaningful codes embedded in sentences, not made up of them. Besides, codes are destined to recipients who share identical "realization principles" regulating the textual production and reception. Therefore, he narrowly refers to discourse (language in use) disengaging from the limiting shortcomings of the previously misleading conflation of text and discourse (see Widdowson, 2004). By implication, any piece of language in use is naturally encoded of one or multiple functions; to derive it/them, one should have recourse to background knowledge in due interactions (Widdowson, 2004; Fairclough, 1989, 1995b; Wodak, 2006; Wodak & Busch, 2004; Van Dijk, 2014a, 2014b; Lemke as cited in Mazid, 2014; Tindale et al., 2001). That is, a set of generic understanding among a socio-cultural grouping allowing its members conduct interactional events smoothly and effectively. Text, from a functional standpoint, has to be equated with discourse.

At this level of representing text, Halliday and Hasan (1989); Halliday (2014) conceptualize it specifically as simultaneously a "product" and a "process". The former, in effect, branches into how text gets organized into systematized sets of structures; this is expressed through the "syntagmatic" axis where items variously extend together. The latter, on the other hand, links to the selective, continuous picking up of senses across the range of systematic networks making up the "meaning potential" underlying language use. I.e., text relies mainly on option from signified meanings. Further, such meanings relate specifically to the "paradigmatic" extensions of semantic choice. In connection with the last point, Halliday (2014) characterizes text as, "…actualized meaning potential" (P. 265). The same linguists, accordingly, come up with a significant assumption which suggests that text as process clearly

signals situation-based interaction (textual function); in other words, they highlight how communicative participants can negotiate endless meanings in their common exchanges. More important, text, from this theoretical standpoint, is to be perceived as a systematized ensemble of "lexico-grammatical" components performing particular semantic roles when they get in touch with the context of situation as well as the larger context of culture devised by Malinowski beforehand–the whole system (context of culture and context of situation) contributing to intended messages both locally as well as globally. Most important of all, with repeated reference to sense as social semiotic, they put accent on the complementary nature bonding the structure of text with that of context of situation in terms of meaning transmission; in a nutshell, how interlocutors noticeably manage to build predictions from text to context and the inverse certainly deserves to be shed light on within the purview of DA. We would afresh invoke the inquisitorial statement by Widdowson (2004): how can people implicated in real-life interactions derive meanings from texts by making inferences?

1.1.2.4.2 Situation: the functional aspect of language.

The other essential item constituting alongside text Halliday's SFG is the notion of "situation". To initiate its description, Halliday (2014) considers it as the overall location where any text earns its operational ("functional" status); although this term has already been explored in the seminal work carried out in the ethnography-related research project by Malinowski, it would be subsequently criticized as being much incomplete in its examination of context, notably by Firth. The latter (as cited in Halliday, 2014) insists that context, in Malinowski's case encompasses more records of what is currently taking place in situational interactions than treating the abstract environment surrounding its operation. Consequently,

situation has to cede its place to the new appellation "*situation type*" given that it is tackled

from a purely sociolinguistic perspective, for Bernstein (as cited in Halliday, 2014,

1971/2003). He, also, employs the terms "social context" and "semiotic structure" to point to

the range of significations whose interpretations depend upon what is known as the "semiotic

system" upholding cultural communities' conceptions of the world. As a matter of fact, it is

unanimously assumed, according to Halliday that recipients involved in communicative

events can often work out their interlocutor's (speakers or writers') semantic intentions; this is

attributed to context-based elements enabling them to determine the type of situation as a

given social context. Noteworthy to mention, those available clues are associated not only

with the linguistic system, but equally and essentially with the social one. As such, any kind

of situation is automatically perceived as a set of semiotic structures of a particular brand.

Regarding this clearly functional perspective of language, Halliday's (as cited in Urban, 1981)

main assumption is that language is socially interactional; it is a tool whereby meaning

negotiation among participants is possible–an "inter-subjective phenomenon" in first place.

Discursive investigation must, by implication, be a priority (Urban, 1981). The dissection of

text manipulations and its interpretations across social situations appears to be instrumental in

the process of addressing language as a social phenomenon.

1.1.2.4.2.1How context is stratified in SFG: contextual components.

Since context is foregrounded particularly in Halliday's SFG and generally in DA, it needs to

be dissected in detail. In fact, Halliday (2014); Halliday and Hasan (1989), specify that the

undertaking of any analytical approach to language whatever its perspective needs to take into

consideration the constitutive elements of situation (context) where discourse operates

functionally. In relation with the functional dimension of text, Urban (1981) indicates how

Halliday's theory shows the encoding of certain context-based functions (metafunctions) by adults into chains of discourse at once; comparatively, it seeks to uncover the way under-18-months children progressively manage to integrate them separately over time into one abstract pattern. The main goal underlying DA, besides, revolves around the identification of such metafunctions and their distinction from one another through routinely discursive practices. Here, henceforth, lie the intricacies characterizing the interface between text and society (context). Actually, in order to shed light on the environment surrounding language use, Halliday, Urban recounts, introduces the notion of "contextualism"; the latter covers the extra-linguistic parameters that, all together, constrain and pilot the unfolding of the exchanged series of texts among interlocutors, namely adults. To say it otherwise, Fetzer and Aijmer (2008) highlight the surrounding context of a communicative occurrence figured out through a holistic consideration of situational clues by participants.The afore-stated constituents of context vary as follows:

- **Field** it refers to topics text is about in a specific interaction (communicative act); what is going on in terms of occurring events,

- **Tenor** branches into the system of interpersonal relations basing upon social roles (statuses); formality as manifested in a given situational interaction,

- **Mode** signifies what text is intended to achieve in a situation in terms of sense and targeted function (social meaning). Equally, it relates to the rhetorical function embodied in language (to convince, to explain, to teach, etc). This is transmitted via the medium (spoken or written "channel"). Also, coherence in syntactic items as well as cohesion linking chains of clauses make part of mode (Urban, 1981; Halliday and Hasan, 1989; Halliday, 2014; Mazid, 2014).

Taking account of Halliday's (as cited in Urban, 1981), valuing of context as a precious source of knowledge relevant to language in use, it becomes immediately obvious that the father of SFG embraces "contextual determinism"; this, constitutes the essence of his examinations of discourse. In short, interpersonal knowledge in interchanges implies cognizance of assumed beliefs and attitudes alongside other concrete features forming the extra-linguistic context (Fetzer & Aijmer, 2008). The situational or contextual space should be omnipresent not only in our daily discourses with others, but also in analytically addressing such practices.

1.1.2.4.3 The socially functional approach to language study.

By going through the Hallidayan functional grammar, one would logically perceive how the socio-cultural dimension occupies the foreground of language study. At the start, Urban (1981); Van Dijk (2016) draw attention to the socially functional address of the language system that is far from being confined to the traditionally propositional function that had long been the standard in linguistics; i.e. the former talks about the "cohesive function" or "co-referencing" carried out by both interaction actors to make sense of what is uttered ("textuality"). Instead, language, as claimed by Halliday (as cited in Urban, 1981, 1978), is a social "phenomenon". Taking the same destination as him, Urban puts it this way, "Halliday is a "functionalist" insofar as he views language as a device designed for accomplishing communicative ends and insofar as function supplies the organizational basis for his description of language" (1981, P. 660). This statement seems to stand as testimony of the common aim set for of language use as well as the guiding parameters in putting it under examination–function. Moreover, in clarification of the purpose underpinning his analytical scheme with regard to language, Halliday (1978) lucidly opts for a mixed approach. On the

one side, he draws upon linguistics to access the constituents of the linguistic system. On the other, he predominantly builds into his theoretical enterprise the study of language from a functional angle–exploring the social use of language in context– to unveil the "social system" (instrumentality of language). He, at this point, insists that these two modes of coping with linguistic survey are complementary; he argues, "…in order to understand the nature of language itself we also have to approach it functionally" (Halliday, 1978, P. 37). In a nutshell, basing on language as a social medium implies that, in the whole, language plays a significant role in the seamless continuation of the social system, which makes of the linguistic system a source of attention likewise. Briefly speaking, the functionality of the linguistic system is at the heart of SFG.

In addition to the newly adopted orientation to the broad exploration of language, it would be quite useful to clarify certain historical facts to do with function. Initially, Halliday (1978, 2014); Halliday and Hasan (1989) assume that function is an intrinsic feature of text within the bounds of context; thereby, he acknowledges openly the significance of insights borrowed from sociology to back up his systemic examination of language especially Bernstein's work. As a matter of effect, the latter readily embeds language in his sociological theorizing as something fundamental with the very objective of exposing how the realm of the social system, which has been evolving over time (continued or transformed across generations), can gain or lose momentum thanks to language. I.e., the way the linguistic system helps maintain or alter social systems. In favor of providing more evidence, Bernstein (as cited in Halliday, 1978) anticipates, "If you are interested in inter-organism linguistics, in language as interaction, then you are inevitably led to a consideration of language in the perspective of the social system" (P. 37). This explanation stands as evidence to the interrelation between social structures and the language system. At this point, stressing the somehow symbiotic

connection between both systems (linguistic and social systems), Halliday (1978) attests anew to the inspiring contribution of Bernstein's social theory because it stimulates interest in language but with a great deal of insight into the issue of its actual status of, "why language isas it is?" (P.38). In lucid terms, drawing on such a theoretical perspective can help account for the way a language system has usually developed in specific structural patterns due to the functional role attributed to it by the social system. As a "channel", Halliday, once again, focuses his analytical scope upon the key part this system performs in either continuing or usurping the social order. Foucault (as cited in Fairclough, 1995a) would, on his part, accent the "social basis" of language signaling the multi-functional nature of language, significantly. This can be assimilated with what Fowler (1991/) points out as cohesive, coherent links inside the semiotic system (language) and with the external set of socio-cultural norms. Relatively, while the structure layout of a language strengthens the spirit of group belonging, its users have to display "allegiance" and faithfulness to it via various deeds including interaction to the detriment of other social entities possessed of their proper linguistic constructions reflective of their respective organizations (Bernstein, 1971/2003). What Halliday (1978, as cited in Halliday & Hasan, 1989) himself terms the "autonomous approach" (description of language) as well as instrumental approach (language's contextual functions) are complementary, for the former discusses the continuity or transformation of socio-cultural structures; the latter covers the functionality conferred on language by such social systems.

1.1.2.5 The centrality of linguistic function.

1.1.2.5.1 The functions of language.

Thanks to stimulating advances initiated by sociologists like Bernstein, the socially functional aspect of language has not only gained in terms of significance, but also theorizing over it has amounted to assumed functions realized by means of language. As a start, For Brown and Yule (1983); Halliday and Hasan (1989) discourse entails endeavor by scholars to come up with a generically theoretical platform about the multiple functions preformed via language. This means exploring the intentions underlying it alongside the accompanying aims of speakers. One point that deserves cautious exposition, at this level, turns around the way users of texts in all their forms manage to anticipate their recipients' interpretations (Widdowson, 2004); to Halliday and Hasan, the functional aspect of language requires such experts to go over context to account for such an interactional process. In other words, researchers in this field must unravel successful communication in everyday situations, and explain how social factors pilot this process as a whole. It would be crucial to point out the new trend in the study of language, which has disengaged from the limitations of structuralism in its approach to this social phenomenon. This very point calls, hence, for looking into the functions performed by language from different theoretical perspectives.

1.1.2.5.2. The transactional and interactional functions.

Trying to set up the operational aspects of language study has been tremendously appealing to experts and scholars likewise. Brown and Yule (1983), first of all, trace the evolution of the scope of study with regard to language particularly in linguistics. They remark that whereas the early-20th-century formalism devoted more time and efforts to describe the structural components of language, scholars in discourse analysis (DA) engaged in expounding on the various aims encapsulated in language in use; in other words, their objective was to unveil the functions underlying discourse. However, the formal approach has been extensively

elaborated and documented in comparison with the DA's functional one, whose literature has been much demanding in terms of exploratory studies, they add. Accordingly, Lyons (as cited in Brown & Yule, 1983); Brown and Yule (1983) focus mainly on two linguistic functions: the "transactional function" and "interactional function". Firstly, they cover the "transactional function" in order to refer essentially to this form of discourse. In fact, language is supposed to express information and propositions of different kinds. Such information must be based on truth; also, it must display clarity toward it receivers to prevent any semantically problematic eventualities to arise in reality. Besides, Brown and Yule assume that the afore-mentioned function of language branches mainly into the transmission of information in a broad sense; however, Lyons himself (as cited in Brown Yule, 1983) considers this framework as being remarkably superficial with regard to describing language in use and the ensuing functions within the socio-cultural environment. Upon some reflection, language role, indeed, cannot transcend reflecting world matters in a natural way–people use language to speak the truth about life. Moreover, he insists that interaction necessarily implies states of mind and emotions and reactions to life issues. Specifically, the linguistic system is vital for introducing and strengthening the mindset underpining social gatherings (Bernstein, 1971/2003). Ipso facto, language, basing on such an assumption, is clearly limited in terms of function, so its social dimension, which has not received adequate consideration on the part of this perspective, requires deeper insights and a larger scope of analysis. What has been discussed hitherto about language functions in the social milieu is in need of more furthering to cover the vast workings it can perform in society.

In must be noted there have been some mounting reactions counter to the above perspective toward language but to no avail. With respect to this position, Bennett (as cited in Brown & Yule, 1983) puts emphasis on speakers/writers' tasks of conveying some specific

messages to their audiences (listeners or readers) expecting them to act in given ways. It would sound clear that this assumption urgently calls for a turn to the social surrounding of language. Nevertheless, Brown and Yule (1983), highlighting the advantageous status of the transactional function, point to the role of it in creating and elaborating different cultural communities; this is due to the big deal of information it comprises. I.e., it can participate to a large degree in the creation and diffusion of diverse and uniquely typical social structures–traditions, customs, rituals, religious beliefs, etc. As a result, both scholars appear to have given this linguistic function its dues as a valuable source of knowledge not only about distinct social communities, but also about different fields of learning. This process relies on written language and dialogic exchanges since these carry useful information in them. On this particular point, they elaborate, "We all believe that it is the faculty of language which has enabled the human race to develop diverse cultures, each with its distinctive social customs, religious observances, laws, oral traditions, patterns of trading, and so on" (P. 2). They explicate things further, "We all believe, moreover, that it is the acquisition of written language which has permitted the development within some of these cultures of philosophy, science, and literature" (P. 2). Concerning precision, the scholars make it clear-cut that the major objective of language users centers essentially on the clarity and effectiveness of the transferred material. Indeed, they accord language of this type the quality of "message oriented", so interlocutors must strive to have full grasp of what his/her peer has to convey. For instance, engineers, guiding planes landing down or taking off, in the tower control have to talk to pilots with complete lucidity in order to avoid any eventual accidents. Language can perform an informative role in communicative situations whether in writing or speaking. Thereby, clarity is a prerequisite for the successful transmission of knowledge.

In contrast with the preceding function, findings have revealed how language in use can be socially functional and influential. As a matter of fact, Brown and Yule (1983); Bernstein (as cited in Halliday,1978, 1971/2003) assume that according to sociological and sociolinguistic general theory, the role of language lies essentially in reinforcing and perpetuating socio-cultural institutions and maintaining relations of power in different social groups. Saying things succinctly, the "social aspects of language in use" form the pivot of the socio-linguistic perspective (Lee, 2008). Besides, sociolinguistics, as stated by Brown and Yule, readily accounts for how the set of the social conventions regulate all forms of human behavior, including the linguistic one; these, in turn, operate under the recommendations of ideologies constitutive of those conventions in various spheres of life (Fairclough & Hasan, 1989). In addition, Brown and Yule (1983); Garfinkel and Cicourel; Sacks et al. (as cited in Mayr, 2000) show how anthropologists and experts in ethno methodology have extensively covered language use and its insightful contribution to practical conversations, which brings to mind the field of conversation analysis (CA). Language, at this level, must be commonly resorted to in the interchange of role relationships among interlocutors alongside the reinforcement of social identities and power relations; that is to say, language is seen as the basic medium during the interpersonal negotiations of social roles as well as relationships, not to the exclusion of social conventions' practices, such as turn taking patterns. Therefore, to use discourse socially equals doing an action, not just conveying pieces of information (Gibbs, 2015; Potter & Wetherel, 1987; Trugill, 2000; Austin 1962; Bernstein, 1971/2003). For instance, when a participant uses the title "Mr" or "Mrs" to address someone he/she is showing respect to him/her. Furthermore, given that such intention-oriented functions pervade our lives through frequent interactions; participants, Brown and Yule suggest anew, should make sure that their respective purposes are accessible to each other. At this stage, the

eventually reciprocal acceptance of interpersonal viewpoints appears quite debatable; with respect to this point, the scholars assume that distinct relations are often activated with the very purpose of obtaining complete acquiescence to perceptions common within the stated communities. Ultimately, such functional performances via language are perfectly illustrative of how given conceptions of the world can be forced by the elites upon less powerful groups.

1.1.2.5.3 Halliday's meta-functions (ideational, interpersonal and textual functions).

As what has been elaborated on above, one would extrapolate that language in use is intrinsically functional in society. Halliday and Hasan (1989); Gee (2005); Gibbs (2015) in this respect, advocate that the semiotic system and function cannot be disassociated from each other; concurrently, they stress the centrality of the functional multiplicity as something characteristic of language. Besides, they equate such functions with what users of language mostly intend to achieve in terms of purposes in actual life. When covering functions historically, Halliday and Hasan, furthermore, look back at some previously devised functions by specialists from different areas including that of linguistics. First of all, they refer to Malinowski's (as cited in Halliday & Hasan's, 1989) proposed double functions undertaken by means of language–the "pragmatic" function alongside the "magical" one. In connection with his primary concern as an anthropologist, with the strictly pragmatic feature of the aboriginal inhabitants' (Trobrianders) routine uses of their language (Kiriwinian), he has derived two other functions out of the former one: the "narrative function" as well as active "function". These, in effect, pertain to reporting what is going on in a situation while aiming to attain a particular purpose. On the other level, the magical function stems from the socio-cultural environment of the Trobriand Islands' society; that is, the users of this language have

to draw on the set of ritualistic practices performed locally, such as religious ceremonies. Also, other contributions from psychology are highlighted. The pair of linguists point out the functions postulated by Buhler in his work (as cited in Halliday & Hasan, 1989). The latter has come up with a set of triple linguistic functions. Firstly, he introduces the "expressive function", which relates to the producer ("addresser" or speaker); secondly, he focuses upon the "conative function", which means the recipient ("addressee" or listener/hearer); thirdly, the psychologist stresses the "representational function", which branches into the larger milieu where participants interact socially. Subsequently, Buhler's model would be furthered by Jakobson who, by premising on Buhler's functional concepts, added in another trilogy: the "transactional" function (referring to the medium of exchange); "poetic" function (pointing to the intended meaning or message); and "meta-linguistic function" (covering the semiotic sign itself). Ultimately, though there would later follow a panoply of endeavors to do with unraveling linguistic functions inspired by the earlier studies, we find it would suffice to cover the most prominent ones, notably Halliday's SFG.

Centering precisely upon examining discourse, Halliday has come up with his analytical paradigm. As a matter of effect, linguistic structure and social aims intersect; i.e., as evoked above, language and social function are closely interconnected; thereby, a series of three meta-functions have been embedded in this SFG model:

1. **The Ideational function** it relates to any text's representation of what is going on in the world in terms of events or actions or situations; in other words, textual structures simultaneously portray and strengthen social truisms as well,

2. **The Interpersonal function** it connects with the textual function to do with

participants in daily communicative occasions; it is a truism that individuals' respective

positions within a society count tremendously in the establishment of relations among

interlocutors in the course of interactions (interpersonal message),

3. **The textual function** it adds to the two prior functions due to its role in the building

of the overall textual structure; indeed, aspects of coherence as well as cohesion create

connection in and out of the semiotic system–linking internal structures together and with

socio-cultural institutions. This way, the components making up the linguistic

system–semantics, phonetics and phonology, lexis and grammar– ensure the textual

function in conjunction. Significantly, since discourse must be regarded as socially

deployed language, this function entails a systematic analysis throughout the levels of the

semiotic system and beyond–socio-cultural container. As such, going over textual

sequences analytically triggers unraveling the set of ideologies encoded in them (Halliday

and Hasan, 1989, Halliday, 1978, as cited in Wodak, 2001, as cited in Mazid, 2014;

Mazid 2014; Wodak, 2001; Mathiessen, Lam, and Teruya, 2010); Fairclough, 1989;

1995a, 1995b; Wodak & Busch, 2004; Fowler, 1991; Van Dijk, 2009, 2014a, 2014b).

What has to be reiterated is that language is at permanent work in society across everyday

situations; this stands out as proof of the interrelation between the linguistic system and social

system of beliefs.

1.1.1.2.5.4 Register variations.

Endorsing the social dimension of the linguistic system makes surveying the functional

potential of it a matter of the highest priority. To start with, Halliday and Hasan (1989);

Halliday (1978) resort to the concept of "register" in order to penetrate into variations of

language stemming from corresponding changes relating to the context of situation. In this respect, register refers to the diversity with which language unfolds throughout various contexts of situation; then, the key parameters making up the context of situation revolve essentially around: field, tenor, and mode. These, as has been discussed earlier, signify respectively–what is going on in terms of events and actions; who is partaking in them; and language's role in the setting and scene, in fact. What is worth a mention, at this point, is the very fact that such situational features have the potential to determine at once the structural organizations with the semantic scope of the linguistic medium as well; i.e., constant variations in the components of the context of situation automatically triggers functional variety operated through the ideational, interpersonal, and textual meta-functions. Importantly, "register theory" aims at arriving at an analytical model explicating the hows and whys of situational parameters shaping up linguistic forms and meanings. Most importantly, the linguists reveal how variation is intrinsically constitutive of human languages in general; we would quote Halliday's words, "*All* language functions in contexts of situation, and is relatable to those contexts" and also, "…*which* kinds of situational factor determine which kinds of selection in the linguistic system" (1978, P. 32). Briefly speaking, to study language, one must do so in association with the context of situation because of the decisive role of its elements in the production as well as reception of social meanings. Field, tenor, and mode determine the range of functions (ideational, interpersonal, and textual); all of these make up register as a continuum of clues and social actions.

In continuation of the close interrelation between the variables relevant to the context of situation and the social performances of language, one would shed light upon the term variation. At first, Halliday (1978) directly recognizes the invaluable, insightful contribution of Jean Ure's work in the survey of register and variation. In this case, Ure (as cited in

Halliday, 1978) claims that "lexical density" relies narrowly on a couple of functions: (a) the type of language (written or uttered); more density lies in the former form, (b) and most significantly, on the encoded social function–"language as action" with much less lexical density. As such, one needs to value the pioneering initiative of Ure when it comes to the social deeds embedded in the semiotic system. This state of affairs is, simultaneously, evoked by Halliday himself; the theorist stresses the social variation potential of languages. Later, Hasan (2004); Halliday and Hasan (1989) would set out to develop their proper conception of this sociolinguistic phenomenon. Both experts, in effect, suggest that variation needs to be viewed from the perspective of "consistency". That is, a broad instance or "talk genre", a type of verbal discourse, encompasses a series of divergent instances. These are so frequently "instantiated" that they can assume the quality of consistency; instantiations belong to a similar, general genre. For example, we may talk about the topic of tourism as an overall genre then debate going walking in the desert, mountaineering, or even going riding in the country. Besides, it is up to the stated group or community to validate a particular genre the way it is actually. Thereby, register, for Halliday (1978), signals the human capacity to predict with higher accuracy the characteristic features that ought to be chosen basing on cognizance of the key items of the context of situation. Over this process, he comments, "the important theoretical question then is: what exactly do we need to know about the social context in order to make such predictions [predict the linguistic features to be selected]" (P. 32). This prediction process, moreover, entails participants being directly involved in a given situation. In short, Halliday recommends fathoming such elements as–"field of discourse", "tenor of discourse" "mode of discourse" as these are abstract constituents of the context of situation without which context remains inaccessible for interlocutors' discursive interpretations. Last but not least, variation and consistency, according to Hasan, (2004), enjoy a symbiotic

relationship; the continuation of a register genre is incumbent upon variation (instantiations) within its range. Linguistic functions and indicative clues of the context of situation complement each other; while the former relatively perpetuate discursive genres, the latter transmits key information to participants for meaning-making.

1.1.1.2.5.4.1 Dialectal variation.

With its ubiquity in many fields of study across theoretical and methodological contributions, the term variation to a large extent demands a further identifying subdivision; the first type of it links to dialects–"dialectal" variations. To start with, dialects, Halliday (1978) explains, are context-bound; in other words, they vary according to contexts as language forms obeying socio-cultural parameters. These, in actual effect, take on the form of available sets of meaning resources ("meaning potential") that are narrowly related to situations. I.e., the situational suitability of such semantic potential is primordial. Additionally, adherence to the "conventions" of register switching imply that it cannot be possible to separate "*what*" is uttered from "*how*" it is uttered since these simultaneously cause registers to differ from one another and allow participants to differentiate between them. The last point, in fact, relates directly to the term of "language users"; in turn, this emanates from Bernstein's sociological dimension (as cited in Halliday, 1978) built into languages' proper operations socio-culturally speaking with an exact focus on the range of context-pertinent meaning potential. In this respect, the linguistic perspective, according to both Bernstein alongside Halliday (1978), intertwines with the "social man". This gives primacy to specific social institutions with which linguistic functions ought to agree. Here, users of language to attain social objectives are classified under the term "user-type"; this is contingent on clues specifying users' social belonging (identities) –setting ("when", where" as well as grouping ("who with"). Besides,

although these contextual elements stand as stable characteristics of the socio-cultural

organizations of given groups, they can obviously vary among their respective members

(Hasan, 2004). Attention is remarkably concentrated on the meaning level, for it is reflective

of users' identities, in parallel (Halliday as cited in Hasan, 2004). At last, Halliday shows how

a frequently used dialect is shaped by, "…who you are (socio-region of origin and/or

adoption), and expressing a diversity of social structures (patterns of social

hierarchy)…dialects are different ways of saying the same thing and tend to differ in:

phonetics, phonology, lexicogrammar (but not semantics)" (1978, P. 35). In a nutshell,

dialectal variation is proportional to community membership or more precisely *language

users'* social identities. Not only encoded messages through discourse can determine

identities, but equally the linguistic level can do so via dialectal variations across contexts.

1.1.1.2.5.4.2 Diatypic variation.

Still branching to the variation property of the linguistic system, more focus is dedicated to

participants' manipulations of language. To begin with, it would be, drawing on Halliday,

(1978); Hasan (as cited in Halliday & Hasan, 1989), necessary to proceed through the

variation-basing-on- use perspective; as a matter of fact, context is of substantial vitality for

the workings of this type of change because it connects the linguistic mechanism to its

(contextual)constituents. At this point, Hasan (as cited in Halliday & Hasan, 1989; 2004) puts

the accent on the primacy of context of situation when she directs interest toward the closely

established relationship between textual stretches and their social surroundings; Hasan (2004);

Halliday (1978, 2014); Mazid (2014); Fairclough (1989, 1995a, 1995b); Widdowson (2004)

remind that discourse means language use within certain bounds identifying with specific

contexts. Furthermore, discourse, Hasan (2004) assumes, ensures the interrelationship between the larger context and text in that none of them can exist or operate without the assistance of the other. In this case, realization is a mutual feature. Text, as a system and process, maintains and crystallizes context when put in use (discursive exchanges); at once, context, being a process and system, too, creates and stabilizes the linguistic system. Thus, whatever the text being an instance of a diatypic variety, it must be made up of two components– "structure" as well as "texture". While the former signals structural consistency (for example, the overall topic of racism), the latter points to continuous variations throughout individual instances (for instance, racism against Muslim minorities in India and China). Significantly, what is known as "structural potential" refers to the global scope of varieties within which instantiation needs to extend. Most significantly, the "genre specific semantic potential" is synonymous with the meaning potential evoked earlier, for they both suggest semantic maneuvers guided by a variety's structural limitations (*textual and socio-cultural*). She, accordingly, stresses the textual features awareness–structure and texture–as these epitomize not only intra-register variations, but equally inter-register ones during daily interactions (from one register to another). By implication, one would draw attention to Halliday's (1978) seemingly compelling definition of register; it means saying something at a particular moment indicated by the actions being undertaken alongside task dispatch among participants ("type of action" and "social division of labor"). Register connotes the transmission of various messages–meta-functions, notably ideational, interpersonal, and textual: phonetic, lexico-grammar, and semantic regulated by the basic operational variables constituting context: field, tenor, and mode.

1.1.3 Pragmatics

As a recognized field of its own, both the Anglo-American and the European schools have perceived pragmatics differently. While the former has regarded it as putting much focus on the way language is used in general, the latter, being more specific, has presented it as one among the many sub-disciplines constituting the study of language in use. For instance, one can mention socio-linguistics and psycholinguistics among others. In other words, the European school's view seems to have been minimizing with regard to pragmatics in that it has reduced it to being merely a sub-discipline with some contributions to offer to the study of language in use (Fairclough, 1989). Moreover, the discourse analyst has concentrated on the Anglo-American perception since it is more prolific in its coverage of pragmatics-relevant issues in English language. Nevertheless, some scholars' respective contributions to pragmatics, such as Levinson's, Thomas's, and Yule's (as cited in Baker & Ellece, 2011) have strictly considered it as a sub-discipline of linguistics that connects exactly to the interactional role of language within context; in other words, pragmatics tries to explore interpersonal communication using language under the set of socio-cultural constraints. According to them, pragmatics must cooperate with other areas of study as well as theories for fruitful findings–socio-linguistics, "speech act theory", "politeness theory", and conversation analysis. Consequently, this respect has had an "identity problem" ever since its inception; it has not echieved coherence and sovereignty in terms of findings as a domain of study yet (Locher & Graham, 2010; Crystal as cited in Locher & Graham, 2010; Cummings as cited in Locher & Graham, 2010). In spite of the insights offered by pragmatics to the survey of discourse, it sounds obvious how it evolves with other fields symbiotically.

The above-mentioned points of view, it can be seen, closely endorse the assumption forming the core of Austin and Searle's "Speech Act Theory". This, in effect, treats language use as being a performance of acts: actions accompanying speech in daily interactions, such as

offers or requests for help, promises to do something, rejections or confirmations of things, etc. People tend to convey indirect meanings when they use language for interaction, in short. In addition, this philosophical framework relates narrowly to the basic conception of language as "social practice", and this principle is even primordially constitutive of many scholars' theoretical frameworks, including Fairclough's Critical Language Studies (CLS) (Fairclough 1989; Austin, 1962; Searle, 2002; Fowler, 1991). At last, the functional performances of language undertaken by its users in the social space assume a vital position in pragmatics, which is quite revolutionary in addressing language.

1.1.3.1 Pragmatics' overlapping relationship with discourse analysis.

From what has been said above, one would readily adhere to the orientation that pragmatics and D A overlap to such a degree that their similarities outweigh their differences. At the beginning, Cutting (2002) explains first the non-syntactic (structural) perspective of both approaches toward discourse exploration. Indeed, the delimitation relative to how words interrelate with each other has been subordinated in pragmatics and D A since the purely structuralist grammar is clearly devoid of any reference to the surrounding social world in which these operate practically. Moreover, this can apply well to semantics for it does not broaden to include the socio-cultural space. Words can make sense individually, in this case. Henceforth, Baker and Ellece (2011) are assertive about how meaning or, according to their own term, the "communicative function" can be at the heart of pragmatic study. In fact, users of language must not only be acquainted with purely linguistic knowledge, such as phonology, syntax, morphology, and semantics, but they have to be well equipped with enough information on key elements to do with the social context: The setting of interaction

(when? and where?), the tone of utterances, and the interlocutors' relationships with one another (social statuses). To explicate the case better, they illustrate:

> For example, the question 'can you pass the salt?' appears to ask if someone is capable of passing the salt. However, if it is said with a rising tone, during a meal, to another person who is closer to the salt than you are, then its communicative goal is probably a request for the salt, rather than a question about ability. The meaning of the utterance is more than what is actually said. (P. 100)

Succinctly, language use in context implies discovering what its users perform with their statements. In the same vein, when it comes to commonality, on the other hand, the two approaches concentrate their analytical attentions on the routine linguistic manifestations within the larger social context. This is prompted by the aim of unraveling the contextual clues crucial for effective interaction and by how language meaningfully reacts to them (Cutting, 2002). In support of this direction, Stilwell and Yule (as cited in Cutting, 2002) observe, "pragmatics and discourse analysis have much in common: they both study context, text and function" (P. 2). Relative to this question, the two fields have been endeavoring to expose the shared knowledge relevant to the immediate (physical context) of interactions, the broader socio-cultural context alongside the relating psychological dimensions; this amount of knowledge facilitates meaning-making in situational exchanges (Cutting, 2002). Brown and Yule (1983, as cited in Cutting, 2002); Brown and Levinson (as cited in Brown & Yule, 1983); Pirsig (as cited in Brown & Yule, 1983); Van Dijk (2008a, 2000, 2014a), similarly, argue in favour of this perspective; as a matter of fact, they stress the significance of assuming a symmetry in social attitudes and conceptions (social common sense) and even in the psycho-social parameters underpinning the inter-personal exchanges of implicit messages.

Moreover, the joint focus on discourse can be regarded as another illustration of the extent to which both fields intersect. Ultimately, Cook (as cited in Cutting, 2002); Holmes (as cited in Locher & Graham, 2010) together show how both fields base their approaches to language study respectively on examining language's social practices (discourse), the forms of such practices (text and its variations), and their meaningfulness (social information) alongside "unity". Thereby, discourse is clearly grounded in the assumption adopted by the most influential scholars in DA: "language as social practice" with context being the larger space where it extends meaningfully (Schiffrin; Van Dijk; Jaworski; and Coupland as cited in Gee, 2005; Fairclough & Wodak; Benque as cited in Wodak & Bush, 2004). The fusion of interests of both respects has been definitely beneficial for the study of language.

Still working on the intersection of the two respects, Cutting (2002) elaborates on the way compatibility in terms of knowledge between parts of discourse is another common attribute to pragmatics and DA. She refers, initially, to "relevance" in pragmatics so as the significance of shared knowledge in interaction can be put to the foreground in any analytical work. Henceforth, "relevance theory" exposes how communicators assume symmetry of knowledge can contribute to the effectiveness of texts in use in terms of meaning expressions and receptions. D A, equally, covers coherence; in other words, inter-personal expectations of common ground knowledge during communicative events. One would deduce the synonymy between both approaches' concepts, thus. The ultimate uniformity involving pragmatics and D A turns around unraveling the intentions of participants in communicative events; this is achieved via immediate aims and subsequent goals (Cutting, 2002). In short, discourse embodies functions in contextual interactions. Similarly, Widdowson (2004), in addressing the expression of intentions, focuses on the terms "illocutionary" and "perlocutionary" functions on his part. The prominent overlap of interests between pragmatics and

DA brings to the fore the symmetrical aspect relating to participants' knowledge plus the targeted intentions throughout situational conversations.

1.1.3.2 Speech acts.

1.1.3.2.1 The logic underlying illocution.

In the course of constructing his theoretical paradigm Searle (2002) stretches preceding studies further toward the outer world in terms of material outcomes. To start, he readily acknowledges that Strawson's "theory of reference" has not been only of a considerable influence in his academic enterprise, but also in the evolution of "speech act theory" as a whole. Srawson (as cited in Searle, 2002), in this regard, directs attention to language users referring to things around them; he assumes that, by doing so, they perform pragmatic acts in reality. Besides, he stresses the endorsement of this assumption. To prop this perspective, he argues that it is not statements which are actual deeds, but speakers through their use of utterances. In other words, language in use does not signify, but its users do. However, for Searle this theoretical framework cannot transcend the bounds of being abstract (general). Furthermore, Searle does not neglect Austin's work on– reference, predicating, speech acts, illocution, and even Grice's "meaning theory"–, which have inspired his subsequent theoretical framework of "speech act theory". Ultimately, in this academic circuit, he has extended both scholars' notions further. In his theorization project, Searl, by drawing on his predecessors, has extended the scope of research further giving more priority to the practical workings of speech acts in social situations.

Reflecting upon things to do with language use by speakers, Ambroise (2010) traces the historical evolution of speech act theory (SAT) from its inception to modern pragmatics. To

start, he notes that specialists in both fields of pragmatics and SAT have often endeavored to compensate the up-to-then weaknesses of the grammatical approaches to language study. He, actually, refers to some scholars, such as Austin, Strawson, Grice, and Ryle, who have set forth to lambast the truth-condition principles underlying language analysis. These present language as chains of related words conveying propositions; their correctness must be proportional to corresponding truth conditions. E.g., when someone utters the sentence "I feel love sick" it only means so if he/she is in a non-reciprocated love affair. That it, the role of language revolves around externalizing human thoughts and attitudes as attributed to it by followers of universal grammar (Vanderveken, 2001). This traditional standpoint has, one can extrapolate, lended no consideration to the social dimension of human language. In the light of this seemingly partial approach, Ambroise sheds light on Austin's contribution as a revolutionary vision in pragmatics in 1950s/ 1960s; in fact, it brought in a fresh perspective to language. In other words, it shook the foundations of "logic positivism" that has long characterized the truth-conditions facts of worldly matters. Austin (1962, as cited in Ambroise, 2010) claims that sentences expressing merely realistic points ("facts") might turn deluding despite their seemingly explicit nature. Thereby, Austin and Searle's works (as cited in Van Dijk, 2009) have been milestones, for they would explore and expound on the hows and whys of language being a "social action". Furthermore, Ambroise shows how later studies have shifted their emphasis on the communicative speech act, departing from Austin's theorization line. The diversion toward the pragmatic role of language in communication has been a major marker in language study.

The practical function of language has amounted to key scholarly entanglement in research to follow. In this respect, Ambroise (2010); Van Dijk (2009); Blackmore (1992) all affirm that, beyond the apparent limitations of the previous assumption, Austin's freshly

framed approach to language revolves around perceiving language as performing some form of action in authentic situations. Actually, this constitutes the core of Austin's work: He is obviously interested in what speakers and recipients can perform with discourse, not what they utter and just convey overtly. To paraphrase, being at the crossroads of concerns with form and abstract aspects of discourse, experts in this field seek to reveal how language in use and its material outgrowth occupy the lion's share of investigation in this orientation. Fowler (1991), in the same direction, elaborates:

> Whereas traditional linguistics had regarded language as primarily communicating ideas or facts about the world, modern trends emphasise that language in also a *practice,* a mode of action. As we are saying something, we are also doing something through speaking. This aspect of the interpersonal function of language has been studied particularly by linguistic philosophers, and notably by J. L. Austen–whose marvelous title *How to Do Things with Words* sums up this perspective– and, following him, J. R. Searle. (PP. 87-88)

Here interferes another piece of solid proof concerning the novelty of orientation in language study. Furthermore, based on the same theoretical framework, Vanderveken (2001) refers to illocution as the basic function underlying language operations. Here, one has to differentiate between what words mean and what their users mean by them–"*uterrance*" and "*meaning*" (Blackmore, 1992). I.e., interlocutors, while in interaction, place their respective sentences within the social context where they can perform with a variety of forces. Vanderveken states:

> They [meaningful utterances of elementary sentences] mean to perform in the context of their utterances elementary illocutionary acts such as assertions, questions, orders, declarations and thanks. It is part of what they intend to communicate to their hearers.

Moreover, they contribute to conversations with the intention of performing with the other speakers *collective illocutionary acts* such as exchanging greetings, giving news, making a deliberation or changing things by way of making official declarations. (P.25)

Supporting this point, Ambroise, likewise, observes, "Austin's aim is thus to focus on what is *done* in discourse rather than on what is said (what is said depending, according to him, on what is done)" (P.2). For Vanderveken, the expressive, attitudinal role of language should be in line with the traditionally grammatical standpoint despite the superficiality of its scientific enterprise. Diving into what discourse can perform socially has gained much impetus in subsequently pragmatic approach to language.

Ambroise (2010); Blackmore (1992) assert that Austin's centre of focus is essentially language use in context, so, the latter, at this point, differentiates between performed "*utterances*" and "*sentences*". Indeed, utterances, no matter how various they can be, depend on what scholars unanimously term "felicity conditions". These ensure the proper performance of speech acts. Actually, Austin (1962) refers precisely to the "appropriateness circumstances" whereby communicators do things with their utterances, "... in the appropriate circumstances… the issuing of the utterance is the performing of an action–it is not normally thought of as just saying something" (P. 6). In other words, unless speakers (participants) observe correctly such appropriateness conditions, their utterances would be doomed for intention-communication failures in authentic occasions. Vanderveken (2001), equally, puts the stress on SAT's contribution to the regulatory rules enabling speakers to communicate with ease; this state can only be possible thanks to the structural (syntactic, lexical,

phonological, and semantic), and pragmatic guidelines (conventions). That is to say, reiterating the significance of the appropriateness requirements, he reminds:

> In particular, certain syntactic, semantic and pragmatic features are transcendent and universal because they are indispensable. A language deprived of such features would not provide for its human speakers adequate means of expression and of communication of their conceptual thoughts. (P.26)

In brief, the just-highlited norms count decisively in efficient exchanges of thoughts and realization of intended goals. Further, for him, any satisfactory performance of speech acts (SAs) must acquiesce to such "universals", which, in turn, rest upon the mental features characteristic of successful human speakers. In addition, by resorting to a kind of "inferencing" through effective coordinations, they can sort out proper functions of structural constructions. At this level, interlocutors' schemes of perception are clearly compatible with one another. In short, there must exist a certain harmony in terms of discursive production and reception among them. Ambroise (2010); Austin (1962) point out that distinct SAs possess their own felicity conditions whereby they can work effectively. Once in use, SAs build on felicity conditions rather than on truth conditions, as mentioned earlier.

Delving into SAs, Austin (as cited in ambroise, 2010) specifies three types of action performed through utterances during interpersonal exchanges. These extend as follows:

- **Locutionary act** when one utters a statement to explicitly mean something; for example, one may talk about the weather stating it is nice, or about food describing a dish as either delicious or horrible,

- **Illocutionary act** consists in switching what one conveys literally with the aim of communicating an indirect meaning. For instance, talking about the nice weather in order to start a talk with someone or praising a dish to have more of it,

- **Perlocutionary act** aims at provoking an effect on recipients; i.e. a speaker tries to exhort his/her listener to react in an intended way: Responding positively to an invitation for a talk or accepting to serve more of that dish.

Austin (as cited in Ambroise, 2010; 1962) particularly emphasizes the second byproduct of SAs as it is the most common in interactions, and it is especially convention-based, actually. People involved in such events have to resort fully and rightly to common procedures so that they can figure out the communicative sense resulting from the change triggered by the illocutionary act. He accordingly explicates, "There must exist an accepted conventional procedure having a certain conventional effect, that procedure to include the uttering of certain words by certain persons in certain circumstances… appropriate for the invocation of the procedure invoked" (Austin, 1962, P. 14). Additionally, Ambroise (2010); Searle (2002) comment on the conventionality of such norms: They take on a legal-like status in the sense that by endorsing their power of altering things around, language users must commit themselves to the obligation imposed by the locution. Searle, arguing for such obligation of commitment, shows how one devises reasons for each intended action via making promises to perform them; this way, he/she gets enmeshed in the necessity to observe them at all cost to reach particular ends. The speaker/writer is the source of those intended actions, he reminds. For example, at a railway station, one can make a statement implying a request for a travel ticket via an SA; hence, he/she must conform to the politeness norms, or a lawyer may offer to defend someone accused of something in a justice court manifesting and committing

himself/herself to the promise to undertaker his/her defense by formally accepting the legal case. These instances, to Ambroise (2010); Austin (1962); Locher and Graham (2010) have to be dependent on conventions' acceptance–continuous adjustments of utterances to various situations as well as addressees–by participants in order to introduce actual changes (effects) as illocutionary forces, therefore. To perform effective actions through SAs, interlocutors must conform thoroughly and sucessfully to relevantly normative conventions.

In the same way, perlocutions are contingent-oriented in their subsequent, effective operations. Ambroise articulates, in fact, that they rely on the locutionary commitment incumbent upon language users so as some kind of influence on recipients can arise taking the form of particularly observable actions taken by them. In clear terms, this connects to Searle's (2002), obligation-driven commitment toward actions stated. Ambroise, hence, draws attention to how the speaker manages to prepare the appropriate conditions for the hearer's instant, intended reaction; e.g., the ticket agent reacts kindly to the traveller's demand appreciating his/her politeness and the Judge admits the X lawyer as speaking on behalf of the Y defendant. Besides, he looks back, once again, to the conditions that logically govern SAs (utterances) but with a more articulate mind. On the one hand, he stresses the significance of such parameters "felicity conditions" with their crucially decisive role in rendering SAs practical; on the other, he outlines the set of conditions piloting SAs broadly. In association with the latter case, Vanderveken (2001) points out that interactional partners jointly build their conversational cooperations replying to each other's SAs with the specific aim of reaching "discursive goals". One of these is what is known as the "descriptive goal", which entails representing things as they really are in the world. This may link to social indicators relative to interlocutors' positions in connection with one another in current conversations via discourse (Locher & Graham, 2010; Holmes as cited in Locher & Graham, 2010).

Interestingly, such cooperative SAs can assume a higher-level status (fully fledged) as illocutions jointly carried; they are known as "explicit performatives" and "collective higher-level order illocutionary acts". Also, the suitability of those coordinated SAs triggers their performative efficacy in contextual situations. In short, mastering the social conventions piloting various SAs, parteners can pretend to be competent–being cognizant of the conditions underlying linguistic forms and their functional illocutions (Austin, 1962; Vanderveken, 2001; Fowler, 1991). Finally, sticking to the felicity conditions equals successful interaction.

Specifically, Vanderveken (2001) and Searle (2002) demonstrate how experts in pragmatics are of like minds regarding the workable types of the illocutionary force. These range as follows:

- **Assertive or descriptive force** reflects life matters as they actually occur or exist without effecting any changes to them. In other words, the speaker must stick to the authenticity of what he/she asserts; for example, in geology, a researcher progresses with the very aim of proving the truth of certain soil-formation processes and relevant phenomena,

- **Directive force** this has as its major aim pushing recipients to do what discourse producers order them. Pupils, at school, have to obey the teacher if he/she orders them to read, or write, or stand up, for instance; also, drivers have to stop at the police officer's signal,

- **Commissive force** this one relates exactly to the engagement of interlocutors in adhering to their earlier interactional promises. E.g., parents must not break the promise of taking their children on holiday or offering them presents on their birthday parties,

- **Expressive force** what actually takes place in this case is speakers externalizing their emotions, thoughts, and perceptions in their variety. In short, various attitudes

manifest themselves toward what is going on around interlocutors. This illocutionary force arises through the statement of something over a particular issue; for example, acknowledgements manifested to someone for the services he/she has done for a country as a soldier, an official, athlete, or artist,

- **Declaratory force** here, one needs to unveil what he/she is doing via his/her actions; that is to say, actions represent intended deeds. At this level, some change is introduced to the surrounding world by participants involved in effective interactions, such as a professor accepting an offer to take part in a conference by responding affirmatively.

Worthy of note is what comes to be realized through an SA in actuality; by stating something explicitly, one implies a particular type of function leading to practical results, which signals a whole process of achieving some aim via discursive interaction. Where seemingly pragmatics and DA's interests criss-cross each other is what one can perform with his/her utterances.

1.1.4 Sociolinguistics

1.1.4.1 Sociolinguistics: foundations and evolution.

The field of sociolinguistics deserves to be looked at historically as it has contributed substantially to the study of language from the perspective of social use. To start, as an autonomous field, it, according to Fairclough, (1989); Hymes (1977) owes much of its evolution to mainly two areas: sociology as well as anthropology. Nonetheless, the very fact

of this respect having as its concern linguistic use and variation in social space automatically invokes the participation of linguists versed in this specialism alongside a range of other experts and theorists originating from such areas as: social psychology, conversation analysis, power and discourse, and ethnography of speaking, Mesthrine (2011) observes. In fact, the earlier minimization of the social context by linguistics has been, as explained by Fairclough, a marker of the rise of sociolinguistics as a reaction to the vacuum left by linguists in their approach to language study. This is not at all; Mesthrine looks back in time, to recount only the then persisting efforts by researchers and theorists attracted by the social nature of language. I.e., their research scope has revolved around exploring language's external realm of authentic uses closely in contact with humans' experiences and diverse objectives– "E language" or "external language" in Chomsky's own terms. This theoretical direction would run counter to the Chomskyan trend, which was predominant in 1960s and 1970s with its mentalist penchant concerning grammar as an abstract structure underlying humans' linguistic competence; mentalism consists in undertaking detailed descriptions of the inner structures of language as they occur in the mind. Consequently, human competence, goes hand in hand with the "I language" (internal structures of language). In spite of the discernible lack of alignment with Chomsky's conceptions on language, these are universally deemed worth their worldwide reputation in association with the acquisition of language, its storage, and its mental processing, Mesthrine avows. What makes the importance of sociolinguistics undeniable in the language examination is its deportation from the mind to the social context.

1.1.4.1.1 Power, language, and social diversity.

In order to have a clear understanding of the three concepts, it would be preferable to backtrack a little in time to review some influential works by some predecessors. As a start, as

early as the 1960s, Brown and Gilmen's project (as cited in Baugh, 2011) was launched with the aim of researching into variations in interactional modes alongside "solidarity" patterns between persons involved in communication in French–in particular the usage of "tu" vs. "vous". In effect, certain linguistic systems deploy distinct pronouns to signal divergent degrees of formality/informality and social statuses (positions; "hierarchies") as appealed to in verbal exchanges. A few years later, another survey was carried out by Bickerton (as cited in Baugh, 2011). The latter researcher would, actually, take Guyanese people's linguistic performances using various pronouns in that Creole to account for the factors determining their uses socially, namely social class membership. He revealed two major facts; firstly, those Guyanese belonging to the top classes tended to insert standard forms, while those of lower classes would employ non-standard varieties of pronouns. Thereby, different extents of acquaintance and solidarity were exhibited via such pronouns where power is in constant motion in connection with relationships between subjects. Furthermore, Baugh, (2011) joins the assumption that humans in their childhood are exposed to uniquely social conditions in their acquisition of language; in addition, such individual conditions, in turn, render them integral members of a large range of groups (ethnic, class, gender, occupation, age, etc). Language is forged within the bounds of a speech community, in a nutshell. Advocating for this focus, Baugh writes, "Speakers of a single language vary in many ways: they differ in class, sex, ethnicity, voice quality, and other idiosyncratic traits that reflect their unique personal experience with language (s)" (2011, P. 17). I.e., to be a member of a speech community implicates speakers in compliance with its archetypical production circumstances, which contribute to the distinctiveness of its linguistic variety. It has been revealed that acquaitance with particular social conditions is the key to the acquisition of language and its use as a member of a given speech community.

Over the years, sociolinguistics has earned a reputation of being specially tempted by exploring linguistic variations in terms of usage indicative of class stratification. In this register, Bernstein (as cited in Baugh, 2011) has worked particularly with class-based distinctions conveyed linguistically; at this point, the sociolinguist highlights the different usages of two varieties of one language by two various classes: "*elaborated codes*" utilized by those with a high-class background; and "*restricted codes*" enacted by subjects of the working class. He could conclude that the children of the elite do have a fully fledged set of vocabulary contrary to those of the lower class with a restricted luggage for the use of a language. In brief, social diversity plus power exertion is manifested through the unequal opportunities available for children of both classes to socialize with a language of the same type. Noticeably, what seems to have been missing in virtually all research endeavors then, for Cherishe (as cited in Baugh, 2011), is the lack of serious consideration of power practices in the background of racial variety. This has been disproportionate with the increasing number of immigrants rushing into the UK and the emergence of the Black English variety, for example. Caste differentiation in daily language exchanges has been noticeable across numerous surveys, but further elaborations are still required concerning mainly power exrecise.

In comparison with the general academic context in the UK, in the USA racial diversity has gained much impetus from ongoing research. As a start, distinctions on the grounds of race have been in top gear leading mostly to explicit racist stereotypes directed at ethnic groups namely Afro-Americans (Van Dijk, 1991). For instance, Jensen (as cited in Baugh, 2011) has conducted a research relying on standard test grades to assess the intellectual potential of white and black American children; in effect, his findings would suggest that those with European descent are superior to those originating from Africa with regard to

cognition and education capacities. He would evoke the ungrammaticality as well as illogicality as the main reasons behind the inferiority of the Black American Vernacular English (AAVL), actually. Labov, conversely, (as cited in Baugh, 2011) would reject such an assumption on the basis that he has proven quite the opposite; the sociolinguist, by going over empirical analysis of the AAVL, could arrive at the result that the previous study had been partial ("biased") since such a variety has been found coherent and logical and flawless. Furthermore, Baugh (2011) attests to the hitherto insightful findings of the work of Labov; it is substantially valid for linguistically varied societies especially for those with secondary dialects' communities who tend to be subdued by powerful elites. Issues to do with racial differentiation in sociolinguistics have been fashionable across the Atlantic.

Another trend in sociolinguistics stems from the plurality in social differentiation's interpretations. Goffman (as cited in Baugh, 2011; as cited in Drew & Curl, 2008); Tannen (as cited in Baugh, 2011) state that, during interactional events, there exist definite parameters to be taken notice of; such mechanisms extend differently. First, the former stresses the public/private language (in public settings, the language used is formal or public in nature, in the context of close friends and household circles, it is archetypically colloquial). Second, similarity or dissimilarity in social status among interlocutors imposes formal/informal variants of language. Third, cases when people with social positions rank higher than others in frequent conversations. Importantly, Goffman's model (as cited in Drew & Curl, 2008) places such three definitions together under the broad frame of duties and rights that must be narrowly complied with. In brief, participants in conversational communications have to respect the regulatory norms of formality when engaged in public or else intimate exchanges. It should, in addition, be remarkedthat the building in of sex-based distinctions instill a flexible variation in formality/informality to such situations managing people's conducts to

each other (Tannen as cited in Baugh, 2011; trugill, 2000). Last but not least, limiting the largest proportion of attention to the association of language, social variety, and power, as argued by Sankoff; Weinreinch (as cited in Baugh, 2011) attests to the impact of power over the social sustainability of language ("elastic power"); that is, scholars in sociolinguistics alongside those in historical linguistics, according to Baugh, (2011), claim that there are various causes underlying the development of language, notably political conditions based on injustice–political decisions to attribute an official status to certain languages to the detriment of other ones. He writes:

> Although a fundamental tenet of linguistic science is that all languages and their dialects are of equal linguistic worth, history has repeatedly confirmed that some languages and dialects lack comparable or superior political clout and are therefore subjugated by others. (P. 19)

In a nutshell, politics has been interfering in the very status of languages and dialects. Ultimately, the above divergent definitions of social discrimination have one thing in common: the strict regulation of the linguistic behavior under particular social constraints, which, in turn, heralds community membership. Social differentiation signals regulatory variants when it comes to language in use.

In alignment with the social dimension underpinning language usage, specialists in this field have begun widening the scope of study of language. At this stage, Fishman; Haugen (as cited in Baugh (2011) have come up with the notions of "sociology of language" as well as "ecology of contexts" respectively. In spite of the different appellations, both terms seem to relatively converge at one crucial point; they focus attention upon the truism that unique social and historical factors readily spawn community-specific speech usages. Besides, this

can effect intense struggle between social groups not only in terms of usage, but significantly well beyond what is customary (usage): social use of the linguistic system–a new perspective. Specifically, Haugen (as cited in Baugh, 2011), by putting into circulation his concept, has accentuated the ecological context where language can be an indicator of sociolinguistic differentiations throughout conversational events, namely in his US-based surveys. Ensuing stereotypes about foreign-accent speakers would be of discernment to him as an outsider, in fact. His arrived at conclusions would demonstrate how social authorities ("social forces") in and out of speech communities paint a lucid picture of unbalanced relations of socio-economic power and rights to education. To further back this advocacy we would report Baugh's own wording:

> Haugen resisted attempts to study language devoid of its ecological context. He recognized early on that linguistic evidence that is gathered and observed in an existing social setting might differ considerably from linguistic evidence that is produced experimentally, especially if the experimental data is socially dislocated from ordinary discourse. By drawing explicit attention to the social and ecological context wherein language is used for different purposes, Haugen has set the stage for a robust and empirical linguistic science that strives to avoid what Labov (1972b) portrayed as the "observer's paradox".… (P. 20)

On a close reading of the quotation, one would state that the larger social (or ecological) environment is of primordial presence and examination in performing empirical work with language on a solid, objective basis far away from the temptations of the self. The semiotic system needs to be fixed in its social locus if it is to be subjected to impartial dissection.

At once, the necessary quality of being cognizant with the normative aspects of conversational communication has gained much momentum along the way. Indeed, Hymes's elaboration of the "communicative competence" (as cited in Baugh, 2011) branches to language in relation with power and equality (solidarity), for the assessment of competent interaction is based on subjectivity on the part of participants. As a matter of fact, interpersonal communication entails inherently common characteristics; for instance, any communicative encounter ought to involve a "sender" whose intended objective is directed at a "receiver" (Bell as cited in Baugh, 2011; Chambers, 1997). I.e., Interaction rests on the universal tenet of generality. With respect to this consideration, Hymes, Baugh reminds, inspired by the anthropological approach in linguistics, such as Sapir and Jacobson has always explicitly pointed to the social space surrounding language workings as well–bonding linguistic forms and functions with the socio-cultural milieu (Hymes, 1977). Moreover, Hymes's insights into those with clout over others in communicative exchanges originate from Jacobson's theorizing. Speakers deemed linguistically competent in a given speech community, might be devalued as devoid of essential knowledge to conduct certain forms of interaction elsewhere (in another culture or sub-culture) especially by those who hold superior cognitive capacities (for example, inequality between participants in an academic conversation). Power, solidarity, and cognizance of socio-cultural norms are sine qua nons while addressing language use in social context: Communicative competence.

1.1.4.1.2 Power exhibited in context-regulated interaction.

1.1.4.1.2.1 Ethnographic trends in sociolinguistics.

Over the years, deep convictions have started to crystallize in sociolinguistics that the overall context is indispensable in dealing empirically with language, which implies extending the

ethnographic approach to the study terrain. To begin with, Wardhaugh and Fuller (2015)

assert that any sociolinguist should fundamentally assume that socio-cultural interaction helps

keep in motion society. Besides, more and more research is currently focused upon how

linguistic use comes to mould and nurture systems of social reality; that is to say, the central

aim of sociolinguistic enterprise stems from the need to find out about the formation of speech

communities' regulations relative to daily communications. In actual effect, ethnography is

one area of study that incentivizes research from the very angle of exploring the interrelation

between language and society. At this point, concentration is, according to Wardhaugh and

Fuller (2015); Hymes (1977) precisely oriented toward the coverage of parameters

archetypical in social interactions; thus,' exposure to actual communicative occurrences

within given social groups or subgroups with describing all the characteristics relevant to the

social conduct is the main mission of active scholars. In this respect, Duranti (as cited in

Wardhaugh and Fuller, 2015) affirms the descriptive nature of ethnographic projects in

addressing social deeds, systemic organization of society, and interpretative acts typical of

particular social gatherings because discourse embodies the latter working order.

Ethnography, additionally, strives to provide answers to directly observed social phenomena,

namely the linguistic behavior; how a phenomenon (language) is viewed under the constraints

of a community (Wardhaugh and Fuller, 2015). Actually, this tends to be in line with

Johnstone's exposition (as cited in Wardhaugh and Fuller, 2015), which reveals the non-

universality of humans' socio-cultural conducts; instead, it confines linguistic practices inside

the cultural boundaries of certain groups. Lastly, such research principles and objectives, for

Wardhaugh and Fuller, make the essence of ethnographic assumptions connected with

interaction: the "ethnography of speaking". The ethnographic dimension must be built into

language use explorations.

1.1.4.1.2.2 Ethnography of communication.

The entanglement in the very business of describing the linguistic system must be open to both local (micro or structural) as well as socio-cultural constructs. As a starter, Hymes (1977) stresses that any approach to language study entails a mix of two vital qualities. On the one hand, the scope of analysis has to endorse a range of disciplines whose complementary findings can help shed light on the institutional patterns underlying speech interchanges from a diversity of perspectives regarding language use in context–psychology, sociology, ethnography, grammar, etc. On the other hand, the analysis of units of speech should not be restricted to the structural level; it has to be expanded to essentially investigate the guidance of interaction in social groups by socio-cultural structures. In short, social context with its constituents emerge as inevitable parameters not solely for performing interaction, but also for undertaking its coverage (Hymes, 1977; Baugh, 2011; Mazid, 2014; Wardhaugh and Fuller 2015; Van Dijk, 2014a; Wodak, 2001). Nevertheless, Hymes does, by no means, devalue the contributions of linguistics; in fact, with its formal insights, it can provide substantial support methodologically speaking (for instance, inference making about context). In association with this point, he clarifies that the socio-cultural background ought to uphold the survey of language provided that the linguistic science cannot capture the highly elusive extensions of language within the larger social milieu. This forms the specialty of the ethnography of communication. Hymes puts it straightforwardly, " it is rather that it is not linguistics, but ethnography, not language, but communication, which must provide the frame of reference within which the place of language in culture and society is to be assessed" (1977, P. 4). Briefly, contextual cues must be singled out for cautious dissection due to their decisive function in effectively guiding communication. Thus, the fusion of interests in the

ethnography of communication –descriptions of language forms and concentration on their operations throughout communicative situations as dictated by communities' normative patterns of interactional variations– culminate in a dual (form-function) study and how both correlate with each other, Hymes (1977); Fairclough (1989) claim. In the end, this trend, in Hymes's view (1977, 1996), represents a move against the tide: more attention has been ever since called to this direction as the linguistic construct attends to "social circumstances" along our requirements and accommodation processes as well. Form and function underpin the frames of reference of current research on language study in the social environment.

Nonetheless, orienting to this perspective looks, somehow, at stake due to the width of the disciplines where it is implemented. According to Hymes (1977) what sounds problematic is the broad location of the ethnography of communication (EC) within such separate areas as: social ethnography, sociology, and psychology; here, each field is supposed to push EC further whatever the perspective might be, yet purely ethnographic endeavors focused exactly on communication are scarce. Worse, the social dimension of language as well as linguistics had been beyond the concerns of experts (Hymes, 1996). Concerning this crucial shortcoming Sapir (as cited in Hymes, 1996) states explicitly, "…such an alienation from experience and social reality on the part of 'the many kinds of segmental scientists of man'" (P. 26). To sum up, the linguist gives a word of caution to spur scholars to dive in exploring how humans' linguistic tool mirrors variant ways of being complacent with particular conceptions of social reality. Thereby, taking this challenge, Hymes (1977) has set forth in an attempt to bridge the gap between EC, sociology, and anthropology in the process of laying the foundations of his theoretical construction; in the pursuit of his enterprise, he could realize that his concern ought to converge with semiotics specifically exhausting Lévi-Strausse's (as cited in Hymes,

1977) social perception of the field. In fact, the anthropologist places the study of signs in society as a priority appealing to concentration on the structural system (linguistics) plus social system (social anthropology and sociology). However, this pretended direction, for Hymes, has not been explored at large then because semiotics had hitherto predominantly described sets of signs (codes) well away from the social context. Morris's (as cited in Hymes, 1977), remarkably, builds in his "tripartite formulation" so as to fit the aim put in place–examination of how language is given life in social context. This, in actuality, invokes pragmatics with its relevance to the creation and reception of signs by participants in everyday interactions. Likewise, language in use yields invaluable insights into the tight connection between linguistic theory and signs in social use. Also, the last theoretical item consists in having a close eye upon syntagmatics as well as semantics, which means inserting syntactic and semantic aspects of systems of signs. Language description takes into consideration what it can do socially most and foremost.

The above pragmatic level characterizes the new move toward tracking down the factors behind linguistic variations. To start, Hymes (1977) explains that meaning/form vary in both directions; in other words, several tools "means" can convey particular messages ("ends"); concurrently, numerous ends may be communicated by hardly changing structures. This, moreover, builds on Lamb's (as cited in Hymes, 1977) set of criteria that assist in the discrimination between linguistic compartments. These, as a matter of fact, consist of the respective criteria of "diversification" as well as "neutralization". While the former denotes the transmission of just a message by means of divergent forms (termed "representation"), the latter evokes the converse; a single meaning representation communicating a series of variant messages (ends). Importantly, the type of linguistics branching in elaborating EC, Hymes (1977) articulates, is exactly sociolinguistics; this is the locus where his main focus lies, so

this subspecialty is about unraveling communication engineering of forms/ends (intentions) within the broad milieu of society. Most importantly, this affiliation centers on the specific goal of matching generic interactional tools (linguistic systems) and intentions. By way of expediency, we would resort to Hymes's own argument:

> Language [being] as an attribute of *man* leave language as an attribute of *men* unintelligible. In actuality language is in large part what users have made of it. Navajo is what it is partly because it is a human language, partly because it is the language of the Navajo. The generic potentiality of the human faculty of language is realized differently, as to direction and as to degree, in different human communities, and is useless except insofar as it is so realized. (1996, P. 26)

To say things briskly, we would state that the linguistic malleability as a universal quality is reified distinctly under the constraints of socio-cultural institutions. Ultimately, this sociolinguistic approach is what is known as the ethnography of communication; its major objective to prod linguists to consider how language use is modeled across the world as well as the social scale (class, sex, age, occupation, race, etc) comes under the scope of the "ethnography of speaking" insofar as discourse is symbolical of such social stratifications, whose management of social behavior is a determinant of membership, too (Hymes, 1977, 1996; Chambers, 1997; Truggill, 2000). What had long been neglected or ignored in linguistics would rise to being the core of sociolinguists' frames of reference.

1.1.5 Discursive and Social Psychology

1.1.5.1 Sociolinguistics, cognitivism, and discursive psychology.

To start with, the bridging of the gap between sociolinguistics and social theory is, according to Potter and Edwards (2003), treated as complex in nature when it comes to cognition. As a matter of fact, both argue that the two respects are enormously distinct from each other;

additionally, what pushes such a complexity further lies exactly in the dilemma surrounding the possibility of pinpointing an eventual symbiosis involving sociolinguistics with the elements encompassed in the broader social theory. In this direction of study, while some researchers notably Drew, Sorjonen, and Heritage's account (as cited in Potter & Edwards, 2003) postulate how the broader social institutions are installed as well as referred to on the spot in frequent interactions as adhered-to- common systems, it should be noted that they perceptibly stand at a distance from any tangible attempt to seriously tackle the supposed overlap between discourse and those structures. Against this backdrop of failure to yield nearly any seemingly conclusive findings of a parallel specification of discursive events, cognitive constructions, and social institutions, Potter and Edwards's theorizing has stemmed as one among other promising paradigms. Interestingly, both theorists overtly acknowledge being versed in diverting their scope of research to unveil the shortcomings of what they deem as holistic in terms of approaching cognition. In due course, they have had to have imminent recourse to sociolinguistics; the latter owes greatly its current status to the interface between purely linguistic as well as sociological studies; i.e., this overlap would constitute the background in which sociolinguistics has emerged as an independent domain. Here, Potter and Edwards (2003); Hymes (1977) presuppose that this area of research could provide solid grounds for researchers in their enterprises as it often draws attention not only to cognitive, but also to grammatical, ethnographic, ethnological matters underlying language use in social context. Previously, sociolinguistics has hardly lent its attention to cognition-relevant issues, excepting those especially related to regulating daily activities and conduct in general (respectively known as "input" and "output") Graesser et al. (as cited in Potter and Edwards, 2003). Social psychologists, likewise, have concentrated virtually exclusively on social cognition instead of bonding it with language study (Condor & Antaki, 1997). Consequently,

Potter and Edwards (2003); readily highlight the significant role of cognitive processes in discursive exchanges; in short, scholars have actively endorsed Potter and Edwards postulates that consist in integrating the cognitive processes of psychology in the linguistic system in use within society.

Nowadays, with the increasing diversion to cognition underlying discursive practices, Potter and Edwards comparatively point to previous works having treated such questions. In this vein, both state that what has constituted research relating to such fields–discursive processes, cognitive science, cognitive psychology, social cognition– has eventually come up with contrasting perspectives to the one put in place by Potter and Edwards. Nonetheless, proponents of this tendency have not aimed at all to juxtapose their theoretical output with other approaches distinct from theirs. Further, in contrast with the commonly held assumption of discourse as being enacted and oriented toward objective interactional acts, cognitive psychology focuses specifically upon its abstract dimension alongside the logicality guiding its work as a system of reference; in effect, this inevitably stands as the missing point having long been skipped by preceding theoretical models. What sounds quite problematic at this stage, for Potter and Edwards (2003); Semin and Fiedler (as cited in Condor & Antaki, 1997), is the improper or deficient reference to discourse-relative-social clues within the theoretical material elaborated in both cognitive psychology as well as social cognition research, however. As such, the apparent weakness of these fields would urgently call for the inclusion of the analytical approach of sociolinguistics to language from the simultaneously outer discursive and inner cognitive viewpoints. One would give sociolinguistics it just dues, for it prompts a thorough approach to discourse with a multi-faceted capacity.

Out of the above intersection of inter-disciplinary conceptions, Potter (1998) reveals that the central target is presenting traditional partisans of social cognition with a discourse-linked approach to social psychology. In line with this trend, the researcher explains how discursive social psychology (DSPS), in its current form, has been evolving with much closer recourse to theoretical notions stemming from DA; this would act as distinctive marker of the 1980s. In effect, some of the seminal productions then were elaborated through collaborations undertaken by such scholars as: Potter and Litton as well as Potter and Wetherell (Potter and Litton; Potter and Wetherell as cited in Potter, 1998). Other fruitful notions provenance, in parallel, was that stemming from C A with the very objective of implementing them in the course of coping with cognitive and social matters at issue mainly the methodological clues available for interlocutors to fulfill social actions–the organizational frame of interaction inserted by social actors themselves into their communicative interchanges (Atkinson & heritage; Sacks as cited in Potter, 1998; Dew & Curl, 2008; Mills, 2004). For Potter, this fusion of interests has been such a frequent practice ever since to the degree of blurring the boundaries between such areas of study, consequently. With this regard, the examination of the use of "text and talk" alongside the mechanisms guiding this action, according to Potter and Edwards (2003), becomes the centre of attention for DSPS; in other words, what seems to inform this segment of research insightfully is the unprecedented fusion of "cognition and reality" with discourse from an analytical angle. Accordingly, this research task consists specifically in providing conclusive findings concerning the discursive representations of mental sets of stances, images, and perceptions of the outer world–how discourse as a medium encapsulates cognitive understandings of external scenes and events; in turn, how such mental constructions come to shape discourse socially speaking. This process, crucially, consists in prioritizing text and talk as a mirror and by product while portraying descriptively

a variety of topics to do with events and situations, people and their mental perceptions. Ultimately, what is commensurate with this theoretical trend is the inference-induced association between the "outer" as well as inner spheres: the cognitive-reality dimensions. To build cognitive structures as well as authentic situations in, the study framework of discursive psychologists owes much to DA and CA.

Working in conjunction with researchers and scholars from other fields is not something devoid of difficulties as it converges with several respects with possible weaknesses. As a matter of effect, this above-pointed- to project is remarkably multi-disciplinary, which suggests that the ensuing endeavor would have been challenging taking note of the fact of putting to the background aspects relating to such an interest , Potter and Edwards (2003) explain. In this respect, both of them have set forth to map out their joint enterprise to show how cognition had been previously tackled in sociolinguistics so as to re-adopt or re-visit it within the purview of DSPS. To achieve this aim, they look back at Stubbs's work (as cited in Potter & Edwards, 2003) based on cognition; it starts with the fundamental argument that sociolinguistics draws on "cognitivism" (mere focus on mental representations) in its address of experience, language, and cognition while covering such areas as: sexism, racism, court room cases, etc. At this point, although they recognize the prominence of Stubbs's work in sociolinguistics with the tremendous echo it has had, further extensions of study and clarifications specifically with DS are a matter of urgency, they claim. Accordingly, integrating cognition in discursive interchanges would eventually be at the heart of examination in DSPS. With regard to this process, the analytical paradigm of Stubbs covering racist discourse in particular has been the platform from which further empirical work would follow later. When delving into that highly sensitive register, Stubbs (as cited in Potter & Edwards, 2003) sheds light upon the way certain terms and words relating to racism would

remarkably foster a general mood of racism among entire populations with Germany being the most striking example. Meanwhile, with the fast spread of such powerful expressions as "scheinasylanten", not only a racist thought starts to materialize, but equally such "lexical creations" become major referents in daily interactions. Subsequently, these would much likely trigger inflexible stereotypes about others, notably immigrants and ethnic minorities; this state of affairs seems to corroborate the narrow link between the linguistic conduct on the one hand and the inner set of internalized conceptions and processes that govern humans' social activities (Stubbs as cited in Potter & Edwards, 2003; Van Dijk, 2000, 2008a, 2012, 2014a). This model, nonetheless, has manifested its shortcomings with time, Potter & Edwards, (2003) observe. Indeed, they draw attention to the important fact that lexis assuming a reference basis lacks empirical foundations. For them, such racist terms, firstly, pertain closer to cognitive social psychology; secondly, discourse doe not solely connect to mental conceptions but it can unfold a multitude of meanings exchanged in routine interactions. Despite the insights yielded by sociolinguistic theorizing, there is more to say about social interaction-cognition symbiosis or as in Potter and Edwards formulated question: how cognitive terms and references surface in communication?

1.1.5.2 Theoretical features of discursive social psychology.

In the course of elaborating their own theoretical and methodological model, experts in discursive social psychology acknowledge the necessity of building in more psychology-relating concepts to do with social activities. As a start, Potter and Wetherel (1987) advocate in favor of language appeal to psychologists since no social deed can be realizable without the support of the linguistic system. Actually, their interest falls within the purview of showing how communicative events with their intrinsic, complex processes require the sharing of

abstract "representational system". At this level, the scholars place language side by side with thinking as well as reasoning patterns; it is vital for their operational encapsulation. Henceforth, the omnipresence of the semiotic system in humans' interchanges across social domains renders its survey advantageous for this area (DSPS). Paradoxically, though language plays a crucial role in our lives, it has been unexplored up till the late 1960s. In effect, Potter and Wetherel hail the Chomskyan contribution as being typically influential in psycholinguistics during the 1960s and 1970s. With respect to such an orientation, they point out that Chomsky's theory centered particularly on introducing a grammar for the generation of chains of sentences. This line of theorizing is still greatly valued in psychology since it exposes the array of grammatical rules being constitutive of the "cognitive structures"; according to Chomsky (as cited in Potter & Wetheral, 1987), such structural rules act as representations any interaction actor must be cognizant of. I.e., he assumes that these networks epitomize the cognitive knowledge of interlocutors. Therefore, this testifies to the psychological dimension present in DSPS in general. As a result, Potter (2008) adopts a psychology-based approach in dealing with social interaction. In doing so, he seems to have centered his research work around the exploratory task of unraveling the role of cognition in discursive processes fundamental for successful communication. He argues that psychology with its constitutive features inevitably interferes in the distinct forms of interaction ranging from face-to-face, on the phone, through written texts, and social media as interactive new media, ultimately. Yet the integration of psychology-specific terms and concepts opens the horizon for further considerations, notably social and pragmatic. It would be inadmissible to ignore or neglect the role of psychological processes in the evolution of discursive examinations.

1.1.5.2.1 Contrasting perceptions of DA.

Discourse analysis (DA) is a discipline DSPS scholars turn to in carrying out empirical work. Indeed, DA or discourse studies (DS), as Potter and Wetherell (1987); Potter and Edwards (2003) claim, constitutes a source from which methodological tools and guiding principles can be exhausted; however, this respect itself has constantly been the locus for a big deal of theoretical perspectives regarding the study of discourse. This business has, ultimately, led to much perplexity concerning some of the basic terms throughout linguistics, psychology, sociology, anthropology, etc. Thereby, DA has been ascribed in accordance with stated perspectives. For instance, for those engaged in dealing with language use in social and cognitive contexts, DA is a common denominator. It is the descriptive explanation of structures larger than sentences. It refers to cohesion connections in texts, and draws on patterns of turn taking, and borrows from studies of semiotics and structuralism provenance, and focuses on issues of truth, power, knowledge, and institutions (Brown & Yule as cited in Potter &Wetherell, 1987; Coulthard; Van Dijk as cited in Potter & Wetherell, 1987; Van Dijk, 1989, 1990, 1991a, 1991b, 2000, 2014a, 2003; Stubbs as cited in Potter & Wetheral 1987; Widdowson, 2004; Wodak & Busch, 2004; Tannen; Van Dijk & Kintch as cited in Potter & Wetherell, 1987; de Beaugrande & Dressler, 1981; Foucault; Pêcheux as cited in Potter & Wetherell, 1987, as cited in Mills ,2004; Foucault as cited in Mills, 2004). As such, one can get easily confused by all that range of definitions of terms and operational concepts to do with discourse study.

In spite of this myriad of discursive perceptions presented so far, discourse has continued to be utilized differently across disciplines but with varying benefits for DSPS. Gilbert and Mulkay (as cited in Potter &Wetherell, 1987, as cited in Potter, 1998) see discourse as all types of "talk and writing", while some, Sinclair and Coulthard (as cited in Potter & &Wetheral, 1987, 1992), present it as how spoken structures (talk) are combined together and

described in terms of length–"rank scale". Besides, Foucault (as cited in Potter & Wetherell, as cited in Mills, 2004) assumes that discourse implies evolutionary practices of language which work under certain historical factors; moreover, discourse is supposed to generate the larger social context: perceptions and their intended impacts. These spawn the spaces where discursive activities are undertaken by proponents of divergent groups. At the other end, focusing specifically on the situational nature of language, Halliday (as cited in Potter &Wetherell, 1987, 2003); Halliday and Hasan (1989) distinguishes DA from strictly textual analysis. Simultaneously, as linguistics and pragmatics, Potter and Wetherell, (1987) explain, intersect they add "social awareness" to the study of language; nevertheless, this does not make part of this endeavor. Discursive social psychologists are rather focused on social interaction and the social reality structure by examining socially generated texts. Also, they have skipped research relevant to both discourse/cognition and purely linguistic issues like text linguistics. There is interestingly a large amount of reference to such areas in terms of terms and concepts fitting the theoretical needs of experts in DSPS; Potter and Wetherell conclude that the introduction of DA, as an approach, in their specialty of research has contributed greatly to the fresh perspective in analyzing social texts.

1.1.5.2.2 Words as actions: saying vs. doing.

In addition to the DA-based methodology and approach to texts adopted in DSPS, Austin's revolutionary theory has been appealed to likewise. To start with, Potter and Wetherell (1987) state that the newly elaborated conception of language and its potential of performing things socially have influenced a vast range of scholars in several fields; in actual effect, Austin's main aim has consisted in exposing the weakness of the common view of conceiving language, which centers on "truth or falsehood" criteria in treating it as having sense. In other

words, the primary role of language as an abstract system lies in reality "*descriptions*" as true

or false to earn its meaningfulness. They comment, "…Austin's argument was directed at a

wide swathe of views of language which take it to be an abstract system whose central

function is the descriptions of affairs" (PP.14-15). This statement stands as proof of the

convergence between DSPS and Austin's speech act theory "SAT", in brief. Here, Austin (as

cited in Potter & Wetherell, 1987, 1962) remarks that certain sentences need to be classified

as "*doing*"; when they are put in convenient contexts, they spur actions– "sentences

performing acts". Significantly, specific circumstances must exist for such actions to fully

take effect, Potter and Wetherell (1987); Mazid (2014), Austin (1962) observe. Moreover,

those regulatory conditions are termed "felicity conditions" (FCs), commonly assumed results

(effects). At this level, compatibility of participants with circumstances is instantly established

by means of applying such procedures rightly as well as entirely. In other words, the scholars

stress that speakers and listeners ought to possess particular conceptions alongside intentions

indicated in the practical procedure; in turn, this recommends certain forms of conduct on

which acts are dependent. Accordingly, Searle (as cited in Mazid, 2014) proposes four types

of FCs: (a) "propositional content" when there is some sort of information, (b) "preparatory"

producer–writer/speaker–is aware of the correctness– "truth content information", (c)

"sincerity" one embraces truthfully what he/she utters, (d) "essential" SA is expected to

trigger some effect. All in all, Austin, Potter & Wetherell (1987) remind, totally rejects the

descriptive feature of statements (constatives) in favor of performances ("performatives").

Austin's contribution has bridged the gap between utterances and actions socially performed;

this seems to run counter the truth/falsehood conception of language.

In the end, seeing things from an evaluative standpoint, Austin's SAT seems to have weighed heavily in DSPS. In corroboration of this extrapolation, Potter and Wetherell (1987) place higher his insights when it comes to the orientation of the social perspective of language; it has opened up new horizons for psychologists to put under scrutiny language from a functional angle.

1.1.5.2.3 Performing talking ethno methodology.

Another area that discursive social psychology specialists have been intrigued with while orienting toward theorizing bout discourse and social reality is ethno methodology. Initially, with the social conceptions it embodies, Potter and Wetherell (1987) have noticed how their whole project would be enriched with the replicable findings emanating from this sub-discipline. They have seen in it, as an approach, a very close investigation ("ology") of the methods resorted to regularly by subjects ("ethno") to manufacture and manage their social affairs ("activities"); of course, discourse stands amid the arena of daily deeds. That is to say, ethno methodology, defined by Gafinkel, (as cited in Drew & Curl, 2009), rests upon the social aspect accompanying the construction, negotiation, and understanding of social actions, which forms the object of study. Also, it must be indicated that the consideration of such a major dimension makes part of interactants' own purposes in the same way as learned social observers, potter and Wetherell let know. Moreover, they go on about this arguing that by rightly making sense of social instances, they can perfectly and practically accommodate themselves to them; the overall matter is contingent on earned conceptions. Such activated understandings foster the dissection of social actions in common interactions to pilot them effectively toward intended goals (Drew & Curl, 2009). In this theoretical destination, notorious gurus in this field are tempted to find out about how jury members in courts invoke

their wealth of knowledge along with the necessary skills so as to contrast "facts" to "opinions" while carrying out their duties as jurors on a reasonable basis. Significantly, rescuing skills, for Potter and Wetherell, are manipulated non-stop, so in the course of jointly enacting situational interactions, participants have to familiarize themselves on spot with the typical social characteristics underlying them. By implication, it would be concluded that experiential knowledge, for discursive psychologists amounts to centrality when it is a question of investigating communicative encounters.

1.1.6 Critical Discourse Analysis as an approach

1.1.6.1 The roots of CDA: from critical linguistics (CL) to CDA.

The origins of critical discourse analysis (CDA) are worth focus. To start, Weiss and Wodak (as cited in Al Sharkawy, 2017) trace the early beginnings CDA to respectively traditional Rhetorics, applied linguistics, sociolinguistics, pragmatics, and text linguistics. On their parts, Van Dijk (as cited in El Sharkawy, 2017); Nickerson (2022) explain that CDA owes much of its working value to the critical perspective underpinning the School of Frankfurt and its ensuing "critical theory". This practically fresh tendency to social critique common among the school fellows aims to trigger a true, non-enforced apprehension of reality for social members (Horkheimer as cited in Nickerson, 2022). Moreover, Neo-marxist sociologists, notably Foucault and Pêcheux, could push the theory further, Van Dijk (as cited in Al Sharkawy, 2017) states. These have been mainly concerned with such concepts like ideology in connection to discourse; the latter works as a tool expressing and disseminating ideologies. In this case, Foucault (as cited in Al Sharkawy, 2017) places attention on knowledge, and he simultaneously points out the way contextual interaction

contributes to its affirmation and reinforcement via discourse. Discursive practices do not only arise within the socio-cultural systems of common sense, but they also constantly encapsulate it in the customary fulfillment of interpersonal needs.

In spite of the seemingly promising sociological insights with respect to discursive exchanges, Chomsky (as cited in Wodak, 2001) indicates how the prevailing linguistic study has mostly centered on the formal dimension; this, according to Levinson (as cited in Wodak, 2001), has been far away from any overt considerations of extra information accompanying language in use. In addition, Hymes and Labov (as cited in Wodak, 2001) focus on the textual dimension as it is a pervasive feature of the then pragmatic and sociolinguistic studies of language. They, however, do not exclude the fact that language in connection with context has begun taking over as a novel orientation in some works; for instance, Wodak evokes de Beaugrande and Dressler's assumption based on the link between language and the socio-cultural institutions. Despite the observable scarcity of descriptions of language in association with society, there have been some tries to go along this path.

In addition to the afore-mentioned material, Svetanant (as cited in Al Sharkawy, 2017) stresses that basic notions incorporated in CDA owe much to both social theorists and linguists' academic output. Indeed, the consideration of language in connection with society has led to the coinage of such terms– "discursive practices", "discursive formations", and "discursive regularities" – whose use relates closely to power and control in society in terms of knowledge and ideological representations. Nevertheless, Fowler et al. (as cited in Al Sharkawy, 2017);Wodak (2001); and Baker and Ellege (2011) backtrack to the early 1970s as

these represented the outset of an emergent trend in addressing language in association with the social institutions (context) mainly in the U.K. and Australia; this field is critical linguistics (CL). At that point, critical linguists' attention was directed toward the functional aspect of language. Obviously, its task of installing and reinforcing power-based social relations were seen as a watershed in traditional linguistics. In fact, Kress (as cited in Wodak, 2001), elaborating on the background of CL, evokes a project carried out by a group of researchers at the University of East Anglia which consisted in exploring language in connection with socially built institutions. In other words, they set out to describe and clarify what Fairclough (1989) calls the "dialectic of social structures and [discursive] practices". The latter, in fact, notes that interpersonal interactions obey dominant social institutions for their effective operations; in turn, such discursive acts contribute to the perpetuity or even the complete disappearance of those social structures. Wodak (2001); Baker and Ellece (2011) additionally, deem some scholars' contributions notably–Fairclough, Kress and Fowler, Kress and Hodge, Wodak, and Van Dijk– as pioneering in the creation of the field of CL. These outlined the main assumptions and methodologies inherent in CL. One would say that CL is the ancestor of CDA.

Like CDA, CL, which had been a major source of inspiration for it, has, according to Rogers (as cited in Al sharkawy, 2017); Baker and Ellece (2011), built on Hallidays' Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG). In support of this very point, they expose the significant contribution of SFG by pointing to both "patterns of experience" and "patterns of ideologies"; in reality, these had been inspiring to critical linguists as these could enable them to access the functional dimension in their analytical enterprises. I.e., SFG's main assumption explicates how social phenomena come into being via discourse. In this sense, language in use works as a tool empowering its users to give vent to their experiences of world matters as well

as ideological standpoints, which means the overall linguistic system links narrowly to both individual as well as social aims. Therefore, Language has become inextricable from the social context. Additionally, for Al sharkawy (2017) and Wodak (2001), scholars in CL, and later in CDA, need to perceive language as primarily performing three functions:

- **The ideational function** relates to ideological stances toward different issues, events, and situations; it allows language to reflect social reality and, at once, fortify or maintain it;

- **The interpersonal function** stands for interlocutors' respective roles during the discursive act; social positions and statuses contribute to the effective progress of interaction; i.e., it is about existing relationships between interactants;

- **The textual function** branches to the overall structure of text in question; in other words, it is the organization of ideas in terms of cohesion as well as coherence. Besides, this same structure keys language items to their social container: texture allows interactants to connect language to social structures.

 On their parts, Wodak; Baker and Ellece briefly but precisely point out that not only has SFG been of worthy contribution to CDA, CL, and even DA, but also has been so the sociolinguistic insights of Bernstein alongside those of conversation analysis (CA) and SAT. Besides, the former theorist apparently furthers the influential scope by referring to other supposedly valuable works elaborated by sociologists as well as literary critics–Pêcheux, Bakhtin, Voloshinov, and Habermars. Wodak, in this register, draws attention to the intricate, multi-dimensional connection between language and society as postulated by critical linguists; henceforth, any approach to explore such a complex relationship must be

interdisciplinary in nature. The multi-disciplinary approach of language in relation to society is a fact.

Stressing the value of CL in the subsequent years, Fowler et al. (as cited in Al Sharkawi, 2017); Baker and Ellece (2011) show how this new tendency has had a great influence on CDA. In effect, Fowler et al., Halliday, and Van Leeuwen (as cited in Al Sharkawi, 2017) concurrently accentuate the fact that the interrelation between linguistic structure and social structure has been so pervasive that would subsequently culminate in a generically analytical scheme. The latter specifically recommends examining the outer grammatical layout; in turn, this can act as the full encapsulation of the system of ideologies ruling social attitudes to the surrounding world. Thus, thanks to CL's extension of the scope of study beyond the formal level, CDA practitioners could catalyze language approach including grammar as a starting point to unveil the tacitly signaled institutions of socio-cultural norms and values: in Halliday's own terms (as cited in Al Sharkawi, 2017) "social critique". Ultimately, Van Dijk's comment regarding the overlap between CL and CDA (as cited in Al Sharkawi, 2017) seems to sum it all, "… [CL and CDA] are at most a shared perspective in doing linguistic, semiotic or discourse analysis" (P. 6). Nevertheless, it would be worthy to draw attention to Bellig and Wodak's reminder (as cited in Al Sharkawi, 2017); Nickerson (2022) that CDA in its current form emerged as a counter reaction to the "asocial" as well as "uncritical" or traditional trends prevalent in the 1960s and 1970s. This may suggest that in spite of the earlier valuable attempts in critical linguistics to link language to society, arriving at more conclusive findings has proven very challenging then; the following years would witness more efforts sparking scholarship on the social background governing language work. The term critical of CL has served CDA so tremendously that it has become one of its kernel constituents.

Wodak (as cited in Mazid, 2014, 2001) goes on covering the evolution of CDA in the following years. In fact, she evokes the "Scientific Peer Group", which was founded in the dawn of the 1990s as the outcome of a symposium held in Amsterdam. The latter could assemble a panoply of experts in the respective fields of discourse, power, control, and ideology, such as: Teun A. Van Dijk, Norman Fairclough, Gunther Kress, Teo Van Leeuwen, and Wodak. In addition, this group took on the appellation of CDA. Besides, she continues adding how each scholar benefited from that intellectual occasion to introduce various theoretical frameworks about text and discourse; this has launched both today's dividing lines as well as common grounds in CDA. On the one hand, there exists a constellation of theoretical and methodological perspectives on discourse and text; on the other hand, scholars must stick to the tradition of defending their respective approaches. For example, Fairclough pioneered in this respect; he elaborated his "three-level paradigm". The latter consists of: (a) "Description" addressing the textual examination at all levels, and corresponding with Halliday's Systemic Functional Grammar-based critical linguistics, (b) "interpretation" establishing the close link between text, as a product and resource, and communication, (c) "explanation" focusing on the existing link between communication and social context with its role in determining the course of interaction (Baker & Ellece, 2011). The fusion of theoretical variants in CDA has provided a great deal of contribution to the demystification of discursive practices in the socio-cultural environment alongside their requirements and parametres.

At once, Wodak (2001); Mazid (2014) show how the outcome of the afore-mentioned symposium has been a watershed in CDA. A series of collaborative projects with different approaches have followed successively in the form of journals and books: Van Dijk's *Discourse and Society*, 1990; Fairclough's *Language and Power*, 1989; Wodak's *Language*

and Ideology, 1989; Van Dijk's *Prejudice in Discourse*, 1984. Besides, exchange programmes like the European Community Action Scheme for the Mobility of University Students (ERASMUS) have been set up with the aim of encouraging the interchange of views among researchers and scholars of different schools. Actually, both scholars are unanimous in their assertion that the 1990s, with flourishing conferences and collaborations on DA and CDA, constituted a milestone in general linguistics: CDA has emerged as an autonomous perspective whose approach to language deviated toward studying the linguistic system in relation to the socio-cultural-structures. This orientation to the examination of language in use has been the result of divergent, but collaborative, CDA-based perspectives.

1.1.6.2What CDA is concerned with (basic principles and aims).

1.1.6.2.1 The Philosophical basis of critical theory.

Before going over the major concerns of CDA and philosophical influences of critical theory, it would be useful to evoke how Davis and Koller (as cited in Mazid, 2014) present a dual specification of the term discourse making up CDA. Firstly, they refer to discourse as an uncountable noun signaling the use of language in the social context; our communicative acts are the bearers of social meanings. Secondly, they present discourse as being countable. To them, this latter function deals with the different attitudes as well as perceptions toward social reality encapsulated via their relevant discourses. In other words, such discourses are expressive of a range of stances on different issues, so, in this context, there surface a variety of discourses over social matters–politics, economics, business, banking, racism, discrimination, religion, etc. Besides, different social stances shape up their corresponding structures, which, in turn, come to reinforce and fortify them; henceforth, through this

correlation one must point to the term "discourse genre". This represents the type of discourse adopted (political discourse, economic discourse, religious discourse, sexist and non-sexist discourse, etc). Simultaneously, such perceptions are typical of particular groups and subgroups that have to strive to make their viewpoints known in all respects of life. For instance, one can evoke the sexist vs. non-sexist discourses in politics. Discourses are in constant search of domination and propagation in society.

It is from these initial considerations that we will set out to cover the philosophical implications emanating from critical theory for CDA. Indeed, Wodak (as cited in Abidi, trans. 2016; Wodak & Busch, 2004) remind how CDA has a multitude of theoretical tenets from a variety of fields–philosophy, rhetorics, sociolinguistics, anthropology, social psychology, pragmatics, epistemology, linguistics, text linguistics, and stylistics. Moreover, Abidi (trans.2016) stresses Marxism as being the common point holding all the disciplines together throughout works preceding and following the inception of CDA. This doctrine has received different conceptions; nonetheless, the critical vision constitutes an intrinsic feature of Marxism, which has been quite beneficial for eventual CDA works. For instance, such thinkers, such as Marx and Engels (as cited in Jessop, 2017) have critically reacted to certain ideological trends; they have advocated a novel, material approach in studying how humans proceed in building and organizing their physical existence to achieve their aims ("needs") and proliferate as a "species" with a life order. As a recapitulation, Marxism has had considerable influence on other fields of study including CDA with the critical perspective it embodies.

Providing a historical background, Abidi (trans. 2016) refers to the generation of philosophers having laid the foundations for critical theory during the period from 1930s to

the 1960s in which the work of Horkheimer would prove decisive in introducing his critical theory in the broad academic research. Concerning this point, Horkheimer, of the Frankfurt School, (as cited in Abidi trans. 2016) maintains that the very use of critical pertains specifically to the dialectical, critical approach to political economy. Actually, he emphasizes the economic dimension in any ideological struggle. Therefore, analysis devoid of any examination of the economic aspect cannot attain the status of criticism since the role of economy in those times centered essentially around determining social relationships alongside prevalent ideologies. Remarkably, he preaches, like most critical theorists of the school the intergration of the philosophical principles in the surveys of social sciences to arrive at foregrounding the "moral" duty of liberating the oppressed and subdued (Horkheimer as cited in Nickerson, 2022). Equally important, as remarked by Abidi (trans.2016), would be the works of Lucastch and Kurtch. Indeed, following the failure of the communist revolts in Germany and Hungary, they engaged in inserting a fresh impetus to Marxism. To achieve this aim, they built on the prominent success of the Bolshevic Revolution in the USSR alongside the need to resist the capitalist ideology. In effect, Lucastch (as cited in Abidi trans., 2016) rejects admitting uncritically the Marxist's theoretical findings. Rather, a re-consideration of its methodological bases formed the essence of his interest. In addition to the above account, the same thinker observes how criticism counts considerably as the direct outcome of human deeds for existence. In fact, ideology, in any society corresponds with the elites imposing their relevant life perceptions upon the proletariat to have strict control over their lifestyles. This lower class, therefore, must develop full awareness regarding the actual conditions so as they can subsequently resist such repression. This consciousness constitutes an integral part of the social members' historical responsibility as it exposes the continuity in the state of things at the social level, moreover. On their part, Marx and Engels (as cited in

Abidi trans. 2016) qualify ideology as being the extension of elitism (dominant attitudes) whose aim consists in sustaining its material hegemony; one would immediately equate between such hegemony and ideological domination. Ultimately, Engels's term "lying consciousness", later re-produced as "false consciousness", (as cited in Abidi trans. 2016; Nickerson, 2022; Van Dijk, 2000, 2003) paints a clear picture of such imposed perceptions. The economic hegemony has for long formed the core of ideology.

The second generation, according to Abidi (trans. 2016), represented the length of time from the 1960s up to 1990s. Actually, this was acting under the leadership of such social thinkers; one of the most prominent figures of the German school of criticism was Habermars. Again, the Marxist influence was quite pervasive throughout the school protagonists' works including Habermars' contribution. In this respect, by adopting a critical approach to society and politics, he readily acquiesces to the Marxist perspective regarding history and social evolution. He, in effect, equates ideology with social consciousness both at the theoretical and practical levels; consequently, anyone tackling ideology must adopt a critical approach that primarily seeks to unravel powerful groups and their practices to maintain their control. Furthermore, Habermars, (as cited in Abidi trans. 2016); Nickerson (2022) criticize the elite's institutions-imposed (political and economic) ideology in society because it often presented and diffused a delusive picture of reality attempting to conceal the harshness of the social conditions among the grassroots and depriving them of any discursive variety ("real democracy"). Correspondingly, the social thinker advocated, sticking to the principles of critical theory, a critical address to society in terms of dominant ideologies with the very objective of eradicating them and spurring their substitution with tolerant, democratic ones. In order to insert more insights into critical theory, Habermars and his peers, for Abidi, put much focus on social sciences and psychology, on the one hand, and discourse and social

interaction, on the other. It would be fair to acknowledge the crucial role of such scholars in determining the significance of critique in CDA; with the renewal of their social perspectives, they could pave the way for the incorporation of the critical approach in the study of discourse embodying social inequalities.

1.1.6.3 The ideological and power dimensions of language.

1.1.6.3.1 Critical, language, ideology, power, and dominance.

Being a fundamental notion in CDA, Wodak (2001), Wodak and Busch (2004), Van Dijk (1989) unanimously remind, "critique" has received different conceptions on the part of scholars in general. Whereas some have perceived it from the Frankfurt School's standpoint, others have drawn on the conceptual framework of literary criticism, and certain researchers have endorsed Marxist ideas. For CDA, on the other hand, critique or critical normally stands for data collection and their placement within their relevant socio-cultural environment. In this respect, the criteria intrinsic in the practice of CDA revolve specifically around unveiling relations of power and control (power abuse) that are activated and transmitted via discourse, and the consequential social injustices. Indeed, this must, still according to them, call for the adoption of a straightforwardly overt political stance in due course. In other words, to engage in CDA, analysts need firstly to reveal their socio-political standpoints while undertaking their critical missions. This is, actually, indicative of particular reflections upon given topics of investigation–racism, sexism, discrimination, xenophobia, Islamo-phobia, etc. In a nutshell, we would point to Wodak and Busch's (2004) advocacy in favor of dissecting the notions of *discourse* alongside *critical* since these jointly make up the backbone of any critical discourse analysis approach.

Taking account of the above, Van Dijk (as cited in Wodak, 2001, 1989) observes how critical science is more versed in covering issues to do with the domination exercised by those holding power, those being under control, and those providing solutions to resist social hegemony. More importantly, critical analysts refer to powerful groups (elites) who activate, perpetuate, and legitimize structures of power and dominance through discourse; such experts are in constant endeavor to assist subjected communities in confronting the elites' control. In effect, dealing with discourse systematically and adopting politically critical attitudes toward those detaining power and unfairly utilizing it to their advantage (critique) automatically make of discourse analysts not only social and political experts, but also activists as well. Most importantly of all, what matters most in carrying out such studies is applying their findings in various spheres of life to spark change; in short, the practice of CDA involves the exposition of ethical issues with the very aim of establishing social equality and justice by defending the rights of disenfranchised groups. Hence, the practical reasons underlying CDA revolve around provoking the public's awareness ("consciousness") about discourse as a tool for power and dominance; consciousness can lead to firmly resisting the established power structures in society and eventually to bring in change (Fairclough, 1989). Discourse analysts set out to offer critical discourse accounts of the social parties concerned with the power relations and domination in order to transform the status quo altogether.

At the same time, the overall task of undertaking CDA, as assumed by Van Dijk (1989), seems, by no means, to be at hand. According to him, endorsing a discursive critique is very hard to cope with given that it implies the necessity of taking in-depth considerations relating to the complex relationship between discourse, on the one hand, and society, culture, domination structures, and power on the other. Thus, a multidisciplinary perspective sounds inevitable if conclusive findings are to be achieved. To make the previous objective

realizable, CDA must cautiously lay the foundations for elaborate theories as well as large-scale empiricism (observation, descriptive methods, and explanation), for these elements stand as the pillars of the socio-political study, in effect. I.e., this is exactly what Fairclough's definition (as cited in Van Dijk, 1989) highlights as "operational criteria" for CDA. However, Van Dijk emphatically evokes the fact of the "human agency" expected to spur authentic change on the social scene; civil rights movements and social uprisings are the products of subjects themselves though this evidence does, by no means, reduce the initiatives undertaken by critical discourse analysts as secondary roles; actually, they are the architects of consciousness rising. Furthermore, the scholar reminds that the late decades have universally witnessed a remarkable rise in social dilemmas–discrimination, racist acts, social inequality, repression, religious intolerance, etc. Such issues cannot escape being a fertile ground for analysts' explorations and expositions in which the adopted CDA criteria would give a fresh impetus to the enlightenment of those subjected to the elites' power-and-dominance structures with CDA experts being unabashed by the virulent criticisms of those elites.

In line with what is stated above, the focus on the narrow connection between language and ideology has constituted, according to Fairclough (1989); Wodak and Busch (2004) a decisive leap forward. In fact, the former insists that this novelty of interest in discourse as a source of ideological power in the social sciences owes much of its evolution to social scholars notably: Bourdieu, Foucault, and Habermars. These have comprehended and unveiled the ideological aspect of language in the course of people's quest for power and control.To provide adequate evidence for this central CDA assumption, he puts it this way, "…the exercise of power" (P. 2). Indeed, the theorist emphatically explains how language has undoubtedly earned such a significant place in the course of practicing CDA due to its correlation with power and ideology in society that would be quite inconceivable to find a

study devoid of this linkage. In other words, it is in the sphere of language in use that power

and domination are tacitly communicated; as a matter fact, discursive acts across daily scenes

constitute the perfect proof of the re-production of unfair relations of control among social

groups in terms of–classes, sex, religion, age, ethnicity, etc– which signals that society can

come under ideological implications of discourse (Wodak & Busch, 2004). Consequently,

language must have its fair share of analytical treatment, for it not only embodies ideological

stances and power, it also strengthens power institutions alongside their relevant ideologies.

Focusing on power, Fairclough articulates that this very notion has received broad

treatment. This fact, actually, denotes that power can unfold to get in touch with other, more

or less, authentic forms like the recourse to coercive warfare. One would illustrate with the

U.S. having resort to military force in its invasion of Iraq in 2003. Thinking back in time, this

presentation of power stems originally from the Marxist conception of how it has been

concretely and typically enacted by the "state apparatus" in favor of the "others" detaining

power (Foucault, 1977/1980). Nonetheless, Fairclough (1989) readily discriminates between

power practices through coercion (oppression via physical and psychological violence) and

those relative to the commonly known "manufacture of consent" in society. For him, and

other CDA fellows like Van Dijk (2000), the second identification of power represents the

basis for the relations of power as an established order at the societal level, in fact. Besides,

what is worthy of attention for Fairclough is the fact that ideology plays a primordial role as a

means whereby consent and consensus crystallize; that is, ideology allows powerful groups as

well as individuals to exert their dominance over the disenfranchized ones and oblige them to

act according to certain ideological agendas. Back to the US-led invasion of Iraq; if any one

had thought this act was intended to usurp its natural resources, it would have been deemed as

"conspiracy theory" by the American establishment; likewise, if there had been any

endorsement of the formerly Soviet ideological system of power, it would have been

denounced as a support for "totalitarianism" by Westerners (Chomsky, 2013; Foucault,

1977/1980). This stands as irrefutable evidence for why language and ideology are closely

intertwined: language diffuses and reinforces ideological structures; in turn, these give life to

linguistic interaction by filling texts with encoded stances and attitudes. In effect, language, as

Mazid (2014) stresses, constitutes a powerful tool of influence on others leading even to their

harm; for instance, he refers to the propagation of socially sensitive problems –

discrimination, prejudice, stereotypes, sexism, racism, etc, which accounts lucidly for the

political nature of language in being an influential tool. Overall, language, ideology, and

power are so inextricably related that none of them could be touched upon separately.

With reference to the homogeneous trilogy– power, ideology, and language–, it would be

useful to avert our attention to the social organizations under which discourse is continually at

work. In this register, Fairclough (1995a) regards social institutions as embodying a wide

variety of "Ideological Discursive Formations" (IDFs) which operate within distinct "speech

communities" (groups). Briefly, each social institution has several IDFs (communities); most

of the time, an IDF can occupy a higher-ranking position than other ones as a dominating

speech entity (community). The latter relies on mechanisms regulating both discursive acts

and ideologies encapsulated via discourse itself. Additionally, members of such IDFs need to

act in compliance with the discursive as well as ideological norms ruling them given that

powerful IDFs are capable of rendering particular ideologies widely endorsed by other speech

communities as "common sense". I.e., power-based relations obey the IDFs imposed by

dominant groups. At this level, Van Dijk (2000), as we will explain, speaks about the

equivalent concept of "false consciousness" forming the essence of the imposed common

sense. In his earlier work, Fairclough (1989), sticking to the same consensual means

(discourse, power, domination, and ideology), uses a synonymous term –social "convention"–as the set of regulatory norms of all kinds of behavior including the communicative one. Furthermore, he carries on explaining that these are grounded in ideologies or, borrowing his own term, "common sense assumptions" associated with power relations in various walks of life. For instance, one would refer to the academic contexts of university where obedience in highly required. Ultimately, he emphasizes the significance of ideology for language, power, and dominance over others; nowadays, this closely knit interrelationship represents the new archetype of hegemony. Social interaction works under the strict regulations of controlling IDFs (social conventions) with their systems of ideological representations as well as discursive occurrences.

When it comes to CDA, it is highly recommended, according to Fairclough (1995a), that the set of naturalized ideologies upholding speech communities should be tackled critically. In effect, the intention underlying this deed turns around unraveling attitudes to world issues and other groups. Importantly, he advocates the adoption of a thorough study that consists in tackling both micro as well as macro aspects relevant to interpersonal communication; in short terms, analysts need to pinpoint the way social structures–ideology-based institutions– construct discourse, which, in turn, helps sustaining them. This, for the critical discourse scholar, runs obviously counter to the uniquely micro, non-explanatory tendency that aims to minimize the globally descriptive approach to discourse in connection with society by exposing and avoiding the shortcomings of this partially descriptive enterprise. That is, as well as discourse analysts, linguists, too, should place much attention upon such crucial concepts as "power" and "social conditions" because these form the starting point from which any CDA endeavor unfolds to shed light on the interactional process and to uncover the overlap between discourse, society, ideology, power, and domination.

1.1.6.3.2 Orderliness and naturalization.

Concerning the mechanisms underlying interaction, Fairclough (1995a) explicates how the notion of "orderliness" regulates discursive events in people's everyday lives. At this stage of proceeding analytically, he is focused on the commonly adhered to "background knowledge" ("BGK") as the core of social exchanges; the scholar shows that the latter is made up of a set of naturalized ideologies– he terms precisely "ideological representations". To him, these can be presented as generic common sense; similarly, Van Dijk (2000, 2014a, 2014b) on his part refers to ideologies in their variety as socially embraced ideas. In the mean time, the analyst reveals anew that the critical goals of CDA study must be directed towards the exposition of the practical workings of the social structures guiding the construction and reception of discourse and the other way round. In other words, how discursive occasions naturalize certain systematic agendas of ideologies ought to come under the analytical lens of researchers and scholars, likewise. To provide evidence to the necessity of prompting this empirical move, Fairclough stresses the inaccessibility of the range of ideologies to participants in interaction as a compelling reason calling for in-depth survey of the interpersonal process of communication. Discursive actions cannot disengage from the networks of socially shared knowledge nor can these do so.

In the light of these presented facts, Fairclough (1995a); Van Dijk (1989, 2014b) with their peers, sound quite on the same wave length when it comes to the development of an all-inclusive approach to discourse (micro level) and social structures (macro level). Indeed, what has long been more or less neglected in critical discourse studies beforehand seems, for Fairclough, to have found its appropriate place amid the process of descriptively covering the "orderliness" of discursive exchanges. Such situational interactions, as presupposed by this

one, assume the forms of interpersonal turn-taking parameters that must fit interactional

contexts' requirements; in clearer terms, participants' discourses need to display complete

compatibility with their interlocutors' respective statuses up or down the social scale. In

addition, as these interactional norms are embedded in discourse, they need to be inferred by

participants during contextual communication. Significantly, the orderliness of discourse

relying on the theorist's own words "…in the particular sense of coherence within and

between turns, and its [orderliness of discourse] dependence on naturalized ideologies" (P.

28). By carefully considering this quotation, one would come up with the conclusion that

ideology acts as the pivot on which the interaction-managing orderliness of discursive

occurrences revolve.

Besides the fundamentally ideological dimension upholding the discursive orderliness

between interlocutors, social conformity seems to be a sine qua non. At this stage of

dissecting and exposing the present state of things, Fairclough (1995a, 1989) overtly

foregrounds the social acceptance of BGK as implicitly conveyed propositions– knowledge

taken as true or "given". In the analyst's sense, this should be equated with Coward and Elis's

(as cited in Fairclough, 1995a) "unified and consistent subject"; nonetheless, for Van Dijk

(2014b), while one community ("epistemic community" from his theoretical perspective)

might vouch for the accuracy and truth of certain knowledge, another one could possibly

spurn it as lacking grounds of truth. In fact, the mention of this latter fact leads us straight to

Foucault's (as cited in Mills, 2003) skepticism toward prevalent common sense, for it is

ideologically charged and probably partial. Thus, by defying frequent modes of thinking, he

seems to run counter to general knowledge endorsed as common sense. Social conformity and

relativity of knowledge are to be well considered as the bases of discursive negotiations

involving power relations and resistance.

Conclusion

In elaborating the first chapter, we have come across many disciplines whose findings all together intersect in CDA. Firstly, we have, initially, covered the field of text linguistics with its insightful contributions to the study of discourse (cohesion, coherence, situationality, informativity, intentionality and acceptability, ellipses, reference, etc.). Secondly, we have moved to the multidisciplinary field of DA, which embeds language in its immediate social context. At this level, we have gone across text/ discourse differentiation, the lingering complexity of the latter, language as social semiotics, the centrality of it social function, contextual stratification and meta-functions along with register variations. Thirdly, we have dealt with pragmatics' intersection of interest with DA; our main focus has been directed to speech act theory and the ensuing functions of speech acts (locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary). We have, after that, dived into sociolinguistics. The foundations as well as evolution of the field have been highlighted. Also, notions of power, language, and social diversity have come under scrutiny. Next, in discursive and social psychology, we have come across the interrelation between sociolinguistics, cognitivism, pragmatics, ethnomethodology, and DSPS when it comes to language use in social context and resulting effects with the assistance of knowledge shared socially. Last but not least, CDA, as an approach in the study of discourse, has been looked at historically; besides, its basic principles have been clarified as well. These range from such as terms as power, language, ideology, and dominance; also, explanations of how these are utilized to maintain the status quo of power abuse and social inequalities and how such social orders can be resisted and even subverted by the disenfranchised are undertaken.

Chapter two The Advent of the Sociocognitve Trend in Discourse Study:

Van Dijk's Social Cognition Model as a CDA Approach

Introduction

After going through the major disciplines that have so far tackled language from distinct angles up to those perceiving it as a social phenomenon, we now direct our scope to one of the most influential trends in CDA: Social cognition. The Second chapter, in actuality, branches into the rise of the sociocognitive penchant in treating language in use; it specifically throws light upon Dijk's theory of context basing on his socio-cognitive perspective, which in turn draws on a variety of complementary areas such− discourse, ideology, sociology, cognition, power, psychology, knowledge, epistemology, politics, etc. Next, Van Dijk's approach to media discourse analysis is addressed with discriminatory and racist discourses being the by-products of media socially speaking. Finally, the chapter ends with showing how racism is a type of shared ideology.

2.1 Towards a Socio-Cognitive Theory of Context: from Cognition to Social Cognition

2.1.1 Ideas

To start, it would be logical to refer to Van Dijk's (2000, 2003) reported definitions of ideology over the years to serve as the basis for further in-depth exploration of it. In this respect, he relates that ideas, being a part of the field of ideology, have been initially addressed under the philosophical scope of the French Enlightenment. Later, ideologies could not escape being attributed the discreditable quality of dominance over people; indeed, they

have been seen as a set of misleading perceptions imposed by elites upon the lower classes'

living circumstances. More elaborate conceptions of ideologies would turn around the concept

of "false consciousness", eventually. Still, somehow associated with domination, firmly

established perceptions (ideas) are enforced on less powerful citizens with regard to their

respective social roles, positions, and the overall order of society where they belong. In other

words, such a system of ideas has been incorporated into their common sense. In connection

with this situation, Van Dijk clarifies:

> As a more sophisticated version of "false consciousness", ideologies were later
>
> described in terms of the persuasive, hegemonic ideas being accepted by dominated
>
> groups as part of their common sense about the nature of society and their place in it.
>
> (P. 15)

In short, ideologies have been equated with social hegemony which would not tolerate reverse

thinking as well as outlooks. Ideology has been determining in terms of social order (relations

and domination).

Furthermore, out of the bounds of interclass struggle and control, Van Dijk (2000) shows

how ideologies (systems of ideas) relevant to any social organization are presented as

opposing. In his sense, fresh ideas contrast commonly accepted conceptions of science and

culture and history; that is, novel types of ideas are produced. Thus, it would be logical to

extrapolate that this ideological version implies non-conformity since having certain sets of

ideas of whatever type can be at variance with what is usually morally and socially tolerable.

Besides to resistance, one may be either indoctrinated with an idea or inserts it into someone's

mind; this, he exposes, attests to the very fact that ideas emanate directly from the thinking

processes located in the mind. In fact, common sense determines this mental dimension as the

origin of ideologies. This, additionally, suggests that thinking activities can be undertaken by a whole social class or else individuals in the pursuit of disseminating resulting systems of ideas. Remarkably, Van Dijk does not abstain from acknowledging that psychology, on the contrary, has been manifesting its indifference in relation to the notion of ideas deeming them as petty matters; experts in this field tend to be mostly focused other properties of sets of ideas: the individual or common (shared by communities) nature of ideologies, their elaborations as well as adaptations to a variety of situations, and their acceptance by members of groups as a necessary condition to be attributed the quality of being socio-cultural. Ultimately, basing on the latter, significant point, one would draw on the critical discourse analyst's definition of ideologies as "socially shared ideas". On the one hand, this would allow us to refer to the relations of power and domination prevalent in society. At this level, the identity of the group is supposedly solicited for ideological formations of attitudes (Cooper, Kelly, and Weaver, 2001). On the other, direct our attention to the notion of the mind. Ideology has come to assume a social quality as sets of ideas.

2.1.2 Minds vs. Body

To begin with, Van Dijk (2000) straightforwardly assumes that the concept of systems of ideas is subsumed within the mind as the outgrowth of it. Indeed, before delving into the realm of this complex dimension, he states that if there is any theoretical coverage of ideologies as sets of ideas; one should invoke the fundamental principles of cognitive science with the range of disciplines overlapping in it: personal and social psychology, cognition, cognitive sociology, and cognitive linguistics among others. However, the notion of the mind with its assumed association with the physical (body), namely in the respective fields of social and discursive psychology has been raising continued controversy so far. On this very point,

the theorist highlights how neuroscience, for instance, is remarkably concerned with viewing the constituent features of the mind as being incorporated in the brain. Conversely, Van Dijk, like most current cognitive researchers, clearly stands apart from the seeming conflation of mind/body; he judges that it is more appropriate to delve into the realm of the "*information processing*" operations of the mind. Actually, he insists that scholars and researchers should benefit from what this metaphor would likely offer in terms of the mind's performance potential: comprehending, thinking, recalling capacities, developing attitudes, etc. It is clear that the operations performed by the mind mechanism are worthy of attention when it comes to elaborating ideas about the world.

Most significantly, what Van Dijk equally centralizes is the social aspect relative to minds. These are, in effect, the outgrowth of social communication; in other words, they are acquired socially; simultaneously, they are put into action as well as modified to match diverse situations. When seen from this perspective, the mind, by implication, is at the heart of ordinary life affairs and even academic spheres; whatever the notion of ideas is, it would be better to confine this to the structural features ("properties") of the mind as this constitutes the principle source of information. Therefore, he emphasizes this mental mechanism as being concurrently the origin of "production" (understanding of different world phenomena) as well as the outcome ("product") of purely mentally systematic processes, such as thinking. He comes to the conclusion that the mind, as a mechanism, forms the basis of theoretical as well as analytical endeavors of whichever type; and we, in turn, would deduce from this discussion that CDA, with its methodological coverage of discourse production, mediation, and reception, notably the socio-cognitive approach, automatically falls within the bounds of this mode of working.

2.1.3 Beliefs and Knowledge

Comparatively speaking, Van Dijk (2000, 2014a, 2014b) largely favors the notion of beliefs, which is psychology-related, to that of ideas. To start, the critical discourse analyst indicates that in spite of being the results and intrinsic features of thinking (the mind), beliefs and knowledge have to be distinguished from each other with respect to truth basis. Indeed, while the former (beliefs) is, in its broad sense, deemed subjective with possibly erroneous truth foundations, the latter (knowledge) is justified as true. This has been the archetypically historical differentiation between the two mainly when dealing with ideology. Nevertheless, in research relevant to epistemology, knowledge must be perceived as a particular brand of beliefs typical of certain communities, cultures, and institutions validated by means of certain "*truth criteria*"; on this very point, he advances his argument, "These criteria establish that the beliefs (for us) are valid, correct, certified, generally held, or otherwise meet socially shared standards of truthfulness" (Van Dijk, 2000, P.19). Actually, one would deduce, by going over the quotation, that such criteria firmly uphold beliefs at the social level. Epistemologically, beliefs are subsumed within the general concept of knowledge as justified true belief [s] to delimit social aggregations.

However, what is attention-gripping, according to Van Dijk (2000, 2014a); Morris (2016), is that even knowledge itself inevitably cedes to the strains of subjectivity. As a matter of effect, the mere interface with group automatically gives, according to Van Dijk's assumption, momentum to beliefs emanating from partial viewpoints with regard to the world; henceforth, relativity would likely find room in terms of truth criteria. In other words, the complete truth does, by no means, stand as so beyond the boundaries of the community in question. Whereas refugees are seen as an imminent threat to society at all levels especially

by Right-wing groups in Europe, they are not conversely rejected by some circles at least for humanitarian reasons, for example. In addition, beliefs associate with the evaluative dimension; they can deem situations or even things as either good/bad, appropriate/non-suitable, admissible/inadmissible, etc. Such perceptions, which come under the term "opinion", emerge as the outgrowth of judgments obeying particular social values. Henceforth, knowledge and opinion, being the products of judging, branch to the broad scope of the theory of beliefs for Van Dijk. To encounter resistance by outsiders of social groups concerning supposedly true beliefs signals a great deal of subjectivite underpinning.

Interestingly, the cognition-oriented theoretical mechanism, to Van Dijk (2000, 2014a) needs more consideration than ever before. With this respect, the proponents of this trend, including Van Dijk, advocate that this approach to beliefs would most likely yield further insights into it; indeed, the discourse analyst stresses the vitality of this step since it connects directly to elaborating an in-depth theory of ideology, broadly speaking. Besides, what is noticeable in the academic enterprise of Van Dijk is the fact that he tends to abstract from the classical presentation of beliefs as merely a "system of beliefs" or "mental stances" or "propositional attitudes" toward stated situations, for he does not see it useful for his overall discussion. Instead, he specifically diverts his focus on perceiving beliefs as the outcome of thinking. In this regard, the scholar assumes that the cognitive treatment of beliefs needs to relate primarily to how they appear in connection with one another through the "mental network". Thereby, beliefs are encapsulated via propositions in the form of clauses that are, in turn, semantic representations of "mental models". Nevertheless, drawing on Van Dijk's claim, the most imminent problem lies exactly in the unconscious nature of the thinking process; that is to say, the complexity of forming beliefs might result from the unawareness

characterizing thought (deriving beliefs out of thinking). The mental processes involved in the creation of beliefs necessitate urgent examination before exposing their relation to the outer world as sets of generic perceptions.

2.2 History and Evolution of the Cognitive Approach to Discourse

Before delving into the triangular interrelationship closely bonding discourse to cognition and society, it would be wiser to provide a background tracing the development of the cognitive approach to discourse. To start, Graesser, Gernbacher, and Goldman (1997) point out that the initial attempts to elaborate cognitive theories of discourse could build on discursive theorizing from other disciplines. For example, Van Dijk, Halliday and Hasan, Grice, Searle, Schank and Abelson (as cited in Graesser et al., 1997) refer to the respective fields of: pragmatics, text linguistics, artificial intelligence and the like. According to Graesser et al. (1997), scholars in cognition, actually, have readily sought to confirm if such areas of research could offer reliable psychological accounts relevant to what is known as "mental representations" as well as corresponding processes in the production and reception of discourse as claimed by experts in them. Therefore, cognitive psychologists have thoughtfully exploited their findings whose insights regarding discourse have been partially valid when put to test. In the course of their research journey, Graesser et al. recount, adepts in cognition assume that the mind builds cognitive representations during comprehension of discourse. To put things in a nutshell, such representations arise as schemata of interpretative codes in the process of discursive construction as well as reception; additionally, these can adopt divergent forms: syntactic sequences and lexis, speech acts (SAs), pragmatic elements, authentic and virtual circumstances, and semantic dimensions, etc. The faculty of the

human mind to activate such schematic representations while exchanging discourse deserves further consideration, notably on a social scale.

Nonetheless, by digging in time, we will discover some compelling facts regarding the earliest study frameworks relative to the role of society in forging common cognition piloting discourse. In effect, Le Bon and Mc Douall, with their respective works (as cited in Tindale, Meisenhelder, Dykema-Engblade, and Hogg, 2001), had pioneered theorizing over social behavior (including language in use); they had perceived it as the outgrowth of social community– in their own term "social aggregate"; further, both had claimed that social acts must obey "collective consciousness" known likewise as "group mind". The scholars, besides, had argued in favor of going over such collective thinking (minds), not individual one if one is to grasp social consciousness. Equally, Mead; Durkheim; and Allport's successive conceptual models (as cited in Tindale et al., 2001) had espoused unanimously generic sense–shared experiences of reality– as a sine qua non for the decoding of social exchanges. However, as Tindale et al (2001); Cooper et al. (2001), explain, with the subsequent rise of behaviorism there has instantly followed a shift of emphasis on the personal mind putting on the margin collective perception. This has meant that social psychology has diverted its attention toward the individual in terms of key notions as well as conceptual understanding associated mostly with mental processes to the detriment of the community's part in carving general conceptions and attitudes. Nonetheless, the latest years have seen a resurgence of renewed focus on the notion of common cognition (Resnik, Levine, & Teasley; Thomson & Fine as cited in Tindale et al., 2001). Indeed, this notable return to the roots owes much to variant orientations principally to the worthy contribution of the European social psychology with a plethora of expert studies in the field (Tajfel & Turner; Hogg, Oakes, Reicher, & Wetherell, ; Hogg & Abrams as cited in Tinder et al., 2001). At this level, the "social identity

theory" developed by Tajfel (as cited in Tindale et al., 2001) has centralized the community as the most and foremost research asset; about this point Tindale et al. comment:

> Tajfel's social identity theory placed the group front and center stage for understanding a number of aspects of behavior. These ideas eventually influenced theory and research in most of the major areas of the field: person, perception, stereotyping, prejudice, attribution, attitudes, self-concept, and so forth. (P. 2)

The recently covered account of the resurrection of the group as a valuable source of accessing the linguistic behavior via socially shared thought has been decisive in the integration of cognition in the study of discourse.

In the same direction of research, according to Graesser et al., (1997), cognitive psychologists have striven for years to come up with solid findings about the cognitive functions in relation to discourse. In effect, they have been interested in how the mind manages to key linguistic input with everyday experiences and background knowledge as well so as to infer implied messages; the term "meaning representations" applies narrowly to this operation, which is deemed very complex as a process. Moreover, for them such experiential knowledge cannot generally extend to all persons; rather, it differs widely across them. However, what seems captivating for such experts is the interactants' capacity to produce and interpret discourse for indirect meanings despite the lucid intricacies inherent in the representational process. On top of all, they are versed in exploring at length the mental operations linked to cognitive representations. To say things otherwise, the scholars go on explicating, such processes branch into–information retrieval, re-constituting information by deleting or adding structures, linking information, comparing different forms in working memory, utilizing words in the mental lexicon, and launching concepts in long-term memory.

In addition, some of these operations can be performed unconsciously at considerable speed, whereas others are consciously undertaken at slow speed. Cognition and discourse have come under the scrutiny of researchers to put to the fore how the two intersect in discursive occasions.

Besides the material presented so far, Graesser et al, stress that cognition scholars have been purposefully pushing toward elaborating a paradigm on how interlocutors deploy their cognitive representations via discourse. With this regard, cognitive studies would likely equip CDA with precious insights that have been available neither in linguistic nor social theorizing let alone some pioneering work over the issue from other fields (Harte et al., 2012); at once, Chilton's comment (as cited in Harte et al., 2012) goes straight to the point, "CDA has tended to draw on social theory of a particular type and on linguistics of a particular type" (P. 191). This is indicative of the significance attributed to the cognitive aspect up to then out of the research scope across disciplines. Graesser et al. are quite unanimous in assuming the complexity of this process; for them discourse entails several layers of processing during communicative events, in effect. In line with this orientation to discourse study, Graesser et al. postulate that psychology-based theories of discursive construction and reception depend tremendously upon cognitive perspectives in terms of theoretical conceptions. In fact, such a contribution can, by all means, yield invaluable, in-depth enlightenment about mental processes, most notably–memory related stages (components and operations), learning, and problem-solving among other elements of cognition. Nonetheless, what appears to be interestingly primordial for researchers turns around language in use (discourse); in clear terms, more and more initiatives have been intersecting to throw light on the processing of discourse in interaction by participants. Thereby, to them, this should testify to the theoretical complexity characterizing this whole process. It seems that there has been so

much common ground between psychological theorizing and discourse processing in terms of cognition that would eventually give great momentum to CDA to further the cognitive aspect of discursive exchanges.

2.2.1 The Cognitive Dimension Integrated Into the Analytical Study of Language in Use (CDA)

At a certain stage of the evolution of the state of affairs concerning approaching language functionally, Harte et al. (2012) elaborate on the subsequently prominent cognitive perspective. In actual effect, the researchers initially draw attention to the fact that analytical approach to discourse, especially the political one, had been obviously limited to the social sciences. Eventually, subsequent   CDA as well as CL work has, in tackling linguistic theorizing, found fodder in Halliday's systemic functional grammar (SFG), which deals primarily with language use in the social context (a functional stand point); simultaneously, both disciplines have equally borrowed much from Foucault's work (Fowler; Fowler et al.; Hodge & Kress; Kress & Hodge as cited in Harte et al., 2012). As demonstrated by Harte et al., the cognitive level would afterward prove revolutionary with the analytical tools brought to hand to unveil a goal highly valued in CDA: "linguistic manipulation" in its broad sense. This critical approach would, as likely as not, come up with more compelling findings than commonly known ones. In other words, critical discourse analysts adopting this angle of research would supposedly postulate fresh ideas and principles for further elaboration at a later point. In retrospect, such methodological tools emanate from the cognitive sciences in general, namely cognitive linguistics as well as evolutionary psychology. The cognitive perspective has left it traces in the practice of CDA leading up to the social cognition theory of context.

At the same time, the field of cognitive linguistics has carried out its academic enterprise consisting in exposing the operational link between mental processes and discourse processing. As a matter of effect, Johnson; Lakoff; Lakoff and Johnson (as cited in Harte et al.) principally assume that humans are remarkably endowed with frames of mental schemata of images; these uphold their reasoning. Moreover, interlocutors partaking in interaction can activate such representations in order to determine space-based relationships between people in society. In more accessible terms, those schemata encompass, what those scholars term, the concept of "container"; this refers precisely to space that is segmented into three components: exterior (place), interior (mental schemata), and boundary (the limits of politics). These automatically enable interlocutors to experience actual situations in their discursive exchanges. For instance, we would mention the case of refugees in a country whose natives overtly show their opposition to their arrival and settlement by enacting their schemata of perceptions. Most significantly, to liaise mental processes with text formation and reception basing on social "phenomena" needs to make up the heart of research in eventual CDA approaches, (Wodak, 2006). This tendency would, eventually, contribute much insight to scholarship in CDA.

2.2.1.1The rise of the socio-cognitive approach (SCA) in discourse study.

Presenting a historical account of the evolution of the socio-cognitive approach (SCA) to discourse automatically brings into mind Van Dijk's work. Actually, Djamaan (trans.2016) states that SCA rests principally on the socio-psychological dimension within CDA led by Van Dijk; the latter draws on the notion of *social representation*. Van Dijk, as explained by Djamaan (trans. 2016), Wodak (2006), relies specifically on the socio-cognitive framework alongside linguistic appreciation outside the bounds of the purely structural organization; this

implies a concentration on the functional aspect of language. As such, the scholars show how

Van Dijk subsequently postulates a deeper grasp of the structures of context. To put it in a

nutshell, context needs in-depth re-visiting. Moreover, social actors do not solely resort to

their personal experiences, perceptions, and strategies in managing interaction, but also

principally activate a set of cognitive parameters (capacities) that are socially shared with

their peers. In this regard, humans' habitually-occurring interaction draws on socially shared

knowledge to ease reciprocal negotiation of messages (Luhman as cited in Wodak, 2006);

actually, this form of common cognition has earned it current status under the appellation

"socially shared cognitions" (Resnik, Levine, & teasley; Thomson & Fine as cited in Tindale

et al., 2001). This, according to Djamaan (trans. 2016); Tindale et al. (2001), creates certain

homogeneity between personal needs–subjective– as well as socially prevalent ones

–objective experiences, henceforth. Most importantly, Djamaan (trans.2016); Aini and

Widdodo (2018); Wodak (2001, 2006); Wodak and Busch (2004); and Van Dijk (as cited in

Djamaan, trans. 2016), unanimously assume that those parameters are to bridge the gap

between the social structures and individual cognition. In short, they extrapolate that

discourse, cognition, and joint society-based cognition must interfere vitally to fulfill effective

interaction. The whole business has, ultimately, been pioneered especially by Van Dijk, as

Chilton's account specifies (as cited in Djamaan, trans. 2016). The socio-psychological trend

in CDA has been influential in addressing discourse study.

Nevertheless, it would be fair and noteworthy to refer to Moscovici's tremendous

influence on the theorizing of Van Dijk. As a matter of fact, for Djamaan (Trans.2016);

Tindale et al. (2001) Moscovici, as the actual founder of social representations, has been

inspiring for generic thinking as a novel trend; inspired, in turn, by Durkheim's initial model

of "collective representations", he advocates that insiders of social aggregates often have

recourse to shared perceptions as the platform of common sense. Additionally, this acts as the "cognitive context", where social actors can undertake their routine social interactions. In simple terms, such SRs archetypically and intrinsically form the basic structures of social groups with their constant dynamism. This suggests that discursive happenings –production as well as comprehension of discourses–arise within the bounds of society; i.e., interaction entails: socially general attitudes, communicative events, and participants' versions of construing the context of these–their own "mental models" as claimed by Van Dijk in his later work. It must, equally, be noted that social organization-linked research as well as theorizing– has to a large extent been influential in the respect of socially shared cognition. Indeed, Weick and Roberts (as cited in Tinder et al., 2001) corroborate this account by showing how the cognitive dimension provides much impetus to the process of social organization. They introduce the concepts of "sense making" and "heedful interrelating" to explain the interrelation between generic thinking (cognition) and social members' cautious organizing into distinctive groups in terms of social actions (social interaction). Shorty after, such academic endeavor would put to the fore the equivalent notions of "common understandings" alongside "shared mental models" lying the foundations of an orthodoxy in social psychology with the invaluable contributions of group-related findings notably discursive acts performances (Helmreich; Klimoski & Mohammed; Thomson; Guzzo & Shea; Hackm as cited in Tinder et al. , 2001). In a nutshell, what is exposed at this point branches mainly into generic conceptions practically activated in situational interchange by respective groups.

Besides to the evolutionary account of SCA, it would be just to include in the study some other scholars and researchers who have pioneered alongside Van Dijk in the insertion of this theorizing into CDA. Koller (as cited in Wodak, 2006), for instance, proposes a novel paradigm consisting in bonding cognitive-oriented work with studying discourse from a

critical angle. Indeed, although cognition should not be tackled overtly by experts in CDA, scholars, like this one, have been putting the cognitive model of interaction in the foreground of their academic work relevant to the exploration of the social institutions regulating discursive interchanges. I.e., he is in favor of engaging in addressing discourse analytically with the very aim of explicating how its production and reception entails the enactment of the systematic order of social perceptions as well as beliefs (generic knowledge). This should be taken as another proof of vouching for the insightfulness of this revolutionary approach to discourse.

2.2.2 Discourse, Cognition, and Society (the Triangulation Paradigm)

In continuation of the recent decades' revolutionary social approach to language, Van Dijk (2008a, 2009) has been loyal to his peers since he places the highest emphasis on the extra-text context as an intrinsic, complex element in the survey of language in use (discourse). In contrast with the previously objective-oriented conceptions of context namely in–text linguistics, discourse studies, social sciences– Van Dijk's (2009) theoretical construction perceives it as essentially subjective rather than objective-based. In other words, participants in interactional situations are not socially constrained in terms of selecting the "properties of context" crucial for meaning negotiation, but they can conceive of such key elements personally. This, in accordance with his assumption, must call for "cognition" as a mental process, which, in turn, ties up with subjectivity. Ahmadvand (2011), additionally, traces the mental dimension of Van Dijk's approach to discourse to his previous work on such social issues like racism and prejudice against minorities. Thus, Van Dijk (as cited in Ahmadvand, 2011) shows how different ethnicities' discursive configurations regarding certain topics automatically reflect the distinctiveness underlying mental standpoints. One would consider

the mental level as a prerequisite to fully explore Van Dijk's theoretical paradigm on

discourse and society.

To evoke a very material issue, Ahmadvand points out that there exists a large gap

between discourse and social structures. Actually, he lucidly indicates the much tremendous

emphasis put on the crucial element of cognition as it can supposedly bridge the afore-

mentioned gap. This key aspect of discourse study in Van Dijk's theoretical framework, he is

in agreement with many critical discourse analysts, has not received enough attention in

critical discourse studies (CDS). In the similar trajectory, but with more detail, Wodak (2006)

refers exactly to the cognitive as well as socio-cognitive dimensions; these have long been in

the margin in CDA, broadly speaking. For the theorist, the mental dimension manifests itself,

alongside common identity practices and historical "memories", in discursive exchanges.

Additionally, all this takes on the form of shared beliefs and perceptions as cognitive

processes ("imagined communities" and "shared memories". Though the historical touch is

clearly predominant throughout her approach, Wodak advocates more in-depth penetration

into cognition interposing between discourse and society. Here, Van Dijk (as cited in

Ahmadvand, 2011, 2014a, as cited in Aini & Widodo, 2018) accentuates both the linguistic

and cognitive dimensions. In fact, he elaborates on the basic tenet of "triangulation"

involving– discourse (text social), cognition, and society (social context) since they constitute

the essence of his multi-disciplinary theory. The discourse analyst, initially, explains,

discourse as any semiotic object (images, para-linguistic clues, sounds, spoken or written

discourse, etc). Indeed, the scholar seems to have drawn on Kress's consideration of various

indicators of socio-cultural representations other than written or spoken discourse, such as:

paintings, photographs, drawings, sculptures, mannerisms, etc (Bezemzer & Bloommaert,

2012). Van Dijk (2012, as cited in Ahmadvand, 2011), on the one hand, points out that

discourse is a type of communicative occurrence arising in the social environment. On the other hand, it reflects and disseminates the whole system of dominant social structures; for instance, discourse re-produces racism and sexism as forms of exercising domination in society. He, next, tackles cognition, which consists of the set of both individual, mental features (attitudes, beliefs, values, aims, and emotions) and society (socio-cultural and political structures, and particular discourse and mental structures). Social cognition has bonded discourse with society.

Concerning the same perspective, Wodak, Halbwachs, Anderson, and Mussolff (as cited in Wodak, 2006), likewise, act overtly in support of the significant insightfulness of Van Dijk's theorizing in CDA. Indeed, for Wodak, the mental processes must link with text production/ reception ("comprehension") and with the social features: These are the set of attitudes, stereotypes, prejudices, and beliefs about discourse and toward other communities as interlocutors are supposed to pilot their communicative encounters effectively with them. To present her standpoint with strong evidence, she explains:

> Almost all of us are convinced that some mental processes must exist which link text production and text comprehension to explicit utterances, text and talk as well as to social phenomena. This becomes most apparent while analyzing phenomena such as attitudes towards language (behavior) as well as stereotypes and prejudices held about specific social groups. (P. 180)

At this stage, according to Van Dijk's (2014a, 2014b, 2008b, 1990, 2012, as cited in Ahmadvand, 2011) perspective, there emerge the general as well as local levels regulating discursive practices. Actually, he segments context into "micro" and "macro" types. The former indicates the specific aspects of interactional situations: Van Dijk has coined the term

"context models" to refer to the subjective construction of communicative events as personalized "mental models", not objective understanding of social context. Such context models, furthermore, take on the form of mental representations because they can provide the clues crucial for context-based interaction. In other words, the discourse analyst points to the different, subjective manipulations of pragmatic elements and SAs during situational interaction. As a result, these can automatically determine whether or not discourse is appropriate (the whys and hows of the appropriateness of discourse). The latter, on the other hand, branches to the socially shared set of knowledge and ideologies, and these can be indicative of social categories; that is, what different groups develop as relationships with each other grounded in the principles of domination and inequality. Racism, for example, is not typical of personal attitudes, but rather pertains to groups having power and domination over other ones. Besides, he explains how the subjective constitution of contextual features in interaction must operate within the broader, cognitive organization of society. It would seem reasonable to deduce that the cognitive dimension inserted into discourse testifies to the significance of Van Dijk's eclectic endeavor as it tries to attach discursive practices to the cognition underlying socio-cultural and political structures.

In the light of what has been pointed out so far, it must be noted that Preceding Van Dijk, Thomas's (as cited in Van Dijk, 2009) consideration of the locally communicative situation has been pioneering. In reality, the latter assumes that an eventual approach to broader socio-cultural systems (structures) in sociology must necessarily go through the "definition of situation"; in clear terms, interactional situations form a prerequisite to the understanding of macro structures upholding social interaction (social context). Despite the promising step forward in this field regarding the overlap between micro/macro dimensions in tackling discursive exchanges, Van Dijk (2009) reminds how the "intersubjective" (personal)

elaborations of contextual features (experiences) have long been in vogue. Furthermore, sociologists, he explains, have traditionally seen context as a set of objectively adhered to social structures; thus, it has relatively received little, if no, attention in the relevant literature. It has not been until Goffman (as cited in Van Dijk, 2009) has addressed the social structures systematically; he had put in place what would subsequently become iconic concepts in sociology when covering situational interaction—"encounters", "public places", and "participant structures" among others. Besides, ethno methodology has, likewise, contributed a great deal of insight into the matter of contextual interaction. For example, with his global approach to spatio-temporal communication, Garfinkel, the ethno methodologist, (as cited in Van Dijk, 2009) points out how interpersonal interaction entails a full grasp of the norms ("methods") regulating the production and reception of discursive encounters. The surrounding set of socio-cultural structures has ultimately found it place in the study enterprise of discursive events.

In addition to the above facts, it would be just fair to evoke conversation analysis (CA) as a major contributor to the determination of context in interaction. Van Dijk (2009) explicates that this field has set out to cover the intricacies managing situational conversations, such as "turn taking"; nevertheless, this predominantly structural focus could not avoid being limited in terms of exploring the social as well as political dimensions of context. Shegloff, Sacks, and, Jefferson, besides, (as cited in Van Dijk, 2009) present context integration (situational interaction) as crucial only if inevitably invoked in discursive occasions by participants. In other words, contextual features fall under cautious examination solely when they prove vital for the grasp of the message encapsulated within discourse. However, situational interactions, with the great deal of attention attributed to them nowadays across a range of disciplines, seem more demanding than ever before in terms of excavating their socio-cultural schemata.

This cannot exclude the crucial role of the cognitive interference in the overall discursive process. Accordingly, Van Dijk (2009) clarifies:

> …contexts as mental models of relevant communicative situations are not just personal interpretations of situations, but are also based on socially shared understandings of time, place, participants and their roles and identities, relations of power, and so on. (P. 25)

What one can conclude from the above quotation is the fact that context is primarily mental; indeed, cognitive science, as asserted by the CDS expert, seems to have caught up with what it has once reduced to a minor interest: The "interface" between discourse, cognition, and society. Further, he focuses on the agency ruling the interface between the micro/macro structures. Context, in actuality, does not solely circumscribe to the local, interpersonal situations, but rather must include the broad, socially shared structures; Van Dijk (2009, 2008a) stresses how agents model and re-model such macro organizations through all forms of interaction, which anew testifies that context is everything beyond the textual range.

Any discursive analysis with reference to the afore-mentioned micro and macro contexts must not circumvent the structural dimension of discourse. Indeed, Widdowson (as cited in Aini & Widodo, 2018), Wodak and Fairclough; Benque; Wodak (as cited in Wodak & Busch, 2004) draw attention to the dual nature of discourse as being spoken or written; in other words, they point out that interlocutors can produce discourse as either utterances or writing. More significantly, the scholars readily adhere to the fact that since discourse is measured in terms of its pragmatic effects; it cannot be dealt with apart from the social context. On this very crucial point in CDA, Aini and Widodo (2018) observe, "Because critical discourse analysis perceives language as a social practice, it presupposes that it cannot function in

isolation, but only within a cultural or social setting" (P. 227). Thus, this can testify to Van

Dijk's three-layered model in approaching discourse (as cited in Aini and Widodo, 2018): (a)

the linguistic level covers the formal dimension (syntax, semantics, stylistics, and rhetorics);

(b) the cognitive (the production, mediation, and reception of discourse); (c) the socio-cultural

(the larger social space for interaction with purposes). Specifically, seen from the micro-level

perspective, the scholars, first, point to discourse as language use in communicative

situations; it can be an utterance or written text, or it can be in the form of any semiotic sign.

Secondly, they refer to the cognitive. The latter relates to memory or mental systems

alongside discursive processes of representations in the form of–attitudes, ideas, and

emotions. Thirdly, the researchers connect discourse and cognition with the fabric of society:

The set of social and political institutions piloting interactional acts. Ultimately, the social or

society pertains to (regulate) both the microstructures underlying situational interaction and

the "societal" branching to inter-group relations based on power and domination. While

microstructures shape up interlocutors' reception of discourse, it would be stark clear and

even fair to stress how the larger socio-cultural system of generic knowledge and ideologies

(macro-level context; social and political institutions) constitutes the source from which

participants subjectively derive context-specific elements in the process of constructing

interactional situations.

Ultimately, we would like to remind that in addition to context types, Van Dijk (2009);

Fiske and Taylor; Wyer and Srull; Mc Cann and Higgins, (as cited in Van Dijk, 1990);

Djamaan (trans., 2016); Tindale et al. (2001) precisely accentuate such interface between

discourse (particular uses of language in given social contexts) and social cognition. This,

actually, takes on the form of social representations (SRs) which are uniform reality

perceptions among social groups. Moreover, Van Dijk (2009); Djamaan (trans. 2016)

specifically assume that interlocutors, by virtue of their social membership, can both establish and diffuse the social, cultural, and political components underpinning discourse, and they manage to achieve this via their personal, discursive, subjective productions of SRs regarding world issues. I.e., discourse is charged with the very role of propagating such SRs. Henceforth, he highlights scholars evidently stick to the macro as well as micro dimensions as the backbone of the socio-cognitive approach to discourse and knowledge, namely Van Dijk's. The co-making of context presupposes adaptation and endorsement to social norms.

2.2.3 Context and Social Cognition: the Social Psychological Aspects of Context (Shared Knowledge)

2.2.3.1 Preliminary definition of knowledge.

In the course of performing CDA, Van Dijk (2014b, 2009) refers not only to language in use (discourse), but also to such notions as–cognition, society, culture, and social cognition. In this register, he puts them on an equal basis with the specific aim of exploring the discursive workings underlying groups and sub-groups. Actually, what essentially constitutes the foundations of Van Dijk's theoretical interest is the socially generic knowledge. The theorist, on the one hand, holds as his central argument that knowledge is as important as ideology in CDA; on the other, the management, control, presupposition, and re-production of knowledge via discourse rests on a multidisciplinary basis. Contrary to philosophy, the humanities and social sciences, which have granted scant attention to this complex process, the foremost task of scholars in CDA must consist in taking an exploratory path in the pursuit of the afore-mentioned operation of knowledge. That is, due to the limited attention paid to the cognitive

dimension, the scholar calls for a thorough approach to social context: social cognition. It is precisely the joint knowledge–perceptions, attitudes, ideologies, beliefs toward world issues–that, in spite of the remarkable insufficiency in their coverage, normally makes up an intrinsic feature of social context. Shared knowledge needs to be at the heart of the socio-cultural mechanisms when coping with contextual interaction from a theoretical perspective.

Van Dijk's (2014a, 2014b) interest, likewise, does not make the exception in this respect; he has engaged empirically in developing a theoretical framework to defend his argument. In fact, in accordance with his assumption, the psychological survey–with insights from epistemology– of the way knowledge is proven as true ("justified") and acquired through discourse has not yielded any conclusive findings so far. This constitutes a significant challenge for CDA, consequently. I.e., what are the mental processes involved in the construction as well as the reception of discourse with all the amount of underlying knowledge available not only at the individual level, but also at the social one? In effect, the very domain of social psychology, as claimed by the theorist, needs further penetration on the part of CDA scholars because it is seemingly versed in the deed of exposing how social institutions and systems ("epistemic communities") re-generate knowledge–the "sociology of knowledge". Nonetheless, discourse, too, plays a crucial role in the diffusion of knowledge at a social scale; this marks a testimony for the social nature of discourse. Similarly, Condor and Antaki (1997), join in the direction of attempting to unveil the extent to which discourse and social cognition can closely intersect. In this respect, they observably disengage from earlier perspectives in social psychology which take the perceptions of social communities' members as being assumingly determining in terms of their socio-cultural affiliations. These are manifested as general constructions of reality and expressed via daily discourse. Instead, they

base on initial social psychology's understandings of social cognition as mental processing of information on humans by individuals in certain circumstances to ultimately postulate a wholly social dimension underlying mental conceptions of the self (as a group subject) and others. What has been missing previously seems to make up the essence of Van Dijk's socio-cognitive approach to discourse; this task needs to exhaust much perspective from social psychology as being an invaluable source of in-depth insights into the social dimension of knowledge.

Being a part of psychology, social psychology is much interested in accounting for causes underlying human social conduct. In this respect, experts in the field like Mc kinley and Mc Vittie (2008); Condor and Antaki (1997) demonstrate how this area tries to enquire into the way members of social communities influence their peers' behavior. In other words, they concentrate on how social groups mould the actions of their subjects. Further, such influence, they insist, can not only affect persons' deeds, but can also shape up their perceptions of others as well as themselves. A crucial manner of society-driven effects on individuals emanates from language in use, actually. On the one hand, the use of language to encapsulate ideas and emotions relies specifically on social interaction with group members who determine language management. On the other hand, externalizing attitudes toward social reality and others through discourse must obey generic patterns within the social community itself. For example, perceptions of others in terms of category (refugees, immigrants, foreigners, conformists, non-conformists, etc) operate under the group's mechanism. Clarifying things in more detail, Mc kinley and Mc Vittie argue:

> One basic way in which other people influence us is through language (though this is not to suggest, of course, that language use is essential, or even primarily, about influencing others). Even when we are alone, at the most basic level we use language to form our thoughts is determined by the way we use language when we are with other people. (2008, P. 3)

The quotation stands lucidly as proof of language being a tool of exerting influence, among other ones, on group insiders whether at a distance or in interaction with other members with social cognition being a leading force. Penetrating into the realm of the underpinnings of social conduct is well situated within social psychology's specialism.

Simultaneously, anthropology, for Van Dijk (2014a, 2014b) forms another area of research challenge for CDA experts concerning the role of discourse in the re-production of culture. The latter has been attributed several definitions; the most pertinent is that it is viewed as generic knowledge each member of a social group must endorse. Here, the linguist has coined the very concept of epistemic community with reference to social groupings. Moreover, anthropology tries to enquire into how cultural mechanisms (shared knowledge) are distinct from one group to another. Basically, culture is acquired via discourse. By implication, all this constitutes the scope of what Van Dijk terms "epistemic discourse analysis", which is, by nature multidisciplinary. Thus, for him such key elements must be viewed as both social as well as cultural concepts, and must be prioritized in any survey about generic conceptions tying social communities. The mere consideration of anthropology's findings about the cultural foundations of discourse reinforces the multi-disciplinary nature of research into its practical part in diffusing culture.

In continuation of his cumulative, theoretical perspective, Van Dijk (1990, 2008a, 2014a, 2014b,) looks back critically at what has already been produced about knowledge. He, actually, remarks that throughout much literature, knowledge has been defined as "justified" or "true beliefs"; however, what seems in vogue in epistemology can be quite problematic. In fact, by orientating to the commonly known notion of "epistemic communities' knowledge", the expert systematically demonstrates that what members of a certain group perceive ("presuppose") to be the absolute truth may not appear as so to "outsiders". In other words, Van Dijk's definition of knowledge as generic–shared– beliefs archetypical of an epistemic society fully builds on the irrefutable evidence for its validity as truth: The "reliability criteria". Furthermore, the latter, it must be noted, acts as the platform for what the theorist terms the "knowledge of participants" or "what they already know" and which they are supposed to enact in their frequent interchanges. Thereby, he has coined the term– reliability criteria– with the particular aim of providing solid foundations for the justification of such knowledge; as a matter of fact, this ranges from historical, contextual, to cultural criteria. Most importantly, such criteria, which work within an epistemic gathering as true belief, might be deemed as mere ideologies, prejudices, or false beliefs by the ones of a different group or even a preceding era. To prop this case up, Eagleton (1991, P. 3) adds, "…that to speak or judge 'ideologically' is to do that schematically, stereotypically…" embracing the group's validating criteria. By implication, knowledge is *"relative"* in nature as well as context-based– literally obeys the credibility criteria of the stated group. That is, what might be assumed as absolute knowledge lacks the potential to be fully adhered to by others; this does not necessarily apply to the inter-group level, but also shrinks to the local one since even proponents of the same community could be at variance when it comes to outlooks to different issues. For fear of any possible misunderstanding of the last point, the critical

discourse analyst clarifies that knowledge (proven beliefs) can be personalized depending on individuals' social needs yet this must not be beyond the pervasive consensus governing society, in effect. Socially generic conceptions of the world are delimited by the boundaries of their relevant groups' truth criteria.

2.2.3.2 The fundamental role of shared knowledge in contextual interaction (discursive events).

In the course of highlighting the significance of knowledge in interactional processes, Van Dijk (2014b) reminds that what one needs to be aware of is that knowledge is located in the mind, not in discourse or society. He, likewise, points toward knowledge as being socially shared–social cognition. In effect, with this assumption in sight, the critical discourse analyst starts from a narrowly cognitive standpoint to demonstrate how knowledge interferes as a major element in the sense-making of discourse (discursive processing); his postulate, it can be discerned, centralizes the ongoing trend in cognitive psychology since the 1970s. The latter has been, as he explicates, built on the principle that generic knowledge constitutes the source of processing underpinning nearly all social performances involving discourse, actually. Nonetheless, there is one fundamental point relevant to knowledge as an object of study. Van Dijk (2008a), with this regard, draws attention to the quite complex nature of knowledge in terms of its components; i.e., one basic element of contextual interaction revolves around interlocutors' knowledge–what knowledge are they assumed to have? More often than not, participants must constantly as well as consistently accommodate to the mechanism of knowledge by manifesting some understanding of it as a strategy to run interpersonal exchanges. Remarkably, the scholar shows how this process is intricate; on the one hand, the abstractness of knowledge makes it confusing for researchers to uncover the stages of the

systematic process of treating known information by participants; on the other hand, the negotiation of interpersonal relationships renders such processing typically exponential to fully dissect. Although knowledge is a sine qua non to communicate efficiently, exploring its management in due course requires in-depth scholarship.

Following up on the abstract-induced vagueness of knowledge, much emphasis is put on the strategic moves needed by communicators in discursive occasions. Throughout a large portion of his theory of context Van Dijk (2008a, 1990, 2014a, 2014b) interestingly states that what is known as "knowledge of participants" strategy stands valid for all types of communicative situations in people's ordinary lives. In fact, contrary to philosophy-based justified knowledge as referred to above, he specifically evokes the term "mental model" in order to focus attention on what is communally shared throughout various epistemic communities (social knowledge; more precisely social cognition). At this level, any perception or set of attitudes that is unanimously presupposed to be embedded in discourse by a given group is knowledge; every member must take cognizance of it. In addition, although knowledge as an integral part of context is not explicitly expressed, it is supposed to be already known by interactants. To decipher discourse, recipients ought to activate an enormous amount of knowledge surrounding it; simultaneously, they presuppose their discourse producers to have done so. Thus, the important, intriguing question that the theorist puts to the foreground is what makes interlocutors aware of each others' knowledge? He, accordingly, responds by accentuating the decisive role of the strategies enacted with the aim of inferring knowledge everyone must conform to within a given community. The discursive strategies of making inferences out of generic knowledge are highly primordial in carrying social behavior.

Furthermore, by going deeper into the systematic frame of knowledge, Van Dijk (2014b) embarks on an explanatory task to unravel the intricacies underlying the functions of knowledge and where it comes from. As a start, knowledge constitutes one of the core components that enable participants to specify the subjective context models when they are engaged in situational exchanges. As a matter of actual fact, unless they can presuppose that their interlocutors know what they are uttering or writing about, there can be no efficacious interaction among people. In clearer terms, knowledge or "common ground" –in Fairlough's (1995b) paradigm named background knowledge (BGK)–plus "presupposition" must be viewed as integral constituents of the subjective "context models"; indeed, the former concept helps evaluating the type of common ground an epistemic community relies on while participating in social interaction. Moreover, knowledge, to Van Dijk, can be acquired from three different sources. Firstly, participants have the possibility to make inferences from what they are already cognizant of in their epistemic surroundings. Secondly, they could also benefit from their previous experiences–via seeing or hearing things (observation). Thirdly, these might access knowledge through discourse already conveyed by others–for instance by going over a book or watching a TV talk show, or a news debate (intertextuality). Hence, what forms the core of social cognition revolves around how much knowledge can be acquired and re-produced via discourse in ordinary situations. Nonetheless, knowledge acquisition and elaboration does not solely count at the socio-cognitive (social psychological) level, but also amounts to the "societal" (macro) one; Van Dijk states that this presupposes investigative work connecting to the way particular kinds of knowledge pertain narrowly to given epistemic institutions: news channels, social networking sites (SNSs), organizations, political parties, news papers, universities, schools, textbooks, etc. Since these, in effect, transmit their world experiences to audiences and readers through variant genres of discourse,

such organizations' role together with that of discourse in the dissemination of knowledge must be explored in full. The cultural dimension–shared knowledge–and the "justification criteria" are at the base of the socio-cognitive approach to interaction.

At this point, Van Dijk (2009) advocates the exploration and development of the concept of "relevance" since the latter represents the interlocutors' cognitive perceptions of the contextual properties; these would help determine what is compatible their mental visions. Actually, in this context of addressing the above issue, he delves into the complex enterprise of uncovering the intricacies relative to contextual interaction. In addition, the study of interlocutors' own cognitive images (representations) regarding relevant properties of the communicative environment is the typical specialty of "phenomenological sociology". At this level, the researcher's theoretical framework attempts to bridge the gap between (a) society, (b) social situation, and (c) subjective "definitions of the situation" in the concoction and consumption of discourse. It appears that situational interchanges are functionally subsumed within the relevance of participants' understandings of various events inside the larger bounds of the social schemata of world perceptions.

2.2.3.3 Mental models as knowledge and discourse.

2.2.3.3.1 The cognitive paradigm of social sense-making and construction of social reality.

During the performance of situational interaction, participants are supposed to activate the schemata of their mental perceptions in order to pursue their intended goals. With regard to this process, Van Dijk (2014a, 2016) assumes that social actors readily activate their "mental models" or "mental constructions" precisely ensured by the brain with a set of cognitive

processes and SRs, which make part of the mentally general knowledge, to cope with unique communicative occasions. In other words, they must anticipate contextual clues by inferring from knowledge symmetrical with theirs. In fact, such clues imply putting together both subjective manipulations of them by interlocutors and a resort to common beliefs depending on groups' respective "criteria of justification" (of what is true for them as knowledge). Discourse, at this level, interferes as a basically indispensable source of knowledge that needs to be used in context for validation. As such, the researcher underlines what is termed "k-knowledge"; the latter is within reach for discourse makers in communicative exchanges to specify their recipients' knowledge; afterward, they try to accommodate it (k-knowledge) to their receivers'. Van Dijk evokes the shortage in modern epistemology to yield detailed, compelling findings concerning the context mechanism in terms of its components and operation despite the new context-based orientation adopted in this field, whose open avowal of this shortcoming testifies lucidly to the fact that capturing the building of meaning is unavoidably derived from contextual clues. Context is valuable for discourse dissection.

At the same time, there have been more urging suggestions on the part of scholars to pursue their advances on how knowledge fuels favorably social interaction. To start, Van Dijk (2008a, 2014a, 2016) assumingly asserts that a systematic consideration of knowledge with its validating criteria from a cognitive angle automatically entails a theoretical framework to produce an account of how interactants generate and mediate their experiences of daily occurrences via discourse. In effect, the concept of mental models, in discursive psychology, has as its kernel objective the coverage of the construction of human representations throughout their lives (past, present, and future). Such models, moreover, cannot be identical "records"; instead, they are personally construed (subjective) models of happenings on the grounds of prior experiences, attitudes, and background knowledge (socio-

cultural). That is to say, the mental model of a given event or situation is broadly the same, yet each one elaborates it differently; henceforth, those models are subjective perceptions of occurrences that are shaped by "daily experiences". Furthermore, the locale where such mental models are placed is the "long-term memory" (LTM) exactly known as the "episodic memory" plus the "self"; actually, these constitute the principle source of active experiencing–in Van Dijk's own words "actor-experiencer". Elaborating on the same process, equally, Newtson and Engquist; Shipiley and Zacks; Van Voorst, Zacks and Swallow; Zacks et al. (as cited in Van Dijk, 2014a) show that participants, in social interaction, tend to mentally arrange the continual flow of "stream of consciousness" relating to routine experiences; this entails the separation of it into a series of models encompassing several, distinct episodes. These can be demarcated by shifts in setting, interpersonal relations, pragmatic intentions, and kind of actions undertaken. Moreover, such mental perceptions and situational representations can, from Van Dijk's theoretical standpoint, eventually amount to generic models that are valid for particular natural epistemologies for they determine common instances of interactional events performed by subjects of given epistemic communities. In a sense, to earn reliability as "correct", the afore-mentioned models must display some symmetry with the k-knowledge criteria pervading a social community. Ultimately, individual knowledge situationally construed, drawing on Van Dijk (2014a); Moscovici (as cited in Djamaan, trans. 2016), does not unfold to generic knowledge provided that the former satisfies the epistemic criteria of the relevant group; at this level, SRs remarkably builds on three key elements: communicative event (context), personal knowledge, along with socially shared knowledge. In other words, they reveal how discursive manufacture and reception in society implies socio-cultural attitudes, interchange occasions, and participants' subjective construction of contextual clues invoking experiences and knowledge.

In the same vein, we need to put under consideration how personal elaboration of the mental models in micro situations accommodates to the mechanisms of the macro level. To begin with, we would like to draw on Plotkin's account (as cited in Van Dijk, 2014a) regarding the re-constitution of the contextual puzzle necessary for smooth interaction amongst participants. The latter explains that people have construed and represented occurrences (via discourse) since earlier times; along the way, the faculty of schematic categorizing ("categorization") evolved genetically. This schema comprises the pinpointing of the setting, event, interlocutors, and the goal during interaction. Besides, these can be accessed furtively and smoothly by group members. Concurrently, Van Dijk (2014a) states that such a schema also arranges clauses and sentences' "meaning representations" relating to communicative occasions; that is, they help categorize the specific structural aspects underpinning variant discourses (known as "propositions"). Further, he focuses on such mental models as the backbone of producing news. In this case, the representations of actual happenings obey the distinct conceptions and appreciations of their reporters (Fowler, 1991). Importantly, Van Dijk points to the adaptation of the mental schema to the unique features of specific occasions–consciousness, self-experience, and social environment align with each other in the micro-level interaction. Indeed, this means accommodating mental models to match the information located in memory and discerned on the spot; in effect, this mental operation arises shortly after consciousness is individually recovered. In association with this point, inferring the relevant data yielded by others presents interaction actors with guiding clues ranging from: (a) identities of interlocutors, (b) their locations, (c) related time, (d) physical and mental state conditions, (e) targeted aim, (f) the stream of memories–actions done beforehand, etc. Subjectivity in forming mental models in specific situations

(micro level) extends within the bounds of the socially shared schemata (macro level) of understanding the world.

Equally important in the process of elaborating mental models is the assembly of key information, but how this is undertaken actually? To elucidate this operation, Barsaou; Glenberg; Vaela et al. (as cited in Van Dijk, 2014a) evoke the activation of the senses to obtain vital clues; consequently, the variety of experiencing social contexts via the senses must be seen as the basis of subjectivity in perceiving different happenings as mental models. In effect, according to Van Dijk, the starting point in the course of building such models reflects individuals' perceptions and conceptions of situation-related events. The latter stage branches specifically to what is termed "pre-conscious state"; the senses, as just mentioned, act as the source of personal knowledge. At this point, Brueckner and Ebbs; Gertler's assumption (as cited in Van Dijk, 2014a) accentuate reliability when it comes to perceptions as well as feelings that are accessible to the group's insiders but quite impervious to its outsiders in real-life situations. As such, the act of experiencing, in association with Wyer's account (as cited in Van Dijk, 2014a), itself constitutes the context where ideas and feelings arise over and over in the construction of mental models. This is, in fact, what psychologists often descriptively refer to with the term "ruminating". Additionally, commenting on self-knowledge (experiential knowledge), Van Dijk (2014a, 1993a) affirms that it is only reliable (credible) if perceptual interpretations of occurrences proceed compatibly with them; for example, we can think of the university context by way of illustration. Again, basing on truth criteria, participants' interchange occasions plus the ensuing outcome are supposed to work under the supervision of social cognition (SC); the same holds for world perceptions and socio-cultural structures of power. SC, as a result, acts as the "mediator" between the local (micro) and the global (macro) dimensions in society. That is to say, discourse in social

context, in spite of being located in individuals' minds, works under social cognitions which are considered as such because they are unanimously endorsed ("presupposed") by any group's subjects. Ultimately, such SCs' role consists in piloting social deeds and constituting the platform for the socio-cultural institutions at once (Resnick as cited in Van Dijk, 2014a). However, Loftus and Thomson (as cited inVan Dijk, 2014a) remind that the truth criteria may turn harsher in case there is a risk of catching relevant data, which would render such reality interpretation versions barely reliable in certain situations like witnesses in the court room. Experiencing daily situations entails awareness of key information within the bounds of SC.

To bring in more insight into the vital role of knowledge in discourse, we need to show how the gap is bridged between both concepts during interactional actions. As starters, Van Dijk (2014a) assumes that since mental models are crucial for the formation and interpretation of discourse basing on generic knowledge, communicators ought to relate discourse to the action or event it intends to *represent*. In fact, receivers can resort to shared knowledge to derive (infer) sense from discourse; simultaneously, discourse itself requires the mental models of individuals to work conveniently and efficaciously. For further explanation, he adds in:

> …representations of the communicative situation also take the forms of subjective mental models, context models, which control the situational appropriateness of discourse. In other words, mental models provide the basis of both the (extensional, referential) semantics and the pragmatics of discourse. (P. 26)

This statement provides evidence of the subjectivity underpinning the exploitation of common knowledge while elaborating the mental models upon which interpersonal coordination is

contingent for the mutual understanding of discursive events. However, mental models, he

insists, tend to be evidently more complex than the discourse reflecting them. In comparison

with previous theoretical enterprises, namely in CDA, Van Dijk's fresh theorizing (as cited in

Van Dijk, 2014a, 2009); Wodak (2006) evidently encompasses a cognitive approach to

context; i.e., the newly postulated paradigm rests principally on an interdisciplinary

context/discourse interrelationship. The critical discourse analyst, through his theory of

context, regards discourse as being conceived of and captured in context, indeed. The latter

key element is, besides, defined as the subjective conception of the interaction arising in

actual situations. In effect, though some scholars' skepticism about Van Dijk's scope being

beyond society (shared cognition), his broad framework represents a renewal of interest in

cognition as a "social property" with its representations and relevant processing tasks; it

centers on how general knowledge gives momentum to mental models' building of reality as

well as specific events (Augoustous and Walker; Fiske and Taylor; Hamilton, as cited in Van

Dijk, 2009; Van Dijk, 2009). This theoretical advance, according to Van Dijk, needs to be

subsumed within a broader theory of discourse since it regulates discursive production and

reception.

At this point, there is the persistent problem of relating discourse to society, which requires

scholars to further the scope of their discourse studies. Concerning this issue, Fairclough and

Wodak; Van Dijk, Wodak, Weiss, and Chilton (as cited in Wodak, 2006); Aini and Widodo

(2018); Van Dijk (as cited in Aini & Widodo, 2018); Fairclough (1989) remarkably focus

attention upon the lingering fault that has been characterizing theorization in discourse

studies. As a matter of fact, how to relate discourse to the social environment is not devoid of

hardships because it is inherently a complex business; Wodak (2006) states, "Mediation

between the *social* and the *linguistic*" (P. 181). Therefore, the scholar presses to more

penetration into the intricacies of this interdependence. Significantly she evokes the absence

of nearly any reference to cognition in this liaising process. Of course, Van Dijk's socio-

cognitive model makes the exception in such an account. In addition to the shortness of

evocation of the cognitive dimension, Wodak stresses that the three notions are by far variant

to be addressed overtly; their component elements can suggest different things across various

fields. In sociology, for instance, while society implies community variance, discourse

denotes a particular sense at the linguistic level, and cognition stands for mental structures

governing interaction (common sense). As such, this state of affairs should call for the

merging of those three perceptions to form the essence of a synthetic paradigm. In line with

this orientation, she goes on explaining, there have stemmed a whole panoply of concepts and

analytical tools from divergent theories; Lemke (as cited in Wodak, 2006) cites, among

others, Foucault's "*discursive formations*"; Bourdieu's "*habitus*" ; and Halliday and

Bernstein's" *register*" and "*code*" respectively . Nevertheless, these theoretical perspectives

do have one thing in common: they are all versed in coming up with a practical way of

extracting insights in the survey of the triplicate model (mediating discourse, cognition, and

society). In this register, the emphasis falls on "conceptual pragmatism", which is when utility

prevails over truth (Mouzelis, as cited in Wodak, 2006). That is, developing an eclectic

theory with conceptual tools that can help cope with the problem-oriented research. We would

conclude that the parallel examination of discourse, cognition, and social cognition is the core

of dealing with mental models as discourse.

What has been pointed out in the above paragraph constitutes, in Wodak's (2006) and

Graesser et al.'s (1997) sense, the first step in tackling the complex issue of relating discourse

to social structures. In effect, the whole enterprise necessitates the inclusion of cognition-

oriented theorizing within the realm of CDA. So far, Van Dijk; Weiss and Wodak (as cited in

Wodak, 2006); Van Dijk (2014a); Hart et al. (2012) confirm that the most prominent outgrowth has been the launching of a novel approach to context; this one is perceived as the set of social structures ("society"). Thus, elaborating a local, subjective context model prototype on which actual experiences of mental model constructions are copied in discursive actions must be a priority. Knowledge, at this level, is put into perspective, for interlocutors differently enact their understandings of the world in conducting and interpreting texts in use; in other words, participants from distinct social groupings are endowed with diverse versionsof world knowledge. There follows, as Wodak (2006) observes, the questions that are supposed to fuel further investigations on the part of experts throughout various areas of research, indeed. Firstly, does the repeated reference to knowledge suggest the vitality of resort to typical versions of world constructions (shared cognition)? Secondly, how and why are such mental processes undertaken by participants? Subsequent studies have hitherto proven revealing in the process of bridging the gap between discourse and society via cognition. Conversely, with respect to the cognitive aspect of representing life, Langlotz's account (2015), sounds less optimistic. Actually, this quality has been extensively explored in social cognition; nevertheless, meaning-derivation within the social space remains short of a compelling, theoretical achievement so far. Rather than grasping social "input" (knowledge) to conduct situational interaction, more interest has gone to humans trying to construe their social surrounding. Concerning this so called- shortcoming, he argues:

> To find orientation in the social practices, social cognizers must produce, attend to, and process social stimuli as cues that may have an immediate impact on their construction of social reality. Thereby, linguistic signals work as the central linking element between cognition, social convention, and social process. Through the ingenious manipulation of linguistic structures in interaction, social agents are able to

creatively adapt to the social environment as well as to adapt this environment to their own purposes. (P. 83)

This critical reading acts as a fortifying testimony to the crucial role of generic knowledge in conducting cognitive processing of discourse at both micro/macro levels.

Comparatively, it sounds that the previously formulated theorizing had not been compatible with this socio-cognitive orientation, which has been high on the agenda in the late decades in many fields of study. With respect to this, earlier cognitivism in relation to sense-derivation, as Langlotz (2015); Bloomaert; Gee (as cited in Langlotz, 2015) remark, has received a load of criticism specifically from: DA, sociolinguistics, ethno methodology, and conversation analysis (CA); they have all ruled out this purely cognitivist model. For them, language is primarily a context-based social activity, not just a set of mental knowledge upon which encrypting and decrypting ideas is contingent. In effect, the adepts of the social cognition model adopt a social constructionist epistemology of meaning making in approaching discourse. To explain, Arundale (as cited in Langlotz, 2015) states:

> […] the great majority of work in LSI [language and social interaction, Discourse Analysis] emphasizes the social basis of what persons interacting say and do […] [and] focuses on the jointly produced, communal and/or interactional bases of communication practices, not their individual psychological basis. (P. 84)

In other words, one would say that the principal concentration is on the jointly communicative conduct instead of the solely cognitive stages; this move, according to Langlotz stems from the critical stance toward the personal (micro) "decontextualized" nature of cognition. In the light of doing things from this perspective, the researcher juxtaposes the cognitivist versions of information treatment with the social interactional ones (sense-making) so as he would

come up with the points of intersection as well as drawbacks to be compensated thereafter. He goes on saying, "Both the lacunae and the intersections will provide the basis for stating a set of desiderata for a fruitful integration of the seemingly opposed perspectives on (social) sense-making" (Langlotz, P. 84). This is, actually, what scholars, in spite of the diversity characterizing their academic and theoretical backgrounds have in common: how discourse and cognition may criss-cross each other in social interaction. Besides to the interest in the crucial convergence of cognitive processes with discourse, context interferes as the inevitable setting for the social extension of interaction. As a matter of fact, what is termed as "social orientation", Langlotz (2015) postulates, depends largely upon the contextual dimension while practically sliding into the intricacies of the social surrounding. Most significantly, this particularly human-capable orientation cannot be fully operated unless taking into account the inner, cognitive level; in effect, he terms this, "the cognition of social sense-making", which had long constituted the subject matter of much of literature emanating from social psychology and social cognition. Also, such an apparently torrent of research had attempted to explore the humans' capability to construe their proper pictures of the world. In association with these mental mechanisms, Bless et al. (as cited in Langlotz, 2015) reveal:

> […] individuals need to 'understand' each and every situation in order to interact successfully with others. And while making sense of social situations often seems easy and simple on the surface, in actuality it poses an enormous challenge. As a consequence, individuals need a highly differentiated system of "tools" to accomplish this essential task. (PP. 84-85)

This means fully-fledged mastery and situation-based adaptation of the set of social knowledge typical of given social entities would much likely and automatically allow social

actors to attain mutual understanding. The focus just evoked by Langlotz obviously provides experts with much priority to conduct in-depth investigation into how "social cognizers" manage to properly construe mental representations of reality by means of functionally cognitive processes. The above socio-cognitive explanations signal that the joint building of what is taken as the social context seems to assume a mental dimension.

2.2.3.4 Ideology.

The term of ideology, which pertains closely to the production and reception of discourse and the shaping of power relations within society, needs to be singled out as an element of paramount significance. To begin with, it should be noted, according to Van Dijk (2003), that this concept has been remarkably ubiquitous throughout a range of domains including especially–social sciences, politics, and mainstream media among others–ever since its coinage by the French philosopher, Destutt de Tracy two centuries and a half ago. In this respect, de Tracy (as cited in Van Dijk, 2003) points in particular to experts conducting scholarly studies as people with firmly "fixed ideas". These are very tough to be altered. So, ideology, for him, is merely an abstract science of ideas; i.e., it branches to "…the study of 'how we think, speak and argue…'" (Van Dijk, 2003, P. 6). Borrowing Van Dijk's reported statement from de Tracy, this definition can be equated with what is known nowadays as the fields of cognitive science or psychology. In addition, though a big deal of literature has been written about ideology, it is hitherto among the most complex and debatable notions in the social sciences. It, indeed, poses a tremendous challenge to scholars to define it at length (Mooney & Evans, 1999; Eagleton, 1991). To sum it up, ideology, from its inception, has cast much controversy among scholars and philosophers.

2.2.3.4.1 Ideologies as (a system of beliefs).

To build on de Tracy's own conception of ideology, Van Dijk (2003) assumes that the latter relates primarily to "systems of ideas" to do with specific gatherings– social, religious, and political– as a source of generic consensus. In support of this assumed perception, the theorist comments:

> Communism as well as anticommunism, socialism and liberalism, feminism and sexism, racism and antiracism, pacifism and militarism, are examples of widespread ideologies. Group members who share such ideologies stand for a number of very general ideas that are at the basis of their more specific beliefs about the world, guide their interpretation of events, and monitor their social practices. (P. 6)

The gist of this explanation revolves around the fact that generally shared ideologies, regardless of their diversity, form the common ground upon which social communities' stances toward world affairs and perceptions of life and social behavior performances are contingent. In other words, ideology-based institutions continuously keep conceptions of world events as well as discursive practices under a close watch. In another definition, Van Dijk (2000), similarly, put the accent on social scope of ideologies when he puts it in this way:

> Ideologies…typically belong to the realm of social beliefs, and are therefore located in social memory. Thus, if ideologies are belief systems, we need to be at least a bit more specific and say that they are *social belief systems*. (P. 29)

Briefly speaking, the social dimension of ideologies sounds so strengthened and compelling in the second explanation that it, alongside the first one, forms the basis for any eventual coverage of it whatever will be the aim.

When covering the concept of ideology, Van Dijk (2003) on his part, takes the initiative to historically review it. As starters, though, the critical discourse analyst defines it specifically as the basic beliefs regulating social and political groups and their proponents, approaches to ideology have not remained static. Indeed, there has been no unanimously complelling explanation of the term to assume the form of a standard definition (Eagleton, 1991). Engels's conception (as cited in Van Dijk, 2003); Van Dijk (2008b); Eagleton (1991) basing on Marxism, for instance, reveals that ideologies have been perceived as "false consciousness" or even "misguided beliefs" or "socially necessary illusions"; these are beliefs imposed on the masses by those belonging to the powerful classes with the very aim of sustaining the "status quo". Consequently, the elites' aim behind such erroneous consciousness–spread socially via literary genres and journalistic writings–has been to hide the authentic, terrific circumstances where the working class barely survives and also to maintain them within the range of their constraining social institutions. In paraphrasing Engels's presentation of ideology, Van Dijk (2003) comments:

> For Engels' interpretation of Marx, and hence in many directions within Marxism, ideologies were forms of 'false consciousness', that is, popular but misguided beliefs inculcated by the ruling class in order to legitimate the status quo, and to conceal the real socio-economic conditions of the workers. (P. 7)

In short, it can be extrapolated that ideology in abstraction has been viewed by Marxists as a means of exerting power over dominated people by persuading them anyhow of the must-be accepted social, political, and economic order. Moreover, till lately the presentation of ideology as a tool benefiting the powerful classes has, in connection with his viewpoint, been much common in the social sciences; this is principally to counteract the logically true

knowledge in science. Such seemingly manipulated systems of ideas have subsequently amounted to the degree of commonsense and political maneuver–"false, misguided, misleading beliefs" that are encapsulated in contrasting writings; for instance, one could refer to opposing scholastic syllabi representing divergent ideological standpoints like those designed in Western countries and the communist ones (the ex-USSR, Eastern Europe, and China). The above portrayal of ideology, he goes on arguing, implies a social disparity or "social polarization" in terms of the emergence of "Us" ("*ingroup*") vs. "Them" ("*outgroup*"); in clear terms, society constitutes the contesting arena for groups ideas to dominate since each community claims to, "We have true knowledge, they [other ones] have ideologies [threatening theirs]" (P. 7). Ideologies have often been considered as the functioning mechanisms of social groupings.

In continuation of exposing the perception of ideology from a Marxist perspective, which sees it as the force driving the elites' social, political, and economic control, Van Dijk (2003) explores the other side of the story, likewise. In effect, he insists that the legitimization of hegemony is practically achieved through ideologies; however, this postulate does not solely suggest a damaging or prejudiced perception of ideologies. There are simultaneously positive ideologies to investigate and expose. The discourse scholar, in this respect, points to the dichotomies pervading the social sphere like: "feminism vs. sexism", "racism vs. anti racism", xenophobia vs. tolerance, "pacifism vs. militarism", colonialism vs. anti colonialism, etc. In addition, the rise of such positive sets of ideas contributes to maintaining in motion and legitimizing the struggle and opposition "*against*" the control as well as the ensuing social injustices. Karl Mannheim has coined the appellation "utopias" in order not only to refer to such "anti ideologies", but also to show that these have developed into systems of beliefs. Besides to being resistant to harmful beliefs, ideologies, especially deleterious ones can stand

as remarkably non-imposing; for example, religious or political or nationalist groups with extremist views are not usually widely heard and followed. Last but not least, Van Dijk explains that approaching ideology from this broad angle leads to more elastic description of it which means unveiling both facets underpinning its workings (negative and positive ones). Albeit, "*critical*" studies of devastating ideologies, as he claims, must not be reduced to the background since these are specifically aimed at uncovering the ideologies fueling all forms of power abuse and social inequalities and dominance. Van Dijk, ultimately, reveals that he is at variance with experts whose assumptions that general examination of ideologies does by no means guarantee conclusively critical findings. Attempting to expose prejudiced ideologies makes part of the duty of the critical discourse analyst is assisting those under domination to resist and try to change the "unfair" status quo.

2.2.3.4.2 Ideology at the heart of social practices: the discursive role.

Besides being shown as commonly endorsed sets of beliefs, ideologies significantly extend to informing the functioning of social behavior including discursive actions. To begin with, Van Dijk (2003) advocates that ideologies, on the one hand, help having a clear vision of reality from groups' perspectives; on the other hand, work as the communicative mechanism– the platform of "*social practices*" for their members. Mostly, ideologies, as he states, tend to guide humans' actions in society. For example, we could mention ideology-charged religious intolerance of majority groups; this leads most of the time to persecution practiced against minorities. Intergroup clashes, all the time, spawn ideologies which consequently split existence into Us and Them. Significantly, he insists, discourse is among the social actions very much affected by ideologies as the latter simultaneously enable language users to have access and also alter ideologies. I.e., ideologies and discourse have a mutual influence with

the former shaping up the discourse genre and the latter legitimizing them. Moreover, nearly all the utterances certain groups' proponents produce when engaged in interaction embody ideological stances in favor of or against people, events, or issues. Initially, the acquisition of ideologies is ensured by interacting with relatives, notably the parents and siblings. Subsequently, the continuation of ideological learning is furthered by: television programs (films, TV talk shows, cartoons, documentaries, news, etc), magazines and newspapers, literary writings, and routine exchanges either with friends or partners at work. As such, several discourse genres can be equated with indoctrination and political propaganda; indeed, this suggests initiating communities' subjects or even fresh joiners to their respective ideologies. We could, by way of illustration, evoke how the youth are indoctrinated by Nazi or Fascist ideologies in Europe. This following quotation should account for Van Dijk's theoretical concern regarding the discourse-ideology connection, "We…pay special attention to these discursive dimensions of ideologies. We want to know how ideologies may be expressed (or concealed!) in discourse and how ideologies may thus also be re-produced in society" (P. 9). Ideology underlies virtually every day activities especially discursive events.

Given that predominantly ideological structures usually nurture humans' social deeds including discursive interactions, legitimizations of control require in-depth treatment when it comes to social effects. First of all, Van Dijk (2003) highlights that "*critical*" surveys should be more foregrounded than ever before due to the fact that these are specifically aimed at exposing all forms of power abuse, social inequalities, and dominance with their ideological underpinnings. Power, similarly, requires a global study, for learned scholars can access unfair hegemony. This renders things further intricate with the working interrelationship between semiotic symbols, power, and ideology; thanks to language power ("symbolic

power") the "manufacture of consent" is arrived at in society. In other words, ideology and language, being interdependent, firmly establish power relations in social groups or subgroups with some amount of physical force that can go along the way (Fairclough, 1989, 1995b, Fairclough as cited in Mooney & Evans, 2015; Monney & Evans, 2015; Bourdieu as cited in Mooney & Evans, 2015; as cited in Milani & Johnson, 2001). To add on the subject matter, Fairclough (as cited in Mooney and Evans, 2015) comments:

> It is important to emphasize that I am not suggesting that power is just a matter of language. … Power exists in various modalities, including the concrete and unmistakable modality of physical force…It is perhaps helpful to make a broad distinction between the exercise of power through *coercion* of various sorts including violence and the exercise of power through the manufacture of *consent* to or at least acquiesce towards it. Power relations depend on both, though in varying proportions. Ideology is the prime means of manufacturing consent. (P. 16)

In short, being structured in particular patterns; ideologies are reflected in the linguistic selections, which must be in accordance with normative systems of shared values; here lies the power of ideology. At the same time, language might alter or even completely subvert whole thinking constructs by means of persistent repetitions over time (Mooney & Evans, 2015). One would extrapolate that ideology moulds language; the latter gains its social power from ideological structures while disseminating them in daily uses by elites or becomes a tool for resistance while employed by those struggling for change.

2.2.4 Structures of Discourse and Structures of Power

Being the mirror reflecting systems of social perceptions and attitudes, discourse tends to be fairly inextricable from the structures of power activated and practiced socially. In this respect, Van Dijk (2008b) remarks that the tight connection between discourse and "societal power" constitutes a novel step in theoretically investigating how power can be activated, expressed, encoded, and legitimized (reinforced and confirmed) through discourse events. Besides, certain notions and explanations linked to power, control, and discourse workings are basically ideological in nature; this ideology-centered elaboration relates particularly to the interface between both macro as well as micro levels. This, in effect, denotes the extension of groups and classes' power to the locally carried communicative occasions within the micro level where dominant institutional structures tend to be frequently invoked by discursive actors. Thereby, concentration of attention upon the impact of powerful institutions upon discursive acts has become a fact (Scherzer and Giles as cited in Van Dijk, 2008b). Van Dijk, in other words, points to the ideological dimension underlying the socio-cognitive framework. Moreover, he reiterates the continuation of his previously launched enterprise with more temptation into stretching the scope of study toward exploring discourse within the bounds of society at length. This is, actually, backed up by Blommaert and Bulcaen's argument (as cited in Shousha, 2010): It regards discourse as an intrinsically obscure bearer of power relations in society; for this specific reason exploring the complex process of establishing, reflecting, and re-producing those unequal power relations lucidly to the laymen is incumbent upon the CDA analyst. Van Dijk undertakes this task from a socio-cognitive perspective.

2.2.4.1 Analysis of power.

At this point, we would focus our attention on the term power, which alongside ideology play a crucial role not only in the interpersonal meaning-making of discourse throughout social contexts, but also in its relevant study. To Begin With, power, as indicated by Van Dijk (2008b); (Wodak & Bush, 2004), has been explored across several specialties of research, namely in political science, sociology, media studies, and CDA from which a plethora of literature has stemmed so far. In effect, what can be assumed, on their part, about social power is that it is an intrinsic characteristic ("property") of intergroup, interclass, and social organizations relationships. I.e., in the theorists' sense, when performing analytical work, it is revealed social relations of power are constantly expressed via discursive interaction. As such, discourse, being a major communicative tool, is representative of relations basically marked with struggle, conflict, and domination between social entities. At this point, groups exert control over others; they tend to take actions with which they can restrain or even subdue them altogether. Significantly, the distinctiveness of Van Dijk's theoretical postulate lies in the very fact that domination at the cognitive level is practiced by powerful elites to keep disenfranchised groups within the range of their control. This demonstration of power, furthermore, suggests a complete mastery of the cognitive basis underlying the dominated entities' actions in terms of: attitudes, beliefs, desires, expectations, and interests. Hence, for him, dominated groups must comply with the elite's schemata of beliefs and conceptions of the world because these constitute the social norms–"consensus". Last but not least, subjects of such communities ought to resort to and enact such imposed mental schemata in order to pursue their social actions involving interaction; submission is in motion at the cognitive levels. Albeit, the CDA specialist importantly points to the varying extents of conformity: these could fluctuate from full adherence to strong resistance. Lastly, discourse, then, interferes as a target for examination because it is the tool whereby power is activated,

performed, firmly rooted, and given legitimacy. Power is a vital element of study in CDA.

In addition to the above clarifications, Van Dijk (2000, 2008b, 2014a, 1993a) goes deeper into the buttocks of power practice in society. Here, he assumes that social power requires particular types of "resources" to be rightly employed namely to sanction those refusing to conform to it. As a matter of effect, these normally involve socially significant advantages (privileges) –social status and rank, different properties (affluence), specialist knowledge, and education– belonging to communities detaining power. Moreover, much effort must be diverted toward the sustainability of such resources in such groups or classes. That is to say, the performance of power denotes its safeguard in the hands of dominant groups as well as its expansion to other ones for complacent acceptance. Simultaneously, it is crucial for the exertion of power to be well informed about the dominated gatherings' cognizance of the elite's sets of perceptions, beliefs, and attitudes; in actual fact, this awareness can be made possible via inferring from the system of generic knowledge as this indicatively precedes social actions alongside intended goals. Dominance can, as such, be stratified into "*control of action*" and "*cognition control*". While the former means limiting the freedom of the subjected (persecution against ethnic minorities like the Rohingya in Myanmar), the latter denotes the exertion of influence over their mindset patterns ("mind management") –for example, the massive campaign following the US invasion of Iraq in 2003 launched by politicians and media. Most significantly, the researcher explicitly puts accent on the cognitive aspect; in this respect, he argues that the most fruitful type of exerting authority and control branches undeniably into the modern process of orientating others' minds toward certain intended visions and attitudes through diverse strategies, such as: "Manipulation",

"persuasion", and "dissimulation". Power implies a wide set of resources in order for it to work effectively–complete dominance.

Then, when it comes to relations of power in society, Van Dijk (2008b, 1993a); Fairclough (as cited in Van Dijk, 2014b) point to the other end of the thread in terms of resistant frames of mindset. The CDA experts, to begin with, state that there might exist several, different techniques to resist or even try to subvert the power abuses of those in control positions in society–this goes under the common term "counter power". Furthermore, resisting this elitist hegemony could be incentivized by a variety of factors: socio-cultural, politico-economic, historical, artistic, or revolutionary (uprisings whether armed or pacific), etc. Pleading in favor of this assumption, Van Dijk himself observes, "…therefore the enactment of power is not simply a form of action, but a form of social interaction" (2008b, P. 30); in brief, negotiating power relations amongst social organizations, namely through discourse, yields salient facts about who strive to perpetuate their hegemony and who struggle to overthrow it and impose theirs. In fact, drawing on discourse's determining role in controlling thinking, they clarify how the activation as well as dissemination of hegemony is reliant in the first place upon frequently intricate strategies underlying discursive practices; these aim to "reinforce", "normalize", "legitimize", and "naturalize" the social status quo. This state of affairs, to the above scholars, is usually characterized with the deleterious "*power abuses*" of those profiting from– unjust uses of laws; social norms and beliefs; conceptions of justice and equality; religious beliefs, etc. Henceforth, what grabs scholars' attention afresh notably in CDA at this stage is the activation of the opposite power by those under domination. Much of recurrent hegemony with its relevant notions of consensus may be virulently "challenged"; for example, how civil rights activists virulently resist the racist discourse especially after police have had resort to violent acts against Afro-Americans recently. This needs in-

depth, cooperative consideration of how power and control unfold functionally via communicatively complex processes, they reitirate. We would stress the vital role of power relations in fuelling the meaning-making of discourse in social context.

2.2.4.2 Control of discourse alongside its modes of reproduction.

After singling out power and the underlying resources smoothing its continual practices throughout society, more attention should be particularly placed on discourse. Indeed, according to Van Dijk (2008b), what is primordial for the exercise of power socially centers precisely on the mastery of discourse along with the very means of its production as well as distribution. In relation to this point, Van Dijk (2008b); Mazid (2014) explicate that powerful communities manage unlimitedly to penetrate into discourse in its variants; consequently, they can utter or write about whatever topic. The powerless, on the other level, are supposed to be uncritically attentive to what they receive–accept everything said inactively. As a matter of expediency, we would cite Van Dijk's own quotation, "Who can say or write what to whom in what situations? Who has access to the various forms and genres of discourse or to the means of its reproduction?" (2008b, P. 31). Simply speaking, it is only the elite who can access discourse and encapsulate their viewpoints by equally putting their hands over the various outlets for its broad expression and dissemination. In addition, by pushing the less powerful into complete acquiescence, such dominant groups' aim is to put them in the background by restraining their freedom (Mazid, 2014). Van Dijk, for instance, mentions media discourse specifically; those who are empowered can noticeably manipulate divergent genres and structures of discourses; at once, they are able to determine relevant situations and set up their agendas of intentions. Ultimately, the social power of those at the top seems so boundless that they can conceive of the subjects for debate; impose the mood(s) and types of

media discourse. Power is mostly put into practice on the grounds of monopoly of discourse as well as the tools for its expression society wide.

Significantly, what stands as evidence at this stage of study is the inseparable link between discourse and power. As a starter, congruent with Van Dijk (2008b); Shousha (2010); Gibbs (2015); Mayr (2000); Ahmadvand (2011); Fairclough's (1989) assumption is that discourse does not solely reveal power structures, but also unfolds functionally under such a system of regulatory rules. As a matter of fact, unfair power relations involving power abuse are most of the time operated via discursive sequences which, in turn, are prompted (their fabrication and reception) by those norms themselves. Moreover, Gibbs refers to Foucault as the originator of this perspective in DA. For Bernstein; Mueller; Schatzman and Straus (as cited in Van Dijk, 2008b), also, the account of such an interconnection acts as an informative indicator of the amount of power possessed by a given community, class, ethnicity, institutional entity as well as their respective proponents' social ranks. With regard to this assumed understanding, there will eventually be a practice of power on the part of those at the top thanks to unequal access to discourse at large. Becker, Hederbo, Pladars, Mattelart, and Schiller's elaboration (as cited in Van Dijk, 2008b), by this time, demonstrate that domination assumes the form of control of the means whereby discourses can be built and socially emitted so as to have massive effects on others. In effect, this links particularly to gurus' monopoly of mass media in terms of financing and technology; these constitute the essence of media working and discursive mediation. Thus, with a tight grip over such media tools, the elites can exercise their authority upon social subjects, which, according to Van Dijk, evidently signals the compelling push toward a generally consensual state. Compatible with this is his statement, "The same power groups also control the various modes of distribution, especially of mass media discourse, and therefore also partly control the modes

of influence of public text and talk" (P. 32). I.e., by enjoying access to the modes of dissemination of discourse, such dominant groups can tangibly mould recipient's perceptions and attitudes. What doubtless prevails as paramount evidence of social hegemony is testified to by the merging of discourse and power as one and the same in the course of carrying it out.

Specifically, those whose power fuels social domination interestingly fall under the analytical scope of survey to shed more light on them. Firstly, Bourdieu; Bourdieu and Passeron as cited in (Van Dijk, 2008b); Johnson and Milani (2010) remind that the tools of expressing discourses are in the hands of powerful entities, but they have distinctively coined the term "symbolic elites" to become subsequently a common denominator when dealing with controlling socially via discourse. Further, these can be stratified into many categories: novelists, poets, journalists, singers, film producers and directors, script writers, etc. They are remarkably empowered with relative freedom; henceforth, as well as their ability to conceive of and construct discourses of variant types and forms, they can equally select and impose certain agendas for debates –news alongside its amount; themes; subjects; people and occurrences' representations–within the range of their influence. That is, the capacity to exert power this way falls, for them, under what is known as "symbolic capital", which, on the one hand pertains to all the means available for such symbolic elites to encapsulate their ideology-laden attitudes about world issues; on the other hand, gives them room for the "news worthiness" evoked above. According to the scholars, controlling aggregations can generate common systems of beliefs; ideologies, norms and values; knowledge; and perceptions– the symbolic power, coined by Bourdieu (as cited in Van Dijk, 2008b; Johnson & Milani, 2010), too, covers this brand of ideology-driven power. Controlling elites in any

society detain the tools whereby they can discursively mediate and distribute their symbolic capital with imposing power.

2.2.4.3 Strategies relating to cognition, control, and ideological production.

2.2.4. 3.1 Ideologies as social cognition (shared social beliefs): a new approach to ideology.

Taking up ideology as being epitomized throughout social occasions of ordinary interactions gives it a discursively symbolic and generic quality, which is a fresh trend in approaching it. As starters, Van Dijk (2003, 2008b) puts to the fore the truism gaining ground concerning social hegemony; in actual effect, the latter evokes the discursive influence upon social member's thinking from a symbolical standpoint. This newly adopted route seems to have ruled out the old-fashioned view of domination as being economic (control of mass media). In this respect, cognizance of hegemony over the less powerful at the socio-economic level, which interferes as a fundamental parameter in both the performance as well as sustainability of power relations, is inevitably affiliated with ideology. This overall state, besides, lends itself to varying degrees of endorsement to, negotiation of, or even opposition to existing common sense. It follows then that ideology, grounding in the current approach of social cognition), must be seen as substantially primordial for discussing the way discourse actively helps legitimizing power relations. According to the social cognition theorist, more and more concentration should be diverted to this intricate process as ideologies mostly guide discursive actions. In Van Dijk's sense, ideology assumes given brands of social cognitions prevalent among social entities of whatever type; he clarifies simultaneously that ideology being social cognition is not merely a range of perceptions and beliefs. Instead, it is portrayed, at this

point, as an intricate system "framework" whose primary work consists in monitoring the production, alterations, and implementations of variant social cognitions (SCs) –points of view, attitudes, and kinds of beliefs– alongside SRs as prejudicial statements. Furthermore, such ideological constructs depend on the set of socially normative values, aims, and principles guiding different conceptual understandings of the world. I.e., the resulting workings of ideological forms obey particular institutions for acquisition and implementation: religion, school, government, family, media, party, books, etc. These, at the same time, pilot social interaction by being closely conformed to and activated in the course of doing so. Language, thereby, encompasses ideology (Mooney & Evans, 1999). In support of his assumption, Van Dijk explains, "In this way, an ideology assigns coherence among social attitudes which in turn codetermine social practices" (2008b, P.34). SCs with shared knowledge and SRs jointly manage social conducts. To conclude, away from socio-economic domination, ideology has presently assumed a socio-cognitive status.

In contrast with the traditional conception of ideology built on Marxism, the social cognition one seems to have fallen apart at the seams with it. Indeed, such basic notions as false consciousness (bias-laden ideological stances), which have been long criticized as misleading beliefs enforced by elites to conserve their dominance, for Van Dijk (2003, 2008b) are comparatively unrelated to his analytical work. What should be fundamental, at this point, centers upon the generic interest of the whole social group (community) in terms of the "(re)construction" of reality as perceived by its members as a whole. This ought to work in harmony with shared goals, likewise. Significantly, the assessment of harmonious social conceptions needs to be contingent upon the extent of their practical relevancy to groups' social deeds, notably discursive exchanges. That is, cases when participants materialize their impartial purposes via discourse. Moreover, whether the evaluation is positive or else

negative about any social truth is proportional to the degree of efficacy with which social performances are conducted. In line with this theoretical orientation, ideology can be defined a common feature of whole groups; besides, it carries within it certain benefits destined at those who are socially dominant; at once, these are equally socially advantageous–admitted by all the community rather than being forcefully prejudicial Bourdieu (as cited in Mooney & Evans, 2015). Albeit, one can, with some sense, perceive some traces of adherence to socially imposed thinking standards of conformity to socially generic thinking.

Taking into account communities and modes of thinking, it would appear logical that ideologies are far from being typical to certain individuals. On the grounds of this novel orientation, ideologies equal, for Van Dijk (2000, 2003, 2008b, 20014a) general beliefs about particular historical happenings as claimed by Marxists. In effect, because ideologies assume a social nature, they must not be researched form an individual angle ("individual memory"). In addition, such ideologies can have substantial influence on personal beliefs; being possessed of subjective attitudes related to personal experiences, such as going on an expedition to Africa ought to be subsumed by the surrounding beliefs of the group–*socio-cultural knowledge.* Significantly, none would likely manage communication successfully unless having direct access to common knowledge on how the world functions alongside how a society's lifestyle is performed across it quotidian experiences. In the course of their lives, people have to acquire a big deal of such knowledge, for it regulates their social activities with their peers and subjects from other gatherings, with whom they negotiate the form of socio-cultural organization. Over the years, thanks to the massive appearance of various media and discourse at school, they would be introduced to other aspects of life: social and work values, religious tolerance, etc. On the one hand, that social knowledge, Van Dijk assumes, constitutes what is known as "*social memory*"; on the other hand, acts as a

systematic set of mental representations stored in such memory. Shared experiences of reality imply a generic memory.

2.2.4. 3.2 Types of memory and representations.

By going over how social communities are bonded together by commonly prevalent perceptions to reality, the terms memory and representations need some classification. With respect to this, Van Dijk (2000, 2003, 20014a, 2014b, 2008a) initially builds on psychologists' linkage of different systems of social cognition to several memory variants. However, the most prominent differentiations revolve around the dispatch of ideologies between two types: the short-term memory and long-term memory. The first (short-term memory) extends to routine situations and that is where re-called ideas and beliefs are recorded; in fact, he describes it as some kind of autobiography reflecting subjectively individual world experiences. Strictly speaking, the part of memory encompassing experiential beliefs is termed "episodic", and such episodic conceptions make up the "episodic memory"; it is very unique and partial since it pertains specifically to the "self" as a central element to do with persons' own experiences remembered daily. This memory, nonetheless, fades progressively with time: experiences cannot be retrieved fully after a certain amount of time. The second type of memory refers to the area in which all shared ideologies are stored. Van Dijk judges this distinction usefully fruitful as it sheds light on ideologies as variants. He indicates that modern cognitive and social psychology both juxtapose respectively the beliefs in a dichotomy form– "concrete"/"abstract", "general/"specific", and "lasting"/ "furtive"–to evoke the two types of memories. With regard to this point, there could be some occurrences experienced both personally and socially as well; in other words, these can be episodic in nature– context-limited and general, abstract,

and concrete. For instance, when the American establishment went to war against Iraq and occupied it in 2003, there was simultaneously a context-specific official standpoint on the so-called "nuclear issue" with the Iraqi government and a general public opinion in favor of bombing Saddam with media playing a mobilizing role despite a relative opposition manifested mainly by pacifists. Representations and memory types interrelate in connection with social cognitions.

Basing on the above distinction, ideologies can be further equated with social beliefs manipulated by social members rather than personal opinions. For Van Dijk (2000, 2003), it turns out that ideologies link to pressing socio-political matters to do with given groups. Actually, they can be about issues relating to humans' "*environmental safety*" as claimed by such groups as Green Peace Movement, or to "*existence and death*" as advocated by anti-abortion groups contesting its legalization, or "*gender*" as reflected in feminists' fight for the equal treatment of men and women in different domains versus sexists' stereotypical beliefs about women , or "*class*" as shown in the combat of subjected classes to achieve a fair distribution of resources in a society (the communist ideology opposing the capitalist one), or even "*race*" and "*ethnicity*" manifested in racist and anti-racist ideologies worldwide. Henceforth, what stems from individuals in terms of reactions to respective ideologies is reduced to mere opinions. This differentiation rests particularly upon the "evaluative elements", which help someone position him/herself toward ideologies, Van Dijk explains. Moreover, the critical discourse analyst employs the term "historical knowledge" to draw attention to generally shared knowledge relevant to certain historical events and figures. In effect, his foremost aim branches to contrasting the strictly "personal knowledge", which is stored in the episodic memory and context-based, with jointly cultural heritage of historical experiences–happenings, peoples, actions, or settings encapsulated by certain communities

like the Algerian Revolution in 1954 being a "*social memory*". What may be misinterpreted as a mere opinion can be a fallacy since humans are subsumed within their communities with the possibility of adapting their shared beliefs to specific, concrete instances.

2.3 Van Dijk's Approach to Media Discourse Analysis

2.3.1 Discriminatory and Racist Discourses: the Role Performed by Media

To begin with, it must, according to Wodak and Busch (2004), be noted that this new trend in CDA in analytically addressing media texts is currently based on the linguistic, qualitative perspective. Actually, this orientation can be attributed to the ever-growing, universal shift toward description-based theorizing while interaction within the larger socio-cultural environment is dealt with by critical discourse analysts. Besides, Jensen and Jankowski's joint concept (as cited in Wodak & and Busch, 2004) the "qualitative turn in media studies" seems to fit this state of affairs; however, they do not suggest any reduction vis-a-vis the long-established survey of media texts common up to these days. This fresh approach, still for Wodak and Busch; Carvalho (2000), encompasses a variety of theoretical standpoints that are quite divergent from the conventional tradition steeped in media studies. For instance, the first co-authors point to conversation analysis (CA) among others. One would say that CDA and even critical linguistics have witnessed a revolutionary diversion of efforts when it comes to analyzing media's textual output qualitatively.

Concerning CA, which emerged in the 1960s, Wodak and Busch (2004) acknowledge that it has been at the foreground with its pioneering paradigm with regard to textual analysis. At the beginning, CA practitioners have tended to be more interested in the superficial, structural

order of everyday conversations without any reference to the socio-cultural context; soon after, this field of study has reversed the focus by drawing on the theoretical principle of ethno methodology. The latter, in effect, adopts an interpretative approach in connection with the organizational structures of social life. In other words, this field of research investigates the following topics: Ethnic groups' cultural features, traditions, customs, social structures, etc that constitute the context for common interaction; nevertheless, CA does not limit its analytical scope solely to this type. Rather, it branches to all sorts of social interaction, including interactive media occasions (TV and radio talk shows, news interviews, etc) since these communicative acts themselves are subject to social constraints shaping up the structures underpinning social interaction. This turn of attention straightforwardly suggests a thorough exposition of extracting meanings from media texts to put them within the proper socio-cultural and even political context(s).

In addition, it would be fair to stress as valuable Carvalho's (2000) observation regarding media's ideology-charged discourse. The scholar, as a matter of fact, points out that there exist a wide range of theoretical output and analytical tools in connection with approaching the previously mentioned discourse. Moreover, this breadth of analytical perspectives readily signals a scarcity of neutrality; in clear terms, most, if not all, theoretical enterprises rest on distinct sets of methodological, attitudinal, ideological orientations, and influential power on recipients. Nonetheless, the approaches to media discourse tend to have one thing in common: they cannot disengage from the centrality of unraveling the text producers' intentions, which, in turn, foreshadow dominant ideologies ruling social mechanisms. This makes the pillar of any DA study of media discourse. In this register, Carvalho argues:

The main assumption of discourse analysis is that the work of deconstruction and reconstruction of texts can give important indications about issues like the intentions of the author of a text utterance, politically dominant ideologies, or the potential impact of an advertisement on a certain audience. However, there is not a standard method for the examination of texts, but multiple forms of going about it.[1] Each of the procedural choices is not neutral, nor does it take the researcher to the same conclusions as others. (P. 3)

In other words, analysts, no matter the pretended degree of scientific objectivity, depart from distinct theorizing frameworks and mostly arrive at findings with somehow ideological implications for scholars and readers in general.

As it will follow in this segment, Van Dijk's analytical model applies precisely in the area of racism and discrimination through the lens of media discourse. To begin with Van Dijk (1991, 2012) reveals that news discourse analysis inherently involves having recourse to the examination of both structural arrangements as well as the intended functions basing on a multi-disciplinary approach. This is due to the assumption that the dissemination of racism and discrimination against ethnic minorities' calls for a socio-political study alongside the way discourse is received and stored in memory (a psychological address of cognition); besides, the forging of ideological attitudes towards them is a question of delving into interaction and socio-cognitive theorizing. Therefore, all of these scopes of research ultimately converge in DA. In this respect, the focus is placed, on one side, at discursive structures and, on the other, socio-cognitive and political structures as well as processes determining the connections between text and context. Further, this framework of study does not stop at the macro level (societal and political dimensions of tackling discourse); instead, it

introduces the local (micro) level. The latter covers interactional events in which racism is remarkably widespread through the discursive medium. Thus, we can say that Van Dijk's approach has broadened the scope of analysis to include both levels: the macro and micro levels.

In line with this vision of things, racist discourse comes directly through the lens of the socio-cognitive perspective to be given top priority in unveiling media's seemingly active part in the whole affair. As starters, Van Dijk (1991, 1993b) states that mass media play a significant role in reproducing racism with their mediation and reinforcement might for the elites; ideologies shaped by social norms are epitomized via media-produced discourses. This perspective is, at some point, revealing as to the type of discourse endorsed by certain media. Therefore, to investigate media's role in diffusing beliefs entails the adoption of a strictly critical perspective to explore the ideological mechanisms dominating in a society. In association with this academic trend, Van Dijk (2012) argues that racism is not a personal issue but a social one; as a matter of fact, relations of power, within groups, are disseminated through discourse. Here, those who have power over others not only circumscribe their freedom and actions, but especially model their mental representations of others. He, additionally, brands these two kinds of domination respectively: "systemic forms" and "systematic forms". While the former term covers socio-cognitive schemata (ideologies, stereotypes, and prejudices), the second pertains to "different thinking [perceptions] about others" with observable acts accompanying them. It is the field of social psychology that, according to Van Dijk (2003, 2012), has come up with the mental postulate, which draws the line between "us" and "them" ("in-group and out-group"); members are fundamentally supposed to adhere to general mode of thinking with complacency and participate in reinforcing that whole system in daily discursive practices. He, at this level, emphasizes the

problematic aspect of how discourse can be a type of social practice directed against others in the same way as authentic acts. In a nutshell, the theorist is engaged in striving to pin point how we get particular modes of thought, and the way this can be mediated between mind and social acts. Equally, he assumes the non-innate quality of such mental forms. Ultimately, the scholar, once again, reminds the decisive role of many public forms of discourse– different media types– in the acquisition of racism and discrimination. He adds in, "At every level of our analysis, we encounter ideologically based beliefs, opinions, and attitudes. This is true both for news reports as well as for our approach to their analysis and evaluation" (Van Dijk, 1991, P. 5). This statement is a testimony to the influential mission media is commissioned to fulfill.

When it comes to the exercise of extensive power and domination against other ethnic groups, the media outlet can prove vital. On this point, Van Dijk (1991, 2003, 2008b, 2008a, 2012) pushes things further. He, in effect, point out that ideology transmissions by dominant elites is given impetus by means of the mastery of tools of "symbolic reproduction"; eventually this allows them to effect considerable influence on the masses (others) and accordingly the fabrication of social consensus. In connection to media-induced process of disseminating racism as an ideological frame specifically in the West, he gives further explication:

> … the media in white dominated societies participate in the reproduction of racism. Experiences and analyses by minority groups as well as other, scholarly, evidence have repeatedly shown that the dominant media in various degrees have perpetuated stereotypes and prejudice about minority groups. (1991, P. 6)

I.e., acting discursively against people with distinct color, from a different racial or ethnic belonging or even religious sects necessitates putting hands on mass media thanks to their ubiquity in our lives. Equally of significance about media, the expert assumes, is the fact that they communicate shared knowledge ("public knowledge") either overtly or covertly. Elites, remarkably, tend to encrypt their ideological viewpoints, namely on racism and do not convey them explicitly. Henceforth, euphemistic forms may be resorted to deal with race issues. For example, we can refer to Johnson's survey (as cited in Van Dijk, 1991); it arrives at the finding that Western media especially the US press hardly deals with racism topics despite the depicting blacks as stereotypically bad: cocaine dealers, armed people, etc. in comparison with whites (knowledgeable and well behaved; white supremacy). In this case, generic knowledge works as a strategic "framework" piloting and easing the encoding process of media discourse. All in all, different brands of media constitute an ideal means in the hands of elites.

2.3.2 Racism (Ethnicism) as an Ideology

In present times, racism is no more solely seen as mere acts taken to the disadvantage of others; it should be something more complex than it appears. Actually, modern racism, Van Dijk (1991) claims, is an intricate system with a societal dimension. This system is based essentially upon dominance; the latter can take on divergent forms in society, political, socio-economic, cultural, and biological. Nevertheless, such manifestations of racism are currently defunct since racism has, in recent decades, turned into a socio-cultural outgrowth: "construction" (Omi & Winant as cited in Van Dijk, 1991). Comparatively, Western racism not only relates to bodily features and the classification of non-Western people into negative categories as it was the case with the imperialist colonization in Africa and the ensuing

perpetration of killings against the aboriginal inhabitants, but mainly relies on cultural (ethnic) properties in treating immigrants especially from the third world. In alignment with this novelty of looking at others, Van Dijk explicates that portrayals of on non-western subjects is contingent upon what typically renders them distinct from Western ethnic models of conceptualizing existence in terms of: Lifestyle, customs, faith, language, morals and ethics, fashion, etc. Arab and Muslim immigrants, for example, are often subject to unfair evaluative categorization when represented in media. In addition, he, by going over empirical work, comes to the conclusion that the norms managing the social hierarchy of races (racism) branches basically into the ethnic-centered classification of the "self and others"; this has given momentum to "ethnicism" as structure of ethnic supremacy. This emergent term signals hegemony on ethnic groups and even denying them altogether. On her part, Wodak (2007) adds more to the subject matter. She, in reality exposes the multi-layered dimension of racism pinpointing "*syncretic racism*" and "syncretic *anti-semitism*". While the first links to regularly excluding terms toward others like "racialization", "otherism", and "discrimination"; the second connects to the creation of "differences" to fuel political, ideological, plus discriminatory deeds on a societal acale. In this concern the theorist explains "Old and new sterotypes form a mixed bay of exclusionary practices; they are used whenever seen to be politically expedient–such as gaining votes" (2007, 205). The activation of stereotypes, which are ethnic- rejecting views of the other, seems to serve political agendas within society. In sum, unjust evaluations of others, nowadays, obey to a certain extent socio-cognitive parameters alongside political institutions.

Endorsing the socio-cognitive approach to racism (ethnicism) as a type of ideology puts into perspective the examination of its structural constituents. As starters, given that ideologies, for Van Dijk (1991, 2012), are relevant to groups, they are constituted of inner

structures of mental representations pertaining to "groupness". In other words, we live in communities to do with age (adults, teenagers, children, elderly); sex (men, women); nationalities (Mexicans, Algerians); race (Arabs, Europeans); ethnicity (Kurds,); religion (Muslims, Jews). Moreover, respective members have to learn continuously about their membership. Thereby, covering modern racism (ethnicism) entails delving into the structural underpinnings alongside corresponding processes ruling the social system, which are ideological in nature; this initiative should encompass the network of social, economic, and political structures of "inequality" plus the socially shared representations invoked in the course of interactional process between participants in daily situations and between media institutions and audiences as well. Most importantly, the researcher assumes that ideology in general is made of "polarization" structures which draw a distinction between "Us and *Them*" – *"our group and their group"*. In this respect, media can encapsulate positive qualities on grounds of dominant ideologies underlying them; meanwhile, they conceal unacceptable habits and qualities by limiting their writings on dominant attitudes on sensitive issues, such as current xenophobic views in Europe and the US. Instead, they might use expressions like public fears of immigrant waves. In association with controversial topics permeating Western societies (racism, discrimination, xenophobia, Islamophobia), media especially the press frequently avoid providing details about them; because such ideologies can be judged by observers as inadmissibly bad qualities, they tend to employ lexical forms and metaphors to soften what may be extremely powerful expressions and wording. In fact, discursive strategies (metaphors for example) are primarily intended to spawn mental models followed with emotional reactions among individuals. This practice, according to him, is what media have in common. To sullen other ethnic gatherings' reputations, building on Van Dijk's own example (2012), certain prejudices can emerge: Muslims are radicals. At the other extreme, the

converse is true; in order to create mental models within the group about others (them: ethnic or religious minorities, immigrants, etc), media attribute bad qualities to them. Highly prejudiced expressions are widely diffused by journalists, hence. We would cite, for instance, some: Muslims are "terrorists", stated immigrants or ethnic groups are aggressive, thieves, etc. In association with this point, Wodak (2007) interestingly draws attention to the novel notion of "racism without race". At this point, exculing discourse appears deviant from pointing stereotypically to any special belonging; it is a kind of "de-referentialized", "floating discourse" where variant forms of racism, xenophobia, Islamophobia, anti-semitism merge together to conjure highly decrying sterotypes. In short, Lacleau and Mouffe (as cited in Wodak, 2007) recapitulate this intricate process through their proper term "empty signifier". Ideologies operate in a more sophisticated way than they may sound.

Conclusion

Across the second chapter, Van Dijk's social cognition has been elaborated on. Here, his approach to the description of context from a socio-cognitive viewpoint has been tackled with emphasis laid on beliefs as knowledge shared socially. In this respect, the evolution of cognitive integration in discourse study and the subsequent insertion of the social dimension in the whole communicative process have been given their due share of explanation–the triangulation paradigm of discourse, knowledge, and society. Thus, the social psychological aspects of context have been demonstrated as fundamentals in his theorizing over context-centered interaction. At this point, mental models as discourse and knowledge have been addressed to account for social sense-making as well as construction of the world. Ideology being treated as a system of beliefs underlying social behavior, furthermore, has been introduced. Afterward, structures of discourse and those of power have been put under

scrutiny in order to elaborate on how discourse alongside its modes of re-production can be

controlled to exercise domination over disenfranchised groups. At last, Van Dijk's approach

to media discourse analysis dealing with the way discrimination and racism are reinforced and

disseminated by mass media has been exposed with specific reference to ethnicism (racism as

an ideology).

Chapter Three: The Digital Age of Social Media and the Brexit issue

Introduction

 This chapter deals with the very up-to-date subject of social media in and the important metamorphoses of society under digitization. Such social networking sites (SNSs) constitute, by far, an integral part of our daily lives. In fact, people of all ages can easily connect to online platforms, and they can express their opinions on any event of interest that takes place in society. That is not all; it is possible for thousands or even millions of members of social networks–Facebook, Twitter, LinkedIn, Instagram, and blogs– to interact with each other live despite the Spatio-temporal barriers separating them. Hence, an overview of theorizing new media from Modernism to Hall's new-Marxist approach to them is undertaken to clarify the changing the changed context of media/recipients interface. Next, the transition from the first to second media age is equally dealt with stressing the move toward the virtual community and sociality online between communities ("platformed sociality"). Along the way, the historical as well as social evolution of social media is covered. In the end, global activism in the digital era as well as the political impact of social media is given some coverage. Also, as part of this chapter the scope of study is devoted to an overview of the Brexit issue in the UK for the sake of presenting a clear backdrop against which things have evolved in the aftermath of the 2016-Brexit referendum in the UK. This consists essentially of a historical account of Brexit from the 1970s up until 2016; besides to this, a brief coverage of the legal proceedings the UK's Government has to undertake on order to arrive at an Agreement Deal with the EU with all the scenarios lying ahead. With this regard, the present part deals with how the Conservatives represented by Mr. James Cameron, Mrs. Theresa May, and Mr. Boris Johnson's Governments have traced the course of their Brexit negotiations and the decisive

role played by Parliament in shaping a Withdrawal Agreement. Finally, the post-Brexit trade agreements between the UK and EU have been addressed.

3.1 New Media and Digital Theory: Theorizing New Media

The emergent study of new media, according to (Creeber, 2009) draws on a multitude of theoretical and methodological materials. Despite the unquestionable suitability of the digital theory when dealing with such new media, the diversity of perspectives can perfectly be of unimaginable significance toward the relevant theorizing; thus, stepping back through time to consider different media-related analysis becomes a necessity. In other words, the approach of new media entails a historical overview of past as well as current lines of media study. Moreover, to catalyze this deed, the scholar insists that Modernism must constitute the outset in terms of consideration with other perspective to follow respectively.

3.1.1 Modernism in connection with mainstream media

It seems that the influence of Modernism has been multi-dimensional throughout the course of history. As starters, Creeber (2009) emphatically points to this era as it represents a goldmine of rationalism and scientificity for studying and comprehending the world's different spheres (economy, politics, society, sciences, industry, etc). Actually, Modernism from its inception at the turn of the 19th century would set out to resist the deeply rooted dogmas of religion and its perceptions of life; these had been dominant in the long period prior to the Industrial Revolution. This new trend, moreover, represents a response to the resulting transformations brought about by industrialism because modernists favorably welcomed this new technological age; meanwhile, a bench of them overtly expressed their fears of any eventual calamities and atrocities born of Modernism: soon after, there would

follow the First and Second World Wars as well as the degradation of individualism. Here lies the paradox; in fact, there reigned a confusingly mixed feeling of optimism and pessimism with regard to the outcome of Modernism, in accordance with the author's account. Ultimately, it would be useful to remind that Modernism originated from a new wave in architecture from the 1920s up to the 1970s that focused precisely on ordinary as well as conformist patterns in designing edifices. It, also, represented many forms of art that took into consideration the structural level instead of portraying authentic situations (Danesi, 2009). Modernism would spur a fresh way of looking at the world outside the bounds of the restraining dogmas.

Furthermore, still in connection with Creeber's explanation, theorists alongside thinkers and even artists engaged in the construction of a predominantly optimistic view of industrialism and modernity. As a matter of fact, striving to re-visit Modernism, the scholar gives paramount importance to the role the thought underlying this movement (especially artistic thought) was supposed to play in challenging the popularly held culture and even the possibility of altering it altogether. We, actually, re-produce his own words to mention his comment on this very point:

> And it was partly Modernism's belief in the power of art and the artist to transform the world that lay behind its overwhelming distrust and distaste for the sort of everyday culture to be found in pulp novels, the cinema, television, comics, news papers, magazines and so on. (Creeber, 2009, P. 12)

In the same line of reflection, Huyssen's presentation of Modernism (as cited in Creeber, 2009) sums it up, "[Modernism was] relentless in its hostility to mass culture" (P. 12), accentuating mainly "avant-garde" art as part of this trend, furthermore. These

scholars claim that Modernist art and mode of thinking could play a decisive role in perpetuating the critical mind both at the social and artistic levels under the dissuasive strains of industrialization (the maintenance of mass thinking or culture).

This overall situation, as Creeber goes on explaining, of avant-garde conception in strong opposition to the firmly fixed "mass culture" would characterize the Modernist approach to mass media during the 20th century. In effect, it would not be less significant to remind that media output was to sustain the prevalent socio-economic order and protect it from any possibly sweeping change. The most notable hoard of intellectuals and thinkers who forcefully rejected and resisted the media-instilled mass culture was the Frankfurt School; actually, the fellows of this school of philosophers were obliged to flee Nazi Germany over World War 2 (WW2) in search of settlement in the United States of America (U.S.A.). Subsequently, the massive industrialization and its seemingly inextricable linkage with the American mass culture sparked their interest to a great extent. Besides, with their overt Marxist background, such thinkers viewed media as being the direct outcome of industrialization whose prime mission consisted in establishing a solid connection between popular culture and Fordism. This term, in fact, relates to the thinking mode prevailing in the US in the 1920s; it refers precisely to Henry Ford's prosperous mass production and high manufacture standards in automotive industry following the introduction of the assembly line in the production process. Moreover, the conception underpinning this perspective would later enable all Americans, including workers, to have access to Ford cars at an affordable price. The latter state of affairs meant that it was the inception of an era of conformism dominated by uniformity of thought and behavior (Danesi, 2009). Accordingly, Creeber shows that such theorists could dissect critically the elements upholding mass culture in place– radio and TV shows, papers, pulp writings (novels, short stories), theatre, cinema, and music–to conclude

how uniform these were in evoking as well as affirming the culture of industry. Thereby, the critical perspective fueling the Marxist-oriented school, which had coincided with the rise of Nazism, would essentially and strongly condemn the socio-economic injustices as well as animosities exercised against the lower classes and minorities (Slater, as cited in Abidi trans., 2016). At once, many Moderist writers would feel entrenched in dutiful reparation of a "dysfunctional culture of information" (Wollaeger, 2006). Mass media were perceived as powerful devices to make subjects of identical minds divesting them of their individual originality and sustaining the status quo.

In support of what has been evoked so far concerning the enforcing role of mass media, Creeber (2009) points to the inert audiences. Since the major principle regulating media over the first part of the 20th century would be mainly to convey the cultural and political underpinnings of Modernism, the author depicts the large audiences as being not only intrinsically inactive, but equally very vulnerable to continual media attacks. For him, this relationship grounded in the enforcement of uniformity within society was remarkably pervasive throughout much literature devoted to media and audience study under the Modernist scope. For instance, the media "effects", which was also termed "hypodermic needle" paradigm, portrayed the audiences as helpless masses subjected to the constant media's indoctrinating power. Indeed, media were seen as being capable of directly impacting the conduct of human beings; their minds would form the target for swaying, with their substantial flow of information in the same way as the hypodermic needle actually does with the human body (Danesi, 2009; University of Twente, 2010). Given the circumstances of the interwar period, which were characterized by the emergence of new brands of media especially the radio and TV as effective tools of manipulation, this theory, actually, postulates the consumers' direct exposure to their highly dominating influence. Consequently, this big

deal of messages bombardment would very likely push audiences toward uniform thinking and behaving (University of Twente, 2010). This age was primarily marked by mass media's continual bombardments against inactive, uncritical recipients.

At the same time, Creeber emphatically reminds that the Frankfurt School's Marxist ideals would prove resistant to the dominant influence of mass culture. In accordance with his account, the school members were deeply preoccupied, in their studies, by the massive power of mind manipulation exercised by mass media as part of the Modernist tradition. Simultaneously, the proponents of this trend would critically tackle media audiences and the textual output deployed by such media in order to maintain the dominant ideologies relevant to the "Bourgeoisie". In short, the Marxists orientation of the board of thinkers consisted essentially in elaborating a critique that would yield a clear picture of the social and economic injustices directed at the lower classes (the grassroots) pointing out the society's pardoxes (Abidi, trans.2016; Cole, 2019). In this trajectory, creeber (2009); Cole (2019) mention other subsequent mass culture-directed critiques; these were on their way to provide an exposition of how the "standardization of mass culture" or "rule through ideology" "in the realm of culture" would be assigned to the mass media arsenal and the dissemination of ideologies. For instance, the former evokes such works as Adorno's study carried out about popular music as well as Lowenthat's coverage of popular literatures alongside magazines and the role of these in instilling a sense of uniformity, socially speaking. Creeber, however, notes that the deep concern of the Frankfurt School with the sweeping effects of media does not put to the foreground the very fact that the academic contributions of its thinkers would undeniably feature a scientific approach to the subject matter. The German school has played a central role in uncovering the social imbalances for the benefit of the the dominated.

In addition to the prominent contributions of the Frankfurt School in connection to the influential deed of media in instilling a sense of conformity, Creeber follows on such a study by focusing on Structuralism. In fact, this trend would draw on scientific procedures and rationalism-oriented thinking in dealing with phenomena at issue; therefore, Structuralism assumes that humans' thought takes form under sociological, linguistic, and psychological sets of constraints. Since those dominant structures, in other words, pilot narrowly their thinking mode, they are evidently beyond their control. Mean while, Structuralists have set out with the specific aim of offering a methodological scheme to uncover such compelling structures applying the principles of semiotics in their exploration of mass culture signs. Basically, the work of de Saussure and pierce in linguistics (as cited in Creeber, 2009; as cited in Chandler, 2017) had been tremendously inspiring to semioticians; it primarily considers any brand of text as encompassing an encrypted "system of signs" due to be objectively decoded as a particular sense (within the bounds of logic reasoning). That is, different mass culture media employ various types of codes (signs) to encode enforced ideologies. Consequently, semiotics has provided Structuralist study with the basic principle of investigating how meaning is concocted depending on ideological outlooks (Chandler, 2017). Significantly, as a kind of analytical study, Structuralism relies mainly on juxtaposing opposite signs and texts to extract their meanings (Danesi, 2009). The semiotic-based methodology could enable Structuralists to unveil the complexity characterizing media influencing the masses, hence.

Pushing in the same direction with more focus on audiences, Creeber clearly insists that this backdrop has represented a goldmine for them. In fact, media output recipients would enjoy the privilege of decoding systems of media-produced signs; that is, large audiences could then confront media bombardments critically. In this sense, Chandler's statement (as

cited in Creeber, 2009) constitutes a solid testimony in favor of this state of affairs, "[d] econstructing and contesting the realities of signs can reveal whose realities are privileged and whose are suppressed. Such a study involves investigating the construction and maintenance of reality by particular social groups" (P. 14). In short, such audiences were no longer constrained and conditioned by media institutions to adhere to their perceptions and ideologies. Most important of all is the very fact that, in accordance with Barthes's explanation, (as cited in Creeber, 2009) Structuralism, with its rationalism, scientificity, in addition to semiotics' objective analysis of sign systems could readily come up with conclusive findings unraveling media's role in diffusing and imposing mass culture on powerless audiences then. Ultimately, Creeber concludes that the era of Modernism and the like (Structuralism) has provided a well-informed theoretical model vis-a-vis media which has exposed how the elites control media and resort to them to bring disempowered communities under their control. As such, those passive audiences have been in need of defense against standard culture. Modernism alongside Structuralism methodological insights about the power of media would eventually equip audiences with useful clues on how to deal critically with them. This contribution would eventually prove enlightening in time as audiences would be attributed an active role in their interaction with media discourses.

3.1.2 Post-Modernism and its Conception of New Media

Focusing on the socio-economic evolution surfacing with the rise of Post Modernism, Creeber (2009) points out that this era has typically witnessed massive metamorphoses. Actually, there has been a remarkable shift from heavy industry (industrial economy) to service-based one; novel brands of technology for communication services alongside investments and markets for consumption have emerged to add to globalization as a term encompassing all of these.

Additionally, the same period, for him, can also be referred to as "Post-Industrialism" or "Post-Fordism" in which the substitution of the white-collar worker of the blue-collar one has, accordingly become the marker of the new state of play; i.e., such changes have subsequently given birth to the services society. Therefore, this would serve as the context for the emergence of the "consumer society" as the dominant cultural norm since citizens have manifestly expressed their strong quest for various forms of consumption, such as leisurely activities (for example, radio and TV). Contrary to industrialism, consumer culture could overweigh production in its original sense. Consequently, the author points to the imminent cultural transformations away from the earlier Modernists' sceptical perception of mass media; these would find more echoes in the newly emerging critical approach to media personified mainly by such gurus in media studies as Mc Luhan. In the end, the advent of this trend would spur relatively more immersion into media output consumption with notable participation in its sense-making by audiences.

Painting a clearly different image of the overall state of affairs, Creeber evokes Mc Luhan's explicit demarcation from Modernist trend in connection with media. In spite of his adherence to the suspicion openly manifested by Modernist thinkers vis-a-vis media's harmful impact on subjected, disempowered audiences, Mc Luhan would not conceal his optimism about the emerging new media; indeed, the theorist has pointed out the valuable contribution new media would offer to society. In this respect, Levinson's depiction of the media studies oracle (as cited in Creeber, 2009) seems to be straightforward: his vision of new media has been ahead of its time in terms of interactivity in connection with media digital output. In effect, McLuhan (1963) himself explains that thanks to electrical technologies the world had turned into a village where individuals, no matter their socio-political orientations, could communicate their outlooks (could be heard or seen); this new era has been typically

characterized by an unprecedented desire for self-expression as well as participation in the discursive process– "action-reaction process". I.e., he lays emphasis upon the now-possible "extension of man". Furthermore, to activate this extension, there must be some understanding of the nature of the extending medium along with its eventual impact at both the individual or social levels. Thus, the scholar points out those media-directed technologies have ultimately aided humans disengage from the media's imposed "centrality" and "superficiality" of the past as they can nowadays encapsulate their divergent ideologies via them. The salient fact here is that the message constitutes the core of the medium; in fact, this is the glare of attention for Mc Luhan, who puts much focus not solely on the message-bearing media, but also on their considerable power. Creeber, to put things in a nutshell, stresses how Mc Luhan has strongly praised new media's a golden opportunity to the once passive audiences to react actively to the digital output. At once, the originality of the novel critical perspective to new media seems to be mirrored in Mc Luhan's famous aphorism "the medium is the message" as well as the devised term "surf". If these imply something, they would signal the opening of a new horizon for audiences to participate actively in the creation of meanings.

In addition to what has been said so far, the newly reigning order in the media sphere has yielded worthy raw material to exhaust facts and concepts from. In this respect, Creeber shows how the already-stated departure from the ideology-grounded perceptions has been the subject matter for much of Post-structuralist's seminal literature. The latter is a trend started by Jacques Derrida and Jacques Lacan as a response to structuralist-oriented assumptions; these claim that sense lies within signs and it is beyond language users' interpretative capacity. That is to say, like the concerns of Modernists, audiences must adhere to the messages transmitted by media outlets in a typical context of mass culture. Conversely, for

Post-structuralists, signs, including media output, are accessible to audiences' initiatives to attribute them their relevant meanings depending on situation-located clues (Danesi, 2009). In effect, scholars of this stream, Creeber (2009) remarks, have been less concerned with the media's influential role on audiences. This can be primarily ascribed to the newly critical approach to media output. Interestingly, having being inspired by the respective works of both Gramsci and Althusser in association with media analysis, Post-Structuralists have come to see the masses as active receivers of media's ideological products given that they would encapsulate more resistance than ever before to them. Further, meanings emanating from media are polysemic; that is, they are open to diverse interpretations depending on recipients' respective backgrounds. In respect with the latter point, Mc Luhan (1963) accentuates the increasing interest in locating media within the context in which they are supposed to get into contact with audiences. The current fact has prodded Seiter to state (as cited in Creeber, 2009), "Post-structuralism emphasizes the slippage between signifier and signified–between one sign and the next, between one context and the next–while emphasizing that meaning is always situated, specific to a given context…" (p. 16).The inception of audiences' direct involvement in meaning-making would act as a milestone in the evolution of media studies, which, simultaneously, signals the limitations as well as imminent end of the earlier Modernist conception.

3.1.2.1 The uses and gratifications theory.

In the similar backdrop of audience-centered focus in the study of new media theorizing, a reference to the Uses and Gratifications model would be primordial in determining the significant role of this theory. According to "the uses and gratifications theory," (n.d.); Morley (1988) this approach to media tries to track down the hows and whys underlying

media users' search for specific media and their broadcasts to satisfy their needs; in other words, the Uses and Gratifications paradigm (UGT) stresses mainly the aim behind media selection and use by consumers. In this register, UFG assumes that media output is open for all recipients who, comparatively speaking, are no longer perceived as just passive receivers of media products; instead, they actively control the choice and utilization of it. Moreover, they can readily have access to the interpretation of its content and introduce the latter into their daily lives as well.This theory has brought up an issue of tremendous importance: the orientation toward the users of media product.

Additionally, UGT is, as indicated by "the uses and gratifications theory," (n.d.), positivist in nature. In its enterprise to investigate how users purposefully pick up certain forms of media to the detriment of others, it takes into account the likely socio-psychological factors as the basis underpinning such a selection, indeed. Adepts of this theoretical stream, besides, point to the psychological dimension as a major achievement since users, by going through certain output, can attain high levels of gratification. Equally, the choice of particular media goods allows consumers to get into interaction with one another at a socio-cultural scale. As a result, the role of audiences, which had long been played down by media gurus has found fertile ground in this theorizing. In line with this orientation in approaching media selection, Ley and Windahl (as cited in "the uses and gratifications theory," (n.d.) puts it:

> As commonly understood by gratifications researchers, the term "audience activity" postulates a voluntaristic and selective orientation by audiences toward the communication process. In brief, it suggests that media use is motivated by needs and goals that are defined by audience members themselves and that active participation in the communication process may facilitate, limit, or otherwise influence the

gratifications and effects associated with exposure. Current thinking also suggests that audience activity is best conceptualized as variable construct, with audiences exhibiting varying degrees of activity. ("the uses and gratifications theory," n.d., para. 1)

What this quotation posits is that audience enjoys nowadays considerable empowerment in terms of selecting and deploying variant media; however, in order to accomplish some kind of pleasure the active engagement occurs at divergent rates. In effect, some tend to be more active than others in doing so.

Besides to those opportunities yielded by this theoretical paradigm to audiences, these can, according to the same source, benefit enormously from the heuristic quality of UGT; it helps elaborating new horizons about media in general as well as the choice and uses in particular. Indeed, being that positivist, as stated above, the model constitutes a solid source of "positivist knowledge". The latter derives from a philosophical trend which claims knowledge is obtained from experience of natural phenomena's main features and connections. In this respect, this thinking, from its initiation in the 19th century by Auguste Comte, was essentially based on a counter-metaphysical perspective in viewing the world (Kaboub, 2008); further, this philosopher (as cited in Kaboub, 2008); "the uses and gratifications theory," (n.d.); "a posteriori knowledge," (n.d.) assume that knowledge and science combined can provide clear understanding of life with all the phenomena it embodies. Therefore, any form of true knowledge draws its validity (truth) on empiricism plus evidence (observational) which is technically known as "a posteriori knowledge". The heuristic quality is another advantage of this conceptual line of thinking about new media.

Meanwhile, when it comes to aims driving the audiences' predilections towards certain media alongside basing on the heuristic nature of approaching them, Katz, Blumber, and Gurevitch (as cited in "the uses and gratifications theory," n.d.) accentuate the needs that fuel such a choice. In effect, the three scholars specify the psychological as well as social needs; these ought to lay the foundations for formulating media conceptions on the part of consumers. These, in turn, readily spark variant ways of media consumption that lead automatically to imminent gratification in its different forms: expected or else unexpected. To simplify things, one would state that the need to access new media output and respond to it critically in terms of fixing what can be suitable to their personal needs intersects with the desire to get in touch with other subjects through the offered interface. Accordingly, this would spawn a mix of satisfaction and pleasure in audience members.

3.1.3 Hall's Encoding/Decoding Paradigm

3.1.3.1The shift toward the audience.

Being one of the iconic figures in media and cultural studies, Hall has demarcated himself off the earlier theorizing that had characteristically stressed the one-way flow of media. As starters, Davis (2004); Hall (1980) state that Hall, being a fellow member of the Centre for Cultural Studies, sees its inception in the 1970s as a total split or "break" with the long established theorization of mass media particularly those of the 1950s and 1960s. Advocating more overlap between media and cultural studies, Hall comments:

> …media studies broke with the models of 'direct influence' using a sort of stimulus-
> response model with heavily behaviorist overtones. Media content serving as a trigger

into a framework which drew much more on what can broadly be defined as the ideological role of media. (1980, P. 4)

This stands for mainstream media having been seen as cultural and ideological weapons whose primary role was to impose socio-cultural structures and specify power relations between social members. On the one hand, scholars and intellectuals, according to both, would encapsulate their own standpoints relative to such issues as breaking with the early times of the evolution of capitalist Britain and if its socio-cultural structures, which had been effected by industrialism, were still static or subject to on-going metamorphoses. On the other hand, this revolutionary period represents a turn toward a freshly oriented move to approaching media borrowing insights from a multitude of areas including: Discourse studies, semiotics, psychoanalysis, structuralism, etc. As a matter of fact, Hall's theoretical construct, as indicated by Davis, revolves around broadening the scope of interest to cover the media audience; he sets out to re-define, "the relationship between the producer of the media text and the consumer" (P. 60). That is to say, what had long been neglected by preceding media theories in terms of media's unlimited influence on audience is nowadays thoroughly rehabilitated by Hall's paradigm. With regard to this, the Centre fellow, according to Davis, initiates his descriptive elaboration by being directly critical vis-à-vis the traditionally "orthodox" views of mass communications, for these had been fundamentally "linear" presenting audience as just being passive receivers of media messages. Hall's vision was revolutionary.

In addition to the rupture with the conventional theorizing of mass communications fueled by the rise of Hall's revolutionary descriptions of the media's interactional process, his Marxist influence seems undeniable. Actually, Davis (2004) shows how Althusser and

Gramsci's intellectual impact had been perceptible throughout the whole work of Hall. It is especially Gramsci who had, beforehand, inserted freshly insightful elaborations into the term "hegemony" to cover power relations determined by the linguistic medium, and this has been inspiring for many fields, notably media and cultural studies (Ives, 2004). In fact, Hall, Davis carries on, has been versed in developing a theoretical model that would later come up with an articulate study of the complex connection between the producer and recipient with a focus on their mutual role in the communicative process. Besides, he directly adheres to "the structures of dominance" within society to account for the producer-audience relationship from a strictly Marxist perspective. Thus, in his apparent start from the hegemony-regulated media flow, the scholar has set off to challenge the preceding American media studies, whose surveys had been marked by the linear flow. I.e. New Marxists have opposed the American understanding of mass communications' texts as being transparent when it comes to meaning– being comprehensible to audiences. Rather, they have focused on the structural intricacy of it alongside the ideology underlying its functions (Hall, 1980). Explaining further, Davis details:

> Hall's thinking around issues of hegemonic relationships pushes the notion of the audience to a more active role than previously characterized by American mass communications studies. It is nevertheless a structure that prioritizes the notion of dominance. (P. 61)

From the first glimpse, it seems that the capitalist-based perceptions having been ruling the socio-cultural order is a pivotal element in the process of re-viewing as well as re-defining the interaction between media outlets and recipients altogether. With respect to this orientation, Hall, Davis points out, attempts to explore the variant steps and forms of interaction involving both interlocutors (producers/recipients) through TV-mediated texts. Further, he argues that

the interaction process is constituted of several different, but linked stages in which the "passage of forms" arises. In Hall's sense (as cited in Davis, 2004), the set of "codes/syntagmatic chain of discourse" forms the essence of his elaborate model. According to it, recipients, while getting in contact with media texts or more precisely "*discursive forms*", grasp them distinctly from the producer-devised ones; this is ascribed to various "…circumstances and conditions of production from consumption" (Davis, 2004, P. 61). One would clarify that divergent socio-cultural constraints can govern the production/reception process. Davis refers notably to such restrictive conventions– political, economic, technical professional, etc– plus the ideological bases effecting the making and receipt of messages. Hall's framework has revolutionized the once-prevailing conception of mass media interaction with its Marxist insights.

3.1.3.2 Circulation at the heart of the encoding/decoding paradigm.

To penetrate into the Hall's complex encoding/decoding model in the course of mass media communication between the source and audiences, we need to take into account "circuitry". At the start, Hall, as indicated by Bodker (2016), stresses the centrality of this component in associating social groups' cultural structures with mass communications' output. At the same time, the scholar, while putting in place his theoretical framework, he deploys such technical terms as: "circuit", "loop", and "circulation"; here, Hall (as cited in Bodker, 2016) readily equates circulation with "production" because the latter, for him, pertains exactly to what he usually terms the process of issuing "products" in the form of "symbolic vehicles". In turn, such vehicles, according to Bodker (2016); Davis (2004), assume a discursive nature. Therefore, the former borrows Hall's description (as cited in Bodker, 2016), "It is… 'in this discursive form' or what he in the 1973 version calls 'this phenomenon form'…that the

circulation of the 'product' takes place,'"; Bodker also continues reporting from the theorist, "…circulation and distribution seem closer aligned, where it says that 'it is in the *discursive* form that the circulation of the product takes place, as well as its distribution to different audiences'" (2016, P. 411); in other words, the message is encoded (discourse) with the sign being the material vehicle. For Hall (as cited in Bodker, 2016) what must be evoked, at this point, revolves around the fact that circulation equals discourse via which the source-generated product occurs and reaches –is "distributed" to–consumers. He maintains, besides, circulation signifies the realization of the discursive outcome, not merely its transmission to audiences. In Bodker's sense, the mentioned term (circuit) counts tremendously in Hall's theoretical conceptualization, for it (the term) encompasses essentially the continued "production-distribution-production" of discursive products. I.e., he points specifically to "circuitry" to account for the whole process of producing and transmitting the discursive material continuously. Circuitry is highly valued in the encoding/decoding theorizing since it ensures the exchange between the producer and recipient.

3.1.3.3 Encoding and decoding TV Broadcast signs.

The encoding process deserves much in-depth address to unveil the various socio-cultural underpinnings. To begin, Davis (2004) states that Hall's attention is specifically focused on how the textual output is encoded specially by TV institutions. In this respect, she, still drawing on Hall's conception, directs interest to such basic terms as–"technical infrastructure", "frameworks of knowledge", and "relations of production"– to account for the way these intersect practically in the production of discourses. I.e., professional conventions alongside world constructions and norms of producer's relations contribute to

rendering texts as they actually are: embedding encoded messages in them. Shared cultural platforms (structures) narrowly govern the productive/receptive negotiation between broadcasters and recipients, indeed. Remarkably, meaning negotiations may be compatible or incompatible between the two parties owing to either similar or else divergent socio-cultural perceptions of reality; thereby, audiences at large regard media-generated texts as being loaded with senses (discourse) and they are all the time striving to extract meaning out of them. This is only realizable if these have active recourse to the modes of discursive interpretations. By implication, such texts do not have any meaning whenever they are far away from their cultural containers (Hall as cited in Davis, 2004). Social space is vital when extracting meaning from media output.

At the other end, the recommendations of Hall's model clearly place the audience at equal distance with the productive source. With this regard, the decrypting of mediated texts, to Davis, must similarly call for the structures of knowledge, audiences' relations, and the overall technical organization ("infrastructure") as well–the way recipients see the world and the kind of relations they have with their interlocutors (media producers). Albeit, the extent to which such interpretative modes differ can be so striking that incompatibility with intended messages would likely be something imminent; in fact, this state of affairs is due to varying statuses and relations among such interlocutors "structural difference of relation and position". Hall accordingly observes, "Asymmetry between the codes of "source" and "receiver" at the moment of transformation into and out of discursive form" (P. 64). That is to say, the theorist overtly mentions the dissimilar encoding and decoding of mediated texts, which is quite sensitive to the above socio-cultural constraints. Noticeably, mass communications' texts can bear in them various meanings in accordance with particular

political, economic, or social agendas (aims); what Wodak and Busch (2004) call the

"decontextualizing" and "recontextualizing" of "social meanings". In other words, consumers

re-constitute the constituents of context to give meaning to the chains of media signs.

Moreover, it appears that the current approach to media's textual output in media studies does

converge heavily with the multidisciplinary address qualitatively adopted in the fields of

discourse analysis (DA),ethnology, sociology, linguistics, conversation analysis (CA) and

anthropology; this novel analytical orientation aims to yield ("deeper insights") into the close

readings of mass communications' discourse within context. As such, the traditional

conception of recipients as passive consumers of fixed meanings evidently has no room in the

current trend (especially Hall's theoretical frame of reference) (Wodak & Bush, 2004).

Likewise, Davis (2004) talks about this transformation, "…these apparent 'distortions' of

meaning that occur are the result of a 'lack of equivalences' between producer and

audience…" (P. 64) foregrounding the determining role in terms of background between both

sides of communication. Practically speaking, while mass media sources activate their

dominant mechanisms in the course of framing their texts, receivers are simultaneously

possessed of their own guidelines ("strategies") of piloting their interpretative reactions to

them. We would definitely deduce that the socio-cultural conventions making up receivers'

immediate environment equally contribute to the re-contextualization and interpretation of

media outcome.

In the course of developing his theory on encoding/decoding processes, Hall justifies his

resort to semiotics as the basis from which he can account for the audiences' interactions with

mass communications' texts. To begin with, Davis observes that the scholar draws on Roland

Barthes's "code" to explicate the stages relevant to the message creation and consumption;

this inclusion of the term in his description aims to shed light on what is meant by the

"dominant cultural order". In simple terms, Hall sets off to explore how subjects of social groups must, in a way or another, comply with definitely general conceptions of symbolic items: signs, colors, sounds, images, shapes, etc. In addition, the awareness of culturally shared conscience is supposed to assist them (group members) in their interpretative activities; however, such a deeply-rooted order imposes its understandings of the world's workings into the minds of those members. That is, the connection between signs and society is straightforwardly established as a fact (Wayne, 2003). Here lies, for Davis, the weight of dominance in Hall's own thinking. In effect, any deviation from the socially directed common perceptions would be deemed or even rejected as discursively irrelevant and pushed for re-adjustment in order to meet what appears acceptable socially in terms of meaning creation and consumption of mediated texts (media-generated discourses). As a matter of expedience, we would refer to Hall's own words (as cited in Davis (2004) :

> The different areas of social life appear to be mapped out into discursive domains, hierarchically organized into *dominant or preferred meanings*. New, problematic or troubling events, which breach our expectancies and run counter to our 'common-sense constructs', to our 'taken-for-granted' knowledge of social structures, must be assigned to their discursive domains before they can be said to 'make sense'. (P. 64)

This description stands as evidence for the determining role dominant socio-cultural structures play in modeling audiences' sense-making tasks. Importantly, Hall, in questioning the transparent, one-direction flows of media output, is devoted to unveiling the mechanism underlying mass communications by re-visiting Gramsci and Althusser's notion of dominance. Actually, Davis shows how Gramsci's "common-sense" pervades Hall's theoretical project; the Marxist thinker has advocated beforehand that common-sense equals

the endorsement by the grassroots of rulers' perceptions viewing them as shared interests

instead of forced ones. Hall, in this sense, moulds his paradigm of active consumers'

decrypting deeds on Gramsci's assumption that media elites try to convince the masses of the

commonality of concerns in a non-coercive way and far beyond any ideologically laden

propaganda (the unquestionable truth). Further, by placing mass communications within the

realm of hegemony, Hall insists that the producer/receiver relation entails "work" undertaken

by audiences with the very aim of legitimizing the interpretation of mediated codes as guided

by socio-culturally dominant frameworks–dominant meanings. This exposition automatically

brings to mind Barthes's dichotomy, "Text" Vs. "work" (as cited in Wodak & Busch, 2004);

he distinguishes between text meaning the output ("fixed pattern of signifiers") and work

suggesting the act of making sense of the chain of signs by recipients. Albeit, the seemingly

sovereign status enjoyed by audiences, Davis reminds us, does not spare them from the

obligations of being highly and constantly cognizant of the group's commonsensical

limitations when it comes to deriving messages out of texts.

In continuation of the hegemonic links regulating media interaction, subjectivity emerges

as an influential factor in the whole process. In fact, Hall, as indicated by Davis, does not

confine subjectivity solely to the receivers' side; rather, it should be extended to the creative

sources of texts as partiality stems from their proper conceptions of world affairs and

happenings. Besides, media outlets prefer the audiences that act in line with intended

positions over various matters, such as: political, economic, moral, religious, environmental,

or social issues. Thus, media gurus appear to be in search of legitimizing their perceptions as

common-sense. In association with this state of affairs, Adorno (as cited in Wayne, 2003)

remarks saying, "That the definitions which make the object concrete are merely imposed on

it–this rule applies only where the faith in the primacy of subjectivity remains unshaken" (P.

155). In other words, the exercised hegemony emanating from subjective views of surrounding space tends to fit well into the elaboration of mass communications from Hall's standpoint. It follows that if media-generated recipients fail to fathom the coded meanings of signs, they must be falling apart at the seams with generally accepted (dominant) or "preferred code". Audiences, in this case, would likely be acting in the domain of the "negotiated code or position" or else the "oppositional code". While the former enables them to internalize certain ideas to the detriment of others (partial agreement with dominant common-sense), the latter puts them at variance with such shared perceptions altogether. At this point, resistance to come up with opposite interpretations arises whenever members of audiences firmly confront hegemonic significations encrypted in signs (Hall, as cited in Davis, 2004). Subjectivity is at the heart of dominant relations within mass media interactions.

In the same direction, the ideological level appears well integrated in the above theoretical frame work. As a matter of fact, Bodker (2016) assumes the centrality of ideologies in the work of Hall; imposed ideologies can be disseminated via discursive mediation (production, distribution, production). Furthermore, the cultural dimension–a set of dominant attitudes in a society– occupies the foreground of the overall circuit. In support of this assumed claim, Hall (as cited in Bodker, 2016) comments, "My purpose is to suggest that, in the analysis of culture, the interconnection between societal structures and processes and form or symbolic structures is absolutely pivotal" (P. 411). This is to put some stress upon the cultural organizations as well as the ensuing processes inherent in issuing or consuming mass media interactions between producers and audiences. Importantly, Hall's argument, as Bodker explicates, depends fundamentally on technology-based and hermeneutical processes whereby messages are materialized (encrypted) into "sign vehicles"; these are, in turn, reproduced after being consumed under certain ideologically constraining mechanisms. However, by referring

to Hall's theorizing itself, it would be quite vague or even ambiguous to stick to the term *reproduce* in its literal sense; in fact, as his paradigm prioritizes the recipients' active role in the meaning-making (decoding) of the media texts, reproduction can be carried out from either parallel or probably contradictory perspectives taking into consideration the socio-cultural milieu of the decrypting agents. Henceforth, re-producing media's discursive content by audiences, in this sense, obeys cultural and ideological constraints that often consist in imposing particular interpretations not intended by mass communication sources. Socio-cultural mechanisms weigh tremendously in producers'-recievers' interaction.

3.2 The Transition from the First to the Second Media Age

3.2.1The Information Society

After presenting an overview of mainstream media theorizing, we proceed with the coverage of the era that ensued with new forms of media and comparatively active audiences. In this new order, Holmes (2005) explains that the outset of interest in what is known as the "second media age" was initiated during the mid-1990s; indeed, these times were marked by the emergence of a variety of publications. In fact, while some of them have dealt with the utopian side of this age, others have openly encapsulated their uncertainty about it. Furthermore, the author accentuates a very important fact; he directs attention to the swift rise of "internet culture" in comparison to the decline in the mainstream "media culture". The scholar, at the same time, does not abstain from evoking the social opportunities offered by the emerging culture to audiences in the form of extended social freedom and participation in meaning making. The second media age reperesents the shift toward the internet culture.

Nevertheless, Holmes states that by looking back in time notably the 1980s one can find out that this decade witnessed the birth of the concept of "information society". Comparatively speaking, the new term clearly differs from the traditional notion of "media society" in that scholarship related to media (media studies) tend to extend it scope well beyond the purview of broadcasting processes; i.e., the traditionally known media studies are subsumed within the broader domain of communication studies nowadays. For him, the unprecedented growth of information and communication technologies (ICTs) has altered altogether humans' conceptions of interaction when the Internet would act as a watershed with its invasion of households worldwide. At this point, Wadding's assumption (as cited in Jones & Hafner, 2012) reveals that the smooth rise of new media would ultimately provoke a novel situation often referred to the "information overload"; Yuran's (as cited in Jones & Hafner, 2012) coinage of the "information abundance" equally denotes the same state. This must act as verifiable and demonstrable evidence of the inception of the newly-born age. This is, to Holmes, particularly where the differentiation can be enacted between the first and second media age, in effect. By the beginning of 1990s, the second media era would become a sort of common thinking across society in general; in connection with this state of things, the same expert recounts, "However, the formalization of the distinction between these two kinds of era, I would argue, received its momentum in the wake of the domestic take-up of the Internet from the early 1990s" (Holmes, 2005, P. 7). This statement attests to the new reality brought along by the pervasive digital media, which has put individuals on the same wave length in terms of interaction. The spawning of the second media era has dramatically acted as a turning point in the human society foregrounding an emergent communication culture with more room offered to audiences.

Simultaneously, the late 1990s saw the sweeping widespread of novel communication technologies that would pervade all layers of society proving its subsequent metamorphosis. In this very respect, Holmes demonstrates how such interaction tools gained an unshakable reputation by being omnipresent in people's routine tasks; as a matter of fact, he stresses what he calls the "widespread talk of cyber space" as a marker of the Internet revolution with it massive social effects. Besides, the researcher, re-producing Schwoch and White's version of perceiving the new age (as cited in Holmes, 2005) observes:

> Their prosaicness, they argue, is what makes of them so important and powerful, because it is in our interface with these technologies, the human–technical interface, that an entire pedagogy of technical competence is fostered, a pedagogy which becomes almost buried in the thousands of discrete habits and routines that both help us, connect us and imprison us in the information society. (P. 2)

This statement, indeed, attests to the possibility brought along by those technological means for users to partake in the making of information and its circulation throughout society. Actually, this sounds obviously in line with Jenkins's (2006) account: technology-generated facilities herald imminently resulting   socio-cultural transformations. These are manifested in procedures relying entirely on the source of content ("who speaks") as well as the conveyed content ("what the things they speak about"); however, recipients nowadays are empowered to have a fully-fledged, participatory role in the assembly and synthesis of broadcasts (different information) globally speaking. I.e., here lies the novelty typical of the current media order–"participatory culture". One would deduce that audiences who had long been deemed as just passive consumers of mainstream media output were yielded the capacity to engage not only in meaning-making, but also in exchanging information online.

At this level, the participation of digital technology users in the interaction process arises as an irrefutable fact. In effect, this novel state of affairs would, as claimed by Holmes (2005); Jones and Hafner (2012) tremendously foster a re-consideration of subjects' connection with each other–interpersonal interaction. In other words, transposing communicative practices from authentic situations to the virtual space has ultimately altered not only their perceptions of life, but especially their interactional patters since digital networks embody most of human relationships nowadays. Concerning the latter point, Holmes is particularly centered on the enlargement of the cyber environment to extend to interpersonal links surpassing individual use. Holmes (2005); Korpijaako (2015); Baudrillard (as cited in Korpijaako, 2015) at the same time, highlight the contest between "inhuman" and authentic, human forms of interaction; for them digital media users are irrevocably subject to the overuse of those elaborate devices to such a great extent that they end up virtually entrenched in them permanently. Hence, what has been long espoused as actual, face-to face exchange would likely be at stake of losing its functioning momentum under the strains of technology. The rise of such interaction technologies means that new ways of interpersonal communication have come to find their place in the current context.

Basing on the previous account of facts, Holmes's own concept of "objectivized" specifically points to the Internet users' immersion in SNSs as a fresh mode of interaction. In fact, beyond the utilization of such digital technologies, he puts much accent on the impetus given to the emergence of novel social bonds by them; in fact, actual interpersonal connections have been definitely extended in terms of space and time. With the same regard, Castell's coinage of "interactive society" (as cited in Holmes, 2005) signals that the move toward the digital era would imminently lead to, "new system of communication, based in the digitized, networked integration of multiple communication modes" (P.8). Upon

consideration of this quotation, one would state that audiences can, comparatively, enjoy more room for interactional activities in their variety, which would more likely yield much momentum for freedom and democracy both at the individual or community levels. Conversely, Castell directly criticizes Mc Luhan's notion of "one-way communication" as the latter seems to put audiences within the confines of uncritical consumption; Castell (as cited in Holmes, 2005); Jenkins (2006) forcefully announce the rise of a new media culture with an unprecedented participation in the dissection as well as re-construction of products from probably endless perspectives. To argue in favor of his explanation, Castell comments (as cited in Holmes, 2005), "…the Mc Luhan Galaxy was a world of one-way communication, not of interaction" (P. 8). Most importantly, he adds that in the digitized environment, messages can earn "communicability" and "socialization" in that these come to be concurrently swapped between communities and singles users online. Relating to this case, he concludes, "From society's perspective, *electronically-based communication (typographic, audiovisual, or computer-mediated) is communication"* (P. 8). Actually, his utterance lucidly brings to mind the frenetic entanglement in digital interaction. Digital media have marked the outset of the virtual communication.

3.2.2 The Era of the Social Networking Sites

What is obviously characteristic of the era of the Web 2.0 is the revolutionary, virtual interaction both at the individual and community levels. To start, Korpijaako (2015) tries to establish the link between what is known as "Hyper reality" and interpersonal relationships; indeed, she evokes that capitalism has had substantial repercussions on the group's sociality with the rugged individualism it embodies. Consequently, social networking sites (S.N.S.s) have, emerged as the ideal sanctuary for humans to re-build their communities' social

organization including interaction: she uses the term "hyper real community" to point to the

phenomenon of online communities. Moreover, people of all age categories are, nowadays,

immersed in joining such virtual groups in search of self-affirmation and identity

performance, she adds. Nevertheless, what sounds, according to Korpijaako (2015); Castell(as

cited in Holmes, 2005) confusing and even contradictory is the fact that the more we are

connected online, the less authentic community becomes; commonly social modes of

interaction are continually losing ground to the wide spreading, digital ones. Both researchers

argue, thus, that this should call for further insight into the up-to-date field of study (virtual

community on social media). The emergence of SNSs has ultimately laid the foundations for

the networking community.

On the other hand, some are elaborating on the changes sweeping society nowadays out of

digitization. As a matter of effect, Van Dijk (2006) stresses that community is not only

connected to traditional networks (telephone, cable TV, radio, etc), but also to the Internet.

Indeed, he, to argue his point, evokes the emergence of a range of popular expressions along

the way–"We live in a connected world", the "connected age", the "human web", and the

"web society". Likewise, with nearly equal pertinence to this phenomenon, Barr's articulacy

(as cited in Holmes, 2005) seems to sum everything up,"…the internet's extraordinary growth

and global reach of the platform in recent years, the passion of its adherents and its maze of

unresolved issues all qualify it as a paradigm shift" (P. 8). Van Dijk (2006); Korpijaako

(2015), at the same time, do not abstain from reminding that such notions might sound odd in

an age long marked by capitalism-induced individualism or "social fragmentation", which

have been pervasive in much of cross-writing genres. However, upon lucid reflection on these

seemingly contrasting issues, Van Dijk himself explains how they turn out to be quite

complementary; actually, he draws on Mulgan's view point (as cited in Van Dijk 2006). To

him, subjects have been free to just a certain extent; they could only enjoy a restricted degree of interdependence prior to the web age. In other words, the Internet can ensure a good balance for its users to either act at the individual level or the collective one. From this angle, one would readily highlight Korpijaako (2015) alongside Castell's (as cited in Holmes, 2005) assumptions relative to the opportunity for organization as virtual groups as a milestone in the evolution of digital technologies– much more momentum is given to democratic interaction in both forms through them. Digitization has altered society forever.

In addition, following the unprecedented boom in interaction technologies, including social media, Lindgren (2017) evokes the notion of digital to describe the new millennium's society. The researcher, despite the ubiquity of the concept in all appellations, reminds of their diversity; for example, he offers such terms as–"post-industrial society", "information society", "network society", among others. Likewise, he gives an account of the close interrelationship between sociality and digital technologies when he notes that because social media (S.M.) are spaces for social interaction, not information outlets, a deeper and direct involvement in the exploration of the social role performed by such media must become a matter of necessity. This can add to the accessibility of S.M.s to the wide public, besides. The latter point holds an utterly significant position in Zeitelbank (2014); Schrage's (as cited in Jones & Hafner, 2012) vision of the new information and communication era, actually. The former relates with pinpoint evidence the dramatic switch from the classical "one to one" or "one to many" (one way) paradigms to the "many to many" communication model; the invention of S.M.s has accelerated the matter with their typical simultaneity and interactivity. I.e., S.M.'s users can interact with each other live regardless of spatial-temporal barriers and can equally make their opinions heard worldwide. For example, she refers to Zuckerberg's

revolutionary launching of Facebook in 2004. Thus, Lindgren (2017) stresses the fact that

S.M. contribute to the shaping and maintenance of the institutions of sociality. This can be

seen in the substantial amount of citizens' time such social networks occupy whether at home

or at work (Van Dijk, 2006). Ultimately, it would be, as Lindgren suggests, worthy to shed

some light on how this process takes place and whether S.M.'s implications for social order

are positive or not. In the end, digital sociality and society are major markers of this age.

Again, with the modernization of the technologies addressed above, it would be sensible to

lay emphasis also on users' attitudes to life performed virtually. As a start, Schrage (as cited

in Jones & Hafner, 2012), too, maintains that the swift increase in Internet use across social

strata has not solely provoked novel types of authentic ties between citizens in terms of

interaction, but has equally incentivized further re-consideration of how they come to perceive

the world–time, space, groups' organizations, etc). Moreover, he reminds that online practices

can re-shape social roles; by being entangled in online communication, subjects subsequently

embrace certain due identities (political, cultural, artistic, gender, etc). At this point, Jones and

Hafner (2012) demonstrate the centrality of the medium–precisely termed the "cultural

tools"– because it significantly interferes as the connector bonding interlocutors together,

facilitating the interactional process as a whole. Henceforth, they must display adequate

expertise while using them, for such tools constitute the outlet for users' range of actions.

Relating to this same issue, Vygotsky's assumption (as cited in Jones & Hafner, 2012) reveals

how any possible absence of self-affirmation tools might detract of human beings' the ability

to coexist interactionally; simultaneously, it would deprive them from their identity

expression. Actually, Jones and Hafner comment on this:

All higher mental processes, he said, depend upon mediation. You cannot act alone. In

order to do anything or mean anything or have any kind of relationship with anyone

else, you need to use tools. In a sense, the definition of a person is a human being *plus*

the tools that are available for that human being to interact with the world. (P. 2)

In short, mediation ensured by digital technologies is at the core of modern versions of communication as well as identity encapsulation.

Taking account of the accessible facilities offered by digitized media tools, Mc Luhan (as cited in Jones & Hafner, 2012) readily pushes the matter further. At this level, the media studies scholar points out the way mediation tools help users extend themselves ("brains"); he elaborates the famous expression "extension of man" when referring to media. In addition, the same medium stands as the bearer of the intended meaning– the "medium is the message"–has proven quite influential when it comes to electronic facilities (Pressman, 2014). In fact, according to Mc Luhan (as cited in Jones & Hafner, 2012) the afore-mentioned extension implies the simultaneous re-modeling of interaction modes, re-conception of social order, plus identity encapsulation possibility. However, on stressing the pros relevant to digital media, Jones and Hafner do not abstract from the cons characterizing them at once; they orientate attention to what experts call "affordances and constraints". This stands for what is possible for internet members and what is not.

At this crucial point of human existence, Van Dijk (2006) affirms with zeal that the rapid growth of social networking sites alongside media networks has given birth to a widely linked globe. In effect, the scholar has coined the concurrent terms the "age of network" as well as "the information highway" to testify to the centrality of SNSs in humans' daily lives in terms of interaction throughout the virtual world. With regard to this state of affairs, he comments

on such emerging and ubiquitous networks as new media, "…media which are both integrated and interactive and also use digital code at the turn of the 20th and 21st centuries" (P. 9). That is to say, we are witnessing a watershed in our social lives thanks to the digitization of human interaction. Mc Luhan has, likewise, devised the concept of the "global village" to represent the same state of affairs worldwide (Pressman, 2014). Besides, for Lindgren (2017), such digital media constitute an adequate universe for social interaction, not mere outlets of information diffusion; he urgently calls for deeper scholarship into the social role superintended by those brands of new media (digital media including social media). Accordingly, by being widely accessible to the huge public, they actively contribute to the moulding of the socio-cultural organism. In this respect, the media analyst demonstrates that due to the large amount of information transmitted via Internet technological facilities like social SNSs, individuals can get in touch with one another sharing different knowledge. Thus, the outcome is doubtless the emergence of digitally virtual community ("digital society"), which obviously heralds massive social metamorphoses–shift from traditional group organization to the virtual one. Most importantly, he draws attention to the plausible evidence that society capably controls the use of SNSs; not the other way round. New interaction tools have ultimately instilled a sense of community around the globe.

3.2.2.1 The historical and social background of social media.

To introduce this section we find it quite useful and even stimulating to refer to Lindgren's (2017) question, "In what social and historical context was the Internet created and how it evolved?" To start with, an overview of the history of media in general should bring in illuminating insights into not only their evolution, but also the social transmutations they have provoked. Actually, Lindgren (2017) evokes the invention of writing by the Sumerians

approximately 3000 years B.C. as a turning point in human history; as a matter of fact, it empowered subjects to transcribe and record the orally transmitted folklore. This was, in addition, a novel impetus to re-shaping social organization. Cavanagh (2019), on her part, explains that historians trace the origins of social media to ancient Persia; in fact, King Cyrus the Great has launched a system for interpersonal interaction known as the post system. Hence, people all around the empire could establish connections with each other via the interchange of the post despite the spatio-temporal obstacles. The scholar, still, evokes the considerable length of time this operation would require. Furthermore, hundreds of years later and amid the industrial revolution, a new means of communication has seen the light: the telegraph. Additionally, Claude Chappe's invention has been the forerunner of what would subsequently emerge as the current internet; historians call it the "mechanical internet". The years 1890 and 1891 were respectively marked by the introduction of both the telephone and the radio, and citizens were empowered with the facilities of exchanging various information at either the community or individual level. In fact, Karinthy's short story, "Chain Links", painted a predicting portraiture of what the eventual set of socio-cultural relations would be like with the rise of the telephone and telegraph (Seargeant & Tagg, 2014). Such forms of communication would irretrievably alter people's lives.

The 1960s and 1970s, as shown by Cavanagh (2019), witnessed the emergence of crucially decisive new brands of technologies designed for social interaction. The Massachsett's Institute of Technology (MIT), indeed, put into use a new type of email known as "Mail Box"which had determining effects on the modern email system. This earlier model could facilitate the process of exchanging emails among the users of that system. Besides, the first online-business shopping and exchange, ARPANET alongside CompuServe added to the whole range of revolutionary social media inventions. During this period, likewise, a more

alaborate form of community-based media were in place, such as the"Multi-User Dungeon" (MUD), so it acted as the actual forerunner of the"virtual community". Finally, a new type of computer system interface termed "BSS" closed this era, and it contributed, by logging up, to interpersonal chat; additionally, it enabled users to upload and download and get hold of various data. To conclude, this period was the outset of a revolutionary era of digital interchange.

Cavanagh does not stop at this point; she carries on with the large range of technological inventions following respectively in the 1980s and1990s. To begin, the "Whole Earth Lectronic Link" (WELL) was put into service; actually, it is considered as a virtual space that has been in use up to now. In addition, the possibility of exchanging–internet links, chat, and files– arrived with the introduction of the internet relay chat (IRL) alongside another operational system called "around about" in the late 1980s. The dawn of the 1990s, besides, was a turning point with revolutionary technologies that irreversibly boosted the sphere of virtual community interaction. Indeed, with the launch of the "web 1.0", the wide public worldwide could enjoy direct access to the Internet; henceforth, the "uniform resource locator" (URL) as well as search engines completed the flow of novel inventions. Subsequently, the web 2.0 entry into service provided a more effective and efficient set of online-applications. The immediate outcome was the inception of a cared for, technology-dependent generation referred to as "Teck-Savvy". Moreover, the year 1997 saw the birth of the first social networking site "SixDegrees"; it would enable users to access numerous services, such as –getting in touch with friends, inviting them, adhering to communities, and inviting other to join them; henceforth it could gain instant popularity because interactivity was within reach for users. At last, blogging groups started to proliferate allowing for journal

publishing. The expert offers some examples–Live Journal, Move On, Asian Avenue, Black Planet, Napster among others. The 1980s and 1990s were milestones in the history of social networking sites.

By going over the technological leap relative to online interaction in the 2000s, Cavanagh (2019) shows how social networking sites mushroomed successively. Indeed, "Friendster" was introduced in 2002, "MySpace" was launched in 2003, and "Wikipedia" and LinkedIn were put into service in 2001. Additionally, the first networking site that offered users the option of fully setting up their personal pages was MySpace: Users could upload videos and music, while LinkedIn was the forerunner of online business. The new millennium represents the height of evolution when it comes to those means of social interaction .

3.2.3 Computer Interface, Internetworking, and Virtual Culture

3.2.3.1The rise of digital society in the age of networks (social media).

To begin with, it would sound pretty wise to refer to Jones and Kucker (2001) who claim that the Internet needs to be looked at outside the bounds of the classical dichotomy: will it completely devastate and sweep the social mechanism? Or else will it bring humans to an ideal existence. Rather, to them, the Internet deserves scholarly consideration by thinking over an efficaciously fitting method to examine this socially prevalent technological tool. In effect, according to Sterne's assumption (as cited in Jones and Kucker, 2001); Jones and Kacker, 2001); Lindgren (2017), this fresh medium has dramatically changed people's routine deeds with its noticeable ubiquity in nearly all walks of life; this manifests itself clearly through the term "Internetworking". The latter should imply interpersonal bonds with some sort of socio-cultural outcome throughout a wide variety of activities. Thereby, as the just-referred to

scholars insist, this very fact ought to be a priority for conclusive scholarship given that Internetworking constitutes a source of culture. Actually, this, basing on their assumption, denotes that the Internet functions as the "carrier of culture" in that it works as a medium for the dissemination as well as selection of texts. In this respect, to Jones and Kucker, settings, feelings, and other clues accompanying textual output would act as inherent parameters in interactional practices online. This way, the Internet contributes to the emergence of virtual culture (Jones as cited in Jones & Kucker, 2001; Lindgren, 2017). The internet-based culture is a novel feature that must be touched upon by cultural studies experts.

Additionally, Strate et al. (as cited in Jones & Kucker, 2001), following up on what has been mentioned so far, report the Internet-survey theorists' postulate. They, indeed, accentuate how interaction is fit into the virtual space (cyber communication); that is to say, because of the close correlation between communication and culture, cultural structures can be altered by new virtual interactional exchanges. Paradoxically, while Wellman and Gulia (as cited in Jones & Kucker, 2001) present the internet exactly as a frequent social happening taking account of aspects related to socio-cultural parameters, they, at once, highlight the flagrant lack of any adequate reference to the cultural dimension in much of internet survey. In fact, most if not all of internet research has noticeably centered on purely technical features to do with "computer-mediated communication" (CMC) especially online mailing as well as community networks at professional places. Conversely, Jones' conclusion (as cited in Jones & Kucker, 2001) stresses that even in this case, virtual culture can, by no means, be detached from the authenticity of life. Online interaction, in other words, in spite of seeming to be at a distance from the socio-cultural surroundings, it does not pretend to circumvent the communicative, regulatory cues of the broad socio-cultural systems at work.

Subsequently, the focus on the electronic mailing system termed "electronic messaging systems" as a means of online interaction has, according to Jones and kucker, meant a turn to text as object of study. In effect, from this perspective, they would like to draw attention to the very fact that the emailing technology has been precisely portrayed throughout much of internet-related literature as a tool whereby the transmission of texts could be made possible. This should call for the quality of relative innovation in association with the earlier brands of virtual interaction, hence. Furthermore, some scholars like Kiesler, Siegel, and Mc Guire; Sproull and Kiesler (as cited in Jones & Kucker, 2001) articulate clearly and directly that the acknowledged outcome of the afore-mentioned deficiency lies exactly in the considerable emphasis laid on the technological properties and features to do with mailing interchange to the detriment of the contextual keys primordial to the progression of human communication. This shortcoming characterizing nearly most of the relevant study, to Kiesler, Siegel, and Mc Guire (as cited in Jones & Kucker, 2001), has provoked experts to readily attribute the quality of "impersonal" as well as solely appropriate for professional uses to electronic mailing as a mode of exchange through overt, hidden-message-free texts, accordingly. Overall, this state of affairs can be borne out by evoking Meyrowitz's version (as cited in Holmes, 2005) of portraying the emergent cyberspace with its varied technologies that have been centralized in most surveys, "In the last few years…widespread talk of "cyberspace" has brought new attention to the idea that media research should focus less on the messages and more on communication technologies as types of social environments" (P. 1). Here is another proof of imbalance nature of approaching the communication tools. Reducing the socio-cultural indicators to the background of related survey suggests that further, conclusive steps need to be taken to shed light on virtual interaction and culture as an up-to-date phenomenon.

During the 1980s, as Steinfeld (as cited in Jones and Kucker, 2001) clarifies, a growing appeal to specialists was an unprecedented concentration on the social level surrounding such exchange technologies. In effect, the outgrowth of this hitherto pioneering initiative was the "social uses" approach to namely the e-mailing system of messaging; this could prove very promising over the years. Besides, this survey of operational tasks carried out by Steinfeld himself would later reveal some invaluable findings of this supposedly communicative device. The most engrossing one was the fact that this network system relies essentially on a couple of objectives; on the one hand, they serve for strictly professional tasks; on the other, and more interestingly, links to the social alongside emotional purposes underlying its actual utility. All this encouraging progress, to Jones and Kucker, would ultimately culminate in a clearly challenging perspective in CMC that could put into question the hitherto marginalized social aspect of these forms of interaction. By implication, the scholars assume that because the latter property could instill a sense of human connection online, it marked the inception of the virtual community.

Equally important, Wellman et al. (as cited in Jones and Kucker, 2001); Jones and Kucker draw attention to the comparative nature of much of literature related to CMC. Indeed, they explain how experts in this domain have set out to perform comparisons between authentic face-to-face interaction (F 2 F) and CMC-based one. I.e., the e-mailing system has been approached from a comparative perspective; the aim has been set to substitute the previously "impersonal" assumption concerning online interaction with a broader one that would definitely be interested in exploring the till-then obscured social dimension. With this regard Drawing on Walther and Burgoon's seemingly revealing claim, Jones and Kucker reproduce their own wording with pinpoint accuracy, "the 'social information processing' perspective used the comparison CMC with F2F to illustrate that 'interpersonality' does indeed form via

CMC, but at a slower rate than in F2F interactions" (P. 216). By going over this statement, both scholars argue in favor of fully endorsing the principles underpinning interpersonal communication in authentic settings – joint act of inferring clues decisive for effective interchange– as prevalent throughout the bulk of CMC interaction, in short. Additionally, what could be arrived at subsequently shows how such modes of interaction differ in terms of the pace of operating; actually, relatively speaking, CMC interactional exchanges take more time to complete than real-world ones. Nonetheless, for Walther (as cited in Jones & Kucker,2001), this would eventually sound much compelling as long as the only variance resides particularly in the speed of execution of cues processing rather than their related number or quantity. Importantly, this state of affairs would likely stand as evidence of the fresh, social orientation gaining ground then. Most importantly, the implications of this theorizing for the next decades would prove highly decisive in terms of addressing internet community as well as interaction. In so far as the outgrowing diversion of focus toward addressing social interaction via e-mail, the "social information processing" has, still basing on Jones and Kucker, crucially incentivized further exploratory steps vis-a-vis e-mail-located communication, which would eventually lead straight to the eminent establishment of interpersonal ties throughout the digital world. In line with this stance and through a critical lens, Walther (as cited in Jones & Kucker, 2001), likewise, remarkably rules out the findings arrived at beforehand by supporters of the impersonal perspective characteristic of CMCs. Online interaction has gained much consideration with the rise of digitized media.

In the same direction, what would eventually emerge as a notable phenomenon in the virtual space deserves some cautious attention. Indeed, Jones and Kucker accentuate the rapid growth of a type of culture known under the term "corporate culture" in the same decade;

simultaneously, the most attention-getting point revolves around the willingness characteristic of much of scholarship branching into this subject alongside the significant role played by the CMC in developing this kind of culture. Over the decades, there has developed a type of extra-work interaction: some form of interpersonal communication off work comparatively speaking. The inception of ARPANET has, most importantly, shown how the technological advance in this line would act as a forerunner to what would later come to be known as networked communication (Salus, as cited in Jones & Kucker, 2001). Contrary to the seemingly inert stance adopted by some gurus in this area with relation to this issue, certain similar specialists have avowed without equivocation that such a progress would provide a fresh impetus to the emergence and rise of the digital culture or, in clear terms, the online community (Hauben & Hauben as cited in Jones & Kucker, 2001; Glezakos & Lazakidou, 2012). Although much of the literature relevant to the Internet and its virtual space had for long been devoid of any worthy capture of the socio-cultural environment underpinning online interaction, it has proven, over the years, how the digital community would rise as a crucial, social phenomenon to be covered at length.

By re-contextualizing the concept of community and culture in the current digital times, we cannot help being entangled in the investigation of its operating mechanisms and their roles in piloting the new modes of interaction. To start, it would be worth a mention to draw on Nazif's statement (as cited in Rhoten, 2006), "we are introducing a new culture: e-culture" (P. 87) since it can accurately paint a lucid picture of the state of flux sweeping modern society worldwide. Also, what takes the glare of interest is Parrish ad Burr's joint, broad statement about the community (as cited in Rhoten, 2006), "Since ancient times philosophers, politicians, and social critics have debated the nature of community" (P.87), which bears out the centrality of this social entity on the agenda of thinkers in their variance since antiquity.

On their part, Glezakos & Lazakidou (2012), in defining the digital community as an ensemble of people communicating online, they lay much emphasis on the fact that the members of such groups must display adequate cognizance of the principles underlying interaction online; in other words, these need to acquire the values making up the communities they are expected to join. Remarkably, two aspects, Parrish; Aristotle (as cited in Rhoten, 2006) insist, revolve specifically around geography and face-to-face interchange as intrinsic components of community. In effect, they claim community is quite a broad notion; nonetheless, such an assumption, for Rhoten, has proven hitherto valid when covering digital networks' groups. In this regard, Fergusson; Mowilt's version (as cited in Rhoten, 2006), basing on specialists in virtual communities, explicitly deem face-to-face encounters simultaneously valuable and useful for the construction of virtual community because these provide fresh possibilities to synchronize contacts with one another online. Actually, Parrish and Robins (as cited in Rhoten, 2006) jointly utilize the term known as "synchronous computer-mediated communication" (SCMC) so as to emphatically evoke the possibility of existing for virtual communities in parallel with authentic ones. In the current age, the virtual space has been smoothly gaining ground across societies worldwide.

At this point, though it might misleadingly appear that the gap between the digital community and the classical one is flagrant, the discussions offered by well versed scholars suggest otherwise. In this respect, by elaborating on community as, "a group of people whom, by virtue of a natural need for interaction, shared goals and interests, sustain bonds of connection, cooperation, and support with one another", Parrish and Hopper (as cited in Rhoten, 2006) both adhere to Parrish's perspective (as cited in Rhoten, 2006), which branches to the fact that modern and traditional communities have certain principles in common when dealt with analytically. In effect, to manage to fathom virtual gatherings, scholars have to base

on principles related to examining traditional ones; this inevitably renders things rather complicated at this level. Thereby, community, for them, needs to be categorized into two types: traditional community and virtual one. At thislevel, these apparently require of researchers and scholars a reasonable, well informed analogy to come up with enlightening insights with respect to the currently pervasive online society. The traditional and digital communities intersect while the second one is under scrutiny.

3.2.3.1.1Virtual community pervades our lives.

 Before exploring the modern phenomenon of the virtual community, we could juxtapose the traditional with the digital one by referring to some eminent experts in the field of digital media. On the one hand, the traditionally know community, according to Aristotle's account (as cited in Rhoten, 2006) is subject to a whole evolutionary cycle. Any group, initially, starts when people unite together to exist; later, it develops from families into villages, then into agglomerations then ultimately into states since they cannot live in isolation from one another. In fact, this evolution, according to Parrish and Aristotle (as cited in Rhoten, 2006) can be primarily ascribed to the generic need of economic organization. Further, Rheingold; Parrish; Rhoten (as cited in Rhoten, 2006) assume that instilling a spirit of common, mutual assistance among community subjects entails unifying their interests in the form of a common sense regulating the functioning of such gathering. With regard to this, Parrish comments, "Individuals coalesce into communities by subsuming their individual wills under a common, 'unified one'" (P. 88), pointing out the urgent desire guiding individuals' fusion into one grouping–common aim. In the same vein, Rousseau's statement (as cited in Rhoten, 2006) seems to bear out this assumption; actually, he indicates how each member is perceived as an integral part of group, "As one, [they] receive each member as an indivisible part of the

whole" (P. 88). That is, individuals cannot exist apart from the bonding mechanisms of the group: shared interests as well as purposes. The mutual craving for coexisting has often driven humans to coordinate their efforts within the boundaries of the social agglomeration.

On the other hand, what has in the last decades emerged as the virtual space with the rise of the Internet heralds an imminent metamorphosis to the notion of community once and for all. To begin with, it wound sound relevant to our discussion to mention respectively Calem; Mills; Van Vliet and Burgers (as cited in Rhoten, 2006); Glezakos and Lazakidou (2012) since these lay much accent on the primacy of shared interests as well as aims as pillars of both traditional and digital communities; comparatively, despite the insignificance of geography for virtual gatherings environment, partisans of internet-based groups appear to be possessed of identical perspectives high on their specific agendas. This way, such digital communities, like traditional ones, can ensure social cohesion among their members, for Kitchin (as cited in Rhoten, 2006), "Similar to the traditional, Cartesian communities, virtual communities are also "strong, cohesive, and supportive"". I.e., even within the virtual, digital realm, users tend to act in solidarity with one another. In line with this perception, Wilbur and Senett's comment (as cited in Rhoten, 2006) sounds to testify to the common grounds tying online groups' subjects, "What is important to communities is a 'holding-in-common' of qualities, properties, identities, [and] ideas". Besides, Parrish; Holmes; Meyrowitz (as cited in Rhoten, 2006) point out that regardless of some reservations manifested by scholars, nearly most of the proponents of digital society readily adhere to the still-valid theorizing relating to community–they jointly cooperate together as citizens' groups online in pursuit of common objectives, including individuals'. For instance, those spaces can allow people to affirm the socio-cultural structures upholding their shared identities as communities (Korpijaako, 2015;

Spitzer, as cited in Zeitelbank, 2014,). The emergence of digital, communicative tools has irrevocably put to the fore the online community.

3.2.3.2 The turn toward virtual interaction and global communication on social media.

3.2.3.2.1 Creating sociality in a connectivity-based culture: participatory culture.

In this age of digital technologies, humans seem to have found the locus for a novel pattern of interaction. With regard to this, Van Dijck, (2013) states that people in their millions communicate online via social media daily; noticeably in less than a decade, a new virtual space "infrastructure" has seen the light on which "sociality" and "creativity" can be performed thanks to technologies. In support of this explanation, Kaplan and Haenlein as cited in Van Dijck (2013), write, "…a new infrastructure for online sociality and creativity has emerged, penetrating every fiber of culture today" (P. 4), orienting attention to the ever-growing impact of social media platforms on all strata in society. Those virtual environments have, furthermore, brought with them unprecedented facilities for users enabling them to re-organize their social lives altogether. Initially, because Internet users had sought to achieve "*connectedness*" between them by joining platforms, their modes of interaction, according to Van Dijck (2013); Jones and Hafner (2012) would later considerably alter both at the individual and societal levels under the massive effects of those virtual infrastructures. Indeed, the technological and ideological principles of web 2.0 form the pivot on which SM rest for their functioning (Kaplan and Haenlein as cited in Van Dijck, 2013). Originally, the elaboration of the web 2.0 at the dawn of the new millennium, for Van Dijck, would herald

the possibility for interpersonal connection via online communities as well as the democratization of the virtual space. Authentic ("offline") alongside online spheres of interaction have ultimately come to fuse in one continuum; consequently, Van Dijck comes over two basic findings; on the one hand, the Internet has become social due to the web 2.0; on the other, all of the afore-mentioned terms (connectedness, online communities, web 2.0) work under the scope of "participatory culture"–people whatever their social belonging can access the digital world and interact socially. Henceforth, the "network society"–the tendency to utilize computer-generated networks in all domains including interaction– was born (Danesi, 2009). The web 2.0 has helped accelerating more the already-rapid rise of networked communication worldwide.

Additionally, with the emerging virtual platforms, new brands of media and a nomenclature relating to online communication have come into being. In this respect, Hills (2009) argues that what is commonly known as digital culture (network culture) has had preponderant implications for many aspects of life; the most discernible is mediated interaction "on the move". I.e., with the forward leaps toward digitization, computer-mediated communication has allowed users to employ new media with mobility; for instance, one can have a chat with a peer on his/her smart phone anywhere. Whereby, various brands of media criss-cross on mobile phones as well as computers (multi-media technologies converge) with the growth of "consumer culture". Nevertheless, this media, as noted by Jenkins (as cited in Hills, 2009), convergence (sound, image, video) does not forcibly denote that one particular type of media equipped with multi-media facilities, but contents can be transmitted across a multitude of new media outlets. The latter (as cited in Hills, 2009) puts it:

> Convergence does not depend on any specific delivery mechanism. Rather,
> convergence represents a paradigm shift–move from medium-specific content to
> content that flows across multiple media channels, toward the increased
> interdependence of communication systems, toward multiple ways of accessing media
> content, and toward ever more complex relations between top-down corporate media
> and bottom-up participatory culture. (P. 108)

In brief, media convergence and participatory culture have spawned interactivity with media content and interaction between users online. At this stage, many networking sites mushroomed successively (Facebook, Twitter, Youtube, LinkedIn, etc) as potentially influential and lucrative media with their user "generated content" encoded into algorithms to ensure communication online–"online sociality". In effect, convergence (of technological facilities) and the ensuing cultural and social metamorphoses rely narrowly on the source of content– "who speaks"– plus the conveyed output–"what he/she speaks about" plus audiences' substantially active role in the assembly of content out of new media variants, which is a milestone in the new media order with producers/recipients joint participation in a fresh mode of interaction on a large scale (Jenkins, 2006). Accordingly, this state of affairs is a watershed in that it represents the transition from participatory culture to the culture of connectivity on a large scale: the shift from interpersonal exchange via internet network toward interaction through platforms (Van Dijck, 2013). Human beings, long searching for participation in connection on virtual environment, have found themselves indulged in novel forms of interaction: social networking platforms (SNSs).

3.2.3.2.1.1 From "networked" interaction to "platformed sociality":
interactional forms and participant structures in social media.

With the spread of the Internet, many notorious offers have seen fruition to attend users in their manipulations of its relevant services. At first, the Internet, Van Dijck (2013) explains, would yield various facilities like weblogs and email that have noticeably assisted in creating virtual communities; they have mobilized offline communities together as well to cope with diverse matters. In this register, Castels; Manovich (as cited in Van Dijck, 2013) assume that with the advent of web 2.0, has arisen the possibility for sociality via platforms substituting the earlier networked communication (email and weblogs). In addition, this development, in accordance with Van Dijk's account, would, in the following years, be deemed as a revolution in the Internet-induced services. New media, actually, have evolved in parallel with their users adding to the already complex media order. Henceforth, it ought to be conceptualized anew as a social by product for interaction; technological institutions (platforms) are designed to communicate socially and culturally where participants from different socio-cultural backgrounds can assemble together online with the aim of encapsulating generic interests (e.g., in politics, sport, or art) (Gitelman as cited in Van Dijck, 2013). Besides, new media structures, for Van Dijk, have been evolving in line with ordinary socio-cultural interactions in that the technological parameters regulating social media (for example, Facebook or Twitter among others) mirror authentic interactional norms. Concurrently, sociality (cultural practices online) perpetuates such communicative patterns as constituents of globally social structures of interchange. The evolution of social media platforms has utterly helped humans transcend the barriers of space and time as regards interpersonal communication.

Since ancient times, human beings have relied on interactions between them to coexist socially. As a matter of fact, the evolution of human civilization, Darwin assumes (as cited in Hartly, 2018), has led to the forging of larger communities (societies); the desire to socialize with one another would grow at once. With reference to this point, he comments:

As humanity advances in civilization, and small tribes are united into communities, the

simplest reason would tell each individual that they ought to extend their social

instincts and sympathies to all the members of the same nation, though personally

unknown to them. This point being once reached, there is only an artificial barrier to

prevent their sympathies extending to the humanity of all nations and races. (P. 15)

To sum up, it is in humans' nature to share their thoughts, feelings, and attitudes with their

community peers, so there are no limits to the instinctive desire to socialize with others

regardless of national or racial barriers. As such, the Darwinian concept of to get in touch

with others, to Hartly (2018), implies more concentration on the group, not the individual.

The cultural dimension in which sociality occurs via linguistic exchanges, identity

connections, generic knowledge within social groups forms the essence of scholarships,

further (Darwin as cited in Hartly, 2018; Buckingham, 2008). On the same wave length,

Pagel's account (as cited in Hartly, 2018) presents culture as a sine qua non for the fabrication

of community; in turn, this collectivity works as a "survival vehicle" for its members.

Ultimately, any scholarship of social media-based interaction should explicate how virtual

platforms have evolved from off-line "complex systems" to be as such since society reifies

itself through interactions with the reigning cultural structures it intends to endure–social

media are, to a great extent, sensitive not only to technological systems, but equally to socio-

cultural systems (Hartly, 2018; Luhman as cited in Hartly, 2018). To recapitulate, the need to

interact socially is inherently human and it presupposes a socially wide familiarity with the

norms underlying community's evolution.

In time, the once-looked-for need to communicate socially would lose much ground to a

virtual brand of interchange arising on the Internet. To start, citizens around the world, Van

Dijck (2013) notes, have ultimately come to transfer their usual interactional deeds onto online platforms with several technological aids in their reach. Simultaneously, this constantly mounting transformation has turned websites from one-directional media into platforms for social interaction subject to "customizing *applied services*"; in other words, they are currently endowed with the possibility of personalizing parameters. In this respect, the researcher clarifies further, "Whereas before, web sites were generally operated *conduits* for social activity, the new platforms increasingly turn these conduits into applied services, rendering the Internet easier to use but more difficult to tinker with" (P. 6). This statement, attests to the opportunity offered to users not solely to interact virtually, but also to customize the working settings. Likewise, this novelty applies to SNSs whose core mechanism has undergone enormous transformations toward what Zitrain (as cited in Van Dijck, 2013) terms "appliancization" (they can be malleable to fit in their users' needs). In alignment with this, Van Dijck (2013); Jones and Hafner (2012) add that online platforms are viewed as media for mutual interchanges– this involves groupings and individuals– as well as content creation allowing connection via interaction to occur; on this subject matter Van Dijck (2013) puts it:

> When companies started to build their platforms on the generic web 2.0 infrastructure, they often presented themselves as utilities transmitting communication and information data. But even if big platforms still want people to think of them as such, this layer of applied platforms is anything but a neutral utility exploiting a generic resource (data): they build on the "ideological and technological" foundations of web 2.0. (P. 6)

That is to say, what has once been thought of mere sources of data exchange is nowadays unanimously conceived as tools whereby whole populations can indulge in ideology-laden

interactions facilitated by web 2.0 technologies. Albeit, such online spaces, as claimed by Van Dijck, (2013); Van Dijk, J. (2006); Chovanec and Dynel (2015); Jenkins (2006); Draucker (2015), must not wrongly be disassociated from the teachings of socio-cultural structures managing communication in general; i. e., their operative design does not suffice, so sociality alongside creativity are quite complementary since they arise amid users' hustle and bustle online. The virtual world is presently an open environment to partake in parallel communications.

Taking into consideration the worldwide trend toward digital interaction has led to a considerable interest in forms of interchange drawing on notoriously ranked pragmatic theorizing. As starters, jones (as cited in Draucker, 2015) reminds that social media have offered tremendous opportunities for users to engage in interaction via new "channels" (media) at a distance without being necessarily on spot. Moreover, those channels empower them to adjust working parameters in accordance with their personal preferences; they can either display or else cover their presence. Such facilities, as a result, have impacted the participatory patterns of communication greatly on SNSs. Nevertheless, what is commonly referred to as "electronically-mediated interaction" has been initially approached from the perspective of ethnography of communication angle (Draucker, 2015). As regards this linguistic orientation, Hymes (as cited in Draucker, 2015; as cited in Mazid, 2014) departs in his study from the dyadic pattern of "construction" of interchange accentuating the two major actors: the "speaker"/ "hearer" as well as their respective roles in the social stratum. In effect, this model, as he assumes, yields plentiful information about participants to different extents; it provides detailed, general, or even wrong indicators. Significantly, the communicative competence on the very basic tenet that the language command does not branch to the mastery of grammatical elements, but it fundamentally relates to the capacity to deploy the linguistic

system in the suitable social context. The ethnographic paradigm has for long been a useful resource for earlier studies to do with interacting online.

Shortly after, what has surfaced as scholarly treatment of virtual patterns of interchange sounds deviant from the Hymes's proposal. In this sense, Goffman (as cited in Draucker, 2015) has pioneered in demarcating his focus from that his predecessor (the model of Hymes); instead, he obviously concentrates upon the roles adopted during interaction ("roles of participation"), not the "dyad". This, in effect, can be very revealing about what is being achieved and done in communicative events. In paradox with the hitherto customary positionings of the ethnography of communication, Hymes himself (as cited in Daucker, 2015) acknowledges that his own model cannot be thoroughly effective. He avowedly comments, "the common Dyadic model of "speaker" and a "hearer" specifies sometimes too many, sometimes too few, sometimes the wrong participants" (P. 50). Through time, this has been ever since endorsed by subsequent researchers with scholars as well as the norm in dealing with participatory coverage. Accordingly, Goffman (as cited in Draucker, 2015) has come up with triple-production construct:

- The "*animator*" or the "*sounding box*" is someone who utters something to be diffused in spoken or written form (speech producer),

- The "*author*" is the one who ensures the final written version by selecting the wording, feelings, and mood to insert in it,

- The "*principal*" pertains to the larger group or else party whose ideological positions are represented as well as affirmed by the wording.

Also, the same scholar claims that the three participatory roles may be fused into one role. For instance, politicians, in this case, can be exemplars of this simultaneity when they speak and write their own speeches, and represent their political trend (parties). In the meantime, such roles might be separated into the first, the second, and the third; for example, while one refers to rulers (as animators), journalists (as authors), and ministers/parliamentarians/party members (as principals). The de-emphasis of the dyadic paradigm has given vent to a more dynamic re-visiting of participatory roles in online communication.

Adding to the dynamic nature of characterizing the very aspects of the practices relevant to exchanging contents through new media, there has been recent, influential contributions worth to review. To begin with, Levinson (as cited in Draucker, 2015) by stretching Goffman's conceptions along, he has put an end to the once irreducibility of that prototype of theorizing about interaction; instead of sticking just to the principle actors' roles, the scholar postulates four roles, which can be presented as follows:

- The "*participan*t" this one links to whether the participants are present or else acting via technological media (cellular, computer network),

- The "*transmission*" of the message this relates to whether one is involved in the communication (transmission) of the message,

- The "*motive*" this points to what underlies one's utterance in terms of reasons of conveying a given message,

- The "*creation of the message*" this pertains to whether one is directly implicated in the making of a message.

Moreover, in his view, Levinson draws attention to the fact that any speaker can be representative of the four features at once–participation, transmission, motive, and creation of form. In other words, complementing Goffman's paradigm, Levinson (as cited in Draucker, 2015) embeds this quartet to the already existing ones; the animator, referred to as "relayer" by Levinson, can take part in a interactional occasion, ensures transmitting the message, creates or authors the outer structures, have a well determined motive behind what is conveyed (principle). Consequently, a combination of the whole range of communicative features is as likely as not. The extension of the earlier mode of interaction has revealed a big deal of insight about the way people assume their roles once immersed in online interchange.

In spite of this leap forward concerning the mediation of messages rendered possible via Internet-based technologies, arriving at exposing and accounting for a strictly discursive perspective seems well missing so far. Over this point Draucker sounds observant of this defect as he demonstrates how the production-mediation-reception interactional framework on SNSs has not received enough coverage yet–both Goffman and Levinson's models fail at bridging the gap between animators and recipients on SNSs. Accordingly, Irvine's (as cited in Daucker, 2015) minimization of both participants' respective roles (dyadic model elaborated by Hymes) is faced with a trend in favor of the highly challenging capture of the current roles within the bounds of contextual exchanges. In fact, the latter draws attention to the partial scholarship carried out till then; she remarks that, relatively like Hymes's work, it does by no means pick up information to do with interacting actors on the virtual space. In addition, the same researcher observes that preceding efforts to achieve a unanimous, fully-fledged framework for interchange beyond the classic dyad has proven parallel with Irvine's critical remarks: deprived of any reference to the "more subtle types" relating to participatory roles. Importantly, the scholar, evoking again the dyadic paradigm, equates the postulates of

Goffman and Levinson on the same scale since these, like Hymes's, can possible yield much information or less information or even none at all. Anew, Irvine's penchant centers on a specification of more micro ("local") parts proportional with the ever flexible context of interaction; she explains, "…specific participant roles should instead be determined more locally, as required for differing contexts of interaction" (P. 51). Even the virtual environment on which the mediation of interaction is ensured via digital technologies must be fully explored as an indicative source of clues about participants' roles for successful interaction.

In alignment with what has been stated above, the pragmatic dimension sounds quite significant and due to be explored at length. As a start, it would be useful to mention Jenkin's (2006) statement that the world of media is witnessing an unprecedented "digital revolution" ever since the 1990s; and borrow equally Romero's appellation (2014) the "*third industrial revolution*" to evoke the switch toward massive digitality; all of this has subsequently led to a massive take-over of old media by novel, much highly sophisticated ones especially with the rise of the Internet. Thus, the once passive role attributed to audiences is nowadays defunct as recipients' access to the meaning-making process is by far feasible. In this respect, Negroponte (as cited in Jenkins, 2006) puts much accent on the mounting importance of "interactive new media". In line with this tendency to trace the intricacies underpinning online communication, Levinson (as cited in Chovanec and Dynel, 2015) adheres to the global assumption that the domain of the pragmatics of interaction emanates from the scholarly heritage of Austin and Searle. In other words, in any communicative occurrence, there are participants, and this must be taken for granted in the course of partaking in pragmatic analysis of interaction (Chovanec & Dynel, 2015; Drew & Curl, 2008). Extraction of sense out of discourse, Verschueren (as cited in Chovanec & Dynel, 2015) advocates, relies essentially upon resorting to participants' respective backgrounds with no neglect of

indicative clues relevant to context–these are termed "variables" as they often vary from situation to another– indeed. Furthermore, for Chovanec and Dynel (2015), the ultimate purpose underlying their entire enterprise resides particularly in combining the current participation patterns with the newly introduced digital frameworks of interaction. This is primarily intended to see how well such communicative modes can fit each other. In short, this scholarship centers on "technology-mediated communication" (TMC). Virtual- exchange practices seem to have finally found more echoes in academic circles than ever before.

Nevertheless, the recent research trends have not completely been deviant from what had been suggested previously notably in connection with interactants' participatory roles. In this respect, the two concepts of "participation" as well as "participatory", according to Chovanec and Dynel (2015), have been at work recently just to mean one thing. In effect, Goffman's prototypal perception (as cited in Chovanec and Dynel, 2015; as cited in Drew & Curl, 2008) branches to the fact that interactional participants assume given enactments; these automatically confine their "*participatory framework*" (PF) by large and exploit context to launch and operate interaction as well ("production and reception"). Besides, the just-introduced term covers the ensemble of roles in hand to go through communicative acts. At this point, PFs demonstrably constitute, as Chovanec and Dynel (2015); Goffman; Garfinkel (as cited in Drew & Curl, 2008); Potter and Wetherel (1987) insist, the foremost element of communicative events since meaning cannot be decrypted unless mutual cooperation between participants (speaker/hearer as major parties in interaction) is properly carried out. In other words, they strongly recommend an in-depth consideration of social aspects of individuals as being members of communities in order to accelerate their familiarity with context during communication. Primacy is given to the active role mechanism of discursive communicators

with much emphasis on the complexity of interaction (Chovanec & Dynel, 2015). They

comment:

> The concept of a participation framework constitutes one of the very basic components
>
> of interaction, arguably the most important one, since the meaning of a message, be it
>
> spoken, written or multimodal, is inevitably co-determined by the two crucial elements
>
> within the basic scheme of interaction, i.e. who communicates to whom. (P. 2)

What is stated in this piece of analysis obviously reinforces the adopted direction in covering

interpersonal exchange. The communicative process in the current era of digital media owes

so much to the ethnography of communication despite the new parameters of the virtual

world.

It must be noted, simultaneously, that the PF has in recent years been approached from a

pragmatic angle in terms of the co-production of content (meaning). First of all, the

pragmatic-driven survey of PF, Chovanec and Dynel, (2015) assume, focuses exactly on the

respective roles enacted by participants in a communicative occasion; as a matter of fact, the

latter orientation builds upon the characteristically dynamic nature in relation to linguistic

keys that are suggestive of intended meaning. These are ascribed variant terms across the

disciplines where they are situated–the "message" in media studies; the "text" in text

linguistics; and "utterance" in pragmatics. To look back in time, secondly, the PF model's

provenance is the Prague School fellows whose advances on PFs can be judged as "proto-

pragmatic" since this step would pioneer in the dissection of the participatory mechanism of

interpersonal exchange. Notwithstanding this, more or less, academic attainment, Bǖhler (as

cited in Chovanec & Dynel, 2015) would subsequently push forward Jackobson's scheme,

that had dug deep in interaction, by switching from the structural level toward considering

backgrounds of participants. What is clear, according to Chovanec and Dynel, is the still

dyadic feature underpinning "speech events" (the one-to one dyad or talk"), remarkably. In

fact, the then on spot-based interaction paradigm making up the core of Goffman's (as cited in

Chovanec & Dynel, 2015; as cited in Drew & Curl, 2008) enterprise has called attention to

the immediately present interlocutors away from other participants (recipients or larger

audiences). Over the years, this pattern, Chovanec and Dynel go on explaining, has been

stretched to full ends; similarly, most scholarship tends to have widened it coverage with

regard to PF just inspiring from Goffman. On first glimpse, however, they expose the

superficiality of this study as it is delimited by the bounds of overall layout of

communication, not the pragmatic-induced explanations to do with the altering nature of

discursive configurations (formats plus meanings) activated with the elastic parts assumed by

participants throughout continually varying interchange situations. The discursive

cooperation between participants has ultimately earned much impetus in research relevant to

Internet-mediated interaction.

 With the rise of the digital platforms as new brands of discursive production, mediation,

and reception, there has been a resurgence of interest in online interaction. Initially, Chovanec

and Dynel remind again that studies, whatever their perspectives, have exposed the

shortcomings pertaining to the Dyadic theorizing relating to discursive collaboration; these

have deemed it as incompatible with the technological growth and resulting communicative

variants regardless of being "intimate", "public", "authentic", or CMC-driven. Instead, newly

brought PFs have seen the light eventually across both ordinary exchanges (face-to-face) and

media-performed ones as several schemes of participation are currently being looked into so

as to unveil "positionings" either adopted or enforced on interactants and how these shape

their grasps of communicative events (Chovanec & Dynel, 2015; Hymes as cited in Mazid,

2014, as cited in Chovanec & Dynel 2015; Bell; Thomas; levinson as cited in Chovanec & Dynel 2015). In elaboration of their argument regarding the emerging PFs, Chovanec and Dynel state:

> The configuration of participant roles is crucial for determining what meanings each hearer may derive. Therefore, pragmatic research can contribute to our understanding of the underlying regularities, irregularities and strategic utilization of participation frameworks in various discourse genres. (2015, P. 3)

To paraphrase, we would say that having sheer knowledge of our respective roles undertaken in interaction facilitates considerably our notice of normality or even any oddities surrounding our discursive cooperations. Nowadays, the advent of social media (SM), as shown by Chovanec and Dynel, 2015; Jones and Hafner, 2012; Schrage (as cited in Jones & Hafner, 2012; Cavanagh, 2019; Lindgren, 2017, means a new source of technological creativity has yielded decisive penetration into new types of PFs outside the confines of traditional ones. That is, content— text, image, video, multi-model content— can be concocted and accessed and received (decontextualized and recontextualized with unbelievable speed and facility. Accordingly, for Chovanec (as cited in Chovanec & Dynel, 2015), scholars have ultimately placed substantial attention on what they describe as "mediated quasi-interaction", for such a mode of interchange is typically with spatially distanced producers/receivers alongside indeterminate numbers of recipients on the other end as well. In the end, what is a common marker in this age is that digital media notably CMC by far surpasses the traditionally two-participant type; Hence, Morris and Ogan (as cited in Chovanec & Dynel, 2015) subdivide the participatory mechanism into four categories depending upon synchronicity/a synchronicity:

- **Synchronous** "one -to- one" or one-to- many" or one-to- few". For instance, we could refer to different chat rooms,

- **Asynchronous** "many-to-many" exchanges. For example, when interaction arises through news blogs with production and reaction to discourses,

- **Asynchronous** one-to-one interaction. SNSs can be exemplars of this case when one publishes a post and a recipient replies to it,

- **Asynchronous "**many-to-one", "one-to one", or "one-to-many". This can be performed via e-libraries or even different web sites like those of universities.

To sum up, to socialize online, participants have been introduced to a supposedly strategic pattern to render it effective as in real-life situations.

3.2.3.2.2 *Global activism in the digital era.*

3.2.3.2.2.1 The political power of social media.

 Following the unprecedented boom in social media platforms, political activism in its broad sense has found its way to the virtual sphere. As a start, new media technologies (the Internet, mobile phones, SNSs, etc.), as claimed by Romero (2014), have altogether given substantial impetus to civic campaigning with it democracy all around the Globe. At the same time, this form of activism has managed in adapting to the globally digital system of digital societies known universally as "virtual societies"; that is, activists in all domains of life including the political one can presently benefit from coordination and collaboration facilities available online. Besides, this new state of affairs aims mainly to democratize especially autocratic systems. Thus, this fast growing sort of digital activism, which is typically transnational, has

remarkably brought a previously unknown kind of democratic revolt to the new millennium–

the "e-democracy". That is, groups' switch their campaigning strategies to the Internet to

mobilize as well as organize the masses. Relevant to this point, Romero observes:

> Definitely, the interactive capacities of new technologies have enhanced citizen
>
> participation and deliberation creating a sort of *virtual agora* or *digital public sphere*
>
> where digital citizens discuss worldwide issues of mutual interest. In this discursive
>
> space, public opinion is formed and exerts influence on political action. (2014, P. 20)

This statement, one would say, testifies to how things progress actually with digital

technologies being the center of gravity for the novel popular debate, mobilization, and

concrete action, namely political one. The rise of digital activism, if one may say so, owes

much to digitality.

This evolutionary change in perceiving things suggests that activism and technology have

irretrievably intersected each other with the spread of social media platforms. In association

with this widely recognized aspect, Romero (2014) values the notion of "global activism"

(GA) and he attributes its unprecedented rise to the new age of globalization in all domains

mainly interaction and information technologies. In effect, she stresses that one can come up

with two significant extrapolations amidst the technological turmoil characterizing our

existence. First, the scholar highlights the waves of socio-political revolts that swept the world

a few years ago; we can illustrate this point by referring the so-caled "Arab Spring" (Tunisia,

Egypt, and Syria). Second, the same author evokes how activists in their difference succeed in

synchronizing their actions due to the possibility offered by digital technologies (information

and communication tools). This synchronicity of efforts can manifest itself in the parallel

occurrence of protests across distant locations and even continents, in addition. In this respect,

such cultural tools (technological means like SNSs) enable their users to realize many things simultaneously; for instance, members of virtual communities on social media can post various information via– videos, pictures, or audios–in order to exchange attitudes toward particular issues and coordinate actions especially during political uprisings as was the case in the Egyptian Revolution (Jones & Hafner, 2012). Moreover, evoking the latter case, Gerbaudo (2012) explains:

> …in the course of the Egyptian revolution, social media became the means of a choreography of assembly, facilitating the coalescence of this cosmopolitan Facebook youth around a common identity, and its material precipitation into a 'street youth'. Derided for years by the state-owned media as 'guys of comment and like', the internet generation became infused with a missionary spirit of national salvation, incited by Facebook pages, blog posts, and tweets. (P. 48)

This sounds a very striking illustration of how SNSs play a decisive role in making campaigners masters of their own destiny as they are imbued with responsibility to act and change their destiny. The evolution of activism would not have reached its current status if no digitization of information technologies had followed in parallel.

In this case, what must be given its due right as the platform underpinning GA is digitality. To begin with, Romero (2014) insists that a thorough understanding of GA necessitates a comprehensive grasp of what is universally known as the "*digital revolution*". As regards, this term has acquired its appellation of the "third industrial revolution", which denotes a swift shift toward digitality. In fact, it reflects the sweeping widespread of information and communication technologies; thus the start of the "information age" marked by the manufacture of digital devices facilitating the dissemination of information with the highest

velocity (Romero, 2014; Van Dijck, 2013, Hills, 2009; Jones & Hafner, 2012). Besides, the revolutionary character of the digital age is materially backed up by the ensuing transformations visible at the social, political, and economic levels, Romero (2014); Jones and Hafner (2012); and Reed (2019) add. As such, Romero, like most of scholars do, draws attention to the truism that the rise of digital facilities has spawned the actual "*information society*". In this new society, interactional processes arise, henceforth (Romero, 2014; Hills, 2009; Van Dijck, 2013; Chovanec & Dynel, 2015). Comparatively, Matsuda, the Japanese sociologist, (as cited in Romero, 2014), on his part, has coined the term "post-industrial society" to substitute the one created by Tourain (as cited in Romero, 2014) "pre-industrial society"; indeed, the making of information, its spread and manipulation need to constitute the column spine of the society as this is the basis of productivity. In other words, the invention of IT (information technologies) has been a worldwide watershed with the ubiquity of socio-political as well as economic consequences. Last but not least, the present state of technological boom, Romero reminds, has definitely announced the information age. Mc Luhan's (as cited in Romero, 2014, 1963) introduction of the "global village" gives a lucid image of how information is at hand in spite of the spatial and temporal distances with the ability to react instantly to any sort of information as well by users including political activists themselves. Nonetheless, such information and communication facilities, for Romero, can be the source of split and division between groups when there is no room for democratic participation in debate over different issues– what has come to be the "digital divide". The latter refers to the widening disparity between the financially disenfranchised, who resort to social media as a source of income and campaigning, and those who detain wealth and control mainstream media to exert power and for advertising purposes (Bollmer, 2016). The information and communication revolution has definitively altered people's vision of reality.

As a direct repercussion of the ubiquity of information and communication devices, participation and mobilization of the masses on a larger scale on SNSs is nowadays something quite normal to be surprising. As a matter of effect, Bannister and Connolly (as cited in Romero, 2014) treat the extent to which the afore-referred-to tools have stimulated direct popular involvement in social issues mainly political actions. The latter experts emphasize the newly aspired form of democracy ("e.democracy"); they draw on findings related to democracy-based surveys since these seem to provide sound evidence that praise the positive outcome of communication technologies in triggering massive involvement in "digital politics" alongside e.democracy as well. Importantly, this era of social media platforms' participatory activism is synonymous with democratization at all levels online and offline (Van Dijck, 2013). Whilst, large audiences can currently play a determining role in re-shaping social attitudes to the constituency of society (political, legal, social, etc.), the popular power has come to be admitted as a truism amid the convergence of all brands of information and communication culture (Jenkins, 2006). For Gerbaudo (2014), thereby, it would be fair not to ignore the precipitating role of SNSs in the overall mobilization of activists through utilizing the Internet as a channel of interaction to partake in political protests despite the equally or perhaps more significant role of verbal communication.The same scholar comments evoking as evidence the Egyptian as well as Tunisian cases:

> …the uprisings in Egypt and before it in Tunisia have been celebrated in the media as 'Facebook revolutions' 'Twitter revolutions', or 'Wiki-revolutions'. These labels rightly highlight the important role played by the internet and social media as platforms for protest communications…. (P. 49)

That is to say, one would state that in addition to the traditional oral exchanges between activists, the support of social media as information and communication means can, by no means be eclipsed. The context where we live is perfectly the outgrowth of the digital transformations that have been swamping social life in all sectors.

3.3A Brief History of British Exceptionalism

3.3.1The 1970s-to Present "Neverrendum" on the UK's Ties with Europe

Talking about the recent split of the UK from the European Union (EU) following the 2016-Brexit Referendum automatically brings to mind the nationalism underlying the ever heterogeneous relationships between the two parties at all levels. To begin with, Anderson's (as cited in Glencross, 2016) states, hinting to the British, that people–ordinary citizens and politicians of all trends– of all countries worldwide enjoy perceiving their respective nations as intrinsically "exceptional". This standpoint, in fact, pertinently link to nowadays nationalism. Additionally, this conception is traced to the salient fact that subjects belonging to a state have many things in common: language; culture; religion; social values; race; ethnicity, etc. He states:

> Citizens and politicians around the globe like to think of their own state as exceptional. It's a comforting thought and one that is intimately linked to the notion of an "imagined community" which is at the heart of modern nationalism (P. 7).

This quotation is the actual proof of the existing spirit of nationalism prevalent over the world; the latter shapes up different citizens' perceptions of their nations as unique entities that need to be preserved at all cost. In the same register, Mautner; Wodak (as cited in Mautner, 2017) evoke the nationalist dimension that was disturbing Britain's links with

Europe trying to revivify the historically sensitive identity myth of the "island nation".

Nationalism and identity have been surfacing substantially intensifying the incompatible

connections between the UK and Europe.

Dealing with the above exceptional ties, Glencross (2016) puts much focus upon the

British side in conceptualizing their membership within the EU. As a matter of fact, Evoking

and explaining the typically British inclination to being highly skeptical about the EU-

membership forms an intrinsic feature of the British "exceptionalism; this attitudinal position

does not, for him, denote any exaggeratedly exceptional nationalism at all. Nevertheless, the

Kingdom's discussions with Brussels sound quite distinct from the usual ones among the

other member states. Its asymmetry, with this regard, with the EU can be instantly singled out.

For example, the author states that the UK has, right from the start, decided to be out of

bounds of the European Schengen border agreement. Also, in terms of its economic policy,

the country is not homogeneous with the rest of the continent; actually, the British side, which

counts principally on the financial business to compensate its trade deficit, can considerably

determine its political and economic ties with the European states. What would very likely be

strikingly surprising surpasses the just-referred-to aspects (politico-economic) since the

kingdom perceptibly prioritizes pragmatism in its variant deals with the Union. Therefore, this

quality marks a foreign policy devoid of a compelling union spirit. In the same vein, Dinan's

comment (as cited in Glencross, 2016) upon the latter point is a reminder of the persistent UK

refusal to cede it sovereignty, which manifests itself clearly as immovable skepticism to fuse

thoroughly in the original enterprise initiated by Germany and France in the 1950s. Overtime,

the evolution of such skepticism has been crystallized through the 2016 Brexit Referendum

leading to the imminent split between the UK and Europe. Relevant to this account is

Mautner's statement (2017), "…the Eurosceptic views that were so strong and widespread in

the 1980s and 1990s still hold sway and have lead to such a concrete political outcome [Brexit]" (P. 237). The archetype of British has been prevailing over its cooperation with its neighboring Europe.

3.3.1.1 The 1975-to- the- 2016 referendums.

Looking back in time can help shedding light on how the seemingly eternal British Skepticism has been ubiquitously weighing in its association with the EU. In actuality, the British, drawing on Glencross (2016); "Brexit," (n.d.), were provided with the opportunity to make up their minds on either to remain or quit the European Economic Community (EEC) on June 5th, 1975; this popular consent, regulated by the "Referendum Act1975" was known as "the Referendum on the European Community", "the Common Market Referendum", or "The EEC membership Referendum". This first referendum was held two and a half years after its adherence under the Conservative office led by Edward Heath in 1973. Beforehand, in their general election manifesto, the Labors had pledged a subsequent ballot over the UK citizens' stance about their country's membership in the Common Market. At the time, the upshot was, according to "Brexit," (n.d.), in favor of staying European; and this significant event would long symbolize the sole massive referendum across the UK in connection with its links with the EU till the ultimate one in 2016, which under the European "Article 50" launched the procedure of putting an end to the bilateral cooperation of the two parties. The fall out was politically unifying at the British Parliament, then. Commenting on the forthcoming fall out of that occasion, the Prime Minister, Mr. Harold Wilson, issued a declaration, "I ask you to use your vote. For it is *your* vote that will now decide. The Government will accept your verdict", "Now the time has come for you to decide. The Government will accept your decision–whichever way it goes" (Para. 3). In spite of the pro-

European orientation of most of the UK voters then (67% in support of EU membership with

an overall turnout of 64%), many notorious politicians in the Kingdom, especially "nationalist

populists" have ever since advocated an eventual withdrawal from the EU by organizing

national referendums on– membership, certain treaties, and the actual Euro currency (Gifford

as cited in Glencross, 2016; "Brexit," n.d.). Besides, the following general election of October

1974 brought the Labor party to power; these had already made a promise to set Britain's

terms of agreement to join the EU back to negotiation; then, submit them to the public's

approval via the ballots accusing the Conservatives of having poorly negotiated the country's

membership with the ECC. Henceforth, the Labors would encapsulate openly their historical

concern about ceding the country's sovereignty under the common economic constraints

mainly, which the Kingdom would continually and inflexibly defend as part of its own

identity ("Brexit," n.d.; Morville, 2019). With this regard, the UK's then Foreign Secretary,

James Callaghan would conceptualize the EEC as merely a "business arrangement". This

description implies the typically British frames of reference that would eventually influence

their determination to step out of the EU in 2016 (Wall as cited in Glencross, 2016). The 1975

referendum had for long acted as a milestone in shaping up British relationships with Europe

in the years to follow.

Nearly four decades later, the UK's membership and its multiple commitments within the

EU have surfaced afresh to be at issue. As starters, the British Prime Minister, Mr. David

Cameron, proposed, in 2013, an "in/out" referendum that would duly help settle the

controversial debate; the then surveys (opinion polls) would reveal a remarkably mounting

popularity of the Conservative candidate amongst the electorate (Chatham House/You Gov as

cited in Glencross, 2016). Subsequently, the victory of the Labor Party in the 2015

parliamentary elections has, as Glencross observes, paved the way to Mr. Cameron to

commence the execution of his kernel plan– the holding of the remain/leave vote. In effect, the Conservative Government, like the 1975 referendum, opted primarily for gaining and strengthening the UK's position vis- a-vis the EU by calling for a re-negotiation of the partnership with the European Institution before it would invoke the opinion of the British people on the matter. Adding more on this systematic process, the author writes:

> More than 40 years on, the most obvious parallel with the 1975 referendum was the government's strategy for winning: renegotiate the terms of membership prior to allowing the people to decide. This move was doubly unilateral by virtue of asking first for British-focused concessions followed by an ex post form of democratic authorization by the British public. (P. 9)

The above explanatory quotation appears to juxtapose the two UK-triggered referendums in order to figure out the unifying aim binding them together. On the one hand, the British have always sought to reinforce their position within the EU by setting out to fully review all the common agreements and treaties; on the other, implicating the citizenry has been a sine qua non as it would yield legality to any subsequent move toward the EU. As such, it would be concluded that the UK's referendums are clearly unilateral in nature; they represent favoring the strategic interests of the Kingdom to the detriment of its ties with the EU.

At the same time, what underpins both referendums seems to be a testimony of the purely national dimension guiding the UK's procedures to deal with the EU. Regarding this point, Glencross (2016) stresses how re-defining the British association with the EU has been a pressing issue throughout the domestic political stratum. In addition to the earlier Labors' attempts to launch a ballot to sort out the outlook of the public concerning maintaining the cooperation with the EEC in 1974, the Conservative Party witnessed an insurgency lead by its

MPs to urge Mr. John Major, the-then Prime Minister to hold a referendum to test the

people's stance on the "Maastricht Treaty"[1] in 1992. Ten years after, another treaty was put to

the popular consent under the aegis of Mr. Tony Blair: the "Constitutional Treaty"[2]. This

would eventually be followed by Mr. David Cameron's will to do the same with what is

known as the "Lisbon Treaty"[3] in his electoral campaign during the 2010 general election.

Though none of the proposed referendums could be completed, the overwhelming victory in

the House of Commons in 2015 would offer the opportunity for the Conservatives to consult

the British people for their feedback on the European membership. Most importantly, the

reasons underlying such repeated calls for referendums by politicians of all tendencies are

quite multiple; albeit, what appears exceptional with the UK revolves around the consensus

that evidently characterizes the British political scene from the staunchest Conservative

skeptics to the moderate Labors and Liberal Democrats. The respective 2010/2014 manifestos

of both the Liberal Democrats and Labors explicitly manifested their plans not to cede any

powers unless validated by an "in/out referendum, for example. Accordingly, the Labors'

premier, Ed Miliband, made of this condition a priority in case his party would access to

office (Hug and Schulz; Finke and Konig as cited in Glencross, 2016; Glencross, 2016). In

spite of their divergent political and ideological orientations, the British political class would

stand on an equal distance regarding demarcating the UK's positions with the EU on a

democratic basis.

Nevertheless, by dissecting the background of the strong decision of the UK politicians to

appeal to the public's blessing for taking any step in connection with the EU, we can come

across some skepticism-induced motives. To begin with, historical reasons, as indicated by

Morville, (trans. 2019) seem to have weighed enormously in favor of the UK's exit. In effect,

being an island, the country had ceaselessly shown it mistrust toward the bureaucracy of

European institutions, notably when it comes to coping with economic crises (the 2008-9-crises as an illustration); concurrently, even the political class in its diversity with British media would subsequently be of like minds as well over this serious concern. Importantly, as Glencross (2016) explains, the European regulations of the economic parameters were seen as highly constraining to the UK's economic policies orienting toward freer trade at a global extent. Most importantly, the British would overtly show their deep worries with regard to the shortage of public opinion expression over the EU membership; this has not been allowed under the restrictive European bounds. Indeed, this can be backed up by Mr. Cameron's declaration (as cited in Glencross, 2016), "the 'democratic consent for Britain's membership has worn wafer thin'" (P. 11), which is a lucid reminder that the early-1970s-and-2016 referendums were both general attitudes toward the possibility to enter the then EEC market or exit the later EU insitutions. Moreover, the UK citizens have never been thoroughly satisfied with what they had expected to gain out of their partnership with the EU. Reporting on Farage's (as cited in Glencross, 2016) seemingly pessimistic statement, the same scholar writes, "Referring to the earlier referendum, the UKIP argued that 'the British people were not getting– and have never got–what we were led to believe we were voting for'" (P. 11). Also, in terms of scientific research, the UK would judge the European restrictions badly ominous; the EU funding has been deemed poorly marginal (covering no more than 3% of the UK's academic research) compared with the tax-based contributions in the kingdom (£13 billion per annum) (Leigh, 2016). Conversely, to some experts, like Morville (trans. 2019) it might have been that the Conservatives lead by Mr. Cameron had ostensibly utilized the outcome as a weapon to strengthen UK's hand in negotiating with the EU. There have been a load of growing obstacles blocking the way to a lasting membership

of the UK within the EU, which have in the end culminated in the Brexit tendency spread across the kingdom.

Simultaneously, the triggering process of exiting the EU has proven legally litigating. Amidst the political controversy following the referendum, Graig (2017) observes, there has surfaced a tension opposing the executive to the Supreme Court over article 50. Indeed, the latter institution would assert that under no circumstances could the constitutional stipulation be ignored in favor of the royal prerogative as the legal key to activating the article; in other terms, the requirements for Brexit have had to be constitutionally met so that it would start taking effect. Henceforth, the crossing of parliamentary hurdles would have been quite unavoidable if the PM had aspired to get a withdrawal bill fully approved immediately after the issuance of the court's rule, the author reminds likewise. Nevertheless, the executive has overtly rejected the operative procedures enforced by Parliament in the course of its negotiations with the EU. For instance, the PM would have to report to the legislature keeping it alert to any evolution regarding negotiating rounds; likewise, this official would be held liable to submit any draft of withdrawal agreement to Parliament for endorsement or else rejection. The enactment of article 50 might have been seen as a simple formality, but, under the constitutional constraints and the watchful eye of Parliament, a withdrawal agreement would eventually turn challenging.

3.3.2 The accession of Theresa May to power and the possible Brexit scenarios.

Succeeding David Cameron, in the head of the state in 2016, Theresa May would have very sensitive matters to cope with high on her agenda especially relating to Brexit. The newly elected top official in the country (the second female Prime Minister after Thatcher in the

1980s), according to "May," (n.d.); Buckledee, (2018); (Craig, 2017); Sacerdoti (2017),

instantly activated Article 50 of the treaty of Lisbon to launch the retreat of the UK from the

EU in two-year-length-negotiations after having notified the European Council of its decision

via an official letter. Shortly after, she would, as "May," (n.d.) explains, unexpectedly reveal

the holding of a "snap general election" in June 8th, 2017. As a matter of effect, the aim

behind this announcement lay in the strategic decision to comfort her position in the much

complicated negotiations with the EU; hence, this would confirm the Prime Minister's solid

leadership in the eyes of the population. Unfortunately, things had not gone right for Mrs.

May since Tories would lose their overwhelming majority in Parliament with their seats

dwindling from 330 to 318 with the official narrowly escaping a "no confidence vote" from

both her own party (the conservative MPs) plus Labor leader Jeremy Corbyn respectively.

The negotiations, at the same time, would prove tough as long as the issues to be tackled have

been imbued with obstacles add to that the fact that whichever point to be debated would be

subjected to parliamentary ratifications across Europe as well as the UK (Buckledee, 2018). In

this respect, the same author comments:

> Hammering out an agreement in just two years was never going to be easy
>
> given the complicated nature of the issues involved plus the fact that whatever
>
> terms were negotiated would have to be ratified by twenty-seven national
>
> parliaments, each of which would have a veto over the conditions. (P. 181)

In a nutshell, setting out on the negotiations journey would not prove as easy as was initially

expected.

Albeit the initially fixed objective of securing a fortified standpoint from which to

negotiate a retreat deal with the EU, the overall election outcome has turned less favorable to

the Tories. To begin with, Buckledee (2018) indicates that the re-elected party (the Conservative party) has failed in obtaining the majority of the electorate's voices; in the House of Commons, results have been right below expectations with solely 318 seats ceding 13 ones and missing 8 to gain the overwhelming majority. Conversely, the Labors have won 30 seats to comfort their position in the general political layout with 262 MPs entering the Commons anew. Moreover, the same scholar remarks that remainers (the name ascribed to pro-European partisans), having been struck by the Labors' act of backing the Governments' activation of article 50, should have changed orientations to parties with unequivocal European tendencies like the Green party or even the Liberal Democrats. Simultaneously, subjects from ethnic groups have sounded hopeful about a less harmful Brexit that would likely preserve their citizenship rights trusting candidate Jeremy Corbyn's due negotiation board. The Labors' manifesto that read "*For the many not the few*" could draw a multitude of supporters from many ethnic communities. Consequently, the new layout of parliament, for Buckleddee, would ultimately affect the process of Brexit negotiations with the EU in the long term. Overall, what Mrs. May had previously planned to attain through the general election would subsequently put her in dire straits.

After the Brexit referendum and the general election there has come the time for more serious points to be negotiated with the hope of reaching an equitable Brexit. Actually, the primary interest lies in the common advantages of the Customs Union as well as the Single Market fundamental for the sustainability of the UK's economy especially for Labors, as Buckledee (2018) shows. In conformity with Mrs. May's 2017-speech, Sacerdoti (2017) comments, extracting the basic fundamentals propping her government's negotiations with the EU stresses precisely "Principle 8". This has come uppermost on her agenda; it ensures it would, "…forge a new strategic partnership with the EU, including a wide reaching, bold and

ambitious free trade agreement and will seek a mutually beneficial new customs agreement with the EU" (P. 72). In brief, The PM had right from the start set up a road map to fullfil a mutually advantageous Brexit and would consequently materialize, "…the democratic will of the people of the UK" (P. 72). Nevertheless, the immigration issue, as Buckledee (2018) notices, has been quite divisive in Britain. On the one hand, Labors would stand for maintaining European residents in the UK with their full rights and ensure the same for UK immigrants across the EU-member states; for the EU Council this question would be one of the negotiating top-priorities besides sorting out the UK's prior financial commitments (Sacerdoti, 2017). On the other, the Conservative Government led by Mrs. May, for the former, has openly expressed their hostility to the flow of immigrants into the kingdom. In addition, May's credo of "No deal is better than bad deal" signals that it would not be conceivable to conduct a Brexit that would probably consume the efforts of the British side of negotiations without point. In fact, the failure of the general election has meant the interruption of hard withdrawal negotiations away from the UK's official institutions (Grice as cited in Buckledee, 2018). If it had sounded tough to arrive at mutually beneficial Brexit, the British board of negotiators, Buckledee observes, would have quit immediately the table of negotiations with their European interlocutors. Regardless of the fiasco of the Tories to gain a majority of votes, the ultimate negotiations have constituted the last steep slope to climb for the UK Government.

The road to Brexit was wide open shortly after the 2017-general election but this time it seemed May would re-consider her initial approach to leading the discussions with the EU. Indeed, sticking to their pledges concerning going ahead with the retreat from the EU, as Buckledee states, May's office would set out for less hard Brexit than the one she had opted for at the beginning. Relatively speaking, what she had attempted to put to the background

earlier in terms of Customs Union as well as Single Market Membership would be re-included onto her negotiations agenda to be negotiated with Parliament consent to be taken into account ultimately. The scholar, at this point, draws attention to the very important fact that unless gaining a majority of voices, the Prime Minister cannot unilaterally and instantly leave the Single Market and the Customs Union even without any fruitful negotiations; this state of affairs would as likely as not prove problematic for Mrs. May. Therefore, with the imminent participation of Parliament, especially urged by pro-European MPs–even Tory MPs– it would seem quite inescapable for her to engage in a soft Brexit. Eventually, with the official Brexit date getting so close–April 12th 2019– the responsible of the UK executive, according to Morville, (trans.2019), has solemnly asked for a postponement of this decision till May 22$^{nd.}$ The aim, actually, has been to try and arrive at a specially last-minute agreement with the ex-partners regarding the Customs Union; however, her repeated claims of delaying the definitive Brexit would face ruthless rejections in Parliament out of unconvincing arguments. The EU party, on the other end, have not shown entire refusal of the proposal, but would, at once, not cede to any imposed "British exit" whatever its nature since this would in time have damaging economic, political, and diplomatic consequences for both sides. To Brussels, the UK's intention to break up from the EU had been foreshadowed in its unambiguous refusal of the "four freedoms of the single market"– non-restrained circulation of manufactures, funds, services, and persons– as well as the EU-regulated customs system (Sacerdoti, 2017). The road to the final exit has not been paved with gold for Mrs. May as the Commons were blocking her way isolating her over and over.

Being at the final stage of discussions with the EU, the UK government would be expected to complete the formal procedures leading up to an official withdrawal; but several scenarios could be predicted ahead. In regard with this, Rutter and Owen (2018); Craig (2017) pay

attention to the complicated mission of the PM, who has been supposed to conclude a

"withdrawal agreement" with Brussels; next, she would have to go through Parliament for

official ratification (assuming the form of a "meaningful vote") along with the EU

Parliaments likewise. A smooth transitional move out would not have been possible provided

that such formalities had been fully achieved, in fact. Thereby, these attempt to go over some

probable scenarios that would have either been obstacles or else effective solutions to

whoever PM to overcome prodecural hardships amidst the tough negotiations. These are five

in total; they are listed as follows:

- Firstly, the PM and EU members (27 in total) would have to reach an agreement

  during their meeting at the European Council which would be adopted by both sides'

  parliaments. This would allow the UK to quit the European political structures on the

  due date (initially, it was on March 29th, 2019) with a transitional period of 21 months

  and in-depth discussions about the withdrawal arrangement alongside the scheme of

  subsequent ties between both sides. The PM would get things done smoothly,

- Secondly, Parliament might not accept the PM's agreement and opt for a "no-deal

  Brexit". Thus, the "Withdrawal Agreement Bill" cannot be passed into legislation. In

  this case, the chief of the Executive ought to clarify its intentions following such a

  refusal within no later than 21 days in accordance with the "Withdrawal Act". Equally,

  the PM would move through Parliaments' chambers to explain its plan of action to be

  ratified; at this stage, the PM needs to compel MPs into going back to negotiations.

  Still, the same act, empowers the Government, if the Brexit deal is rejected anew, to

  show its plans but within just 5 days to be voted on. Hence, the PM would cede to

  Parliament's rejection of a "no-deal" Brexit.

- Thirdly, The Government is re-ordered to re-negotiate after its agreement deal is dropped by Parliament. Here, it would entirely depend on what is not accepted by the Legislature (if a basic point–such as the UK's financial dues to be paid– is at issue, the PM cannot act freely and would be blocked). Significantly, the potentially lingering

- problem is: the length of time for re-negotiations, the EU's decision to react to this proposal positively, and Parliament's acceptance of a road map by the Government,

- Fourthly, if it is not possible to arrive at a mutual agreement on the final retreat deal between both sides of the negotiations, the PM would find it inevitable to state its inability to deal with Brussels to Parliament. The latter, in turn, acts on this move for ratification; it would declare officially that the UK would quit the EU without any deal at all,

- Fifthly, there is another possibility for Parliament to interfere against a no deal and orders the Executive to re-open the negotiations with the EU. In this case, the nature of the parliamentary action would be quite obscure as there are no clarifications of the type of role that would be undertaken by Parliament if a no deal were ensued ahead then.

As a summary, the negotiations with the EU are not something easy, nor are they a matter of a short duration; rather it must stick to a systematic ensemble of legal formalities in which Parliament is expected to determine the Government's course of action to attain a definitive Brexit with the least harm to the UK.

4.3.3 Brexit Withdrawal Agreement under Boris Johnson

 To fulfill its retreat from the EU, the UK must sign a final agreement with Brussels that would set the terms and conditions of its ultimate Brexit. According to "Brexit withdrawal agreement," (n.d.), the official appellation of this treaty is the "Agreement on the withdrawal of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland from the European Union and the European Atomic Energy Community [(Euratom)]". As a matter of fact, the UK, EU, and Euratom signed this treaty on January 24th, 2020 to give effect to the definitive withdrawal of the UK from both organizations; this was a reviewed version of a earlier one that had been blocked by Parliament (the Commons) thrice forcing Mrs. May to resign and leave office to Mr. Boris Johnson, the new Conservative Party leader as well. Actually, she had already expressed her will to quit her post as PM on the aftermath of the Parliamentary polls against her proposed Draft Treaty, which would plunge the country in an unprecedented constitutional confusion on a large scale (Isaby, 2020; Adam, 2020). The road to Brexit would prove thorny for both parties involved in the negotiations with the bundle of formalities as well as procedures to adhere to to reach a mutually satisfactory Brexit.

Conversely, the final stage of Brexit negotiations and approval by both UK Parliament and European Parliaments has been achieved by Mr. Boris Johnson, the newly elected PM. As a matter of effect, Mrs. May's successor in office, stated by "Brexit withdrawal agreement," (n.d.), would manage to pass the hurdles of Parliament with a re-visited version of the re-negotiated agreement ; nevertheless, the shortness of sufficient back up to hasten the ratification process has convinced him to interrupt the legislation calling for a general election to be held soon. Subsequently, the Parliament of the UK gave its ultimate consent to the Withdrawal Agreement on January 23rd, 2020 followed by the European Parliament on January 29th, of the same year. Significantly, such topics as immigration and residents' rights, trade and financial matters, and border issues have been specified in the agreement

along with a transitional duration plus a schedule for bilateral relations between the UK and EU. The Withdrawal Agreement started taking effect on January 31st, 2020 at 11p.m. GMT, finally. Thereby, all European treaties ceased applying to the UK automatically following its entry into vigor (Craig, 2017). The Withdrawal Agreement has been the fruit of a marathon of negotiations involving both sides and necessitating the consent of their respective Parliaments.

3.4 The UK Post-Brexit Trade Agreements

The economic and trade policies have been some of the most irretrievable negotiation issue between the UK and the EU.To initiate, long before manifesting its will of departing from the EU, Araujo (2019) observes, the UK has been thwarted from directing its own commercial policies and knitting trade ties worldwide. As a matter of fact, this prerogative has been exclusively restricted to Brussels to specify the foreign trade mechanism, conduct negotiations, and attain business agreements. Henceforth, right from the inception of the Brexit negotiations between the two parties, the UK has firmly stuck to regaining this right, which has been presented as immovable; as soon as the UK's departure is proclaimed, the country can automatically activate this "competence", the authors comment. However, much doubt has been cast upon the power devolved to local councils to handle matters relevant to international trade agreements ("international trade law"); these may conern such sectors as: transportation services, health care, agriculture and fishing, education, and environmental issues. The Withdrawal Agreement bill has specified the maintenance in vigor of the original legislation after the UK quits the EU–the "retained EU law, which means that such regional administrations would probably be at stake in terms of managing their own trade policies.

What the two negotiating parties have been hitting is the problem of regulating trade and concluding trade agreements.

The other obstacle to cross along the way has been the Northern Ireland case and its position in post-Brexit UK. In respect with this point, Araujo (2019) evokes the trade policy of the kingdom would be as likely as not strictlycontingent on adherering unquestionably to what is known as the Good Friday Agreement signed in 1998[4]. The latter establishes the the pacification process initiated in Northern Ireland; this consisted in suppressing the land bounderies in Ireland. The life span of this process, for him, would face an end in the light of the new context, nonetheless. Indeed, the borders would re-appear as a way of regulating the national customs' routine services of controls and tax collecting. Besides, to overcome this difficulty, the UK and EU signed a compromising protocol in 2018; this was intended to keep Northern Ireland the European customs system and the free movement of manufactures in accordance with the EU norms of managing the domestic market. The recourse to this measure to reduce the tensions between both sides, the status of this area on the UK and EU's political map would be another minefield for the bilateral negotiations because sparing the island customary controls over goods from the continent would imply its exclusion from the UK's external commercial agreements after Brexit, nevertheless. Succincly speaking, the UK's treasury would imminently lose its due financial benefits from European trade agreements with foreign partners worldwide not to mention the dwindling bilateral exchanges in trade negatively impacting both sides (Morville, trans. 2019). In sum, from the trade economic angle, the post-Brexit prospect of regulating trade would be awkward to handle both the two parties.

Conclusion

To sum things up, we have tackled, in this chapter, the theoretical dimension underlying the functioning mechanism of new media from the earlier paradigms of modernist thinking up to Hall's encoding/decoding framework. Furthermore, moving along the way, we have focused our attention on the shift from the first to the second media era, in which the world has turned into a little village with people interfacing with new sorts of media allowing them to exchange information on the Internet. In addition, our account has extended to encompass the rapid rise of the SNSs alongside the ensuing birth of the virtual community as a parallel space for interaction between online members as partisans of various groups campaigning for political as well as social causes–hence the birth of participatory culture in the age of social media platforms.

In the same chapter an overview of Brexit in the UK has been done. In fact, to analytically place the parties involved in the context of discursive struggle for power and domination, we have attempted to paint an lucid picture of the overall state of affairs to serve as a background for sufficient understanding of the Brexit issue with the relevant steps as well through which the destiny of the UK have evolved, evoking the legal hardships and obstacles, marking its definitive break with the EU. The post-Brexit trade negotiations have been tackled in conclusion of the third paragraph.

Footnotes

1"Maastricht Treaty" in 1992 The Treaty on European Union, commonly known as the Maastricht Treaty, is the foundation treaty of the European Union (EU). Concluded in 1992 between the then-twelve member states of the European Communities, it announced "a new stage in the process of European integration"[2] chiefly in provisions for a shared European citizenship, for the eventual introduction of a single currency, and (with less precision) for common foreign and security policies. Maastricht Treaty (n.d.) retrieved from https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Maastricht_Treaty

2Constitutional Treaty the Treaty establishing a Constitution for Europe was adopted by the European Council on 18 June 2004, and signed in Rome later that year in the presence of the EP President, Josep Borrell Fontelles. Approved by the EP (Méndez de Vigo-Leinen report), the Treaty was then rejected by France (29 May 2005) and the Netherlands (1 June 2005) in their national referenda.
Following the rejection of the Constitutional Treaty Member States began work on the Lisbon Treaty. Retrieved from https://www.europarl.europa.eu/about-parliament/en/in-the-past/the-parliament-and-the-treaties/draft-treaty-establishing-a-constitution-for-europe

3the Lisbon Treaty (initially known as the Reform Treaty) is an international agreement that amends the two treatieswhich form the constitutional basis of the European Union (EU). The Treaty of Lisbon, which was signed by the EU member states on 13 December 2007, entered into force on 1 December 2009.[2] It amends the Maastricht Treaty (1992), known in updated form as the Treaty on European Union (2007) or TEU, as well as the Treaty of Rome (1957), known in updated form as the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (2007) or TFEU.[3] It also amends the attached treaty protocols as well as the Treaty establishing the European Atomic Energy Community (EURATOM). Retrieved from https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Treaty_of_Lisbon

4 Good Friday Agreement The Good Friday Agreement (GFA), or Belfast Agreement (Irish: *Comhaontú Aoine an Chéasta* or *Comhaontú Bhéal Feirste*; Ulster-Scots: *Guid Friday Greeance* or *Bilfawst Greeance*),[1] is a pair of agreements signed on 10 April 1998 that ended most of the violence of The Troubles, a political conflict in Northern Ireland that had ensued since the late 1960s. It was a major development in the Northern Ireland peace process of the 1990s. It is made up of the Multi-Party Agreement between most of Northern Ireland's political parties, and the British–Irish Agreement between the British and Irish governments. Northern Ireland's present devolved system of government is based on the agreement. Retrieved from https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Good_Friday_Agreement

Chapter four: Methodology and Analytical Work of the Pro-Brexiteers and EU-remainers' Discourses on Facebook and Twitter

Introduction

As the title indicates, the third chapter is dedicated to the overall research methodology with its respective stages and the analytical side of this work. Firstly, it goes through broad methodology with the philosophical assumption underpinning the procedural steps and analytical tools (methods) inherent in any CDA endeavor treating pressing discursive and social issues. In addition, it encompasses such elements as– the sources selected to obtain data, the type of the data gathered, the data collection tool, and rationale behind such a selection. Secondly, it initiates the practical task of analyzing the data in the form of discourses elaborated by both the Pro-Brexiteers and EU-remainers' communities on the social networking sites (Facebook and Twitter) as these are the main actors involved the Brexit issue in Britain. This deed consists in applying Van Dijk's "Social Cognition" approach to discourse as a paradigm.

4.1 Research Methodology

4.1.1Research Design

Concerning the research design, Creswell (2009) states that this term signifies the general plan alongside the procedures adopted throughout the research. In effect, this organizational layout enables enquirers to progress smoothly from the initial assumptions to the specific methods deployed for data gathering and analysis; in simple terms, Wikipedia (as cited in Priatmoko, 2013) views research design as "a blueprint for research" (P.33) in that it signals

a specific scheme of performing research work. Besides, the layout, for Creswell, encompasses several steps based on philosophical options, "The overall design involves which design should be used to study a topic" (P. 3). This, actually, rests on: (a) the assumptions adopted, (b) study procedure (strategies), (c) the particular methods of data collection, analysis and interpretation, (e) research problem and subject tackled, and (f) population under study. It would be noteworthy to specify that the actual population targeted in this research project is broadly the two communities (Brexiteers vs. EU-remainers) whose selected groups are the sources of corpora analytically covered. In this, he argues, "Research design, which I refer to as the *plan* or *proposal* to conduct research, involves the intersection of philosophy, strategies, specific methods of inquiry, and methods" (P. 5). The author, thus, specifies three design types that can apply for academic enquiry: the qualitative approach, the quantitative approach, and the mixed-method approach.

This work builds specifically on both the advocacy/participatory and social constructivist philosophy. In fact, Creswell (2009) classifies these as purely qualitative research approaches. For the participatory worldview, Creswell explains that it has emerged as an open reaction against the restrictions of Post Positivism; these do not encourage enquirers to tackle matters relevant to social injustices as well as dominated subjects in society. Henceforth, such crucial issues necessitate an urgent consideration by researchers. Relevant to this respect, Neuman (as cited in Creswell, 2009) relates how researchers proceeding with the advocacy philosophy have drawn on social thinkers–Marx, Adorno, Habermars, Marcuse, and Freire–to urgently incorporate both politics and political agendas in research. In other words, any analytical work needs to carry in it an action agenda in order to free marginalized, disenfranchised citizens from the dominance of the elites and provoke change to the imposed social institutions ruling their lives. As far as Creswell is concerned, fresh socio-cultural subjects should receive

detailed attention, for these depict issues associated with power, control, and injustice in society, so enquirers often initiate their works with such issues as the core of research. Indeed, the present endeavour, tries to exploit social cognition as an approach to the study of discourse; it consists broadly of exploring the triangular relationship between discourse, cognition, and society (Van Dijk, 2014a). Additionally, it tries to investigate how unjust power relations, control, power abuse are enacted as well as resisted socially through discursive practices (Aini & Widodo, 2018; Van Dijk, 1989, 1990, 2008a; Fairclough, 1989, 1995a). Social constructivism, on the other hand, presents social members as trying to grasp the world where they live in that they can subjectively convey their perceptions toward reality (world issues), Creswell remarks. As a result, a multitude of attitudes will automatically surface leading researchers to engage in uncovering the intricacies of the generation of such perceptions to counter dominant ones in society.

Besides to what has been said so far, Creswell; Grotty (as cited in Creswell, 2009) point out that for social constructivism worldviews subjectively elaborated need to be negotiated socially and historically. In effect, by taking part in interpersonal interactions conditioned by socio-cultural as well as historical constraints, people come to exchange and make sense of their respective stances to reality; this accounts for scholars' focused attention to the process of contextual communication and the relevant, influential factors: social, cultural, and historical. In other words, context underlying social interaction forms the core of enquiry. From the social constructivist perspective, analysts, besides, are supposed to adopt certain interpretative positions depending on their socio-cultural backgrounds as well as prior experiences with the world; that is to say, their main task revolves around making sense of interactants' conceptions of the world. Ultimately, since meaning-making in discursive

exchanges is determined by society, researchers are aided in their interpretative tasks by the data gathered; meaning is derived from discourses of participants in situational interactions.

Taking account of the above-mentioned material, the intersection of both philosophical penchants (worldviews) would account for the choice of critical discourse analysis (CDA) as the qualitative strategy of research underpinning this work. Actually, CDA, as multidisciplinary approach to the study of discourse, tries to put out the complex relationship between discourse, ideology, power, unequal power relations, control, and inequality within society; CDA focuses on discourse as the means through which ideology-driven, social injustices are activated and conveyed and opposed. Furthermore, CDA attempts to explore social topics by tackling discourse analytically; the latter necessitates the elaboration of theoretical paradigms and relevantly descriptive methods as these are very central in dealing with the intricacies of the connection between discourse and social structures of dominance regulating interaction. Thus, by engaging in CDA, practioners must firstly reveal their socio-political standpoints. In fact, by unraveling the unfairly dominant structures governing society, critical discourse analysts point critically to the elites who unjustly enact, perpetuate, and legitimize such systems via discourse with the very aim of acting in defense of subjected groups to assist them freeing themselves from the grip of those power holders (Van Dijk, 2014b; Wodak, 2001).

4.1.2 Research Approach

As starters, it would be useful to observe that the overall approach adopted here is essentially qualitative in nature, and the purpose is expository, descriptive. According to Creswell; Newmann and Benz (as cited in Creswell, 2009) this approach tries to unveil individuals and groups' perceptions of social phenomena, so it is concerned with words instead of numbers.

That is, because discourse acts as the representation of variant attitudes to world issues, it constitutes the target for examination. Qualitative discourse analysis, actually, consists in describing and comparing discourses in order to uncover the relationship (similarity or dissimilarity) between them (especially social communities including virtual ones); this entails the explanation of the socio-cultural conditions underlying their (various discourses) respective productions, mediations, and receptions at length. This process generally culminates in analysts interpreting and then classifying as similar or different discourses relative to particular issues, consequently (Uwe Flick, 2013). Concerning this project, we try to explore analytically both the Pro-Brexiteers as well as Eu-remainers' discourses on Facebook and Twitter to hopefully and eventually come up with some findings regarding the power relations between the two SNSs' communities and how discourse may enact struggle for dominance among such virtual groups and help affirming their shared conceptions of the world. In addition, for Silverman (2013), opting for qualitative research may be misjudged as entirely subjective; indeed, building on personal experiences in doing research denotes evident bias in choosing specific cases for social survey as these, in turn, such objects of study embody authentic, subjective attitudes to life within societies. In other words, we, by adopting this mode of research, subjectively approach the social behavior of humans in the particular context of the Brexit issue in Britain by focusing on Brexiteers and Non-Brexiteers along with their forceful debate on SNSs. In arguing in favor of this point, he writes, "…an interest in subjectivity and the authenticity of human experience is a strong feature of some qualitative research…this kind of naturalist model is one of the dominant paradigms within qualitative research" (Para. 5). However, any qualitative work has to retain its fundamental nature of objectivity; of course, this is thanks to the multiple stages involved in it–data collection and analysis tools, findings, and discussion of findings. To sum things up, tackling socio-cultural

organizations and interactional mechanisms must appeal for a combination of subjective/objective approach from a qualitative perspective.

Nonetheless, it would be useful to clarify right from the start that we occasionally resort to some quantitative elements to complement the qualitative ones in due course. For Creswell (2009) enquirers need not see both approaches as intrinsically different; rather, they can deploy components of each other to achieve a certain complementation when it is necessary. Consequently, the overall approach adopted throughout this work revolves around the mixed-method approach. On the one level, the predominant approach, the description of the corpuses, serves qualitatively the analytical examination of the afore-mentioned groups' discourses to try to reveal the underlying attitudes to the Brexit issue. On the other, when quantitative data requires of us some counting, we readily have recourse to this technique; indeed, we proceed with counting the number of the corpuses of both campaigning communities dealt with across the months making up the two lengths of time set for their study. In a nutshell, the research approach permeating this paper is broadly based on a mixed method, but its instruments of gathering and analyzing data are mostly qualitative excepting for the corpuses' respective numbers.

4.1.3 Unit of Analysis

The unit of analysis making the object of the present study centres on the discourses of the Pro-Brexiteers and Eu-remainers' communities on the social networking sites (Facebook and Twitter) following the 2016-Brexit Referendum. Actually, their respective discourses regarding this controversial issue come under Van Dijk's CDA model namely social cognition.

4.1.4 Source of Data

When it comes to the source from which the data are obtained, we rely entirely on specific Facebook and Twitter activist groups. On the one hand, the Pro-Brexit groups are respectively: "Leave Means Leave" (Twitter and Facebook), "Change Britain" (Twitter and Facebook), and "Brexit Central" (Twitter and Facebook). On the other, the EU-remainers encompass: the Very Brexit Problems Club (Facebook), Anti-Brexit Bristol Activists (Facebook), East London for Europe/London East Anti Brexit (Face book), Brighton Hove for EU (Twitter), European Movement UK (Twitter), and Brits for the EU (Twitter). Actually, both SNSs (Facebook and Twitter) are unquestionably two of the most common social networks, alongside YouTube, among ordinary users and especially political activists worldwide. Facebook, in effect, is an online social networking site that was launched in 2004 by Mark Zuckerberg and his Harvard University colleagues: Chris Hughes, Eduardo Saverin, Andrew Mc Collum, and Dustin Moskovits. It allows users to perform multiple deeds– upload various materials (pictures, images, videos, files), exchange messages, create their own profiles, and join or create new communities. Additionally, this SNS is made up of many facilities: a Timeline (a space for users to post their contents and receive comments from their friends), a status allowing users to signal their present location and state, and other meta-platform services– including Instagram (a social network for sharing videos and photos), WhatsApp (a "VoIP" facility or telephone-based communications online with a text-messaging option), plus Messenger (an instant chatting application). Moreover, the number of subscribed members reached the average of 2.1 billion in November 2017. By 2021, Facebook would attract up to 3 billion users to come top of the most popular SNSs with 1.5 billion visitors on a daily basis; actually, it ranks third in terms of active visitors after

YouTube and Google in the United States of America and across the world according to a 2016-statistic This SNS, besides, constitutes an arena for a variety of issues: political, economic, socio-cultural, and legal in 96 languages (Facebook, n.d.). Twitter is equally an SNS for micro-blogging that was founded in 2006 by Jack Dorsey, Evan Williams, Biz Stone, and Noah Glass. It, in effect, enables utilizers to send short messages online ("*Tweets*"); however, these must not exceed 280 characters. Furthermore, its online-sevice has attained a number of 313 million active users per month in March 2017 with 500 million tweets sent daily. Twitter is available in more than 40 languages. Finally, on April 25th, 2022, the SNS was taken over by Elon Musk for 44 billion dollars (Tweeter, n.d.).

4.1.5 Data Collection Tools and procedures

The data gathering tool deployed in this work revolves exactly around corpora as reliable sources of qualitative data. With this regard, Meyerhoff, schleef, and Mackenzie (2015); Creswell (2014) define corpora, whose singular is corpus, as being a mass of language (text) a scholar or researcher gathers in order to perform some analysis on it. Additionally, despite their shortness in terms of length, they must be representative of the original language form (s); furthermore, they discriminate between spoken and written corpora (audio-visual materials). Whereas the fromer links to transcripts or audio records, the latter branches to– letters (correspondences), newspapers and magazines, or social media interactions through texts. The current analytical project is, actually, about the respective discourses of the Pro-Brexiteers as well as EU-remainers' communities on both Facebook and Twitter. Thus, their discursive output makes the essence of the overall written corpus. Further, Meyerhoff et al. add that language in use can not only be represented by written corpora, but can also be supplied by other types of data: transcribed speech and videos for example. By being valuable

tools for data gathering, corpora enable enquirers to dive in the task of fulfilling a variety of analytical purposes; specifically, one would refer to distinct frames of social cognition that might be encapsulated via discourses as the basis of the research problem underlying this work–performing CDA over both virtual groups' discourses to unravel the possibly contrasting perceptions of the Brexit issue.

4.1.6 Sampling and Sampling Procedures

Provided that this research project adopts a mixed-method approach (qualitative, quantitative one), the sampling technique that seems the most appropriate in this context is the "quota sampling". In effect, this technique combines, according to Newman (2014), the sampling strategy of both qualitative-quantitative types of research. On the one side, the former (qualitative research sampling) consists, Flick evokes (as cited in Newman, 2014), in extracting characteristics typical of certain units in order to spot common aspects among them as "categories" representative of larger communities; such aspects pertain to social phenomena (social interaction norms–shared knowledge) as well as processes (social relations between both groups' members). That is, one has to pick up particular aspects; after that, tries to classify groups within their generally relevant categories. In our case, for instance, we select the socio-cognitive perceptions toward the Brexit (pro-Europe vs. anti-Europe conceptions) as well as power relations (inter-group struggle between them to exercise power and control through discourse) to categorize the two online communities whose corpora (discourses) will provide us with data for examination. In association with the qualitative approach of sampling, Newman explains:

> …the logic of qualitative sample is to sample aspects/features of the social world. The
>
> aspects/features of our sample highlight or "shine light into" key dimensions or

processes in a complex social world...our goal is to deepen understanding about a

larger process, a relationship, or a social scene. (P. 247)

In short, this sort of sampling gives more access to groups' (in our case facebook and Twitter

communities) interactional mechanisms and determines their mutual perceptions of one

another. On the other side, the latter procedure (quantitative sampling) entails the selection of

a definite number of units through which one can derive insights necessary for the full grasp

of whole units referred to as "population". In clear terms, Newman points out that sampled

units constitute the key to "…the much larger population of cases or units", (P. 246) as the

findings arrived at can be generalized to it. He, actually, comments:

> The primary use of sampling in quantitative studies is to create a representative sample
>
> (i.e. a **sample**, a selected collection of small cases or units) that closely reproduces or
>
> represents features of interests in a larger collection of cases, called "**population**".
>
> (P.246)

 In a nutshell, populations across research have to be addressed selectively due to the

largeness of their sizes. Hence, quota sampling helps specifying the groups whose sampled

corpora will form the object of critically discursive examinations. It must be reminded,

however, that in the present study our resort to quantitative sampling is just to establish the

exact number of sampled groups and their corpora selected for CDA analysis, so we do not

need any statistically-directed procedures in the course of our work. In conclusion, such

categorizing has enabled us to sample a definite number of social networking sites'

communities whose profile correspond closely to the two categories: nine EU- remainers and

Brexiteers groups on Facebook and Twitter representative of entire communities of both

political standpoints alongside their relevant corpora (selected discourses).

4.1.7 Data Analysis procedures

In the course of undertaking the analysis of the collected data, we conform fully to Van Dijk's theory of context. In this respect, he shows the interrelation between discourse, knowledge (cognition), epistemic community (shared knowledge), power, and ideology; in other words, the theorist shows how discourse works in close connection with individual cognition and the larger social-based one. Besides, the critical discourse analyst stresses that discourse plays a central role in the ideological re-production of dominant knowledge (social members' common experiences of the world as well as perceptions of other groups), which participants in situational interactions infer from (they do so from various sources, such as family, school, and political institutions among others) to make sense of each other's discourses. At the same time, social structures based on relations of power and dominance forge and regulate discursive acts; henceforth, knowledge is both relative and contextual–different epistemic communities possess diverse forms of perceptions to life (Aini &Widodo, 2018; Van Dijk, 2014a, 2014b, 1993a, 2000, 2003).

4.1.8 Specification of the Data Period

When it comes to the length of time relevant to the selection of both communities' groups and their discourses in the form of posts and Tweets for analysis, we have decided to divide it into two main periods. The first period relates to the pre-UK-official withdrawal from the EU –approximately from the end of 2017 to January 31st, 2020. The second represents the post-Brexit period following January 31st, 2020, when the Brexit took actual effect, onward. In effect, these two phases constitute a milestone in the modern history of the UK, for its citizens have been, since the Brexit Referendum, at variance over whether to remain within the

European Union and share the same interests with the other member states or "retrieve" their political, social, cultural, and economic features as an entity of their own.

4.1.9 Limitations and Delimitations of the Research

4.1.9.1 Limitations.

While conducting the current research, we have come across a range of restrictive limitations; these can be indicated as follows:

- Firstly, there is a large number of online groups campaigning on Twitter and/or Facebook from both sides, so we have tried to choose the most active ones; their publications tend to be more frequent than those of others. It would sound noteworthy to evoke that this is not an essay task to perform: it would have very likely rendered the work too dense and time-consuming if we had ventured to select numerous groups and corpora.

- Secondly, working on the corpora of the two sides (their discourses) at a distance–from Algeria–does not permit us to be fully acquainted with the major events (social, economic, political) forming the overall context of the Brexit issue in the UK let alone what we could pick up on the internet and TV (in trying to key discursive items to the frames of thinking of both communities' groups vis-à-vis such happenings). In effect, such occurrences alongside the relevant attitudes to them can prove useful as clues in the discursively analytical process. Hence, we could rely only on the virtual space to contextualize the targeted data (corpora) for socio-cognitive examination, which, as a research problem, has added to the incipient difficulties.

- Thirdly, we would like to draw attention to the long period of the Brexit dilemma: since 2016 (the referendum day) till the definitive retreat of the UK from the EU in March, 2021. Thus, if we have covered the whole length of time (referendum period, negotiations with the EU, and the leaving period) it would have taken too much time, effort, and space in our thesis, which would likely render the matter too awkward to handle. This, actually, would account for the reduction of the time span (two main periods–pre-Brexit and post-Brexit).

- Fourthly, nearly all the posted texts are not that long to be structured in article format (introduction, body, and conclusion); however, we have ultimately resorted to divide them into such a format in spite of their relative shortness– they mostly come in a series of fragmentary sentences or at their best in single paragraphs.

3.1.9.2 Delimitations.

The overall scope of this study, as the thesis title shows, centers upon applying the CDA approach in dealing with EU-remainers and Brexiteers' discourses; it precisely adopts the socio-cognitive model developed by Van Dijk to unravel the systems of social commonsense of both virtual communities. In actual fact, basing on this multi-disciplinary approach to discourse analysis, we have accordingly delineated the boundaries of our endeavor:

- In the first place, we would remind that our project in entirely concerned with practicing CDA in addressing such online groups' discourses and the underlying shared knowledge about the world as well as power relations between them, so it has nothing to do with purely political, economic, or social discussions relating to Brexit

- though these assumingly constitute the objects of discursive acts (are encapsulated via discourse as social issues viewed from certain standpoints).

- In the second place, we have initially placed our choice of analytical tools on Social-cognition. Therefore, although we refer briefly to other disciplines and approaches in the elaboration of the theoretical part of the work, we evidently focus exclusively on Van Dijk's CDA paradigm (CSA as a theory of context).

- In the third place, due to the lengthy duration of Brexit and the ensuing circumstances, we have found it expedient to limit our spatio-temporal concentration on the UK (England, Northern Ireland, Wales, and Scotland) as well as the period specified above (first and second periods: the referendum outcome and the post-Brexit-Referendum periods).

- In the fourth place, our cause for concern turns around performing CDA on social media groups' discourses, not TV channels or news papers' ones (main stream media discourses).

4.2 Data Analysis, Interpretation, and Discussion of Findings

After having dealt with the overall methodological steps inherent in carrying out CDA-based analysis, the second section covers the analytical stage of the collected data. In effect, Van Dijk's socio-cognitive paradigm is adopted and applied in addressing the respective publications of the above-referred to communities on social networking sites, notably Face book as well as Twitter; these groups seem to have elaborated two divergent discourses with respect to the Brexit issue in the UK. This implies that struggles for power and domination should be at their utmost as opposing forms of knowledge and attitudes collide via discursive

practices. Discussion of the findings follows automatically with the aim of trying to bring in an answer to the research questions particularly the first and second ones:

- To what extent can Van Dijk's social cognition prove fruitful in addressing two forms of discourse that tend to be symbolical of ideological clash and struggle for domination between social communities online, notably Pro-Brexiteers and EU-Remainers on Face book and Twitter?

- Are Face book and Twitter really worth the reputation they have been attributed to be actually the contending arena for opposing perceptions to world matters as ideologies? If they are so, how do they operate in terms of discursive construction, mediation and reception (triangulation model: discourse, cognition, and social cognition)?

4.2.1 The Number of pro-Brexiteers' posts on Facebook in the two periods

Table 1

The Number of the Pro-Brexit posts on Facebook Analyzed in Period 1

Year	Brexit Central	Leave Means Leave	Change Britain	Total
Late 2017				
2018				3
2019		1	1	
Up to January 31st, 2020	1			

Note. What we remark in the chart representing the first period relating to the Brexiteers' posted texts is the active initiative undertaken by these on the social networking site, Facebook. Actually, in spite of selecting just three publications (two in 2019 and one in January 2020) as a sample, it is evident that the campaign to fulfill Brexit was at its height in the months prior to the official retreat day. Besides, the three communities, as we see, have realized the substantial significance of the SNSs in mediating their discourses concerning Brexit and having influence on the ultimate course of Brexit being representative of the majority of the public opinion's perceptions of the issue.

Table 2

The Number of Pro-Brexit Posts on Facebook Analyzed in Period 2

Year	Brexit Central	Leave means Leave	Change Britain	Total
After January31st, 2020	1	1	0	2

Note. In continuation of the Pro-Brexit published texts on Facebook in the second period (following Britain's official withdrawal from the EU: January 31st, 2020), we notice that such online groups were still struggling to urge the Conservative Government led by Mr. Boris Johnson, who had succeeded Mrs. May, to complete the Brexit whatever the outcome even with a no-deal Brexit. Here, we have two texts: one by Brexit Central and the same by Leave Means Leave. Henceforth, the post-referendum period has seen an intense campaign materialized by Brexiteer discourses to keep the dominant attitudes intact– the UK's Retreat from the EU.

4.2.2 The Number of the EU-remainers posts on Facebook in the two periods

Table 3

The Number of EU-remainers' Posts on Facebook Analyzed in Period 1

Year	East London for Europe/London East Anti Brexit	Anti-Brexit Bristol Activists	The Very Brexit Problems Club	Total
Late 2017				
2018		1		
2019				2
Up to January31st, 2020	1			

Note. Relatively speaking, the EU-remainers seem to have oriented toward Facebook.

Actually, in order to resist against the anti-European trend in the UK, they could utilize such a

social networking site to construct and disseminate their discourses; at this level, two

published texts have been selected (one by Anti-Brexit Bristol Activists and the other by Eat

London for Europe/London East Anti Brexit).

Table 4

The Number of EU-remainers' Posts on Facebook Analyzed in Period 2

YEAR	East London for Europe/London East Anti Brexit	Anti-Brexit Bristol Activists	The Very Brexit Problems Club	Total
After January31st, 2020	1	0	3	4

Note. Likewise, the EU-remainers have gone ahead with their posts on Facebook. Indeed, the total number selected from the groups' overall publications is four; we have sampled three texts by the Very Brexit Problems Club and one by East London for Europe/London East Anti Brexit. We reiterate that the pro-European communities have tried to adopt a European discourse to attempt resisting the state of affairs (referendum for Brexit and the parliamentary push forward for it).

4.2.3 The number of pro-Brexiteers' posts on Twitter in the two periods

Table 5

The number of Pro-Brexiteers' Posts on Twitter in Period 1

Year	Leave Means Leave	Change Britain	Brexit Central	Total
Late 2017				
2018	1	1	1	
2019				3
Up to January31st, 2020				

Note. What arrests our attention is the fact that all the texts (three in total) were posted in the same year in the second period, which is 2018. Also, the pro-Brexit communities have clearly occupied Twitter with their discourses relevant to Brexit; these would range from withdrawal negotiations with the EU to ratifications or rejections by the UK's Parliament. Comparatively speaking, such groups have obviously dominated this SNS by far; therefore, power relations regarding the global perceptions of Brexit in the UK have been maintained through a strongly anti-European discourse (national discourse) on Twitter, despite the constantly discursive resistance by the EU-remains especially on Facebook.

Table 6

The Number of Pro-Brexiteers' Posts on Twitter in Period 2

Year	Leave Means Leave	Change Britain	Brexit Central	Total
After January31st, 2020	1	1	0	2

Note. Similarly, the second period was marked by a preponderating domination of Brexiteers's texts; we have selected just two (Leave Means Leaves as well as Change Britain) to illustrate how these have exerted power and control to the detriment of EU-supporters not only in the British society, but notably SNSs.

4.2.4 The number of EU-remainers' posts on Twitter in the two periods

Table 7

The Number of EU-remainers' Posts on Twitter in Period 1

Year	Brits for the EU	European Movement UK	Brighton Hove for EU	Total
Late 2017	0	0	0	
2018	0	0	0	
2019	0	0	0	0
Up to January31st, 2020	0	0	0	

Note. What it is striking in the case of the EU-remainers' case in Twitter during the first

period is the total absence of their actions on the platform. In fact, this can be due to the quasi

dominance of the pro-Brexiteers on the Twitter; this is manifested by the high number of their

posts from which we have selected our samples. Whereby, the latter communities have

exercised much power and control over the public opinion influencing not only their choice

for leaving the EU, but also the course of their actions (protests to achieve a definitive Brexit

even without a an Brexit deal with Brussels, which Most MPs have pressed for including even

a number of Tories.

Table8

The Number of EU-remainers' Posts on Twitter in Period 2

Year	Brits for the EU	European Movement UK	Brighton Hove for EU	Total
After January31st, 2020	0	0	0	0

Note. We would make the same statement as have for the first period, for the room for maneuver for the EU-remainiging communities seems quite restricted on Twitter. Hence, the essence of their actions to counter the pro-Brexiteers, as is indicated in their Facebook statistics, would find an alternative on the Facebook. Again, this sounds as another example of the exercise of power and domination on the virtual space, which would likely spur forms of inequality in expressing attitudes to world matters.

4.3 CDA Social Cognition Analysis of the Brexiteers' Posts in Period One on Twitter and Facebook

Table 9

Macro structure Analysis of Brexit Central's Post on Twitter *January17th, 2018*

Topic (theme)	The overall theme marking this post by Brexit Central revolves around the heated debate in the British Parliament over the ultimate form of the Brexit deal with the EU involving Labors and Tories. The post is "The EU Withdrawal Bill is essential to ensuring the smoothest possible Brexit. But tonight 243 Labor MPs voted to try and block it–putting politics above the national interest".

Table 10

Micro structure Analysis of Brexit Central's Post on Twitter *January17th, 2018*

Semantics (Super structure)	- This aspect starts with **introductory** part that sets the overall scene: the attempt to pass the Brexit Withdrawal bill through the British Parliament to achieve the definitive retreat from the EU in due time in the aftermath of the referendum. - The **content** of the post tackles the centrality of this bill in the process of Britain's withdrawal from the EU without much damage or collateral effects at all levels: political, economic, immigration…etc. However, the major problem lies exactly in the obstacles lain on the road to Brexit by the Labor MPs who have, according to this post, launched a campaign to hamper the bill adoption by the Parliament by voting against. - The **concluding** part of the post accuses that this act should be a political maneuver as the Labor MPs have attempted engage in the usual political struggle reducing the national objectives ("interests") to the foreground of their policies. - In support of the general topic, a prepositional **metaphor** is used: "…putting politics above the national interest". Actually, it means that Labor MPs favor their political interests rather than the country's ones. Additionally, this metaphor is made up of both a participle phrase as well as abstract nouns: "politics" "interests"; this is done on purpose in order to reduce the subject's significance in spite of being the source of this blocking act. The pro-Brexit community covertly expresses its ideological outlook toward the

Semantics (Super structure)	Labors. ✓ Furthermore, to draw attention to the contrasting nature of both Brexiteers' as well as EU-Remainers' stand points to the Brexit issue, the post points to the Brexit deal implying the leave supporters then shortly to the Labor MPs suggesting the anti-Brexit partisans. ✓ Usually, **disclaimers** make part of discourses so as to conceal ideologies; this consists of writing or uttering one thing while encapsulating another. In fact, Brexit Central states that the Brexit Bill is of utmost importance to the UK, while it conveying the second message, which condemns the EU-Remainers at large for trying to delay the Brexit bill. This is expressed via the usage of the coordinating conjunction "but".
Lexis	✓ The selection of wording is quite vital in building discourses as it reveals attitudes toward others. Thus writers resort to specific adjectives, modals (adverbs, auxiliaries, key noun frequencies, verbs, and pronouns) to encode as well as encapsulate their ideological stances (Shousha, 2010) ✓ Different types of **adjectives** are deployed throughout Brexit Central's post. First, the one-word nouns functioning as adjectives "EU" alongside "withdrawal" precedes the noun bill in order to modify this words, but also, and especially, to attribute an ideological dimension to it as being typically European; threatening to the British nation. Thus this must call for an imminent retirement from the EU. ✓ Moreover, the adjective "essential" follows directly after the linking verb to be to add more emphasis to the bill as a decisive step to be taken to

Lexis	accelerate the Brexit process.
	✓ Equally, two successive adjectives are placed next to each other; the first adopts the superlative form "smoothest", which is indicative of the highest degree of something: Brexit. Another noun with adjectival function appears preceding the word MPs: "Labor". This is aimed to identify the affiliation of such MPs who presumably stand counter to the withdrawal bill. Accordingly, ideology is at work: the pro-Brexit group accusingly points to the Labors as enemies of Britain and its pursuit of regaining its complete sovereignty.
	✓ Finally, the adjective "national" comes prior to the noun "interest" on purpose to limit the scope of the latter to Britain, not to other side (the EU). This encapsulates the ideological stance predominant in the community's discourse: British nationalism away from the EU.
	✓ In addition, **adverbial phrases** make part of the twitter post. Actually, a prepositional phrase ("to ensuring the smoothest possible Brexit") alongside an infinitive one ("to try and block it") function as complements of verbs indicating purpose. The former expresses the objective of achieving a full Brexit; the latter conveys the aim of blocking it. We have here two opposing ideologies: Pro-Brexit vs. EU-Remainers'stances.
	✓ The lexical component, also, encompasses the employment of key nouns and pronouns repeated throughout the text; this is intended to accebtuate the main theme expressed here: leaving the EU. Thus, the nouns "withdrawal bill", "Brexit" are followed by the pronoun "it" with the aim of showing the community's central concern.
Lexis	

Syntax	✓ Syntactic constructions of sentences in their different forms encapsulate ideological standpoints; that is, they signal writers' (here online communities) ideologies vis-à-vis topics and toward each other. Hence, a variety of linguistic features can be resorted to for this purpose–use of coordinators, conditionals, nominalization, imperatives, passives, and cohesion (Shousha, 2010).
	✓ In this posted text, for instance, the proponents of Brexit Central community make use of **coordinator** "but" so as to express contrast. On the one hand, the Pro-Brexiteers encapsulate the most suitable outlet for their country; on the other, they openly point to the Labor MPs as being representative of the counter-trend: obstacles for Britain's withdrawal from the EU. Here, one would conclude that there is a striking instance of ideological struggle in terms of shared perceptions to the Brexit issue which is indirectly conveyed through the discourse of Brexit Central as just stated above.
	✓ **Nominalization**, equally, is present at this level. The sentence "**The EU Withdrawal Bill** is essential to ensuring the smoothest possible Brexit" is initiated with a nominal phrase (indicated in bold face), which is made up of abstract nouns (the EU, withdrawal, and bill). These structure functions as an agentless subject; this implies deemphasizing the actual doers or the precursors to subsequent Brexit (those who voted for Britain's withdrawal in 2016). Indeed, Brexit Central, with their shared knowledge in connection with this issue, should have resorted to this strategy on purpose to suggest that the role or pro-Brexit supporters has legitimately given way to the Brexit Bill; the latter is supposed take its expected course of action to the definitive withdrawal.

Syntax	In short, they, by formulating this nominal form, attempt to conceal and probably victimize the "Brexit agitators", while they ascribe the responsibility of hindering this process to the other party (the EU-Remainers). Of course this is performed for ideological ends.
	✓ On the other hand, one can remark the purposeful recourse to the **active agency** in the passage "…But tonight **243 Labor MPs voted to try and block it**–putting politics above the national interest". Actually, by putting the noun Labor MPs in the first position, the group depicts such seemingly anti-Brexiteers evidently responsible of their action indented to delay the legal procedure of giving legitimacy to the bill to become an applicable law afterward. Accordingly, Brexit Central's attitude to other pro-European ones is embedded and mediated via their discursive constructions on Twitter among other social media.
	✓ Another aspect of syntactic organization lies in **cohesion** throughout texts. In fact, in accordance with Dooley, Robert, and Levinson's explanation (as cited in Shousha, 2010), the deployment of linguistic tools to achieve cohesion can be vital for discourse recipients as they enable them to connect variants of mental representations encoded through texts to reconstitute broad, unified ones. Such representations can adopt divergent patterns from the introductory part (the "lead", that specifies the overall context) through the body (the "follow up", that elaborates the topic with details and comments) to the conclusion (that provides a summary or evaluation of the stated theme). Besides, each of these compartments complements the other (Shousha, 2010).

Syntax	✓ In the case of the post of Brexit Central, the division does not obey the frequent format in long texts as explained above due to the shortness of the posts. However, what we can observe is the **initial sentence** "The EU Withdrawal Bill is essential to ensuring the smoothest possible Brexit", which signals the background underlying the publication: the introduction of the Brexit Bill into the Parliament for debate. Next, there comes the main clause sequence "…But tonight 243 Labor MPs voted to try and block it…." To yield some detail about the event covered (the action undertaken by the Labor MPs at the Parliament. Finally, the phrase"… putting politics above the national interest" follows directly to connote the closing section of the tweet; it is in the form of an evaluative conclusion that accuses those politicians of betraying their country. Again, ideological standpoints toward issues and others are in top gear in the tweet.
	✓ Further, to ease receivers' task of understanding, the publishers of the posted tweet make use of nouns, their synonyms, and pronouns referring to them to create cohesion between parts of texts. For instance, the pronoun "it" refers back to the noun "EU Withdrawal Bill", which, in turn, is synonymous with the phrase "… the national interest". The latter noun is modified with the adjective "national" in order to attribute a patriotic quality to the bill in addition to focus on the tight link between the components of the text.
	✓ Cohesion can occur not only at the single items' level (words), but also at the sentence one; actually, two or more parts of the sentence may be joined by conjunctions or transitions. Here, the coordinating conjunction "but" links the two sentences together

Syntax	in spite of being two independent ones indicating disagreement. It must be noted, likewise, that all the characteristics relevant to cohesion help the externalization as well as emphasis of ideologies.

Table 11

Macro Structure Analysis of Leave Means Leave's Post on Facebook April 2nd, 2019

Theme (topic)	
	✓ In this selected text, which is a statement by the group's leader, published on April 2nd, 2019, the Pro-Brexit group writes, "The government and both major parties promised to leave the EU, the single market and the Customs Union. All of the options being presented, including PM's Withdrawal Agreement, lead to this commitment being overturned and a Brexit Betrayal. Leaving without a deal is now by far the best option. This would free us to make our own laws, free us from paying money and lower the cost of living by removing tariffs. Combined with making trade deals and taking back farming and fisheries our economy will boost as a result. It is time to leave with No Deal and deliver the will of the people. John Longworth, chairman of Leave Means Leave".

Table 12

Micro Structure analysis of Leave Means Leave's Post on Facebook April 2ⁿᵈ 2019

Semantics (Super structure)	
	✓ The **introduction** of the text covers the overall setting and scene underlying this published text. In effect, the time relates to the period preceding the deadline for the UK Government's negotiations with the EU before the actual Brexit would take effect on January 31st, 2020 whether reaching a withdrawal deal or not. The prevalent situation was marked with an intense debate not only between pro-Brexiteers and EU-Remainers but especially between the formers group and the Tory government lead by Mr. Johnson over the sort of deal that would be arrived with Brussels. In short, the PM must stick a smooth Brexit alongside the Labors as promised then. As for the **body,** the Brexiteers believe that any form of withdrawal agreement with the EU without parliamentary consent would be a treason to the nation as it would contradict the promised retreat. Thus, the best option to them is a complete no-deal withdrawal, for it would benefit the UK in the first place especially economically. In the **conclusion**, it is claimed by the community that the moment has come to regain the UK's economic sovereignty through a no-deal Brexit respecting and executing the popular choice.
	✓ The **source** of the text is the Facebook group Leave Means Leave, from which we have selected this posted text.
	✓ For the rhetorical figures of speech clarifying the general theme, we can present some like, "…, **lead to this commitment being overturned**…", which is at once a noun-verb and

Semantics (Super structure)	prepositional metaphor. In fact, this expression is metaphorical of a sudden change of an earlier decision (in this case a pledge by the UK PM to leave the EU even with a no deal with the EU). Equally, in "…**deliver the will of the people**", we have suggestive of freeing the British people from the "restrictive" economic and legal commitments of the EU, such as taxes. Indeed, the group's attitudes towards the EU and its supporters seem to rest upon an ideological basis: the sovereignty of the UK at all levels. ✓ **Parallelism**, moreover, interferes to show consistency within the compartments of the text; for instance, we would mention, "**The government and both major parties promised to leave the EU, the single market and the Customs Union**". In this extract, w can notice an agreement between ideas indicated by the constant use of positive sentences. Also, "**This would free us to make our own laws, free us from paying money and lower the cost of living by removing tariffs**" is another exemplar of the latter case. ✓ **Antithesis**, on the other hand, can be illustrated in the use of, "**The government and both major parties**", "**Brexit**", and "**No Deal**" vs. "**the EU, the single market and the Customs Union**" and "**Withdrawal Agreement**". I.e. what the aim here is to paint a clear picture of the ideological contrast between the Brexit trend, on the one hand and the European one on the other.
Lexis	✓ The lexical phase of analysis starts with **adjectival** functions. In the, "**All of the options being presented, including PM's Withdrawal Agreement**…" the participial phrase specifies the type of options being

| **Lexis** | discussed (those suggested by the PM) ascribing responsibility to him in case of any eventual failure to reach a compelling agreement with the EU. Similarly, the same is applicable in, "…**lead to this commitment being overturned and a Brexit Betrayal**" plus the one-word adjective defining the referred-to betrayal (betraying the promise to quit the EU and the UK people then). The prepositional phrase in, "**Leaving without a deal is now by far the best option**…" describes how leaving must be (without any deal that would likely be disadvantageous to the country). Simultaneously, this option is perceived as the most beneficial one. The infinitive alongside prepositional phrases are, equally deployed in, "**It is time to leave with No Deal and deliver the will of the people**" in order to respectively modify the moment that all Britons had been longing for (to end the UK's membership with the EU) as well as whose will they are pointing to (the popular will in the UK after the referendum outcome). Thus, the group's ideological basis is forced out through of the way they conceptualize the overall political dilemma–the best option for the Government is exit the negotiations without a deal. |
| | ✓ Modality is represented only by two modals. The first one in, "**This would free us to make our own laws, free us from paying money and lower the cost of living by removing tariffs**". This Modal, indeed, encompassed the group's general attitudes as signal the certainly with |

Lexis	which they which they, through their leader, foresee things in the future (the No-Deal will improve the economic sector and they lives as well). The second one, too, expresses certainty in**, "Combined with making trade deals and taking back farming and fisheries our economy will boost as a result**…". Therefore, the community's optimism about quitting the EU is reflected in how they talk about the outgrowth of the No-Deal with such a firm certainty.
	✓ **Adverbial** forms can be exemplified in some extracts. For instance, we can notice such a function in, "**The government and both major parties promised to leave the EU, the single market and the Customs Union**"; in fact, the infinitive phrase adds more meaning to the verb (promised) rendering the action to be taken obvious (breaking out of the EU's institutions). In the same way, we mention, "**This would free us to make our own laws, free us from paying money and lower the cost of living by removing tariffs**", in which another infinitive phrase does similarly specifying how Brexit will benefit the British citizens. All in all, such adverbial phrases are representative of the ideological orientation of the online group: heading straight for the retreat from the EU is a must-be course of action.
	✓ The most frequent **nouns** in the text in support of the chief theme tackled. In regard with this, such nouns as "**Brexit**" as well as "**Withdrawal Agreement**" are used synonymously

Lexis	to emphasize the departure from the EU. On the other hand, "the EU", "the single market", and "the Customs Union" are equivalents; meanwhile, they used as antonyms to the first ones with the aim of showing contradiction in terms of ideological positions between the two sides involved in the discursive controversy.
Syntax	✓ Concerning the syntactic dimension of the text, we initiate our analysis with the implied **imperatives** "**Leaving without a deal is now by far the best option**" and "**It is time to leave with No Deal and deliver the will of the people**". Here the community indirectly but mildly exhorting the political leadership to adopt this sort of rupture with the EU in respect of the people's will. What can be discerned at this level is that the Government has been up to then held in reverence despite the occasional suspicion manifested toward it notably the Pro-Brexiteers concerning the Withdrawal Agreement to be achieved. ✓ Nominalization is, also, present in, "**Leaving without a deal is now by far the best option**" so as to hide the actual doer of action. From an ideological standpoint, Leave Means Leave sounds partial in terms of their mental representations about Brexit and the relevant processes of withdrawal; they purposefully reduce the role of the PM and with it the Government in the whole matter as it executes the popular will represented by the Commons. ✓ To put to the foreground the

Syntax	responsibility of the UK Government in sticking to what they have announced beforehand, the community uses the active form in certain cases like, "**The government and both major parties promised to leave the EU, the single market and the Customs Union**". That is, the political elite in the country does not have much scope for maneuver to the detriment of the UK' future.
	✓ **Cohesion**, which assists audiences in effectively combining the group's shared representations mentally, can be exposed in the discursive production. For example, the introduction, body, and conclusion follow each other in chain; this facilitates the transition from idea to idea in the negotiation of meaning as there exists a causal connection between such parts (the introduction sets the context of the situation, the body elaborates on it, and the conclusion embodies an evaluation of how things have to arise. Besides, agreement within the text in terms of attitudes is indicated by the use of conjunctions, such as, "but" in "**It is time to leave with No Deal and deliver the will of the people**". Consequently, the anti-European ideology seems grounded in constancy and inflexibility.

Table 13

Macro Structure Analysis of Brexit Central's Posts on Face book *January10th, 2020*

Theme (Topic)	The topic relevant to the publications on Brexit Central's homepage is about the ultimate stage that remains for what is known as the "Withdrawal Agreement Bill" to be fully approved or else rejected. They are respectively, "Withdrawal Agreement Bill clears final commons hurdle as MPs give it a Third Reading with a 99 majority" and "Boris Johnson's Withdrawal Agreement Bill passes its final stages in the commons".

Table 14

Micro Structure Analysis of Brexit Central's Posts on Facebook *January10th, 2020*

Semantics (Super structure)	✓ The lead part (**introduction**) of these posts presents the backdrop against which it circulates; it implicitly draws attention to the period just prior to the due Brexit Day (January 31st, 2020) in the UK with the final debate and close reading of its broad contents. Besides, a general state of expectancy permeated the kingdom as the final countdown for a historic decision was consuming its remaining days and hours.
	✓ Meanwhile the **content** reveals that the bill has been adopted by the overwhelming majority of the Commons MPs; thus, after the initial rejections of May's Withdrawal Bill, Boris Johnson's one could pass successfully through Parliament.
	✓ The group, as a **conclusion**, explicitly hails this longed-for step in seizing back its sovereignty over all matters by leaving the EU definitively.
	✓ Furthermore, the posts have been selected from Brexit Central, which is a pro-Brexit community acting on Facebook. Also, they take on the form of a direct quotation since we report the exact wording of the community.
	✓ Concerning the **rhetorical figures**, we can extract the noun-verb metaphor "Withdrawal Agreement Bill clears commons hurdle…" to back the overall theme up: transforming the bill into an official withdrawal decision by adopting it in the British Parliament. Moreover, we notice the use of the abstract noun "withdrawal Agreement Bill"; this aims to reduce the significance of the subject itself implying that it is the

Semantics (Super structure)	choice of the British citizens that would eventually culminate in this will through the held referendum, campaigning mainly on social media networks, and finally defending the people's choice in the legislative institution. Nearly the same applies strictly to the second metaphor, likewise "Boris Johnson's Withdrawal Bill passes its final stages into commons".
	✓ The other semantic feature relates to parallelism. Indeed, we remark that agreement characterizes the first post's structure; it is composed of two positive clauses. That is, there is consistency between the independent clause, "Withdrawal Agreement Bill clears final commons hurdle…" and the dependent one, "as MPs give it a Third Reading with a 99 majority".
Lexis	✓ At this level, we would deal the selected wording since these constitute the discursive tools loaded with conceptions of others that can be biased against them– (Garner as cited in Mazid, 2014; Shousha, 2010).
	✓ Thus the focus falls initially on **adjectives**. In effect, we can notice the use of the two noun-adjective "**Withdrawal Agreement** Bill" throughout both posts. This adjectival type, on the one hand, encapsulates the Brexiteers' ideological viewpoint toward the Brexit issue and its opponents on Facebook–irretrievable support for leaving the EU–; on the other, adding variety to the text with other adjective types. The latter feature is expressed via the one-word-adjective "final

Lexis	
	commons…", "**third** reading…", "**final** stages…", phrases with adjective functions "a third reading **with a 99 majority**" alongside "final stages **in the commons**". Equally, these adjectival forms carry ideology-based attitudes within them–split with the EU.
	✓ In addition, adverbial functions are deployed through phrases–"clears **final commons hurdle**…", give it a **third reading with a 99 majority**", "…passes **its final stages in the commons**". Interestingly, such phrasal forms signal pro-Brexit stances–celebrating the imminent divorce with Brussels.
	✓ Next, repeating key nouns (key noun frequency) is manifested in the name of the bill (**Withdrawal Agreement Bill"**; this can be considered as a leitmotiv showing the significance of the historic future law. At once, the nouns "**hurdle**" as well as "**stages**" are employed synonymously in order to imply consistency in terms of the transmitted message–Brexit bill getting ultimately approved by Parliament. Besides, "commons" is repeated twice to focus attention on the parliamentary branch to legitimize the bill (the House of Commons).
	✓ Concerning **pronouns**, we notice the use of "it" as an object pronoun (patient pronoun) that receives the impact of the doers' action (MPs). Indeed, this is done

Lexis	on purpose to emphasize the agents' active, decisive involvement in the approval of the bill. Since groups' social representations (SRs), as claimed by Tindale et al. (2001), uphold and regulate their respective common sense, and shape up their experiences of the world, we would conclude that Brexit Central is discursively biased in favor of Pro-Brexit MPs. Ie., the grasp of the shared cognition of the group is a sine qua none for interpreting the piece of posted discourse. Here lies its Anti-European ideology.
	✓ Equally, the **possessive pronoun** "its" in the second post refers back to the subject (Boris Johnson's Withdrawal Agreement Bill); the latter is represented here as a doer that successfully makes its way through the last stage in Parliament to acquire officially its legitimacy as a law. The group encapsulates its ideological standpoint pointing again to the active subject as the source of action in the processing of quitting the EU, too.
Syntax	✓ For shousha (2010) the typical order of words making up sentences would likely embody ideology in its broad forms; in other words various structures can convey a wide range of

Syntax	ideological positions. As a matter of fact, **nominalization** is mostly deployed at the start of both posted pieces of discourse "Withdrawal Agreement Bill…" and "Boris Johnson's Withdrawal Agreement Bill…". Though this phrasal form often tends to conceal the role of active agents, it appears in this context in order to signal that the Brexiteers' responsibility stops outside the walls of the legislative institution (Parliament); they voted in 2016 for Brexit, so their role is to campaign online and offline leaving democracy to take its normal course. I.e., it's the MPs' task to look after the law project at this level. Actually, this is a way to tell Europeans that the British political institutions are fully autonomous to take historic decisions for the future of the country that would match their citizens' whishes.
	✓ Grammatically speaking, the active form follows in the second sentence of the first post; in fact, the word "MPs" occupies the initial position and it emphatically represents the active agent (doer) responsible for the action of approving the bill.
	✓ Another syntactic feature is **cohesion/coherence**. In fact, having recourse to linguistic tools helps establish coherence throughout texts; interlocutors can effectively link pieces of mental representations to create a whole image during interaction as these, in spite of being initially seen as "text-internal", the outgrowth of extra-linguistic parameters (social representations) (Dooley & Levinson as cited in Shousha, 2010; Tischer et al., 2000; Renkema & Dressler as cited in Tischer et al.2000; Van Dijk, 2014a, 2014b). In respect with this characteristic, the composers of the posts elaborate them relying on the layout adopted in writing–division

Syntax	into small sections here with the introductory part specifying the setting, "follow up" for relatively explaining, and the conclusion for evaluation. Thus, this pattern would very much likely assists the online group in transmitting their attitudes and aims in a well knit order–informing the audiences and persuading them of pushing forth the Brexit.

Table 15

Macro Structure Analysis of Leave Means Leave's Post on Twitter *August22nd, 2018*

Theme/topic	The overall theme of this pair of posts centers specifically on the British public's distrust towards the way Theresa May's government handles the Brexit deal with the EU. The first post reads reporting Kate Hoey's statement "We can no longer trust the government to deliver the results of the referendum. It is time for all those who voted to leave to speak out and make their voice heard". The second declaration follows "we must not allow the Remainers to betray the people". 3

Table 16

Micro Structure Analysis of Leave Means Leave's post on Twitter August22nd, 2018

Semantics (superstructure)	✓ Firstly, due to the shortness of the post, there is no title. Secondly, though it is not lengthy, we can divide it into the three constitutive parts of any text–the lead (introduction), body, and conclusion.
	✓ The **introductory section** often sets discourse in its context; the whole situation and ensuing events are set in Great Britain in the months following the Brexit Referendum (2018). Furthermore, the overall situation is marked by much controversy as well as political tension since the Brexiteers do not hesitate to openly manifest their mistrust of their government's handling of the outgrowth of the referendum. Next, the **body**, which is actually made up of a single sentence, take on the form of an urge to all those who voted in 2016 to take concrete action in order to exert more pressure upon the "accused" government. Finally, the double post **concludes** that the Pro-European partisans must not be given the opportunity to spoil the British people's will to split definitively from the EU.
	✓ Concerning the **source** used, we have, as mentioned in the title and the introduction of this work, focused on **Twitter**. The latter, actually, is one of the most useful social networking sites when it comes to political activism. Specifically, the corpus is one obtained from the Pro-Brexit group Leave Means Leave, which reports what a Journalist said in the form of a posted tweet. Henceforth, the quoting technique is direct: a written statement by Kate Hoey published on the site and it is

Semantics (superstructure)	indicated with round brackets.
	✓ **The rhetorical figures of speech** equally subsumed in semantics. In support of the general theme, two **metaphors** are deployed; in fact, the first one is a **verb-noun metaphor** "…deliver the result of the referendum…."; it implies that the conservative government ought to respect the choice of the British nation and translate the leaving option into workable deeds especially when negotiating the final Brexit deal with the EU. The second one, on the other hand, in a **word metaphor** for supporters of European membership "…Remainers…"**,** whose outlooks are anti-Brexit.
	✓ One of the major constituents of this semantic element is **parallelism**. In fact, for Shousha, (2010) contributes much to the intended meaning and form as well. By means of illustration, we can extract the following series of phrases "…for all those, to speak, and make their voice heard. Also, according to the same scholar, parallelism can be suggestive of either agreement or disagreement through similarity and variance between sentence structures. For instance the excerpt, "We can no longer trust the government…. It is time for all those who voted leave…" shows this contradictory state of being via negative and positive forms of course from the community's accusing perspective.
	✓ Additionally, to this analytical tool, adds **antithesis for** emphasis**;** here there is reference to one group ("we" and "those who voted leave") then to the other ("Remainers") to express ideological animosity. In fact, Fairclough and Wodak (as cited in Wodak & Busch, 2014) claim that by studying discourse in its context, one can establish the interrelationship

Semantics (superstructure)	between discursive events and socio-cultural structures; discourse strengthens groups' identities. In our case, Brexiteers Vs.EU Remainers with their opposing discourses.
	✓ In comparison with the instances of use disclaimers to signal given ideologies, these posts adopt a straightforward discourse towards the leaving issue making their ideological stand point cut-clear–there must be no room for maneuver on the part of the government.
Syntax	✓ Syntactic formations in terms of the word order reflect variant ideological standpoints in connection to topics and others. To begin with we focus on the use the **imperative** form conveyed through modality; "we must not allow…" is an example of command with subject inclusion. On the one hand, this technique serves to indicate that something is of the highest degree of obligation. On the other, is not dictated on the supposed doers of the action (not ordered to do it); rather, Brexiteers deem it as their duty to act and stop the EU Remainers' so-called "betrayal". This, consequently, shows their attitudes toward others (Anti-Brexit proponents.

Syntax	✓ Moreover, we can localize another case of order based on agent's insertion; it is specifically "…those who voted leave…" and it reveals the non-forcefulness of the command this time. That is, in comparison with the previous order directed at the Brexiteers of this community, this one implies less obligation concerning their expected duty ("to speak out and make their voice heard".
	✓ What is observable throughout this two-part post is the deployment of the active form. This implies that more importance is given to agency (Brexiteers) as the main source of action and places the "suspected" government as well as the EU "Remainers" in the position of object with nearly no significance attributed to it.
	✓ When it comes to cohesion, Dooley, Robert, and Levinson (as cited in Shousha, 2010) explain that the deployment of linguistic tools help achieve coherence throughout any text; actually, interlocutors manage to connect variants of mental representations together as a unified text. Indeed, there are different strategies of performing cohesion (Shousha, 2010). Here, the community resorts to the "**problem/solution pattern**"; the latter presents the difficulty "we can no longer trust the government…"; then, it offers a solution to cope with it "it is time for those who voted leave to speak out and make their voice heard"; also, "we must not allow the Remainers to betray the people".
	✓ In addition, cohesive tools for a variety of purposes. In this case, the inverted commas indicate two quotations by one person (Kate Hoe).

Syntax	✓ Moreover, the constitutive short sections of the posted text are complementary with each other: setting and actors (introductory part), development part (short body) via a very brief explanation, and conclusion (obligation to act as soon as possible).
	✓ For descriptive reasons, a clause follows the noun "…time…" to clarify it; equally, a clause specifies the ones addressed "those who voted leave…" ; this way would likely enable readers to grasp the unifying link throughout the text.
	✓ Hence, such devices embody ideological outlooks against opposite perceptions of world issues as a form of resistance (Mazid, 2014; Shousha, 2010) like the Brexit issue as seen by the two opposed parties. In short, both groups are in struggle for domination and control via discourse.
Lexis	✓ To convey attitudes, ideologies, and descriptive representations of others via discourse, the building of wording is vitally necessary. Reproducing Reah's own account (as cited in Shousha, 2010) Shousha puts it, "As word choice can create an ideological slant towards groups 'word choice is a powerful tool for establishing an ideological stance…'" (131).
	✓ Firstly, we start with the **adjectives** deployed; the adjective clause "who voted leave…" to modify the pronoun "those". Secondly, the adjective heard as a past participle is used as one-word in order to add some quality to the noun "voice". Thirdly, the prepositional phrase "…of the referendum" modifies the noun "result". Hence, there is some variety of the adjectival function.
	✓ When it comes to models (modality) and adverbs, we can mention them as follows: (a) the first posted discourse

Lexis	involves initially the modal "we **can** no longer…" to express the inability to encapsulate any patience on the part of the members of this Twitter community towards Britain's ultimate split with Europe, (b) the second one makes use of "… we must not…" as the highest degree of obligation concerning preventing their opponents (Remainers) from obstructing and spoiling their "cherished goal".
	✓ The **adverbial** function in expressed via respectively infinitive and prepositional phrases "…trust the government to deliver the result of the referendum" as well as "…to betray the people"; these complement the meanings of the verbs, so these enable the proponents of Leave Means Leave to communicate their stances on issues including Brexit.
	✓ The use of pronouns and nouns (in spite of the apparent absence of repeating key nouns) serve as words expressing opposition: "we" and "the people" against "the Remainers". Actually, they are indicative of ideological struggle between two groups.

Table 17

Macro structure Analysis of Change Britain's post on Twitter *August19th, 2018*

Topic/Theme	✓ The theme relevant to this post a critical response to a European official who has apparently deemed Brexiteers as haters of immigrants. It reads "It's wrong of Mandelson to insult leave supporters as "nationalists" who "hate foreigners". We don't hate foreigners–what we don't like is our money being wasted, our laws being out of our control, and our trade being restricted by EU politicians like him".

Table 18

Micro Structure Analysis of Change Britain's post on Twitter *August19th, 2018*

Semantics (superstructure)	✓ The first component of this element is topic selected. The overall situation, as indicated in the **introduction** is opposing outlooks regarding sensitive issues like immigration, legislation, and finances in the aftermath of the Brexit Referendum exactly in 2018 in the UK.
	✓ The **content** reveals a responsive statement by Brexiteers to a European politician who has apparently accused them of being haters of foreign immigrants.
	✓ They **conclude** by firmly asserting their stances the afore-referred to issues–they do not contempt foreigners on the British soil; instead, they would like to get back their finances, their own legislative capacity, and trade practices.
	✓ Furthermore, the **source** of this tweet is traced to Twitter (SNS) specifically a pro-Brexit community named change Britain. Moreover, it is a direct source it is a reported quotation produced by the proponents of the community.
	✓ Concerning the **rhetorical figures** of speech, we can remark the practical use of **parallelism** "… our money being wasted, our laws being out of our control, and our trade being restricted by EU politicians like him". Indeed, a series of phrases are practically used to show agreement among the community members–shared beliefs relevant to a specific political position (opposing EU-Remainers' ProBrexit stances). Additionally, this structural agreement adds more rhythm that

Semantics (superstructure)	often arrests readers' attention.
	✓ There is, also, some utilization of **antithesis** at the structural level; both discursive chucks"… who hate foreigners". "We don't hate foreigners…" are indicative of disagreement in terms of beliefs (ideological positions) between the two communities over the Brexit issue (Shousha, 2010).
	✓ Likewise, in the post, there is reference to Mandelson, the European official and then to others, us, Brexit supporters; this suggests antithetical standpoints regarding the Brexit issue. I.e. while the former tends to criticize the Brexiteers as staunch nationalists rejecting foreign immigrants, the latter group reacts to the "prejudiced" accusations against them.
	✓ Another constituent of superstructure is the employment of **disclaimers**. Indeed, in the passage "We don't hate foreigners–what we don't like is our money being wasted, our laws being out of our control, and our trade being restricted by EU politicians like him", the group starts the post with their disavowal of feeling any contempt toward foreigners; then, it conveys its hatred to European officials and their economic and political perceptions. Frequently, this is a discursive strategy to code ideologies and mediate them via discourse. In effect, such discourse (form and content) is shaped up by the shared ideologies of groups–in particular the Brexiteers of Change Britain– which in turn they (pro-Brexit stances) take on their legitimacy from relevant discursive practices (Shousha, 2010; Mills, 2004).
	✓ In this case, the Brexiteers of this group and in general can challenge EU-Remainers' political standpoints

Semantics (superstructure)	(staying part of the European Union) via this form of discourse and try to eradicate them. Thus, language is the appropriate medium through which some resist the ideological positions imposed by others and strive to make their more dominant (Green as cited in Mazid, 2014). Henceforth, by building on Garner's account (as cited in Mazid, 2014), which states that everyday discursive practices are bias-charged and might encapsulate certain types of bias for or against others, we would deduce that this community's strongly struggles with EU-Remainers for power and control online.
	✓ The other figure of speech is **metaphor**; actually, in this posted piece of discourse, we can find some: noun metaphor, noun/verb metaphor, prepositional metaphor, and infinitive ones. Firstly, the infinitive phrase"…to insult leave supporters as…" functions as a metaphor for unfair prejudice against Brexiteers, accusing them of being xenophobic extremists. The latter is signaled via "nationalists". Secondly, Brexit proponents are, equally, represented as racists through the verb/noun metaphor "hate foreigners". Thirdly, the phrase "… being out of our control…" to refer indirectly to loss of sovereignty within the EU according to them. In fact, for Van Dijk (2003), going over such rhetorical metaphors analytically helps unveiling specific beliefs toward others–Mundelson's perception to Brexiteers as an EU-official. Thus, he refers to this strategy with the term "negative other description". I.e., this strategy is ideology-driven as it represents the shared knowledge of the anti-Brexit community in general, which is characterized with negative representation of Brexiteers.

Semantics (superstructure)	
Syntax	✓ We start our analysis with **agency** within the structures of the posted discourse. Here, we remark that the proponents make use of active agency by placing agents first in the sentences "We don't hate foreigners–what we don't like…". Actually, this signals ideological purposes– putting much emphasis upon subjects as doers of actions in support of Britain's Brexit from the EU. ✓ Another aspect of syntactic constructions within the micro-level of analysis revolves around **agentless passive.** In spite of the phrasal forms, the subjects are transposed to the final position to deemphasize them as doers of action "… our money being wasted… and our trade being restricted by EU politicians like him". In other words, for ideological reasons, the agents (EU officials) are put to the background in comparison with the Brexit campaigners' role represented as active. ✓ When it comes to **cohesion,** Change Britain resort to some linguistic tools so as to create coherence among the components of the post despite of being just a short one, not a series of paragraphs. For example, they enclose the noun "nationalists" as well as the sentence "hate foreigners" within inverted commas for identification of some people that are presupposed to be known for members of the group since these are aware that they are shown as extremists and xenophobes by their opponents–the EU-Remainers and

Syntax	certain European politicians like Mandelson according to this Twitter community.
	✓ Equally, the use of the relative pronoun in "…nationalists" **who** "hate foreigners" is likely to enable audiences (internet users) to establish the link between the compartments of the piece of posted discourse with ease in the process of decrypting it; "who" refers back to nationalists.
	✓ Also, the components of the posted discourse (the lead part, body part, and the conclusive one) are complementary; the first presents the context in which the post is produced; the second follows up on the theme with some details; the last sums up the overall theme. Henceforth, this division of the text in use into its constituents yields much consistency to it by tying such parts together.
	✓ Other cohesive means include the **dash** in "–what we don't like is our money being wasted…" especially for illustrative details. Besides, there is a remarkable disagreement between Change Britain's stances and those of the European official and through him the pro-European activists as a whole. In this respect, EU Remainers and Brexiteers' (here Change Britain) contrasting statements encapsulate variant attitudes toward Britain's leave of the EU; this is indicated through the dash followed by Change Britain's response to the "alleged" declaration of the EU official (they oppose all forms of European interference in British affairs: economic and legal ones.
	✓ Finally, in an attempt to reduce the importance of the Europeans official (Mandelson), this online community has recourse to nominalization as they refer to his deed "…of Mandelson to insult leave

Syntax	supporters…" despite being the one who says this. This calls for ideological implications.
Lexis	✓ Concerning the wording dimension, we would begin with **adjectives**. The excerpt "It's wrong of Mandelson…" is made up of the linking verb (to be) is followed by the adjective (wrong) to express disapproval of the "allegations" directed at Brexiteers in general (immigrant haters and ultra nationalists). This is a case of ideological clash. Equally, the noun in "…leave supporters…" functions as an adjective as it modifies another noun (supporters). Thus, more emphasis is added to the ideological orientations of the group. Besides, the **adjectival clause** "…"nationalists" who "hate foreigners", describes those nationalists as racists. Again, condemning this statement as outrageous stems from shared attitudes to Europeans and their supporters in the UK. At once, the adjective "EU" precedes the noun "politicians" to accentuate the disagreement already in place (Brexiteers vs. EU-Remainers).
	✓ Also, **adverbial phrases** in the last part of the tweet complement the meaning of the verbs (function as adverbs) "…**is our money being wasted, our laws being out of our control, and our trade being restricted by EU politicians like him**". Actually, such phrases permit the members of the community to make their stances known–they strongly disagree with Europeans' strategies in handling Britain's affairs.
	✓ The deployment of words showing ideological **contradiction** takes on the form of opposites; for example, the nouns "leave supporters" opposes "EU politicians".

Lexis	✓ Key nouns and pronouns are resumed throughout the posted text to emphasize the main theme; "leave supporters" is followed by a continuous use of pronouns "we" and "our" to evoke the theme of the UK's definitive Brexit from the EU. On the other hand, "Mandelson" alongside "EU politician" and "him" suggest the European trend.

Table 19

Macro Structure Analysis of Change Britain's Post on Facebook September 2nd 2019

Topic/Theme	
	✓ In this post published during the few months before the Brexit day due to take effect in January 31st 2020, the pro-Brexit group writes, "They promised they would honour our votes. They promised it was a once-in-a-generation decision. They promised we could leave the EU. It's time that Remain politicians live up to their promises to voters and stop trying to block Brexit".

Table 20

Micro Structure Analysis of Change Britain's Post on Facebook September 2ⁿᵈ 2019

Semantics (superstructure)	✓ We start analyzing the text by going over its constituents. The **introductory** part provides some useful clues about the general setting–the sensitive period prior to the ultimate retreat of the UK from the UE in which the debate between the two sides was at its peak concerning the future of the country at all levels (political, economic, and diplomatic). Simultaneously, the **content** of the text serves as a reminder for Remain elites to honour their commitment to the respect of the referendum result that had been in favor of quitting Brussels. In the **final** part, remainers were exhorted to disengage from interposing between Brexit supporters and Brexit itself.
	✓ The text's **provenance** is the Facebook-based community named "Change Britain", which was struggling for the fulfillment of Brexit by the UK Government.
	✓ Focusing on **metaphorical expressions**, we mention the following ones: "… **it was a once-in-a-generation decision**" as well as "It's **time that Remain politicians live up to their promises to voters**…". The first is a metaphor for the decisiveness of the action that would be taken by politicians chiefly those who had manifested their reluctance to Brexit (Labors); history would have perpetuated by if all political elites had endorsed this course of action changing the fate of the kingdom forever (leaving the EU). The second suggests that Labors who had pledged would have to adhere to it, likewise. Thereby, the discourse to be communicated by the

Semantics (superstructure)	group assumes a Brexit-loaded message.
	✓ **Parallelism** is, moreover, covered in the text. Indeed, by considering the sentences making up the textual structure, we would realize they are virtually all in the positive form, which gives the impression that there is much harmony and agreement within the text and the community's perceptions as a whole.
	✓ To draw attention to instances of **antithesis**, we would refer to such exemplars as: "**They**" (EU-remainers, especially politicians) vs. "voters" (specifically Brexiteers), the "**EU**" vs. "**Brexit**". This signals intense ideological clash between both parties
	✓ In terms of the use of **disclaimers**, the writers of the text objectively enumerate the earlier promised publicly stated by EU-proponents , notably politicians; however, in the end of the text, the online Brexiteers seem to unleash their political ideologies in , "…**Remain politicians live up to their promises to voters and stop trying to block Brexit**". Therefore, the mental representations (MRs) of the group are expressed subjectively heralding its ideological orientations at length.
Lexis	✓ With regard to wording, we would open our study with adjectival forms. First, we have the compound adjective, "**a once-in-a-generation**" to emphatically modify the noun "**decision**". I.e., this word is given the quality of utmost significance–crucial decision that would permanently determine UK citizens' future. Equally, the **adjective clause** in, "**It's time that Remain politicians live up to their promises**…". Here, the clause describes and clarifies which time is being referred to (time to translate their promise into concrete

Lexis	action). Further, the same function is preformed but via a **phrase** (**prepositional**), "…**promises to voters**…" specifying the kind of promises (they stated to UK subjects). Thus, the stated adjectival forms carry EU-remainers' perceptions within them–going straight to Brexit whatever the outcome and respect the pledges made by politicians mainly Labors.
	✓ Some **Modals** are deployed for various functions; for example, "…**they would honor**…" to refer future from the point of view of the past suggesting that would await for the Labors in the months to follow the referendum; also, the one in, "**could leave the EU**" expresses ability as a reported statement probably made by politicians to the British people. Thus, a past possibility pledged by political elites to enable them to exit the EU.
	✓ **Adverbial** forms, too, complete verbs' meanings. Actually, in, "…**live up to their promises to voters and stop trying to block Brexit**", two phrases– "**to their promises**" as well as "**trying to block Brexit**" explain the verbs ("**live up**" and "**stop**"–giving the sense of obligation to them). Similarly, different ideological constructs are encoded and transmitted.
	✓ When dealing with **Key nouns,** would draw attention to some contrastive words being used to display two strongly opposing mental representations at work: " the EU" and Remain politicians" vs. "Brexit"
Syntax	✓ The syntactic description starts with the **imperative form**; in effect, the community, without being too forceful, invite the EU-remainers chiefly politicians to respect their stated promises and admit the

Syntax	outgrowth of the 2016-referendum: "**It's time that Remain politicians live up to their promises to voters and stop trying to block Brexit**". Though the disagreement between both sides is really obvious, the imperative has been softened with the inclusion the subject (**Remain Politicians**). This is intended to influence their standpoints toward Brexit once and for all.
	✓ In connection to the agents' roles in the text, we observe that the complete dominance of the **active form**. In fact, signals that the doers are absolutely responsible for their carrying out their earlier commitments regarding Brexit; for example, we can state, "**They promised they would honour our votes. They promised it was a once-in-a-generation decision. They promised we could leave the EU**". That is, the EU-partisans should join the UK citizens' decision to step out of the EU; this act entails disengaging from blocking the Brexit process in Parliament.
	✓ Moreover, **cohesion** is expressed through some linguistic items. Firstly, the **intra-paragraph** constituents create some kind of complementary relationship within the text; the" **lead**" provides the overall context underlying it, the details in the "**follow up**" enlighten audiences, and the "**end**" sums up and evaluates the general situation. Consequently, this pattern helps readers combine mental perceptions into consistent (SRs) discursively communicated via texts.
	✓ Secondly, **agreement** is indicted indirectly via simple sentences all built in the affirmative form, which suggests that such items like of course, normally, in fact, definitely can be utilized to show consistency. To conclude, cohesive connections

Syntax	between textual compartments are greatly demonstrative of particular ideological orientations to world issues like Brexit.

3.4 CDA Social Cognition Analysis of Anti-Brexiteer's Posts in Period one on Twitter and Facebook

Table 21

Macro Structure Analysis of East London for Europe/London East Anti-Brexit's post on Facebook *December22nd, 2020*

Topic/Theme	The subject covered throughout this EU-Remainers' (London East for Europe/ London East Anti-Brexit) post revolves around some form of solidarity with their European peers, who simultaneously have so far manifested their sympathy with the Britons standing against Brexit. It reads "We've received this from "European by choice". They're a collective of activists who firmly believe in going beyond the politics and boundaries of Europe and celebrating its diversity! Standing for European ideals, but more fundamentally standing for people reaching out and connecting with each other irrespective of their religious and political views. In the light of Brexit, some Europeans came together to create a farewell video for the Brits and we want them to know that they will never walk alone. We want this message of solidarity to reach as many of our European friends as possible."

Table 22

Micro structure Analysis of East London for Europe/London East Anti-Brexit's post on Facebook December 22nd, 2020

Semantics (superstructure)	✓ Firstly, we begin with the topic underpinning this piece of discourse. Actually, its **introductory** part presents the overall setting and situation surrounding it–it is set in the UK just a few months after its official withdrawal from the EU amid a wave of solidarity between the EU-Remainers and their peers from Europe throughout social media (Twitter and Facebook) groups.
	✓ Secondly, the **content** reveals the centrality of the "European ideals" claimed and defended by the Europeans –including the group "European by choice"–as these basic principles take positively into consideration humans as a whole regardless of their political stances, religious belonging, ethnical or race membership …etc.; this is indicated in the passage, "Standing for European ideals, but more fundamentally standing for people reaching out and connecting with each other irrespective of their religious and political views".
	✓ Finally, the **concluding** part represents the proponents of London East for Europe/East London anti-Brexit's feelings of reciprocity toward their European "partners", with whom their share the same perceptions to the world (European Union at all levels–political, economic, and cultural–without distinction of specific properties of ethnicity, race, religion, or even political orientation. This reciprocity is manifested in, "In the light of

Semantics (superstructure)	Brexit, some Europeans came together to create a farewell video for the Brits and we want them to know that they will never walk alone. We want this message of solidarity to reach as many of our European friends as possible". Thus, the Facebook community, as it can be discerned, makes its position quite straight right from the start and they would like their peers to be aware of it; they would never abandon Europe and its cherished ideals and they would equally "struggle" to keep them intact whatever the outcome following the Brexit.
	✓ Moreover, the source from which the post has been selected is the Facebook group, London East for Europe/East London anti-Brexit; in fact, it assumes the form of direct statement issued by its members. Hence, there is more credibility given to the posted discourse since we have here the actual wording of the producers themselves.
	✓ The other component of semantics revolves around the **rhetorical figures of speech.** Indeed, to strengthen the overall theme, the anti-Brexit group deploys metaphors; the first one, "…going beyond the politics and boundaries of Europe…", and it suggests that believers in the EU ideals do not limit themselves to what such principles just carry for the continent people in terms of politics and economy but they would extend these to include the Britons, who may not by admitted as purely Europeans in thought and character. Also, the one which reads, "…, but more fundamentally standing for people reaching out and connecting with each other…"; this implies a tendency to try to preserve the ties with other peoples despite their cultural, political, economic, or even religious orientations. This applies

Semantics (superstructure)	narrowly to the British, seen as an integral part of the continent. Besides, the metaphorical expression, "…and we want them to know that they will never walk alone" functions as an encapsulation of reciprocal solidarity from the Britons to their European peers; in fact, they firmly express their will to stay within the Union to which, according to them, they actually belong.
	✓ **Parallelism**, equally, manifests itself to show either agreement or disagreement. On the one hand, the former is expressed via the use the conjunction "and": "…firmly believe in going beyond the politics and boundaries of Europe and celebrating its diversity!" and "Some Europeans came together to create a farewell video for the Brits and we want them to know that they will never walk alone". On the other the latter is expressed through "but" to signal that supporters of the EU do not endorse such ideals blindly and apply them to narrow extent but they would love to share them with others beyond the European space–in this case the people of the UK. Furthermore, parallelism interferes in the post through the display of similarity between the Europeans (living in the continent and those of Britain); they both share the same vision–inter-European solidarity mainly in hard times (Brexit). Therefore, we can observe the ideological symmetry between both parties conveyed via their anti-Brexit outlooks.
	✓ Using **disclaimers** is another feature semantic superstructure. At this point the posted discourse specifically in the passage, "Standing for European ideals, but more fundamentally standing for people reaching out and connecting with each other irrespective of their religious and political views" says something–of

Semantics (superstructure)	Europeans sticking closely to EU ideals–but then means another one–developing links with those considered non-Europeans regardless of the difference they might display.
Syntax	✓ Since syntactic structural sequences often carry within them ideological outlooks toward issues and others, we need to explore their components throughout the present text. To begin with, we would focus on the overall pattern making up the posted text; it follows: an introductory part ("**lead**" presenting the setting and backdrop around which the events center), the **"body"** (follow up part via some details and comments), and the **end** part (conclusion) providing a summary. Actually, the three constituents complement each other functionally speaking. Henceforth, the whole layout adopts a **problem/solution** order; it starts with a group of European activists displaying their deepest regret of the UK's withdrawal from the EU after the Brexit has officially taken effect through a video of sympathy; and it follows with reciprocity expressed by their British peers, who have equally issued a message to encapsulate their

Syntax	shared compassion with European by choice. I.e., the former group's fears of a non-UK's response has subsequently found echoes
	✓ Besides, linguistic tools are resorted for a variety of functions, such as: **predictions**, "we want them to know that they **will never walk** alone"; **agreement**, "**and** we want them to know…"; **disagreement**, "Standing for European ideals**, but** more fundamentally standing for people reaching out and connecting with each other irrespective of their religious and political views"; **presentation of a source**, "We've received this from **"European by choice"**; and **description with a relative clause**, "activists **who firmly believe in going beyond the politics and boundaries of Europe and celebrating its diversity!**"; and **description with a phrase**, "beyond the politics and boundaries **of Europe**" . In effect, these all these linguistic characteristics can have ideologies in them–in this case displaying Europeans and anti-Brexiteers as campaigners having harmonious compatibility of views by focusing on shared perceptions of the issue.
	✓ Simultaneously, we remark that all of the sentences across the posted text are built in **active form**, not the passive one. In fact, this technique is done purposefully in order to attribute more significance to subjects as doers of action. Here lies the ideological implications; as well as the European activists, the anti-Brexiteers of the group are responsible of their actions, not just receivers of others' influence. For example, we could mention the following extracts as evidence, "**Europeans** came together…"and "**We** want this message…", and "**We** want them to know…".

Syntax	✓ Besides, in the passage, "**We want them to know** that they will never walk alone", there is a slight form of **imperative**; members of European by choice are requested to be aware of the reciprocity expressed to them by their European peers. In this case, the order is, by no means, forceful; indeed, it reflects the reverence shown for the European group by the EU-Remainers themselves.
Lexis	✓ Concerning the selection of the wording (**lexis**) throughout the post, we will focus the different part of the sentence as these usually encapsulate ideologies.
	✓ We start with **adjectives**; actually, the most recurring ones used here are mainly to do with the continent: "European ideals "and "European friends". Additionally, "religious and political" are deployed to add more emphasis to the areas traditionally sees as divisive between nations in terms of ideology. In the expression, "farewell video" the noun farewell adopts an adjectival function to stress the "split" caused by the UK's exit of the EU.
	✓ Simultaneously, the adjectival functions here are achieved by means of phrases: **prepositional phrase** in, "They're a collective **of activists…**" to modify the noun collective, **participial phrase** in, "standing for people **reaching out and connecting with each other irrespective of their religious and political views**" to describe people , another prepositional phrase in"…create a farewell video **for the Brits…**" for the description of the farewell video, also the same type of phrase to specify the message, "this message **of solidarity to reach as many of our**

Lexis	**European friends as possible**".
	✓ Moreover, this function extends to clause in order to realize the same purpose: the relative clause to describe the noun activists "activists **who firmly believe in going beyond the politics and boundaries of Europe and celebrating its diversity!**". This is, in fact, the only clausal function in the post, but it plays a major role in specifying who those activists are– activists advocating for further opening of European values to others away from the mainland the Britons). Thus, the varied use of adjectives helps transmitting attitudes to different issues based on ideology: more integration is required of European official to maintain the UK in the Union in spite of the divergent policies of both parties toward world affairs.
	✓ **Adverbs**, which complete the meaning of verbs by ascribing certain characteristics to them, enable writers and speakers to externalize their ideological standpoints toward others and toward the topics covered. As a result, they have various aims.
	✓ First, through the adverb "…**firmly** believe… ", the partisan of East London for Europe/London East Anti-Brexit their opinion and attitudes; hence, they strongly give vent tot their partiality regarding Brexit as well as the EU. Similarly, in the excerpt, "…more **fundamentally** standing for people reaching out and connecting with each other…," the above adverb forcefully reflects a subjective-oriented perception by the same activists. In the same vein, the adverb, "…they will **never** walk alone…" refers to frequency; implying that the anti-Brexit group will surely not abandon their support for the European "partners".
Lexis	

Lexis	
	✓ Phrases with adverbial functions, equally, permeate the post. For instance, in the prepositional phrase "… believe **in going beyond the politics and boundaries of Europe and celebrating its diversity!"** more sense is added to the verb and, thus, accentuates the subjective opinion of the community; equally, the infinitive phase "…some Europeans came together **to create a farewell video for the Brits…**" complements the verb showing the solidarity emanated by the Europeans to the UK people, especially those standing against the retreat from Europe. In the same vein "We want this message **of solidarity to reach as many of our European friends as possible.**" Encompasses a prepositional phrase in order to serve the previously stated purpose. Therefore, the anti-Brexit ideology is clearly in motion as it is incessantly expressed via adverbs and phrases adding more subjectivity as well as emphasis to the EU proponents.
	✓ For **key noun frequency**, we would stress the most noticeable nouns across that piece of discourse. In fact, what draws our attention are the leitmotivs: "**European by choice**", "the politics and boundaries of **Europe",** "some **Europeans** came together". These are indicative of the European orientation of those online activists–cultural, political, and economic. Furthermore, particular nouns are used pragmatically to signal total compatibility in viewpoints and to urge common action by both sides; actually, the nouns "**European**" and "**Britons**", though they can often suggest contradiction, are brought together via the addition of other nouns: "**friend**", "**diversity**", "**message**", "**activists**", and "**solidarity**". Again, this is strategy intended to adopt common action based upon shared

Lexis	perceptions of the world–the two are in favor of keeping the relationships between the UK and the EU intact by opposing the Brexit Referendum and the ensuing outcome.
	✓ To achieve cohesion within the text, pronouns are employed. In "**We**'ve received this from "European by choice", the subject pronoun refers back to the supporters of the EU-remainers' group; equally, it shows them emphatically as the active doers of action: receivers of the message from the Europeans "friends". At once, in "**They**'re a collective of activists…" such European campaigners are depicted as active agents, too. Thus, both activists, despite the geographic distance, are shown as activists who pursue common aim–maintaining solid ties between the UK and the EU. Also, in the excerpt "**we** want **them** to know that **they** will never walk alone", London East for Europe/ East London against Brexit has two goals; on the one hand, the use of "we" implies that they are taking action whose effects are supposed to affect their European peers ("them"); on the other, the pro-Brexiteers, in the second half of the sentence, represent the latter activists as actors who are expected to react to the UK remainers' action (taking joint action with their British peers).

Table 23

Macro Structure Analysis of Anti-Brexit Bristol Activists Post on Facebook May 21ˢᵗ 2018

Theme/topic	What this post addresses is the organizational pattern adopted by this group is managing its campaigning occasions. Furthermore, they explain the aim underlying their anti-Brexit activism alongside their future plans. It states, "We formed in late May 2018 and have a wealth of experience of campaigning in the Remain movement. Our goal is to engage as many people as possible in direct action to stop Brexit. Our first event will be in collaboration with Swindon for Europe as part of the 'Remain at Festivals Campaign'- handing out crowdfunded Bollocks to Brexit stickers and asking festival goers to write a postcard to their MPs. We'll be dressing up as our namesake too. We can't wait!"

Table 24

Micro Structure Analysis of Anti-Brexit Bristol Activists Post on Facebook May 21ˢᵗ 2018

Semantics (superstructure)	
	✓ As a starter, we tackle the issue. In fact, the **introductory** part provides the overall setting as well as the situation where the action takes place; in fact, it occurs in the UK, in the period prior to the due Brexit, amid the anti-Brexit campaigning seems as its peak. Next, the **body** part encompasses the intended activities' planning in support of remaining within the EU. Finally, the **concluding** part appears in the form of a state of mind of the group members: they feel rather impatient to take action.
	✓ When it comes to the source, the posted text has been selected from a Facebook community named Anti-Brexit Bristol Activists, which is evidently an EU-remaining group.
	✓ The quoting technique is in the form of direct statement; we have reported the exact wording produced by the EU-remaining community without any modifications.
	✓ After that, our focus falls on the **rhetorical figures of speech**. In effect, the sentence "… **has a wealth of experience of campaigning in the Remain movement"** is a metaphor for the know-how acquired by the members in conducting their campaigning activities counter Brexit. Also, "…**crowdfunded Bollocks to Brexit stickers**…" stands metaphorically for Remainers' derision directed at the standpoint of the Brexiteers in the form of mocking stickers, too. Such a type of metaphor is often termed "adjective metaphor". Equally, "…**asking Festival goers to write a postcard to their MPs**"

Semantics (superstructure)	implies a reminder for the UK parliamentarians to about the likely abysmal possibility of splitting with the EU. Another ultimate metaphor is "…**dressing up as our namesake too**…"; this connotative of the slogans that would be printed on their different clothing–EU messages countering pro-Brexit ones.
	✓ Besides to the above figures of speech, **parallelism** constitutes an indication of agreement; so in the passage "**We formed in late May 2018 and have a wealth of experience of campaigning in the Remain movement**", we can say the conjunction "and" ensures the consistency between the sentence constituents. The excerpt "**Our First event will be in collaboration with Swindon for Europe as part of the 'Remain at Festivals Campaign'- handing out crowdfunded Bollocks to Brexit stickers and asking Festival goers to write a postcard to their MPs**", likewise, performs the same role. Thus, there can be no doubt about the community's ideological outlook in connection with the Brexit issue.
	✓ On the other hand, **antithesis** can be discerned in the phrase "**handing out crowdfunded Bollocks to Brexit stickers**"; indeed, we can remark the usage of two opposed noun phrases: "**crowdfunded Bollocks**" vs. "**Brexit stickers**." This encapsulates ideological clash between the two sides of campaigning: anti-Brexiteers and the EU-Remainers. At once, the phrases "… **to engage as many people as possible in direct action to stop Brexit**," we have a large number of people (Eu-Remainers) to be duly mobilized against the pushing Brexit. Also, the nouns **"Festival goers"** is employed in contrast with "**MPs**" for the same purpose. Accordingly, the relations between

Semantics (superstructure)	both online groups, whatever their appellations as well as actions' frequency, are essentially based on struggle for power and control from an ideological perspective.
	✓ Moreover, we focus on **disclaimers** in the posted text. In effect, in order to imply ideological viewpoints, the group writes one thing but intends to convey something else; for example, they say initially "**Our goal is to engage as many people as possible in direct action**…" yet they suggest "…**to stop Brexit**". In the same way in "**Our First event will be in collaboration with Swindon for Europe as part of the 'Remain at Festivals Campaign'-**…**"** but they aim to express this point "**handing out crowdfunded Bollocks to Brexit stickers and asking Festival goers to write a postcard to their MPs**". Henceforth, disclaimers help transmitting ideological positions indirectly but effectively.

Syntax	✓ The first feature related to the syntactic analysis of the online discourse of this remain group revolves around the **use of coordinators**. With this regard, the clauses making up the sentence "**We formed in late May 2018 and have a wealth of experience of campaigning**…" are connected by the subordinating conjunction "**and**". Here, it expresses consistency in the actions performed by the members of the community.
	✓ What is remarkable throughout the posted text is that the **agents** are mostly focused upon as **active doers** of actions; this is suggestive of ideological bias toward the role of the anti-Brexit activists in trying to hamper it. Thus, nominalization deployed to reduce the importance of the doers is virtually absent in this case.
	✓ In addition, the active participation of the doers in the course of shaping up the outgrowth of the Brexit shows the predominant use of the active forms all across the piece of discourse. For

Syntax	example, we would mention "**We formed in late May 2018**…" and "**We'll be dressing up as our namesake too. We can't wait!**" in which the active agents are placed in initial positions to stress their roles. Hence, more room is given to ideology.
	✓ **Cohesion**, moreover, has a major impact when recipients attempt to cope with the linguistic tools that help attain it; in effect, this consists in binding variants of mental representations so as to form a complete one. Henceforth, this operation helps the uncovering of the producers' perceptions along with the bearing structural layout as well as the corresponding aim (s) (Dolley, Roberts, and Levinson, as cited in Shousha, 2010). With this respect, we can begin with the general organization of the text. Actually, the posted text comprises an **introductory part**–"**the lead**"–establishing the setting (the post-Brexit Referendum campaigning to abort it ultimately; the "follow up" providing some details about; and the final part constituting a future decision in the form of an action (putting on Brexit-representative clothes and campaigning actively).
	✓ Furthermore, certain **linguistic items** are deployed to ensure cohesion. These indicate chiefly **expectation** and **inevitable future**: the former is"**Our first event will be in collaboration with Swindon for Europe…**"; the latter is "**We'll be dressing up as our namesake too**…". Besides, **agreement** is shown via the conjunction "**and**" in "**We formed in late May 2018 and have a wealth of experience of campaigning in the Remain movement**" and "…**handing out crowdfunded Bollocks to Brexit stickers and asking festival goers to**

Syntax	**write a postcard to their MPs**" with "**and**" connecting two phrases together. In sum, all these syntactic forms are much likely demonstrative of specific mindsets ideologically speaking: opposing fiercely Brexiteers' actions to get the Brexit through.
Lexis	✓ The descriptive examination of the posted piece of discourse entails going over the overall wording selected by the anti-Brexit community because, according to Shousha (2010), opting for certain wording is essential for the transmission of ideological stances while describing people or things . Actually, **adjective** in their variety are deployed to give ideological dimension to the text's components. First, we focus on **one-word adjectives**. For instance, "…**the Remain movement**" is indicative of the orientation of the group (pro-EU attitude), "…direct action…" implies strong, forceful opposition to the Brexit. Next, in the "**Our First event**…" , the word "**first**", in modifying "**event**" signals the first action to be undertaken in an eventual series of due actions. Then, the compound noun "**crowdfunded**" explains the following noun "**bollocks**" to imply the general orientation adopted by the anti-Brexit community. The same holds for "…**Brexit stickers**…" where "**Brexit**" determines the origins of the "**stickers**". Here, is a typical case of struggle for power and control guided by two contradictory ideologies. ✓ The other type of modifying words is the form of **phrases with adjectival functions.** In effect, "…**Swindon for Europe**…" encompasses a prepositional phrase modifying the proper noun "**Swindon**": "…**for Europe**…". The same type of phrase in "…**part of the 'Remain at**

Lexis	Festivals Campaign'-…" performs this function: the phrase "**of the 'Remain"** describes the noun "**part**"; in turn, "'**Remain**" is clarified by the following phrase "…**at Festivals Campaign'-…**". As such, we would assume that the Facebook group could ascribe the use of these adjectival phrases to their seemingly pro- European position.
	✓ The other part relevant to the lexical analysis connects to **models** and **adverbs**. With this respect, we could notice the deployment of some, notably "**will**" used twice in the passages "…**will be in collaboration with…**" as well as "…**We'll be dressing up as our namesake too**", what is supposed to be done in the future is expressed: EU-activists joint participation in festivals alongside the way they will dress. Besides, "**can't**" in "**We can't wait!**" signals emphasis with such campaigners' impatience to take action at length.
	✓ Adverbs and adverbial functions ensured by phrases are to be taken into account at this level. However, what attracts our instantaneously is the remarkable absence of one-word adverbs. Instead, phrases, too, appear throughout the posted discourse to add in more meaning to verbs; of course, with much ideological input to be derived. To begin with, we can focus on "**We formed in late May 2018 and have a wealth of experience of campaigning**…". Indeed, "…**in late May 2018**…" completes the verb "**formed**" and "…a **wealth of experience of campaigning…" does alike with "have**". Similarly, in the excerpt that says "**Our goal is to engage as many people as possible…**", the infinitive phrase extends the sense by providing the verb with more detail; the intended mobilization of numerous activists in the future to try and block

Lexis	the Brexit. Moreover, we select "**Our First event will be in collaboration with Swindon for Europe**…", "**We'll be dressing up as our namesake too**" to show the identical role undertaken by respectively the prepositional as well as nominal phrases in association with the verbs.
	✓ Interms of the nouns reproduced across the discursive composition on the group's Facebook page, we would try to lay the accent on the most recurring ones. Accordingly, "**Remain**" plus "**Brexit**", "**festival**", "**Festival goers**", and "**campaign (-ing**)" tend to be leimotifs as they encapsulate strong rivalry between both virtual communities. The terms are, obviously, loaded with ideologies representing how the two sides construe the world.
	✓ Equally important are **pronouns**. In effect, cohesion can be ensured by means of pronoun variants. For instance, we could excerpt "**Our** First event will be in collaboration with Swindon for Europe…", where the possessive pronoun refers back to pro-Brexit group campaigning online. Also, the passage "…festival goers to write a postcard to **their** MPs" comprises the pronoun "**their**" with the similar reference (the remain-in-EU-group); additionally, in the sentences "**We'll be dressing up as our namesake too. We can't wait!**" and "**We formed in late May 2018 and have a wealth of experience of campaigning…**" we can find out the subject pronoun "**we**" functioning here as both a subject and doer. Thus, it lays more emphasis upon the community's active role in influencing the course of events–stopping the Brexit.
Lexis	

4.5 CDA Social Cognition Analysis of Anti-Brexiteer's Posts in Period two on Twitter and Facebook

Table 25

Macro Structure Analysis of East London for Europe/London East Anti-Brexit's post on Facebook February9th, 2021

Topic/Theme	The overall subject tackled in this post centers essentially on drawing a comparison between two cases in the UK. The first one relates to proceed legally against citizens not observing the quarantine protocols; the second one is about the "impunity" with which "liar MPs" are treated according to the anti-Brexit group. It is written as follows, "If you fail to quarantine or lie on a quarantine form, you can now get up to 10 years in prison. If you lie to a country, mislead your citizens as an MP, nothing, no legal repercussions at all. This has to stop! Agree? Sign this petition".

Table 26

Micro Structure Analysis of East London for Europe/London East Anti-Brexit's post on Facebook February9th, 2021

Lexis	✓ The **lexical** approach of the posted discourse takes into consideration the wording to derive the transmitted ideologies.
	✓ We start with the chosen adjectives deployed for description; thus, we find in the passage, "…**a quarantine form**…", the noun quarantine functions as an adjective to specify the type of form. Furthermore, the group ascribes the legal status to the penalty MPs must undergo, "…**legal repercussions at all**"; in fact, the members of this pro-EU tendency advocate for the condemnation of MPs who, for them, are accused of betraying the British nation. This testifies to the group's conception of the Brexit issue.
	✓ **Adverbs**, additionally, work effectively in the encapsulation of ideologies. In this respect, array of adverbs and phrases with adverbial functions are utilized. In the excerpt, "**If you fail to quarantine or lie on a quarantine form, you can now get up to 10 years in prison**…", three phrases (one infinitive and two prepositional) complete the sense of the verb (fail). Similarly, the phrases "If you lie **to a country,** mislead **your citizens as an MP, nothing, no legal repercussions at all**" perform the stated role. Also, "This **has to stop!...**" is another instance of the adverbial function of phrases.
	✓ **Modality,** equally, relates to auxiliary verbs which mostly carry attitudes toward events as well as others. For example, here, "**This has to stop**!" the meaning is a firm call for

Lexis	thwarting what this Europe-oriented community perceives as a betrayal. Moreover, the sentence "**you can now get up to 10 years in prison**" encompasses the possibility of standing trial in case truth is not given as it is to the people.
	✓ **Nouns**, too, are crucial in the expressing major themes; hence, the frequency of the noun "**quarantine**" suggests the the paradoxical situation prevalent–penalizing those subjects non-adhering to COVID 19 strict rules vs. the total impunity of lying politicians. The word "**MP**", actually, points to the other side of the affair: the so-called injustice in dealing with both cases. Remarkably, the two nouns, "**repercussions**" as well as "**prison**", "**country**" as well as "citizens" despite their synonymous use, allude to the "flagrant contradiction".
	✓ **Pronouns**, likewise, have their role across the whole stretch of discourse. Indeed, the use of the pronoun "**you**" all along not solely addresses the U K citizens, but equally draws their attention to the unjustifiable paradox lingering in their country: trial for failing to observe the COVID 19 regulations but the impunity of the deception of the nation. As a conclusion, this Facebook group of activists seems quite lucid about their stance vis-a-vis the Brexit.
Syntax	✓ At the **syntactic** level, the order of words counts considerably in mediating various ideologies. The

Syntax	first construction relates to the conditional; in this respect, it appears that audiences are exposed to two opposite messages encrypted into the same type of conditional. On the one level, there is a tacit piece of advice about lying to quarantine, "**If you fail to quarantine or lie on a quarantine form, you can now get up to 10 years in prison**"; on the other, another implied one on deceiving the UK subjects, "**If you lie to a country, mislead your citizens as an MP, nothing, no legal repercussions at all**". The intended aim out of this juxtaposition centers on unveiling the power relations between the clearly dominating Brexiteer rulers and their power abuse over those under their control (the masses) by unfairly treating the above situations.
	✓ Besides, a couple of imperatives are employed for two purposes. In "**This has to stop!**", they, through this command, imply their complete disrespect for Brexit alongside its ensuing outgrowth, while in "**Sign this petition!**", they forcefully urge the UK citizens to take immediate action to block leaving the EU.
	✓ In terms of the **form of verbs**, we notice that all the forms are **active**; for instance, "… **you fail to quarantine or lie on a quarantine form, you can now get**…" or "…**you lie to a country, mislead your citizens as an MP**…". This signifies that the subjects are valued as doers of action, rather than passive ones, which informs indirectly the British about the two unjustly paradoxical eventualities and spurs them to act

Syntax	before it is too late.
	✓ **Cohesion** works by using linguistic items in order to link parts of text in meaningful way; this often enables participants to reconstitute pieces of mental representations. In this case, the choice of the **pronoun** "**you**" throughout the text helps readers to progress smoothly from idea to idea effectively since they should be aware of the actors referred to each time alongside their respective actions. Furthermore, the components of pieces of writing (introduction, body, and conclusion) make the general background of the topic being covered penetrable; also, the modal in "…you **can** now get…" reflects possibility. For descriptive goals, adjectival forms can occur: adjectives "**legal**" and "**quarantine** "and phrases "…years **in prison**". It follows then that such features embody ideological outlooks (attacks against Brexit proponents).

Table 27

Macro Structure Analysis of the Very Brexit Problems Club's Post on Facebook April 25th, 2021

Theme/topic	✓ The community's publication regarding Brexit and its due outcome reads, "Many British people who voted for the UK to leave the EU now regret their vote and feel they have been lied to about everything. If you also feel the same, just remember who it was that peddled all the lies? It was Boris Johnson And The Conservative Party, They Swindled All Of Us-Learn from Your Mistakes and Don't Ever Trust Them Again".

Table 28

Micro structure Analysis of the Very Brexit Problems Club's post on Facebook April 25th, 2021

Semantics (superstructure)	
	✓ Firstly, the publication **opens** with the setting; it is in the post-Brexit UK with all the controversies and debates involving politicians and supporters of both currents (pro-Brexit and anti-Brexit ones) especially across SNSs. Secondly, it goes on pointing to those who, according to them, have misled the UK citizens into voting for quitting the EU citing their identities (Bris Johnson and the Conservativeparty). To **conclude**, thos piece of writing exhorts the misdirected people to recover their sense and stop having faith in those "swindlers" again.
	✓ The **source** of this text is the Very Brexit Problems Club, a Facebook-acting group. Actually, it is a direct one since it is quoted straight from their page.
	✓ The **rhetorical figures**, we can cite the unique metaphorica expression, "…**just remember who it was that peddled all the lies?**", which connotes an "badly intentioned scheme" to concoct and accelerate a fallacy that would disseminated society wide and "deceive" the subjects. In fact, the anti-Brexit members direct attention to the head of the party in power for reprimand.As such, this is used to strengthen their mindset toward the issue.
	✓ Parallelism, equally, characterizes the parts of the text. For instance, we would mention the excerpt, "**Many British people who voted for the UK to leave the EU now regret their vote and feel they have been lied to about everything**". This

Semantics (superstructure)	reflects agreement and consistency in the community's statement. Also, **antithesis** is present in the text; here, opposite nouns are deployed to show contrast of attitudes and perceptions: "**Brish people**" vs. "**Boris Johnson**" and the "**Conservative Party**"; "**UK**" vs. "**EU**".
	✓ **Disclaimers**, too, appear at this level to encrypt the ideology of the community. For example, while they inititate their text by saying that those who voted in 2016 in support of breaking up the UK's ties with the EU have felt regretful about their act, they next accuse the Prime minister and his party of manipulating the voters to opt for Brexit. The fallout requires all the "deceived" subjects to shed their confidence in them. Thus, subjectivity follows pretended objectivity in treating this subject matter.
Lexis	✓ To begin with, we woud focus on adjectival forms. For convey their ideological stances, they resort to one-word adjectives: "**British people**". Likewise, the adjectival clause in "… **just remember who it was that peddled all the lies?**" performs the same function by clarifying the ones behind the deed of "fabricating" lies.
	✓ Adverbial forms are, simultaneously, employed to complement verbs and anble their perceptions to unfold. We mention as illustration three examples: "**just remember**" as well as "…**They Swindled All Of Us**" and "**have been lied to about everything**". These encapsulate the seriousness of the harm committed by the Conservative Party and its leader: "lying to the people"
	✓ Interms of **key noun frequency**, two specific key nouns are repeated as synonyms to emphasize the central

Lexis	theme: "**Boris Johnson" And The Conservative Party**". This discursive technique is aimed to shed light emphatically upon the source of all the manipulation and lies.
Syntax	✓ The syntactic-dimension analysis of the text starts with pointing out the imperative form. In the passage "–**Learn from Your Mistakes and Don't Ever Trust Them Again**", the UK citizens are strongly oxhorted to avoid the previous miscalculations of voting for Brexit and to view the country's leadership with a suspicious, distrustful eye. Indeed, such an address of the pro-Brexit electrorate implies the attitudes of the group toward them: they have to regain their good sense and reasonable judgement.
	✓ What is remarkable throughout the piece of discourse is the omni-presence of the active forms to single out liability in the course of events. In "**Many British people who voted**…", the responsibility of miscalculating the outcome of the UK by voting for Brexit is ascribed to the the citizens (doers of action). In "…**They Swindled All Of Us**", the

Syntax	UK officials are held responsible too for misleading the citizenry.
	✓ Concerning **cohesion,** we begin with the constitutive elements of the text. The introductory part, the follow up details, and conclusive item contribute to bonding the communities' mental representations. Presenting an overall background of the post-Brexit controversy is followed up on with a virulent comment on the mistaken voters; finally, some forceful advice is given to the manipulated citizens. Therefore, coherence between the fragments of the group's representations would allow them to achieve their intended goal: informing their audiences of their mistakes and persuding them to take action to rectify them.
	✓ The coordinating conjunction "**and**" is used as a linguistic tool to show agreement and consistency in the text. The **dash**, on the other hand, in "…**They Swindled All Of Us-Learn from Your Mistakes and Don't Ever Trust Them Again**", is used to present a piece of information that the group believe is crucial for audiences to be cognizant of: this takes the form of a order to spur them to benefit from their past misunderstandings and shed their "blind" confidence in the current leadership. All in all, such linguistic tools function as strategies to encode and mediate the ideological standpoint of the community to the pro-Brexiteers and their UK leadership specifically: voting for quitting the EU has been the outgrowth of lying to the people and influencing their mode of thinking.

Table 29

Macro Structure Analysis of the Very Brexit Problems Club's post on Facebook July 9th 2021

Theme/topic	In this post published by one member, Tories (Conservative Party) proponents are given a reminder about the role played by one of the iconic leaders that had run the party and been Prime Minister years in maintaining the UK in the EU: Mrs. Margaret Thatcher. The piece of discourse says, " A strange thought bothers me…did all these Tory brexiteers suppose Mrs Thatcher was stupid or blind when she brilliantly managed to (struggle) to get the best pace (indeed) at the higher rank in the European Community? And how could they believe clowns as Farage and Johnson would be smarter?!!!? Or worstly naïve, defenders of?!!!

Table 30

Micro Structure Analysis of the Very Brexit Problems Club's post on Facebook, July 9ᵗʰ 2021

Semantics (superstructure)	✓ We initiate our study with at the micro level with the selection of the covered topic. This links to the constituents of the written items. The subject is **introduced** with a thought that intrigues the speaker (the group as a whole). It, actually, specifies the overall setting and situation: Britain after the retreat following the Brexit Referendum and doubting the rightness of Johnson's actions. Then, it questions, in the **body**, whether or not Brexiteers (Tories) do perceive former Prime Minister, Thatcher, idiot or thoughtless to have maintained the UK within the European Community (EC); finally it **concludes** by showing their surprise at the misguided praise of Farage and Johnson's anti-European orientations by Tories.
	✓ In addition, the **source** from which this corpus has been selected is the Facebook community under the name "the Very Brexit Problems Club".
	✓ The rhetorical figures are represented via various types of metaphors. One of them is the adjective metaphor "Thatcher was …**blind**…" implying thoughtlessness. Also, **the expression "to (struggle) to get the best pace (indeed) at the higher rank in the European Community?"** is metaphorical as it implies what would Thatcher, the ex-Peime Minister, achieve during her office term in terms of leading the UK to a top position in the in the EC. "…**clowns as Farage and Johnson would be smarter?!!!? Or worstly naïve, defenders of?!!!** ", likewise, are compared to the clown in their "lack of good sense"; this shoud be a form

Semantics (superstructure)	of derision directed at them by the EU-remaining group.
	✓ **Parallelism** in this short piece of discourse is manifested via agreement (similarities) as well as dissimilarities (disagreement or antithesis). For example, "Miss Thatcher was **stupid** or **blind**…" to focus on the Tories' possible attitude toward the former Prime minister suggests agreement "**stupid or blind**". On the other hand, antithesis is encapsulated via the reference to one person then to others, "MrsThatcher" and "Farage and Johnson" as these, in spite of the lapse of time separating them, have divergent visions to the EU, according to the group. Most importantly, there is strong antithesis between two facts: the possibility of Mrs Thatchers's "irresponsible" actions in favor of Europe at the time of her service as Prime minister (as Brexiteers might believe) and the actually active role she has undertaken to place the UK higher in the EC (as claimed by the EU-Remainers). This antithetical situation is indicated in "…**did all these Tory brexiteers suppose Mrs Thatcher was stupid or blind when she brilliantly managed to (struggle) to get the best pace (indeed) at the higher rank in the European Community?** In addition, the excerpt, "**smarter**?!!!? Or worstly **naïve,** defenders of?!!!" illustrates contradiction of opinions, also.
	✓ **Disclaimers**, which are equally constitutive of rhetorical figures, can be indicated. Used primarily as tools to encode ideologies and express objectivity, they take on forms of questions, "**A strange thought bothers me…did all these Tory brexiteers suppose Mrs Thatcher was stupid or blind when she brilliantly managed to (struggle) to get the best pace (indeed) at the**

Semantics (superstructure)	**higher rank in the European Community?".** Here, infact, the community questions whether the Brexiteers see Thatcher's actions were thoughtless; after that it immediately lets its standpoint know: she would fight hard for a UK's eventually leading position in the EC. So, the Eu-Remainers write one thing, but what they mean is something else–a pro-European stance. In the same way, "**And how could they believe clowns as Farage and Johnson would be smarter?!!!? Or worstly naïve, defenders of?!!!** presents something but implying another one: questioning Farage and Johnson's cunning then affirming their acute naivety.
Lexis	✓ With regard to the choice of wording, we need to go across parts of speech in order to demonstrate expressed ideologies toward major issues, notably the Brexit Referendum. ✓ We begin with adjectival forms; "A

Lexis	
	strange thought … **Tory** brexiteers suppose Mrs Thatcher was **stupid** or **blind**" includes one-word adjectives to reflect attitudes to Brexiteers's beliefs and actions as well. So, what is held as an idea about the other side of the conflict is described as running against the current in the UK (strange) and pro-Brexiteers are narrowly associated with Tory party led by Boris Johnson. Besides, the pro-EU community suspects their rivals of deeming Thatcher as stupid or devoid of good thinking, which would be outrageous if proven true: unfairly prejudging this iconic figure in the history of the country. This probably true position must discredit the pro-Brexiteers for such a "prejudice". Likewise, in the sentence, "…at the **higher** rank in the **European** Community?", the position of the UK under the Thatcher's office is clearly defined (higher) the European dimension is stressed. This sounds as a counter viewpoint to that struggles against anti-EU online communities. Moreover, "…would be **smarter**?!!!? Or worstly **naïve**", the group strongly criticizes the possibly believed thought by pro-Brexiteers that both Johnson and Farage are clever or, as seen by the group, full of naivety. Thereby, the group lets its attitudes to the controversial retreat from the EU.
	✓ Adverbs are, also, utilized here for the encapsulation of ideologies. In "…**brilliantly managed**…" the adverb builds the quality of brilliance to the action by Mrs Thatcher; here, the group's viewpoint toward the former Prime minister is fully respectful. Conversely, "…**worstly naïve**…" epistomizes the disrespectful attitude to both Tory leaders (Farage and Johnson).

Syntax	✓ With regard to the syntactic level, the focus falls on the uses of the active voice throughout the text; for instance, we would mention, "**A strange thought bothers me…did all these Tory brexiteers suppose…**". In fact, although this form of verbs mostly grants more importance to agents, an abstract noun is used (thought) instead. This is intended to reduce the role of Brexiteers whose reasoning, according to the group, is a source of great concern. Also, in the question form, "**how could they believe clowns as Farage and Johnson**…" they are depicted as fervent believers in a sense-lacking leadership: doers of a mental action (believe).
	✓ Cohesive devises are equally employed for a variety of reasons; for example, "**And**…" here creates consistency all through the text and hence showing agreement between the community's stances to Brexit and Brexiteers.

Table 31

Macro Structure Analysis of the Very Brexit Problems Club's post on Facebook October13th, 2021

Theme/Topic	This piece of text is posted by this community draw the attention of those who voted in 2016 and in the General Election to Johnson's "big lies". It reads, "No matter which way we all voted in the last General Election and 2016 Referendum-I think it's fair to say that only a stupid person can't see that Johnson hasn't delivered the Brexit he promised, hasn't handled the pandemic very well, broken several promises he made in his manifesto and now he is telling a bunch of lies to cover it all up."

Table 32

Micro Structure Analysis of the Very Brexit Problems Club's post on Facebook, October14th, 2021

Semantics (super structure)	
	✓ Firstly, we begin with the topic components. The **introductory** part of the text deals with the holding of the referendum as well as the2016-General elections, which changed the UK's destiny with regard to its former ties with the EU.
	✓ The major theme covered a clear reminder to htose who voted for Brexit in 2016; it draws "stupid" Brexiteers' attention to the irreparable mistake they made in opting for leaving the EU because, for the group, Boris Johnson, the Prime minister, has failed the whole nation.
	✓ The posted text **concludes** by criticizing the satus quo: Johnson is still deceiving his people.
	✓ With regard to the **provenance** of the texts, thses have been selected from the group the Very Brexit Problems Club's post campaigning on Facebook. So the source is directly quoted from the very Brexit problem on the same platform.
	✓ For the rhetorical figures of speech, we start with metaphors; in "…Johnson **hasn't delivered the Brexit he promised**" we have a metaphor for the strategy adopted by the Prime minister to get the Brexit passed. Another one is "…**broken several promises**…", which implies "betrayal" as believed by this community. Therefore, the attitudes of the group are anti-Brexiteer since it represents the other side as deceivers and traitors.
	✓ Paralelism is also suggestive of either

Semantics (super structure)	agreement or opposition. In "…**I think it's fair to say that only a stupid person can't see that Johnson hasn't delivered the Brexit he promised**…" there is a luck of alignment expressed through the sentence structures–positive form then followed by negativeone. In the same way, antithesis is expressed via different persons; for example, we "**I**" as a member of the whole group and "**we**" versus "**a stupid person**" from the other side (pro-Brexiteers). All in all, what is discursively revealed is an ideological animosity between two rival online communities.
	✓ We have equally the employment of **disclaimers** to make ideologies less noticeable; when looking at "**No matter which way we all voted in the last General Election and 2016 Referendum-I think it's fair to say that only a stupid person can't see that Johnson hasn't delivered the Brexit he promised, hasn't handled the pandemic very well**," we can remark that the seemingly objective statement initiating the text is directly followed with a prejudicial representation of the others (stupidity).
Lexis	✓ The lexical section of analysis opens with the constituent **parts of speech**. Firstly, **adjective** are utilized throughout the post; for instance in "…**the last General Election and 2016 Referendum**…" the one-world adjective "**last**" and the compound adjective "**2016-Referendum**" to specifically and emphatically refer to the elections in question. Secondly, in the passage "**I think it's fair to say that only a stupid person**…", the copular adjective (after to be) ascribes the quality of fairness to the anti-Brexit community's judgement about the Brexiteers' way of thinking of the British Prime minister's failing steps in his copig with the Brexit

Lexis	
	issue. Simultaneously, the other side of the conflict is represented as being thoughtless ("stupid") as its members are incapable of realizing their "stupidity". Thirdly, we can notice the use of adjectival; in "…**Johnson hasn't delivered the Brexit he promised**…" and"…**broken several promises he made in his manifesto**…" such clauses' role is to modify the tow nouns respectively (the Brexit as well as promises). Indeed, thses adjectival structures render the sort of Brexit and Promises illegible or even unreliable. Adjectival phrases are, also, employed for the same purpose. For example, we could exemplify with "…**a bunch of lies**…", in which the prepositional pharse ("of lies") specify the noun ("bunch").
	✓ **Adverbs and modals (modality)** are, equally, present if the posted text. The model verb "can't" is used in the excerpt "…**a stupid person can't see that Johnson hasn't delivered the Brexit**…" to draw attention to the lack of sense of the Brexiteers. Moreover, to add more emphasis in "…**hasn't handled the pandemic very well**…" the adverbs "very" and "well" are deployed, which brings into question the handling of the issue as pledged by Boris Johnson. Additionally, some phrasal forms in the text function as adverbs in that they complete the meaning of verbs: in **"…broken several promises he made in his manifesto and now he is telling a bunch of lies to cover it all up."** and "**voted in the last General Election and 2016 Referendum**…", "…**in his manifesto**…" modifies the berb "made"; "…a bunch of lies to cover it all up."; adds more sense the verb "telling"; "…in the last General Election and 2016 Referendum…" explains "voted". Henceforth,

Lexis	completing the meaning expressed by the verbs here provides a clear picture of what the community is trying to convey about the Prime minister (failure to deal with Brexit) and pen their opponents' minds to discern the extent of their "stupidity".
	✓ All in all, the use of adjectives and adverbs serves to encapsulate ideological outlooks toward particular or even controversial issues like the case of Brexit and its relevant hardships in the UK. I.e., this attests for the subjectivity on the part of the group.
	✓ **Key nouns frequency** is manifested through certain nouns repetition. For example, the noun "**elections**" is used synonymously with "**referendum**" to evoke the overall theme of the posted text.
Syntax	✓ As regards the structural constructions, we would consider mainly the use of active voice; for example, in "…**we all voted in the last General Election and 2016 Referendum**…" the community shows the British people as the subject-doers of action. They have, actually, taken the initiative to make their viewpoints known on the Brexit. In addition, the passage "…**Johnson hasn't delivered the Brexit he**

Syntax	**promised, hasn't handled the pandemic very well, broken several promises he made in his manifesto and now he is telling a bunch of lies**…" depict Boris Johnson as responsible for a series of actions that failed the British citizens. This would likely account for the group's subjective representation of the world.
	✓ For **Cohesive** aims, particular linguistic tools are resorted to. The conjunction "**and**" expresses agreement between ideas they convey. This attests to their ideological outlook (that of criticizing the Prime minister's actions and pro-Brexiteers through this).

4.6 CDA Social Cognition Analysis of Pro-Brexiteer's Posts in Period two on Twitter and Facebook

Table 33

Macro Structure Analysis of Leave Means Leave's Post on Facebook, February19th, 2020

Theme/Topic	As a means to make their outlooks heard regarding immigration from the strictly British perspective, this Brexit group writes, "A points-based immigration system is fairer, less discriminatory and more in the interest of the British people than the EU immigration system. Let's invest in our own UK workforce, welcome the best & brightest from around the world and maintain full control of our borders."

Table 34

Micro Structure Analysis of Leave Means Leave's Post on Facebook, February19th, 2020

Semantics (super structure)	
	✓ The published text **opens** with a critique of the European system of dealing with immigration, which, according to them, does not suit the British people. Instead, they believe it is wiser to bring back the British one for it is deemed more just and "…less discriminatory…" and beneficial to them. The main **theme**, next, is a form of invitation to the Government to "**invest**" in the local "**workforce**" rather than European one. Then, it closes with the suggestion to adopt a selective immigration policy–that of admitting competent immigrants to the country.
	✓ The published discourse has been obtained from the Facebook-based pro-Brexit community named "Leave Means Leave". Thus, it is a direct source as their publication is directly quoted.
	✓ **Parallelism** is reflected in the agreement between sentences; for example, we would excerpt, "**A points-based immigration system is fairer, less discriminatory and more in the interest of the British people**". Hence, the community's stance is consistent (campaigning for a pragmatic immigration system). Besides, **antithesis** (disagreement in attitudes) is manifested in the paradoxical mention of "**British**", "**UK**" and "**EU**".
	✓ **Disclaimers** are equally deployed to encode ideologies. In "**A points-based immigration system is fairer, less discriminatory and more in the interest of the British people than the EU immigration system**", One point is made (advocating a more

Semantics (super structure)	beneficial immigration policy), but issuing an attack on the European migratory treatment.
Lexis	✓ In order to create variety multiple **adjectival** forms are employed. For instance, in "**A points-based immigration system is fairer, less discriminatory …the British people … the EU immigration system**" as well as "…**UK workforce, welcome the the best & brightest**" a compound adjective, a copular, four one-word adjectives are deployed to differentiate between the UK/EU schemes of dealing with immigration. Moreover, some phrases with adjectival functions are present. We can illustrate with, "**the interest of the British people**", in which the noun interest is modified by the prepositional phrase. ✓ Adverbial functions are, likewise, achieved by means of some phrases like, "**Let's invest in our own UK workforce**…" and "…**maintain full control of our borders**". Here, the prepositional phrases complete the meanings of the verbs. Consequently, ideologies are epitomized–the group claims a return to UK immigration standards. ✓ To introduce the main theme, key noun "**immigration system**" is repeated twice. Also, "people" and "workforce" are used synonymously to refer to emphasize the local dimension in their published texts.
Syntax	✓ At this stage of analysis, we would focus, firstly, on the use coordinators. For example, "…**welcome the best & brightest from around the world and maintain full control of our borders**" is well combined as a structure thanks to the coordinating conjunction "and".

Syntax	✓ **Nominalization**, moreover, is often useful in concealing actual doers for different reasons; in this case, the group attempts not to stress the UK government as the main actor in its passage, "**A points-based immigration system**…". In fact, in spite of the their struggle to push the it to disengage from the EU-immigration regulations, the UK government, for them, should not be given direct reference in order to avoid ascribing racist accusations to it namely by their opponents. Likewise, the same principle applies to this part of text, "**Let's invest in our own UK workforce, welcome**…", in which the real subject is not directly revealed. This de-emphasis of the subject's role embodies ideological standpoints as the group wants to demark its positions on immigration from open racism.
	✓ For cohesion within the parts of the text, we could go over some linguistic tools in order to illustrate their use. Firstly, agreement and consistency between idea is shown in, "…**and more in the interest of the British people**…". Secondly, descriptions throughout the publication depend on various forms; for example, in "**A points-based immigration system is fairer, less discriminatory**…" two forms are used (a compound noun and tow copulars−adjective following to be). Additionally, we observe that in the excerpt, "**Let's invest in our own UK workforce, welcome**…" the imperative form is softened to the point of showing invitation, not forceful order when it comes to the UK government concerning the suggested measures to do with controlling immigration. Henceforth, attitudes toward others (anti-Brexiteers) as well as their partisans (pro-Brexiteers) can be deduced.

Table 35

Macro Structure Analysis of Brexit Central's Post on Facebook, February1st, 2020

Theme/ Topic	This written discourse posted just after the official Brexit of the UK seems to celebrate this historical event. It is as follows, "The UK finally leaves the EU after 47 years sparking, euphoric scenes as Boris Johnson pledges to unleash UK's full potential."

Table 36

Micro Structure Analysis of Brexit Central's Post on Facebook, February1st, 2020

Semantics (superstructure)	✓ Firstly, we start our analyses by going over the **opening** of the post. It reports the definitive withdrawal of the UK from the EU after more than four decades of cooperation with the continent at all levels. **Then**, it gives a short description of the effervescence which marked the popular celebrations soon after the official announcement British leave. **Finally**, reminds that Boris Johnson's promise to exploit the potentials of the nation at full.
	✓ Concerning the **sources**, we have relied on Facebook's community Brexit Central, which is one of the most active groups on social media before, during, and after the Brexit. Henceforth, it is a direct source.
	✓ For the figures of speech, our focus falls upon metaphors; for instance, in "… **sparking, euphoric scenes**…", to emphasize the energy and passaions with which the UK citizens have celebrated Brexit. Also, we can notice this metaphorical expression, "…**to unleash UK's full potential**." to suggest the great wealth and capacities of Britain away of Europe.
	✓ **Parallelism** can be demonstrated in the following excerpts of similar structures, "**The UK finally leaves the EU after 47 years sparking, euphoric scenes as Boris Johnson pledges to unleash UK's full potential**". In fact, there is a clear agreement and consistency between the parts of the text encapsulating the ideological unity characterizing the

Semantics (superstructure)	group.
	✓ **Anti-thesis**, there is only one indicator– the two appellations "**The UK**" and "**the EU**"– just to accentuate the divide in the Britain over this controversial issue, which has led to a split from Brussels after months and years of arguments and counter-arguments.
	✓ **A disclaimer** is deployed in this brief text to convey implicitly an ideological outlook. This can be shown in the passage, "**The UK finally leaves the EU after 47 years…**", where writing objectively about the British retreat from the EU; next, there sounds obvious subjectivity in "…**sparking, euphoric scenes as Boris Johnson pledges to unleash UK's full potential**". I.e., the group implies its actual standpoint (as pro-Brexiteers) behind a mentioning a piece of objective information.
Lexis	✓ We begin the lexical analysis with adjectives. In, "…**sparking, euphoric scenes…**" one-word-adjectives modify the noun scenes to convey emphatically the theme of great happiness and satisfaction following the Brexit. Equally, another adjective "…**UK's full potential**." Is employed with very objective of ascribing more importance to the nation's multiple resources away from Europe. Thereby, the pro-Brexit tendency is made lucid through the group's adjectival forms.
	✓ Concerning adverbs, we would refer first to words like, "**The UK finally leaves**..."; this adverbial function connotes the duly ultimate break with the EU after which there will be no membership anymore. Likewise the same function is ensured via the prepositional phrase, "**The UK finally leaves the EU after 47 years**"

Lexis	to add meaning to the main verb: the duration of being an EU member. Such adverbs uses signal the prevailing attitude among the community toward the Brussels–the desire to quit.
	✓ **Key nouns** are equally utilized to strengthen the major theme. For example, we would mention **"the UK"** and **"the EU"**, which are used in order to convey opposition between two really different perceptions.
Syntax	✓ The syntactic study opens with **conjunctions** linking the text's parts together. Thus, "**The UK finally leaves the EU after 47 years sparking, euphoric scenes as Boris Johnson pledges to unleash UK's full potential.**" Contains the subordinating conjunction "as" to indicate the relation of time between the two clauses; Boris Johnson acts simultaneously with the start of the Brexit celebrations to put forward his promise of "unleashing' Britain's power. Implicitly, the UK government seems to be in total harmony with the euphoric population.
	✓ Besides, what is observable is the fact that all of the sentences are in the active form, "**The UK finally leaves the EU…**" as well as "…**Boris Johnson pledges to unleash…**". That is to suggest that more importance is given to subjects as active doers of actions (the UK and the PM): they are represented as masters of their own destiny in terms of breaking free from the EU and

Syntax	regaining the nation's sovereignty in all domains. All in all, ideology is obviously in play since pro-Brexit parties with their perceptions to the world are put to the fore.
	✓ In terms of **cohesion and coherence** through the text, certain linguistic tools can be deployed for this purpose; for instance, we can mention ,"**finally**", "**after**", and "**as**" to refer to the sequencing of ideas and relations within sentences expressing them respectively (agreement and consistency between expressed attitudes). Further, the constitutive elements of text (introduction, content, and conclusion) ensure cohesion within it though it is short. This way, recipients can link variants of mental representations together and form a clear perception of what is taking place actually. In the end, what we can remark is that the community's outlook tends to alight behind the UK government altogether in putting an end to the alliance with the EU.

Table 37

Macro Structure Analysis of Change Britain's Post on Twitter, October 25th, 2021 on Twitter

Theme/topic	In the posted text by Change Britain, we find, "There is no mandate for a second referendum or a Brexit blocking Parliament. Labour MPs were elected on promises to deliver Brexit. They should stop making up excuses, vote for an election and face the voters with their new position".

Table 38

Micro Structure Analysis of Change Britain's Post on Twitter, October 25ᵗʰ, 2021

Semantics (superstructure)	✓ The **introductory part** of the post covers the definitive decision as expressed by the group of quitting the EU. In fact, for them what has already been decided by the British people must be respected. The **content** deals with election of Labor MPs to carry out the Brexit alongside their peers (The Tories). To **conclude**, they remind the Labors of their obligations: stick to their earlier promises, ratify the ultimate version of Brexit to be passed through Parliament, and to display honesty to the UK electorate.
	✓ The **source** of the text is Twitter; we have excerpted it from the Pro-Brexit community "change Britain", so it is a direct source.
	✓ For the **rhetorical figures of speech**, we can illustrate with some like: "…**face the voters with their new position"** and "…**MPs were elected on promises to deliver Brexit**". These are metaphors for trust by voters toward MPs (Labors) as well as honestly clarifying new standpoints by these (join Brexiteers: the Conservative MPs).
	✓ **Parallelism** is shown in the following passages: "**There is no mandate for a second referendum or a Brexit blocking Parliament**" (here, there is some similarity of structure–rejection of both possibilities via the negative form), "**They should stop making up excuses, vote for an election and face the voters with their new position**" (here, identical imperative forms with should; less forceful).

Semantics (superstructure)	Indeed, this is expressive of agreement in terms of opinion with the whole community with regard to the Brexit outcome.
	✓ **Antithesis**, on the other hand, is found in the two contradictory words ("**referendum**" and "**Brexit**") as the former connotes asking for popular opinion on Britain's European status; the latter, suggests debates within Parliament to get it passed. Equally, in "…**stop making up excuses, vote for an election and face the voters**…", we can detect a kind of contrast between "**excuses**; **vote and face**". I.e., Labors have to stop making tricks and take concrete action.
	✓ **Disclaimers** present in "**Labour MPs were elected on promises to deliver Brexit. They should stop making up excuses, vote for an election and face the voters with their new position**". At this level, what is said initially is something (Labors' election), but what is meant is another (they must disengage from dribbling the public and openly support the Brexiteers). Ideology, in this case, is covertly encapsulated. It is up to the audience to negotiate it.
Lexis	✓ **Adjectival forms** appear throughout the text to convey particular messages. Firstly, one-word adjectives ("**a second referendum**" as well as "**new position**") point to another vote on leaving the EU, which is strongly spurned as inadmissible, and to total adherence to the national consensus by Labors respectively. Additionally, phrases functioning as adjective are shown in , " …**Brexit blocking Parliament**", in which the participial phrase modifies Brexit.
	✓ When it comes to **adverbs** and **models**, which bear in them

Lexis	ideological positions, we would select some as illustrations. Thus, "There **is no mandate for a second referendum**…", where the prepositional phrase completes the meaning of the verb. Also, in "**Labour MPs were elected on promises to deliver Brexit**" we find the same phrasal role. Further, the model "should" in "**They should stop making up excuses, vote for an election and face the voters with their new position**" signifies mild obligation directed at the Labors, who are supposed to commit themselves to the their expressed promises. By adding certain qualities to verbs, adverbs and modals enable text writer epitomize their attitudes to Brexit; for instance, in the first phrase, there is pressure exercised upon Labors to remind them of their pledges.
	✓ **Major noun frequency** is shown in the use of synonymous words to stress the central theme. So, the words "**referendum**", "**election**", "**Brexit**", and "**voters**" are synonymous; they refer to the right of the British people to determine their own destiny. Moreover, the nouns "**Parliament**" alongside "**MPs**" do likewise in that they both imply parliamentary roles as well as procedures to do with UK's withdrawal from the EU. On the other hand, the theme of ideological contradiction is indirectly conveyed via "**Labour MPs**", whose overall positions have been pro-remain, and "**voters**" especially the majority of Brexiteers.
Syntax	✓ We initiate our syntactic study by dealing with the imperative from expressed through **modality** ("**should**"); in "**They should stop making up excuses, vote for an election and face the voters with**

Syntax	**their new position**", elected Labor MPs are recommended to clarify their attitudes to the electorate.
	✓ The agentless passive is present in "**Labour MPs were elected on promises to deliver Brexit**" to ideologically conceal real doers and leave them up to readers to guess them–in this case the UK citizens voting mainly for leaving the EU. In fact, this order of words is intended to put Labors in front of their historic responsibility as elected MPs. After that, come the active form "**They should stop making up excuses, vote for an election and face the voters with their new position**", in which they are place initially as active subject with obligations to fulfill (take action, join Tories, and be loyal with Brexiteers).
	✓ **Cohesion** is indicated via linguistic devices; for example, they employ the conjunction "**and**" in order to tie clauses together and with them mental perceptions and render them comprehensible for audiences (agreement). To perform descriptions for the same purpose, words as well as phrases are resorted to: "**new position**". Pronouns, equally, are employed to create coherence between ideas ("**they**") refers back to Labors.

Table 39

Macro Structure Analysis of Leave Means Leave's Post on Twitter, May 19th, 2021

Theme/topic	
	Making their stances towards the UK Prime Minister, Mrs. Theresa May, lucid, the community has posted this text "Everyday @theresa_may stays in office = a year in the political wilderness for the @Conservatives. Why do her colleagues not see it, when everyone else in the country does? The fault now lies with the people keeping her here".

Table 40

Micro Structure Analysis of Leave Means Leave's Post on Twitter May 19th, 2021

Semantics (superstructure)	
	✓ To begin with, this text by Leave Means Leave can be divided into the customary parts. It opens with an **introduction** giving some hints about the general setting and situation (Britain during the ultimate stages of negotiations with the EU and the ensuing political crises between Mrs. May and Parliament relating to the outcome of such negotiations. Next, the **content** reveals the "regrettable" lack of awareness by her colleagues in the Government and the Conservative party that the PM's is the source of all the political turmoil shaking the UK. Finally, the text **ends** with an open criticism of such May's assistants to whom the responsibility for the crisis is attributed.
	✓ The **source** of the text is Twitter; it has been selected from the pro-Brexit group "Leave Means Leave".
	✓ The text, besides, embodies some **metaphorical** expressions; for example, in, "…**a year in the political wilderness for the @Conservatives**" we have a prepositional metaphor which implies the political vortex Conservative caused due to the PM's route map concerning the Brexit deal with the EU. Thus, the very theme of political clash is rendered fundamental through the metaphorical use.
	✓ Furthermore, in order to show agreement, the writers clearly similarity between the textual structures. For instance, when they state, "**Everyday @theresa_may stays in office = a year in the**

Semantics (superstructure)	**political wilderness for the @Conservatives**", we can see that both clauses are positive (with the sign = meaning equals). ✓ On the other hand, **antithesis** is well manifested in the question, "**Why do her colleagues not see it, when everyone else in the country does?**". Here, we can discern a note of strong disagreement and political argument between both parties (Brexiteers and EU-remainers). ✓ A disclaimer is utilized to encode ideological positions expressing some impartiality first ("**Why do her colleagues not see it, when everyone else in the country does?**"). Shortly after, the intended meaning conveyed ("**The fault now lies with the people keeping her here**"); i.e. those who work with the PM and the Tory-party members and even those who have voted for her party.
Lexis	✓ As far as the lexical aspect is concerned, we tackle first the adjectival forms. The, "…**political wilderness**..." is an example of the one-word adjective which specifies the type of confusion ranging on in the UK. Moreover, the excerpt, "…**a year in the political wilderness for the @Conservatives**" attest for the adjectival function of phrases–the first prepositional phrase describes "**a year**"; the second "**the political wilderness**". ✓ Adverbial functions, on the other hand, can be illustrated in, <u>...@theresa_may stays in office</u>, which completes the meaning of the verb, indicating place. Equally, the adverb clause, "…**when everyone else in the country does?**" complements the dependent clause, "…**Why do her colleagues not see it**…" to indicate time relation. ✓ For the key noun frequency, we

Lexis	would mention "**@theresa_may**" and "**@Conservatives**" and "colleagues" as these are used synonymously to focus on one side of the dilemma (political crises relating to Brexit negotiations". Implicitly, the group signals its position, which is opposed to the PM and her staff when it comes to her plan of action via-à-vis the final outcome of the Brexit deal. I.e. the group sounds against any form of concessions to the EU by the Conservative Government. Henceforth, the community is not only in confrontation with EU-remainers but also with Mrs. May.
Syntax	✓ The syntactic analysis open with an implicit imperative; it reads, "**Why do her colleagues not see it, when everyone else in the country does?**" and the intended meaning is that the Conservative MPs and Ministers must adhere to the popular rejection of Mrs. May's frame of proceeding. ✓ The active form with active agent is deployed in, "**@theresa_may stays in office**…" and "…**everyone else in the country does?**" to stress the one still holding power (Mrs.May's responsibility for the crisis) and all citizens' awareness of the "thoughtless" actions of the PM. Conversely, in, "**The fault now lies with the people keeping her here**" using an abstract noun ("**the fault**") to reduce the colleagues of the PM role in the whole matter perhaps being misled by her influence on them. ✓ **Cohesion** appears through certain linguistic tools. For instance, the constitutive parts of the text allow readers to move smoothly throughout it and joint their mental representations in their minds. Additionally, to show contrast, in this context, between ideas, the group members resort to the conjunction

Syntax	"when"– "**Why do her colleagues not see it, when everyone else in the country does?**" (inability of most Conservatives to realize the "lack of sense" exhibited by the PM. In contrast with the rest of the UK subjects). All in all, these forms certainly convey ideological penchants–not agreeing with the PM's approach of the Brexit deal with the EU.

3.7 Discussion of the Findings

Going over the qualitative-quantitative analyses of the corpora selected from both the pro-Brexiteers and EU-remainers' texts on Facebook and Twitter reveal a range of observations that have to be enumerated:

- Firstly, we could notice an overwhelming dominance of the pro-Brexiteers' texts throughout the SNSs when it comes to number and influence, which suggests that power and control are in the hands of those who had voted for the UK's departure from the UE. This is due to the fact that their ideological perceptions of the actual situation (Brexit issue) empowers them to have the power to control the means of producing their discourses and their dissemination likewise (Facebook and Twitter). As such,the socio-cultural and political institutions' ruling power relations across various discursive situations are being reinforced through such practices with their counter structures being resistant to userp them (EU-remainering groups).

- Secondly, while the pro-Brexiteers could encapsulate their social representations (SRs) as a social and online community about the handling of the Brexit process by the UK Government on both Twitter and Facebook, the EU-remainers have had recourse solely to Facebook. Indeed, according to our research on Twitter, we could

not manage to find any group to defend Europe and counteract the discourses of the pro-Brexiteers.

- Thirdly, the virtual space of social media can, as in authentic, social situations, be the locus of the dissemination of shared knowledge about the world through discourse in order to exercise power and domination by particular political groups over disenfranchised ones. Therefore, the anti-European trend translated by the 2016-referendum sounds perfectly epitomized via forms of discourses covering various aspects of Brexit: political, economic, social, cultural, etc.

- Fourthly, this implies that SNSs serve as parallel platforms for the maintenance of domination or the subversion of the status quo as well as has been the case for the controversy surrounding the Brexit dilemma in the UK ever since the referendum outgrowth.

General conclusion

We would recapitulate by giving the gist of what this work has covered so far. We have initiated our research with first chapter. The latter branches into a broad theoretical background about the most relevant disciplines whose methodological tools and findings have been fundamental in approaching discourse analytically. Firstly, we have covered the field of text linguistics, where the basic terms and notions constitutive of it have been exposed to render them accessible. In this respect, cohesion alongside its components–reference, ellipses, conjunctions, lexical cohesion, and pragmatic cohesion–has been explained succinctly. Besides, coherence, intentionality and acceptability, informativity, situationality, and intertextuality, as communicative as well as pragmatic features, have been

exposed in terms of how they contribute to the production/ interpretation, unity and parallelism in interactional events between people. Secondly, we have gone across the field of discourse analysis (DA) with its nomenclature. Here, the differentiation between text and discourse has been undertaken from a socially functional perspective to disengage from the earlier definitions of DA when it comes to language study. Next, we have moved to the lingering complexity of discourse as a concept differently perceived through various disciplines, such as philosophy, sociology, linguistics, and social psychology. At once, Foucault's complex perspective has received some coverage as it is multi-dimensional: discourse, knowledge, power, and domination. Language as social semiotics, after that, has been addressed with a focus on it as a set of signs operational in the social environment earning the status of social phenomenon. Here, the context of situation and culture have been foregrounded showing how scholars like Halliday had drawn considerably on the anthropology-driven heritage of Malinowski and later the pioneering theoretical model of context elaborated by the linguist Firth. In line with approaches to contextual interaction, Hymes's SPEAKING framework has been explained in terms of its constituents followed with that built by Van Dijk; the main aim centers on identifying context-related clues on which situational exchanges are contingent.

Soon after, more focus has been put upon Halliday's Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG), for it has been really influential in DA with its theoretical and methodological insights when dealing with language use in social context. This signals text as well as communicative situations merging, which attributes texts their functional aspects socially speaking. Then, his stratified model has been addressed (field, tenor, and mode); at the same time, the emphasis on the centrality of the linguistic function has been encapsulated in Halliday's meta-functions (ideational, interpersonal, and textual functions) across interactional occurrences. We,

ultimately, have presented the concept of register as it makes up the essence of SFG; it relates to constant discursive shifts resulting from changes in contextual situations' elements (field, tenor, and mode) referring to both dialectal and diatypic variations.

Furthermore, we have continued our theoretical exposition with pragmatics as a field that highly converges with DA. Concerning this point, it has been shown that the two areas have one thing in common–experts in them have extended their scope of study beyond the structuralist tradition as the basis in approaching the language system. At this stage, the communicative function underlying discourse has been adhered to as starting point, notably in pragmatics and DA (their focus being primarily text, context and function). Henceforth, the basic term speech acts (SAs) has been examined from the perspective of their functional performances undertaken socially by participants in interaction (the locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionaly functions). Naturally, Austin's speech act theory (SAT) has been drawn on as it embodies a close reference to the pragmatic effects realized through discourse in actual exchanges; that is to say, utterances count essentially on what is said explicitly, what is meant implicitly, and what is done authentically (what is performed via discourse) to be fully functional. The fundamental conditions (felicity conditions) regulating SAs have, in the same way, been evoked in support of our discussions. In this respect, the assertive force (reflecting world truths as they occur); the directive force (the authority exerted by discourse producers upon receivers); the commissive force (adhering to discursive engagements previously uttered), the expressive force (participants' attitudes and feelings toward what is actually said), and declaratory force (the transformations effected by means of utterances) have been clarified. We, shortly after, have followed up on sociolinguistics as another domain whose theoretical perspectives and findings have been of significant support to CDA. In fact, a short historical account has been conducted tracing its evolution to such disciplines as sociology as

well as anthropology, linguistics, discursive psychology, power and discourse, conversation analysis (CA), and the ethnography of speaking. It has been demonstrated that the mere interest in tackling variations of language across diverse contexts entails recourse to a range of specialties. Simultaneously, sociolinguistics departure from the purely structural theorization of the inner grammatical organization in the mind as had long been claimed by Chomsky to the outer context has been evoked. In addition, the notions of power, language, and social diversity have been searched into in order to account for varying types of acquaintance and solidarity within social communities via language employment. The latter is constrained by a set of specific conditions which determine one's social belonging–ethnicity, class, job, age, sex, etc. We, immediately, have come across the generally agreeable finding that being a member of a speech community necessarily suggests the endorsement of common circumstances typical of the production of its linguistic variety. Specifically, much accent has been put on the ethnographic trend in sociolinguistic research; at this level, by going over language and society interrelationship, the social behavior's workings have been explored under systems of interaction typical of speech communities (the ethnography of speaking). At last, the scope of the ethnography of communication relevant to the micro as well as macro levels of language study has been penetrated pointing out the descriptive nature of the multi-disciplinary literature about language in social context conducted so far.

Afterward, we have moved to the broad field of discursive psychology. Indeed, coming across the eventuality of an overlap between sociolinguistics, cognitivism, and discursive psychology, the complexity of bonding sociolinguistics with social theory in connection to cognition has been taken a look at. With regard to this, what has been claimed as an attempt at unraveling reference to society's institutions as commonly shared systems during daily communications has been granted attention; the shortcoming of failing to expose the

connection between discourse and such structures has been exposed as well (discursive occasions, cognitive structures, and social institutions). Thus, the resort to insights stemming from sociolinguistics by scholars in discursive psychology has been stressed as central since it includes not solely cognitive considerations, but also linguistic, ethnographic, and anthropological considerations in any relevant study enterprises. In short, the novelty of research branching into discourse in connection with social cognition, which calls for a multitude of respects to converge, has been emphasized as crucial in discursive and social psychology (DSPS). The theoretical framework of combining linguistic interchanges with their inherent processes of sharing abstract systems of representation has been explored accentuating the centrality of language in the whole process, equally. We, directly after, have re-drawn attention to the DA or discourse studies (DS) as well as Austin's framework related to SAT. Actually, the reliance upon DA's different theorizations in accordance with specified perspectives has been shed some light on, namely the one pertaining to issues of truth, knowledge, socio-cultural institutions, power, and performances arising out of utterances (doing). To conclude, the interest manifested by experts in DSPS in the social aspects underpinning social performances concerning the construction, negotiation as well as reception of social actions by learnt, accommodating observers in their social environments–ethnomethodology–has been highlighted (the centrality of experience-driven knowledge while tackling social interaction).

The next step of our work has been an overview of critical discourse analysis (CDA) as a multi-disciplinary approach to language examination. At the beginning, tracing the evolution of CDA from the earlier domains of traditional rhetorics, applied linguistics, sociolinguistics, pragmatics, CA, sociology, literary criticism, the critical orientation of the School of Frankfurt, and critical linguistics has been carried in this section. Moreover, the concepts of

ideology and knowledge in relation to discourse initiated by Neo-Marxist thinkers like Foucault and Pêcheux have been inserted placing the scope of description on how social interaction affirms and strengthen sets of knowledge, which, in turn, guide social practices in the form of relations of power and domination in society (knowledge and ideological representations). Additionally, the early initiative taken by a board of scholars and researchers at the University of East Anglia regarding the functional workings of language under socio-cultural institutions has been covered with the aim of showing how the former (social communication) perpetuate or else subvert the latter (social structures). Again, Halliday's SFG has been evoked as a useful contribution to the survey of language from a functional angle; the focus has been directed at the fact that discourse enables users to externalize their ideological viewpoints basing on the way they experience the world as participants with individual and social aims. Therefore, the inextricable relationship between language and social context has been shown as pivotal in CDA with language performing three major functions: the ideational function, interpersonal function, and textual function. Importantly, the ultimate findings arrived at by especially critical linguists about the multi-dimensional, complex relationship between language and society has been indicated determining the influential role of CL on CDA (the interrelationship between linguistic structures and socio-ideological structures). More importantly, the board of experts in DA, power, ideology, and domination–the Scientific Peer Group– has been pointed to along the way, for this gathering would constitute later the diversity and convergence intrinsic in CDA. Additionally, the philosophical dimension resulting from CL has been mentioned, for works in this respect had readily bonded together a variety of theoretical perspectives ranging from philosophy, rhetorics, sociolinguistics, psychology, linguistics, anthropology, pragmatics, sociolinguistics, critical linguistics to stylistics. Marxism, at this point, has been stopped at as a catalyst for the

critical orientation in CDA subsequently. Indeed, a historical account of this philosophical trend has been conducted with reference to the pioneering figures of critical theory and their breakthroughs in examining social relations and dominant ideologies. Next, the second generation of Marxists under the aegis of social thinkers forming the German school of criticism has been presented as well with a focus on the critical standpoint in addressing issues to do with ideology, society, politics, and history. In this register, critique, ideology, language, power, and control have been addressed from a CDA angle; similarly, specifying the criteria of unveiling the relations of power and control (power abuse) enacted and disseminated through discourse in society has been shed light on. Besides, the fact that analysts need to adopt socio-political stances in their scholarly enterprises to help the disenfranchised resisting the hegemony of elites has been clarified. To end these discussions on CDA, both the orderliness and naturalization underlying discursive events has been explored. The determining background knowledge (BGK) commonly resorted to in daily communication by participants with the system of naturalized underpinning of ideologies (ideological representations typical of particular groups' agendas) has been put under scrutiny.

On the other hand, the second chaptre of has been concerned with Van Dijk's socio-cognitive approach to CDA. As a matter of fact, such notions as ideology have been accounted for historically with ideas being part of it. In effect, ideologies, as tools to exercise dominance in the hands of powerful groups (false consciousness), has been evoked; here, imposed perceptions on disenfranchised subjects regarding their social roles and the general social order as common sense has been elaborated upon. Besides to the hegemonic nature of ideological systems, opposition has been attributed as an intrinsic feature characterizing inter-group relations. Accordingly, resisting ideas at variance with commonly held ideologies has

been evoked with reference to possible indoctrination in its broad sense. Furthermore, ideology being representative of thinking processes occurring in the mind (the commonsensical indication of the mental provenance of ideologies) has been explicated. As well as the individual level, thinking activities within society in search of spreading particular sets of ideologies has been tackled, likewise. Then, the psychology-related account of the generic dimension of ideologies in terms of their production and reception within the bounds of given communities have been dealt with as criteria for the attribution of the socio-cultural feature to them.

Next, the issue of the mind as the locus where sets of ideas are constructed has been brought up in our explanations. At this point, the major principles of cognitive science with the fields converging in it (personal and social psychology, cognition, cognitive psychology, and cognitive linguistics) have been pointed to as insightful contributions. The controversy about whether the mind is subsumed in the brain (body) alongside the demarcation from this trend in cognitive research toward in-depth consideration of information processing in the mind have been given their due right, equally. At the same time, it has been shown how minds are acquired socially and how they are activated and modified to suit variant social circumstances. The centrality of the mental mechanism in association with discursive making and reception in the purview of CDA has been inserted into our work from the perspective of Van Dijk's socio-cognitive approach (SCA).

Afterward, the preference of the concept of beliefs to that of ideas and the obligation of differentiating between knowledge and beliefs in connection with truth foundations have been put to the fore. At this level, the findings stemming from epistemology defining knowledge as specific types of beliefs branching to communities and their cultural institutions that are

validated by definite truth criteria have been explicated. In this way, subjectivity underlying belief sets making up knowledge of the world–relativity of truth criteria– has been seen from the same theoretical angle. Additionally, the materialization of beliefs via structures (clauses) alongside the simultaneously semantic representation of these as mental models, which stands specifically upon Van Dijk's Socio-cognitive paradigm, has been described. This, actually, has been undertaken to try to shed light on the complex, unconscious process of beliefs' formation out of thinking.

Subsequently, we have continued our theoretical background with a historical account of the evolution of the socio-cognitive approach of discourse. To begin with, recourse to other areas of discursive study in theorizing about the cognitive dimension of discourse has been followed up. The foremost interest of scholars in proving or rejecting the validity of the psychological insights linking to mental representations and the ensuing productive/receptive processes have been exposed in our study. In effect, such fields as artificial intelligence, pragmatics, and text linguistics have been mentioned as sources. Specifically, the act of activating such representations during discursive interactions as a mechanism of interpretative codes has been included in the explanatory stage. With some re-consideration, earlier attempts to single the social impact out on the formation of shared cognition stimulating socially related acts of discourse has been pointed to. In this sense, social behavior involving discursive interchanges crystallizing out of communal constraints (social aggregate) has been presented focusing upon the primordial role of collective consciousness (group mind) in the whole business. At once, a short hint to the rise of behaviorism with its individual implications for the collective mind ruling interaction has been made in a sort of exposition of contradictory aura that has marked relevant research into discourse in association with cognition. Afresh, the renewed concentration on generic thought as the most outstanding asset

in accessing how community weighs substantially in encoding and decoding discourse notably within European social psychology has been stated. Besides, reference to some scholarly elaborations by notorious adepts of the field has been undertaken. Lastly, the efforts by cognitive psychologists to come up with explications about how cognition operates functionally concerning discourse (invoking experiential knowledge to infer meanings) has been devoted an account.

In line with the same subject matter, the focus has fallen on the insertion of the cognitive perspective in exploring discourse analytically. In this register, broadening the scope of research beyond the delimitations of social sciences (the exploration of the functional quality of language in social context) to include cognitive processes has been directed attention to so as to stress the manipulation of language deemed revolutionary in CDA. In this respect, bridging the gap between mental processes as well as discourse processing in the area of cognitive linguistics has been highlighted. At this level, having recourse to mental schemata with which humans are endowed in interaction to determine interpersonal relations relevant to positions in society has been featured. Thereby, basic terms constitutive of such schemata as a container with its components (exterior, interior, and boundary–political delimitations) have been mentioned as expedients in routine communication. Shortly after, our concentration has been drawn principally toward the rise of the socio-cognitive perspective in connection to discourse as a major trend in CDA with Van Dijk being one of the precursors. The socio-psychological basis guiding his theoretical postulate to re-consider the structures of context in-depth alongside interactants' activated generic knowledge (socially shared cognitions) have been gone over as well to unveil how interaction is smoothly enacted socially.

In the same vein, the triangulation model (discourse, cognition, and society) developed by Van Dijk has been foregrounded. Indeed, the theoretically prominent association between discourse and social structures by means of the notion of cognition has been stressed as this has meant a major advance in critical discourse studies (CDS). Thus, the revolutionary, multidisciplinary consideration of the linguistic and the socio-cognitive dimensions has been elaborated on. Simultaneously, the link between discourse (as a mode of reflecting and disseminating social structures) and cognition (as mental processes and features: attitudes, beliefs, emotions, and aims) and society (as the system of socio-cultural and political structures: shared beliefs, perceptions, stereotypes, and prejudices about discourse and others) has been presented as the core of discursive social cognition. Besides, emphasis on both micro and macro types of context– to respectively account for subjective conceptions of interactional occurrences as appropriate mental models and socially shared knowledge and ideologies demonstrative of social categories–has been laid. From this perspective, the socio-psychological aspects of context, in effect, have been addressed pointing to the nature and processes underlying knowledge manipulation, re-production, and diffusion via discourse. I.e., the newly introduced orientation toward social context (social cognition) has been accentuated

Directly, the centrality of mind-located knowledge during socially communicative events borrowing from the domain of cognitive psychology has been provided room in our coverage; the crucial role of general knowledge in conducting social practices has been emphasized. Further, the complexities surrounding the type of knowledge interlocutors are supposed to have and their adaptation to its overall mechanism (knowledge of participants' strategy) in daily interactions have been presented putting the accent on its abstract nature and the ensuing intricacies relevant to information processing. In regard with this, principles relating to

making presuppositions of participants' grasp of what is being stated in interactions for successful interchange have been penetrated into. This comes under the scope of construing subjective context models (knowledge). Henceforth, attention has been placed on terms, such as background knowledge (BGK) or common ground knowledge alongside presuppositions forming integral parts of subjective context models pertaining to epistemic communities. Equally, both sources of knowledge acquisition and relevance have been gone through in due course. In accordance with such explanations, the concept of mental models has been viewed. Firstly, mental models as knowledge has been explored to vouch for the resort to schemata of mental perceptions stimulated by the brain and social representations (SRs) to cope with specific discursive occasions. This depends closely on true knowledge for inferring clues and validating it. Secondly, the notion of mental models as discourse has been followed on in order to point out the representative role of discourse (relating discourse to the events it represents). At this stage, recipients' reliance on common knowledge for deriving meaning out of discourse has been juxtaposed with subjective representations of interactional situations to centralize the role of mental models in the co-making of sense.

Ideology with its ubiquity across a vast range of areas has been introduced in our work. The multidisciplinary connections of the latter with many areas of research and the resulting complexity have been evoked, initially. After that, the discussion of ideology goes on; drawing on the most predominant conceptions, it has been defined as systems of ideas relevant to particular communities as platforms of social consensus. Moreover, it has been accounted for historically hinting to Marxist conception of it as imposed false consciousness intended to maintain the status quo of elites' dominance over the disenfranchised socially, economically, and politically. Society, furthermore, has been portrayed as the contending arena where hegemony is legitimated through ideologies; at the same time, non-prejudiced,

positive ideologies have been shown to exist in constant opposition to hegemonic ones being the source of social injustices. At this level, the critical approach to ideology to unravel cases of power abuse and social inequality has been taken into consideration. Ideology as the core social practices within the bounds of social communities as well as the encapsulation of their understandings of reality, likewise, has been examined.

Structures of discourse and structures power have been developed, then. In effect, the novel shift toward bridging the gap between discursive practices and societal power has been noted with the aim of unveiling the theorization about how power is enacted, performed, and encoded. Also, the survey of power by experts in a multitude of fields has been evoked taking account of it significance in analytically approaching discourse plus its role in determining inter-group relations. In the same section, control of discourse along its means of production and distribution has been concentrated on since this double mastery is very essential for the exercise of power and hegemony. As a result, the new approach to ideology as a form of discursive (symbolic) influence upon the thinking of social members with ideology being at the heart of discursive legitimization of prevalent power relations has been inserted in this section. In addition to the fact that ideology assumes various social cognitions (SCs) among social gatherings as an intricate frame work responsible for monitoring their operations (productions, implementations, or even rejections of specific types of beliefs and attitudes), prejudicial representations (SRs) of such SCs have been presented. In this register, ideologies as forms of common interests and goals, and their practical relevance to groups thinking modes via discursive acts have been discussed. Finally, the distribution of ideologies between

the short-term and long-term memories as sources of subjective (abstract and context-based) and shared (concrete and context-free) ideologies as assumed by Van Dijk has been highlighted.

The chapter closes with an overview of Van Dijk's approach to media discourse analysis. In fact, the move to analyzing media ideology-charged texts within their social and political contexts as well as the partiality emanating from the range of theoretical standpoints has been elaborated.   Specifically, Van Dijk's analytical paradigm relating to racism and discrimination disseminated through media discourse against ethnic minorities has been taken as a priority in this respect. Besides, the multi-disciplinary framework guiding his work has been pointed out since he resorts to socio-political and socio-cognitive perspectives; that is, his focus is placed, on one side, at discursive structures and, on the other, socio-cognitive and political structures as well as processes determining the connections between text and context. Simultaneously, it has been demonstrated that this framework of study does not stop at the macro level (societal and political dimensions of tackling discourse); instead, it introduces the local (micro) level. The latter covers interactional events in which racism is remarkably widespread through the discursive medium. Racism (ethnicism) as an ideology, actually, has been dealt with from a socio-cognitive angle showing how patterns of conceiving the world can determine how others are presented. Thus, exploring the structural components of mental representations underlying racism as a shared ideology has been followed on.

The third chapter covers two themes. The first one relates to a broad overview of new media theorizing looking back at major theories underlying the functioning as well as role of media. In this regard, Modernism in connection to old media has been looked into; the adoption of avant-garde thinking that had originally countered the popular mass culture

induced by industrialization constraints in approaching mass media has been emphasized. The Marxist tendency of the Frankfurt School thinkers to expose the media's role in enforcing mass culture and connecting it to Fordism in the US as a common mode of thinking has been accounted for, here. In fact, audiences depicted as being typically inert and vulnerable to the massive influences of media leading to complete uniformity at all levels has been discussed in parallel. Besides the Marxist School of Frankfurt's enlightening role in unveiling the dominating nature of mass media, Structuralism as a trend engaged in unraveling how humans' thought takes form under sociological, linguistic, and psychological sets of constraints has been added to our discussions for the same purpose. The methodological framework intended to uncover such imposing structures by means of applying the principles of semiotics in treating mass-culture signs has been indicated, at once. Specifically, the compelling work of de Saussure and pierce in linguistics considering any brand of text as embodying an encrypted "system of signs" to be objectively decoded as a particular sense has been equally referred to. This is due the fact that various mass culture media employ variant types of codes (signs) to encode enforced ideologies on passive audiences. The opportunity for them to free themselves from the constraining delimitations of mass media by endorsing a critical perspective in confronting their output has been captured, at this point.

Post-Modernism and its conception of new media have followed immediately. Here, the shift from the industrial to service economy marking the inception of a new age has been introduced and developed. Furthermore, the rising search of novel forms of consumption (consumer society) and the cultural transformations running counter to the earlier scepticism of Modernism toward mass media has been drawn interest in. In effect, McLuhan's notion of global village bringing citizens of the world together via digital media to participate in the discursive process of action/reaction has been put to the fore ("the medium is the message").

Moreover, the Use and Gratifications model (UGT) has been mentioned with much concentration on the motives and ways underlying media users' choice as well as use of the stated type of media. Media products being at hand for audiences to interpret and utilize in their daily lives grounding in socio-psychological factors leading to higher levels of gratification and encouraging large-scale interaction on socio-cultural bases have been pinpointed.

In association with theorizations demarcating from the inflexible one-way flow of media output, we have incorporated Hall's encoding /decoding framework to account for the active role of consumers in receiving media texts. Being a fellow member of the Centre for Cultural Studies, Hall's perception of its inception in the 1970s as a total split with the long established theorization of mass media particularly those of the 1950s and 1960s has been built on, initially. Indeed, Hall's theoretical construct revolving around broadening the scope of interest to cover the media audience implying his review of the relationship between the source of the media text and its recipient has been put at the centre of explicating this theoretical orientation. Similarly, the Marxist traces pervading Hall's work and personified by Althusser and Gramsci's thinking especially in terms of language-mediated hegemony determining power relations have been indicated. In this sense, New Marxists opposition to the American understanding of mass communications' texts as being transparent when it comes to meaning alongside their focus on the structural and ideological intricacies underlying their functions have been added some detail. Thus, Hall's complex encoding/decoding model in the course of mass media communication between the source and audiences on grounds of circuit, loop, and circulation have been further elaborated as the core of his theorizing. The latter is relevant to the process of producing output in the form of symbolic vehicles assuming a discursive quality (message encoded in the material vehicle). At this stage, the subjectively

commonsensical foundations presupposing adherence on the part of recipients leading to either parallel decoding, negotiated position, or even interpretations opposed to dominant ones have been treated as fundamentals making up Hall's overall enterprise.

Next, we have set out to go over the transition from the first to the second media age. The rapid rise of internet culture has been compared with the decline in the mainstream media culture; the information society replacement of the traditional media society has been given prominence amidst the unprecedented growth of information and communication technologies (ICTs). At the same time, the revolutionary, virtual interaction both at the individual and community levels in hyper reality has been given its share of coverage as social networking sites (SNSs) have emerged as the ideal sanctuary for humans to re-build their communities' social organization including interaction. Additionally, tracing the origins of social media historically has been undertaken. After that, the notion of Internetworking and its implications for the birth of virtual culture has been worked upon. In this sense, the classical community has been re-visited into virtual community where the turn toward virtual interaction and global communication, notably on social media platforms has been accessed and discussed at length. In this respect, virtual environments yielding facilities for users to achieve connectedness (participatory culture) by joining platforms for sociality has been pointed to. Lastly, political activism on social media worldwide has been searched into concentrating on the expediency of the virtual societies as the new locus for joint campaigning and e-democracy.

The second topic of the third chapter treats is the Brexit issue. In effect, its historical background from the 1970s to 2016 has been offered to shed light the long craving for splitting from Europe manifested by UK citizens and successive governments. The ultimate

Brexit polls revealing the popular decision to leave the EU and the due negotiations between the UK Government and the EU Council about the conditions and terms of withdrawal have been reviewed. The legal Launching of Article 50 to conduct the retreat of the UK from the EU officially has been mentioned briefly, too. Straight after, the political and constitutional turmoil that has swept the country, notably during Mrs. May's clash with Parliament over the ratification of her proposed draft withdrawal deal and its repeated rejections have been given some address. Then, passage of Mr. Boris Johnson's reviewed Withdrawal Agreement through Parliament and the European Parliament's consent to it have been added to our coverage pointing to the post-Brexit relations between the two sides. These include matters to do with immigrants' rights, economic and financial matters, alongside border issues. Last but not least, the due Brexit date has been identified after the agreement had been ratified by both parliaments. Finally, the negotiations about the post-Brexit commitments in terms of trade policies and deals have been gone across.

In the fourth chapter, the methodology of research this project adheres to as well as the analytical approach applied in the practical analyses of both pro-Brexiteers and EU-remainers' discourses have been advanced upon. On the one hand, the broadly methodological tools relied on have been specified and singled out (research design, research approach, units of analysis, and data collection tools–corpora, etc). On the other, the application of Van Dijk's theoretical framework in the course of analytically approaching both communities' discourses has been undertaken as the practical part of this work. At this stage, the respective discourses of both communities about Brexit have been dispatched and analyzed across two main periods: the first period (before January 31st, 2020), the second after the official Brexit (after the afore-mentioned date). Ultimately, a discussion of the

findings has been conducted; in it the significance of social cognition as a CDA approach to discourse as well as it applicability has been confirmed practically. In reality, discursive and socio-cultural structures are so inextricably connected that none of them can work independently. As such, common experiences of the world and others under ideological constraints not only constitute social communities' shared knowledge, but also shape and regulate their daily discourses in their variant genres. Simultaneously, discourse generally contributes to the dissemination of particular ideologies and attitudes to different groups and issues, which makes it an effective tool whereby power and dominance can be exercised on a large scale within society to subject the disenfranchised and maintain the actual status quo as well. Equally, resisting modes of thinking deploy discourse in their struggles to provoke socio-political change. All of this occurs under the purview of socio-cognitive processes managing discursive practices; this is what makes of Van Dijk's CDA theorizing multi-disciplinary and multi-layered. Finally, some suggestions for further research bring the chapter to a close. Here, encouraging fresh scopes to conduct CDA from a sociocognitive standpoint has been suggested as we believe that the extent of this perspective could be stretched subsequently to cover a variety of issues to do with the evolving world affairs.

Suggestions for further research

While going through the compartments of this practical work, we could relatively come up with some duly useful findings that we hope would benefit at once scholars, researchers, and, why not, teachers in the short or long run. Nonetheless, we firmly believe that whatever the results arrived at, there are certainly some lacunae. Henceforth, we recommend that further research into social cognition and discursive production/ reception across situational interactions online continues to cover other up-to-date issues and how these are perceived

depending on the prevalent relations of power and domination, knowledge and ideology, and resistance and subversion. For example, CDA-based projects could deal with how refugees escaping civil wars into mostly Eastern Europe are seen throughout Facebook or Twitter communities, or even blogs either activist-run or seemingly far-Right ones. Equally, the way such SNSs' groups construe the current Russo-Ukrainian armed conflict basing on the socio-cultural institutions governing their discursive constructions, mediations, as well as interpretations could prove nourishing.

References

Adam, R. G. (2020). *Brexit: causes and consequences* [Adobe digital version]. Retrieved from https://fr.b-ok.africa/s/Brexit%20causes%20and%20consequences

Ahmadvand, M. (in press). Critical discourse analysis: an introduction to major approaches. Retrieved from https://www.unisbank.ac.id/ojs/index.php/fbib1/article/view/382/pdf

Aini, N. and Widodo, P. (2018). Critical discourse analysis of the bombing attack news: and analysis of Teun A. Van Dijk's model. Advances in Social Sciences, Education and Humanities Research, 165, 226-230. http:// www.atlantis-press.com

Ambroise, B. (2010). From speech act theory to pragmatics. Advance online publication. https://halshs.archives-ouvertes.fr/halshs-00514810/file/From_speech_acts_theory_to_pragmatics_-_Bologna.pdf

A posteriori knowledge. (n.d.). In *Wikipedia*. Retrieved May 21 from https://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/A_priori_and_a_posteriori

Araujo, B. A. M. (2019). UK post-Brexit trade agreements and devolution [Adobe digital Editions version]. *Journal of Legal Studies*, 39, 4, 1-24. https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/legal-studies/article/abs/uk-postbrexit-trade-agreements-and-devolution/C02F580D1D712FE781F529803C09034D

Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to do things with words* [Adobe digital Editions version]. Retrieved from https://fr.b-ok.africa/book/783490/7ad547

Baker, P. and Ellece, S. (2011). *Key terms in discourse analysis*. London: Continuum International Publishing Group

Barker, C. and Galasinki, D. (2001). Cultural studies and discourse analysis [Adobe digital Editions version]. Retrieved from https://fr.b-ok.africa/book/966541/6ec401

Baugh, J. (2011). Power, social diversity, and language. In R. Mesthrine (Eds.) *The handbook of sociolinguistics* [Adobe digital Editions version]. Retrieved from https://booksc.org

Bernstein, B. (1971/2003). *Class, codes, and control: volume 1 theoretical studies towards sociology of language* [Adobe digital Editions version]. Retrieved from https://fr.b-ok.africa/s/?q=Class%2C+codes%2C+and+control%3A+volume+1+theoretical+stud

Bezemzer, J. and Bloommaert, J. (2013). Gunther Kress. In W. Blackwell (Eds), *Ecyclopedia of applied linguistics*. https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Jan-Blommaert/publication/313440578_Kress_Gunther/links/5b8e43a892851c6b7ebb2de3/Kress-Gunther.pdf

Blakemore, D. (1992). *Understanding utterances: an introduction to pragmatics* [Adobe digital Editions version]. Retrieved from https://fr.b-ok.africa/book/2222756/49620c?dsource=recommend

Brown, G. and Yule, G. (1983). Discourse analysis [Adobe digital Editions version]. Retrieved from https://fr.b-ok.africa/book/960103/c95bc2

Bodker, H. (2016). Stuart Hall's encoding/decoding model and the circulation of journalism in the digital landscape. Journal of critical studies in media communication, 33, 5, 409-423. https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/15295036.2016.1227862

Bollmer, G. (2016). *Inhuman networks : social media and the archeology of connection* [Adobe digital Editions version]. Retrieved from https://fr.b-ok.africa/book/2738945/3211e8

Buckingham, D. (2008). Youth, identity, and digital media [Adobe digital Editions version]. Retrieved from https://fr.b-ok.africa/s/?q=Youth%2C+identity%2C+and+digital+media

Brexit. (n.d.). In *Wikipedia*. Retrieved May 22nd, 2021, from https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/2016_United_Kingdom_European_Union_membership_referendum

Brexit withdrawl agreement. (n.d.). In *Wikipedia*. Retrieved January 25th, 2021, from https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Brexit_withdrawal_agreement

Chambers, J. K. (1997). *Sociolinguistic theory*. Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishers Inc

Carvalho, A. (2000). Discourse analysis and media texts: a critical reading of analytical tools. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/288984827_Discourse_analysis_and_media_texts_a_critical_reading_of_analytical_tools

Cavanagh, M. F. (2019). What is social media? In R. Luttrell (Eds.) *Social media how to engage, share, and connect* [Adobe digital Editions version]. Retrieved from https://fr.b-ok.africa/s/?q=Social+media+how+to+%09engage%2C+share%2C+and+connect

Chandler, D. (2017). *Semiotics: the basics* [Adobe digital Editions version]. Retrieved from https://fr.b-ok.africa/s/?q=Semiotics%3A+the+basics+

Chomsky, N. (2013). *Power systems: conversations with David Barsamian on global democratic uprisings and the new challenges to US Empire*. London: Aviva Chomsky and David Barsamian.

Chovanec, J. and Dynel, nM. (2015). Researching interactional forms and participant structures in public and social media. In M. Dynel and J Chovanec (Eds.) *Participation in public and social media interactions (PP.* 1-23) [Adobe digital Editions version]. Retrieved from https://fr.b-ok.africa/s/Participation%20in%20public%20and%20social%20media%20interactions

Cole, N.L. (2019). The Frankfurt School of critical theory. www.thoughtco.com/frankfurt-school-3026079#:~:text=The%20Frankfurt%20School%20was%20a,Erich%20Fromm%2C%20and%20Herbert%20Marcuse.

Condor, S. and Antaki, C. (1997). Social cognition and discourse. In T. A. Van Dijk (Eds.). *Discourse studies: a multidisciplinary introduction volume 1* (PP.320-347) [Adobe digital Editions version]. Retrieved from https://fr.b-ok.africa/s/?q=Discourse+studies%3A+a+multidisciplinary+introduction+volume+1+Van+Dijk

Cooper, J. Kelly, K.A., and Weaver, K. (2001). Attitudes, Norms, and Social Groups. In M. A. Hogg and R. S. Tindale (Eds.) *Blackwell handbook of social psychology: group processes (PP. 259-282)* [Adobe digital Editions version]. Retrieved from https://fr.b-ok.africa/s/?q=Blackwell+handbook+of+social+psychology%3A+group+%09processes

Craig, P. (2017). The process : Brexit and the anatomy of Article 50. In F. Babrini (Eds). *The laws and politics of Brexit* (PP.49-69) [Adobe digital Editions version]. Retrieved from Retrieved from https://fr.b-ok.africa/s/the%20Politics%20of%20Brexit

Creeber, G. (2009). Digital theory: theorizing new media. In G. Creebre and R. Martin (Eds.) *Digital cultures* (PP. 11-22) [Adobe digital Editions version]. Retrieved from https://fr.b-ok.africa/s/Digital%20cultures%20

Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* [Adobe digital Editions version]. Retrieved from https://fr.b-ok.africa/s/?q=Research+design%3A+qualitative%2C+quantitative%2C+and+mixed+methods+%09approaches

Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* [Adobe digital Editions version]. Retrieved from https://fr.b-ok.africa/s/?q=Research+design%3A+qualitative%2C+quantitative%2C+and+mixed+methods+%09approaches

Cutting, J. (2002). *Pragmatics and discourse: a resource book for students* [Adobe digital Editions version]. Retrieved from https://fr.b-ok.africa/s/?q=Pragmatics+and+discourse%3A+a+resource+book+for+students+

Danesi, M. (2009). *Dictionary of media and commnications*. New York: M. E. Sharpe, Inc.

Davis, H. (2004). *Understanding Stuart Hall* [Adobe digital Editions version]. Retrieved from https://fr.b-ok.africa/s/Understanding%20Stuart%20Hall%20

De Beaugrande, R. A. and Dressler, W. (2002). *Introduction to text linguistics* [Adobe digital Editions version]. Retrieved from https://fr.b-ok.africa/s/Introduction%20to%20text%20linguistics%20 (Originalwork published 1981)

Drew, P. and Curl, T. (2008). *Conversation analysis: overview and new directions.* In *K. Vijay, K., K. Bhatia, J. Flowerdew, and R. H.* Jones (Eds.) Advances in discourse studies Oxon: Routledge

Dunt, I. (2017). *Brexit: what the hell happens now*? [Adobe digital Editions version]. Retrieved from https://fr.b-ok.africa/s/?q=Brexit%3A+what+the+hell+happens+now%3F+

Eagleton, T. (1991). Ideology: an introduction [Adobe digital Editions version]. Retrieved from https://fr.b-ok.africa/book/851401/17cad6

Facebook. (n.d.). In *Wikipedia*. Retrieved October 22nd, 2021, from https://fr.wikipedia.org/wiki/Facebook#:~:text=%C2%AB%20trombinoscope%20%C2%BB%20en%20anglais)%20est,sur%20une%20vari%C3%A9t%C3%A9%20d'appareils.

Facebook. (n.d.). In *Britannica*. Retrieved July 11th, 2022, from https://www.britannica.com/topic/Facebook

Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and power* [Adobe digital Editions version]. Retrieved from https://fr.b-ok.africa/book/905882/0a183c

Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis: the critical study of language* [Adobe digital Editions version]. Retrieved from https://fr.b-ok.africa/s/?q=Critical+discourse+analysis%3A+the+critical+study+of+language+

Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis: the critical study of language* [Adobe digital Editions version]. Retrieved from https://fr.b-ok.africa/s/?q=Critical+discourse+analysis%3A+the+critical+study+of+language+

Fetzer, A. and Aijmer, K. (2008). Pragmatic and discourse-analytic approaches to present-day English. Journal of pragmatics, 90, 9, 1497-1502. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2008.04.013

Flick, A. (2013). The Sage book of qualitative data analysis. Retrieved from https://www.ewi-psy-berlin.de

Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/ knowledge selected interviews and other writings 1972-1977* (C. Gordon, l. Marshall, J. Mepham, & K. Soper, trans.) (Original work published 1977) [Adobe digital Editions version]. Retrieved from https://fr.b-ok.africa/book/960617/9b1a7c

Fowler, R. (1991). *Language in the news: discourse and ideology in the press*. [Adobe digital Editions version]. Retrieved from https://fr.b-ok.africa/s/?q=Language+in+the+news%3A+discourse+and+ideology+in+the+press

Gee, J. P., (2005). Introduction to discourse analysis: theory and method [Adobe digital Editions version]. Retrieved from https://fr.b-ok.africa/s/?q=Introduction+to+discourse+analysis%3A+theory+and+method+

Gerbaudo, P. (2012). *Tweets and the streets: social media and contemporary activism.* [Adobe digital Editions version]. Retrieved from https://fr.b-ok.africa/s/?q=Tweets+and+the+streets%3A+social+media+and+contemporary+activesm.%09

Gibbs, G. [Graham R Gibbs] (2015). Discursive psychology [video file]. Retrieved from
    https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=F5rEy1lbvlw&t=1764s

Glencross, A. (2016). *Why the UK voted for Brexit: David Cameron's great
    miscalculation* [Adobe digital Editions version]. Retrieved from https://fr.b-
    ok.africa/s/?q=Why+the+UK+voted+for+Brexit%3A+David+Cameron%E2%80%99s
    +great+%09miscalculation

Glezakos, N. and Lazakidou, A. (2012). Organizational design of online communities. In N.
    Glenakos and A. Lazakidou (Eds), *Virtual communities, social networks and
    collaboration* (PP. 61-73). [Adobe digital Editions version]. Retrieved from
    https://fr.b-
    ok.africa/s/?q=Virtual+communities%2C+social+networks+and+%09collaboration

Graesser, A. C., Morton, A., Gernsbacher, A., and Goldman, R. (1997). Cognition. In T. A.
     Van Dijk (Eds.) *Discourse studies: a multidisciplinary introduction volume 1* (PP.
    292- 319) [Adobe digital Editions version]. Retrieved from https://fr.b-
    ok.africa/s/?q=Discourse+studies%3A+a+multidisciplinary+introduction+volume+1+

Gruzd, A., Wellman, B., and Takhteyev, Y Imagining Twitter as an Imagined Community.
    Journal of American Behavioral Scientist, Volume 55 issue 10, 1294-1318.
    https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0002764211409378

Hall, S. (1980). Cultural studies and the centre: some problematic and problems. In S. Hall, D.
    Hobson, A. Lowe, and P. Willis (Eds.) *Culture, media, language* (PP. 2-36) [Adobe
    digital Editions version]. Retrieved from https://fr.b-
    ok.africa/s/?q=Culture%2C+media%2C+language+by+Stuart+Hall

Halliday, M.A.K. (1978). *Language as social semiotic: the social interpretation of language
    and meaning* [Adobe digital Editions version]. Retrieved from https://booksc.org

Halliday, M.A.K and Hasan, R. (1989). *Language, text, and context* [Adobe digital Editions
    version]. Retrieved from https://fr.b-
    ok.africa/s/?q=Language+as+social+semiotic%3A+the+social+interpretation+of+lang
    uage+%09and+meaning

Halliday, M. A. K. (2003). A brief sketch of syntactic grammar. In J. Webster (Eds) on
    language and linguistics (PP. 180-184) [Adobe digital Editions version]. Retrieved
    from https://fr.b-ok.africa/book/1063569/57320a

Halliday, M. A. K. (2014). Halliday's Introduction to Functional Grammar. Kmutt Journal of
    Language Education, V17, 1, 72-74 retrieved from https://sola.kmutt.ac.th/sola/wp-
    content/uploads/2010/06/V-17-1_Feb-2014_for-website.pdf#page=7

Hamidreza, H., M. (2011). Standards of Textuality: Rendering English and Persian Texts
    Based on a Textual Model. *Journal of Universal Language*, 12, 1, PP. 47-74.
    http://dx.doi.org/10.22425/jul.2011.12.1.47

Hart,C. and Rymes, B. (2012). Analyzing political discourse toward a cognitive approach.
    Critical Discourse Studies, Vo.2 189-201.
    https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/17405900500283706

Hartly, J. (2018). Pushing back: social media as an evolutionary phenomenon. In J. Burgess, A. Marwick, and T. Poell (Eds.) *The Sage handbook of social media* (PP. 13-35) [Adobe digital Editions version]. Retrieved from https://fr.b-ok.africa/s/The%20Sage%20handbook%20of%20social%20media%20

Hasan, R. (2004). Analysing discursive variation. In L. Young and C. Harrison (Eds). *Systemic Functional Grammar* (PP. 15-53) [Adobe digital Editions version]. Retrieved from https://fr.b-ok.africa/book/857679/9addba

Hills, M. (2009). Participatory culture: mobility, interactivity and identity. In Creeber, G. and R. Martin (Eds.) *Digital cultures: understanding new media* (PP. 117-121) [Adobe digital Editions version]. Retrieved from https://fr.b-ok.africa/book/1000402/1a677b

Holmes, D. (2005). *Communication theory: media, technology, society* [Adobe digital Editions version]. Retrieved from https://fr.b-ok.africa/book/834479/855376

Hutchins, J. (In press). From text linguistics to a human linguistics of texts: the scientific paper as a case study. Retrieved from http://citeseerx.st.psu.edu. Pdf

Hunt, A. and Wheeler, B. (2017). "Brexit: all you need to know about the UK leaving the EU". Retrieved from https://samantha145.wordpress.com/2017/11/02/wheeler-alex-hunt-brian-brexit-all-you-need-to-know-about-the-uk-leaving-the-eu-bbc-news-bbc-26-oct-2017-www-bbc-comnewsuk- politics-32810887/

Hymes, D. (1977). *Foundations in sociolinguistics: an ethnographic approach* [Adobe digital Editions version]. Retrieved from https://fr.b-ok.africa/book/5287215/b50464

Hymes, D. (1996). Ethnography, linguistics, narrative inequality: toward an understanding of voice [Adobe digital Editions version]. Retrieved from https://fr.b-ok.africa/book/882672/478ee6

Ibrahim Shousha, A. (2010). A critical discourse analysis of the image of the Arabs in the American press (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from https://awej.org/images/Theseanddissertation/AmalIbrahimShousha/amal%20ibrahim%20shousha%20full%20thesis.pdf

Isaby, J. (2020). The Brexit story as told by Brexit Central. https://l.facebook.com/l.php?u=https%3A%2F%2Ftwitter.com%2FBrexitCentral%2Fstatus%2F1223675633777172488%3Ft%3Dyqs2HHWyjdy2Sub2R-dBBw%26s%3D07%26fbclid%3DIwAR1NoyN5ohzwTwRcKf1yGQUbg00zxAV91Q227NZrqH0lt wBS4EbywYKfkTY&h=AT1Y6Px3DiaaMZYPO_znDkAykLd7LsXjQGplsefKwRZa 9ARuESXG43okT8   mGZor7jNRSB-fiqN4sU3d9LwdnMYFVeYKOEaKcIsn-Xu7bj3-CDtiTZm-1siHw6uyS_CBSCPx7

Jenkins, H. (2006). *Convergence culture: where old and new media collide* [Adobe digital Editions version]. Retrieved from https://fr.b-ok.africa/book/926171/723a8a

Jessop, B. (2017). From Karl Marx to Antonio Gramsci and Louis Althusser. In R. Wodak and B. Forchtner (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of language and politics* (PP. 30-42)

[Adobe digital Editions version]. Retrieved from https://b-ok.africa/s/the%20routledge%20handbook%20of%20language%20and%20politics

Johnson, S. and Milani, T. M. (2010). Critical intersections: language ideologies and media discourse. In T. M. Milani and S. Johnson (Eds.), *language ideologies and media discourse: texts, practices, politics* [Adobe digital Editions version]. Retrieved from https://booksc.org

Jones, R. H. and Hafner, C. A. (2012). *Understanding digital literacies: a practical introduction*. Oxon: Routledge

Jones, S. and Stephnie, K. (2001). Computers, the Internet, and virtual cultures. In J. Lull (Eds.), Culture in the communication age (PP. 212-225) [Adobe digital Editions version]. Retrieved from https://booksc.org

Junco, R. and Chickering, A. W. (2010). Civil Discourse in the Age of social media. *About Campus*, 4, 12–18. https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1002/abc.20030

Kaboub, F. (2008). Positivist paradigm http://personal.denison.edu/~kaboubf/Pub/2008-Positivist-Paradigm

Korpijaako, M. L. (2015). Cracking Facebook [Adobe digital Editions version]. Retrieved from https://booksc.org

Langlotz, A. (2015). *Creating social orientation through language* [Adobe digital Editions version]. Retrieved from https://booksc.org

Lawrance, W. (2014). Social research methods: qualitative and quantitative approaches [Adobe digital Editions version]. Retrieved from https://booksc.org

Lee, D. Y. W. (2008). Corpora and discourse analysis. In V. K. Bhatia, J. Flowerdew, and R. H. Jones (Eds.), *Advances in discourse studies* (PP. 86-99). Oxon: Routledge

Leigh, C. and Galsworthy, M. (2016). EU Referendum comment: Brexit or not? *New Scientist*, 230, 3076, 18-19. https://doi/10.1016/SO262-4079(16)30994-0

Lihong, S. (2012). Context and text. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 2, 12, PP.26 63-2669. http://dx.doi.org/10.4304/tpls.2.12.2663-2669

Linde, C. (1997). Discourse analysis, structuralism, and the description of social practice. In G. R. Guy, C. Feaging, D. Schiffrin, and J. Baugh (Eds.), *Towards a social science of language* (PP.3-31). Volume 2 social interaction and discourse structures [Adobe digital Editions version]. Retrieved from https://fr.b-ok.africa/book/1243485/878100

Lindgren, S. (2017). *Digital media and society* [Adobe digital Editions version]. Retrieved from https://booksc.org

Lin, C. C. (2004). Communicative competence (Dell Hymes) abstact retrieved from web page Dell Hymes's page (http://www.virginia.edu/~anthro/dhymes.html

Locher, M. A. and Graham S. L. (2010). Introduction to interpersonal pragmatics. In M. A. Locher and S. L. Graham (Eds.), *Interpersonal pragmatics* (PP. 1-13). https://edoc.unibas.ch/14703/1/20131011100933_5257b23d7e0d6.pdf

Mathiessen, C. M.I.M., Lam, M., and Teruya, K. (2010). *Key terms in Systemic Functional Grammar* [Adobe digital Editions version]. Retrieved from https://booksc.org

Mautner, G. (2019). Brexit and discourse studies; reflections and outlook. In V. Koller, S. Kopf, M. Miglbauer (Eds.) *Discourses of Brexit* (PP. 237- 240) [Adobe digital Editions version]. Retrieved from https://fr.b-ok.africa/s/Discourses%20of%20Brexit%20

Mazid, B. M. (2014). *CDA and PDA made simple: language, ideology and power in politics and media*. New Castle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing [Adobe digital Editions version]. Retrieved from https://booksc.org

Mayr, A. (2000*). Language as means of social control and resistance: discourse analysis in prison setting* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from http:// theses.gla.ac.uk

McLuhan, M. (1963). *Understanding media: the extensions of man* [Adobe digital Editions version]. Retrieved from https://fr.b-ok.africa/book/11071037/3fbc74

McKinlay, A. and McVittie, C. (2008). *Social psychology and discourse* [Adobe digital Editions version]. Retrieved from https://fr.b-ok.africa/book/694133/cb26c9

Mesthrine, R. (2011). Introduction: the sociolinguistic enterprise. In R. Mesthrine (Eds.) *The handbook of sociolinguistics* [Adobe digital Editions version]. Retrieved from https://booksc.org

Meyerhoff, M., Schleef, E., and MacKenzie, L. (2015). *Doing sociolinguistics: a practical guide to data collection and analysis.* Oxon: Routledge

Mills, S. (2003). *Michel Foucault* [Adobe digital Editions version]. Retrieved from https://booksc.org

Mills, S. (2004). *Discourse* [Adobe digital Editions version]. Retrieved from https://booksc.org

Mooney, A. and Evans, B. (2015). *Language, society & power*. Oxon: Routledge.

Morley, D. (1988). *Family Television: cultural power and domestic leisure* [Adobe digital Editions version]. Retrieved from https://fr.b-ok.africa/book/935185/212195

Morris, M. (2016). *Knowledge and ideology: the epistemology of social and political critique* [Adobe digital Editions version]. Retrieved from https://booksc.org

Morville, P. (2019, April4). Brexit: très difficile sortie d'une crise anglo-européenne. Le quotidien d'Oran. https://www.elwatan.com/edition-du-jour/edition-du-04-04-2019-04-04-2019

Nickerson, C. (2022). Understanding Critical Theory. Simply Psychology. www.simplypsychology.org/critical-theory.html

Potter, J. and Margaret, W. (1987). *Discourse and Social psychology beyond attitudes and behaviour* [Adobe digital Editions version]. Retrieved from https://booksc.org

Potter, J. (1998). Discursive social psychology: from attitudes to evaluative practices. European Review of Social Psychology, 9, 1, 233-266. https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/14792779843000090

Potter, J. [Dominik Lukěs]. (2008, July10th-12th). *Discourse and cognition* [video file]. Retrieved from https://youtube.com/watch?v=jChg4PQvfjA&features=share

Presenter, Elsharkawy, A. E. (2017, 4-6 October). What is critical discourse analysis (CDA). Paper presented at the Second Literary Linguistics Conference, Jo hannes Gutenberg-Universität Mainz). Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/311713796_What_is_Critical_Discourse_An alysis_CDA

Pressman, J. (2014). *Digital modernism: making it new in new media* [Adobe digital Editions version]. Retrieved from https://booksc.org

Priatmoko, F. X. N., A. (2013). *Critical discourse analysis of Susilo Bambang Yudhoyno's* [*master's* thesis]. Retrieved from https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/35371958.pdf

Rhoten, E. S. (2006). Cultural diversity and the digital divide. In S. Dasgupta (Eds.) *Encylopedia of communities and technologies* (PP. 87-94). Retrieved from https://fr.b-ok.africa/s/encyclopedia%20of%20communities%20and%20technologies

Romero, L. D. (2014). On the web and contemporary social movements. In P. Bogdan and M. Monica (Eds.) *Social media in politics: case studies on the political power of social media (PP. 19-33)* [Adobe digital Editions version]. Retrieved from https://booksc.org

Rutter, J. and Owen J. (2018). *Autumn surprises: possible scenarios for the next phase of the Brexit. Retrieved from* effective Institute for the Government Website https://www.instituteforgovernment.org.uk/publications/possible-scenarios-next-phase-brexit

Sacerdoti, G. (2017). The prospects : the UK trade regime with the EU and the World. Options and constraints post-Brexit. In F. Babrini (Eds). *The laws and politics of Brexit* (PP.71-91) [Adobe digital Editions version]. Retrieved from Retrieved from https://booksc.org

Seargeant, F. and Tagg, C. (2014). The language of social media: identity and community on the internet [Adobe digital Editions version]. Retrieved from https://booksc.org

Searle, G. R. (2002). Speech acts, mind, and social reality. In G. Grewendorf and G. Meggle (Eds.) *Speech acts, mind, and social reality* (PP. 3-16) [Adobe digital Editions version]. Retrieved from https://booksc.org

Silver, D. (2006). Where is internet studies? In D. Silver and A. Manssanari (Eds.) *Critical cyber culture studies* (PP. 1-17) [Adobe digital Editions version]. Retrieved from https://fr.b-ok.africa/s/?q=Critical+%09cyber+culture+studies+by+david+silver

Sinclair, J. and Coulthard, M. (1992). Towards an analysis of discourse. In M. Coulthard (Eds.) *Advances in spoken discourse analysis* (PP.1-34). London: Routledge.

Taylor, G. (2017). *Understanding Brexit: why Britain voted to leave the European Union* [Adobe digital Editions version]. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1108/9781787146785

Text linguistics. (n.d.). In *Wikepedia*. Retrieved October 23rd-27th 2018 from https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Text_linguistics

Theresa May. (n.d.). In *Wikipedia*. Retrieved January 2nd-3rd, 2021, from https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Theresa_May#

The uses and gratifications theory. (n.d.). In *Wikepedia*. Retrieved September 15th , 2020 from https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Uses_and_gratifications_theory#:~:text=Uses%20and%20gratif 0gratif ications%20theory%20(UGT,media%20to%20satisfy%20specific%20needs.&text=Ra ther%2C %20the%20audience%20has%20power,media%20into%20their%20own%20lives.

Tindale, S. Meisenhelder, H. M., Dykema-Engblade, A. D., and Hogg, M. A. (2001). Shared cognition in small groups. In M. A. Hogg and R. S. Tindale (Eds.) *Blackwell handbook of social psychology: group processes* (PP. 1-30) [Adobe digital Editions version]. Retrieved from https://booksc.org

Tischer, S., Meyer, M., Wodak, R., and Vetter, E. (2000). *Methods of text and discourse analysis* [Adobe digital Editions version]. Retrieved from https://booksc.org

Truggil, P. (2000). *Sociolinguistics: an introduction to language and society* [Adobe digital Editions version]. Retrieved from https://booksc.org

Twitter. (n.d.). In *Wikipedia*. Retrieved July 11th, 2021 from https://www.google.com/search?q=twitter+wikipedia&sxsrf=ALiCzsZf78fzuXx3uN_ wHIXUQNYX7rsjgg%3A1657537653906&ei=dQTMYtryNtq8xc8P- Z2akA8&oq=&gs_lcp=Cgdnd3Mtd2l6EAEYAjIHCCMQ6gIQJzIHCCMQ6gIQJzIHC CMQ6gIQJzIHCCMQ6gIQJzIHCCMQ6gIQJzIHCCMQ6gIQJzINCC4QxwEQowIQ6 gIQJzI HCCMQ6gIQJzINCC4QxwEQ0QMQ6gIQJzIHCC4Q6gIQJ0oECEEYAEoECEYYA FAAWABgqqkCaAFwAXgAgAEAiAEAkgEAmAEAoAEBsAEKwAEB&sclient=g ws-wiz

University of Twente. (2010). Hypodermic needle theory. Retrieved from https://www.utwwente.nl/cw/theorieenoverzicht/theory%20clusters/Mass%Media/HypodermicRMIC Needle Theory/

Urban, G. (1981).Untitled. *American Anthropologist*, 83, 3, 659-661. [Peer commentary on the paper "Language as social semiotic: the social interpretation of language and meaning," by M.AK. Halliday]. Retrieved from https://www.jstor.org/stable/676785

Vanderveken, D. (2001). *Universal grammar and speech act theory* [Adobe digital Editions version]. Retrieved from https://booksc.org

Van Dijck, J. (2013). *The culture of connectivity: a critical history of social media* [Adobe digital Editions version]. Retrieved from https://booksc.org

Van Dijk, T. A. (1989). Structures of discourse and of power. Advance Online Publication. http://www.discourses.org/OldArticles/Structures%20of%20discourse%20and%20structures%20of%20power.pdf

Van Dijk, T. A. (1990). Issues in functional discourse analysis. Advance Online Publication http://www.discourses.org/OldArticles/Issues%20in%20Functional%20Discourse%20Analysis.pdf

Van Dijk, T. A. (1991). *Racism and the press* [Adobe digital Editions version]. Retrieved from https://booksc.org

Van Dijk, T. A. (1993). Principles of critical discourse analysis. *Discourse & Society*, 2, 249–283. https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0957926593004002006

Van Dijk, T.A. (1993). *Elite discourse and racism* [Adobe digital Editions version]. Retrieved from https://fr.b-ok.africa/book/2544852f

Van Dijk, T. A. (2000). *Ideology: a multidisciplinary approach*. London: SAGE publications Ltd

Van Dijk, T. A. (2003). Ideology and discourse: a multidisciplinary introduction. Retrieved from http://www.discourses.org/UnpublishedArticles/Ideology%20and%20discourse.pdf

Van Dijk, I. (2006). The network society [Adobe digital Editions version]. Retrieved from https://booksc.org

Van Dijk, T. A. (2008). *Discourse and power* [Adobe digital Editions version]. Retrieved from https://booksc.org

Van Dijk, T. A. (2008). [Dominik Lukes]. (May27th, 2014). Discourse, communication, and knowledge [video file]. https://youtube.com/watch?v=303vOQ3EhN8&feature=share

Van Dijk, T. A. (2009). *Society and discourse: how social contexts influence text and talk* [Adobe digital Editions version]. Retrieved from https://booksc.org

Van Dijk, T. A. (2012). [Hrant DinkVakfi]. (December4th, 2012). Discriminatory discourse and the role of the media 2 [video file]. Retrieved from https://youtu.be/TdypIWHa20c https://youtube.com/watch?v=303vOQ3EhN8&feature=share

Van Dijk, T. A. (2014). *Discourse and knowledge: a sociocognitive approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Van Dijk, T. A. (2014). [Chris Hart]. Some issues in epistemic discourse analysis. Retrieved from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=gvo1gOnF3Us&t=1259s

Van Dijk, T. A. (2016). Critical discourse analysis. In D. Tannen, H. E. Hamilton, D. Schiffrin (Eds.) *The handbook of discourse analysis* (PP. 466-485) [Adobe digital Editions version]. Retrieved from https://www.bookzz.ren/s/The%20handbook%20of%20discourse%20analysis%20

Waller, S. (2015). Cohesion is still not coherence, so what is? *Teaching in China,* 6, 31-35. Retrieved from https://www.xjtlu.edu.cn/assets/files/publications/etic/issue-6/6_10_waller_2105.pdf

Wardhaugh, R. and Fuller, J. M. (2015). *An introduction to sociolinguistics* [Adobe digital Editions version]. Retrieved from https://booksc.org

Wayne, M. (2003). Marxism and media studies: key concepts and contemporary trends [Adobe digital Editions version]. Retrieved from https://booksc.org

Widdowson, H., G. (2004). *Text, context, pretext* [Adobe digital Editions version]. Retrieved from https://booksc.org

Wodak, R. (2001). What CDA is about- a summary of its history, important concepts, and its developments. In R. Wodak and M. Meyer (Eds), *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (PP. 1-13). https://booksc.org

Wodak, R. and Busch, B. (2004). Approaches to media texts. Advance online publication. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/292805354_Approaches_to_media_texts#:~:text=According%20to%20Wodak%20and%20Busch,localization%22%20of%20meaning%20(p.

Wodak, R. (2006). Mediation between discourse ad and society: assessing cognitive approaches in CDA. Discourse Studies. 1, 179–190 https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/1461445606059566

Wodak, R. (2007). Pragmatics ad critical discourse analysis: a cross-disciplinary inquiry. Journal of pragmatics and cognition 15, 1, p. 203-225. https://doi.org/10.1075/pc.15.1.13wod

Wodak, R. and Krzyzanowski, M. (2008). Qualitative discourse analysis in the social sciences [Adobe digital Editions version]. Retrieved from https://booksc.org

Wollaeger, M. (2006). Modernism, media, and propaganda: British narrative from 1900 to 1945 [Adobe digital Editions version]. Retrieved from s://fr.b-

ok.africa/s/?q=Modernism%2C+media%2C+and+propaganda%3A+British+narrative
+from+1900+to+%091945

Yuran, D. (2014). Information abundance. In K. Harvey (Eds), *Encycolpedia of social media
and politics* (PP.679-680).

جمعان, أ. , د. بن عبد الكريم. (2016). من تحليل الخطاب الى تحليل الخطاب النقدي: مناهج ونظريات. عمان: دار كنوز
المعرفة للنشر والتوزيع

عبيدي, م. (2016). التحليل النقدي للخطاب: نماذج من الخطاب الاعلامي. عمان دار كنوز المعرفة للنشر والتوزيع

Appendix A

Brexit Central (Twitter)

"The EU Withdrawal Bill is essential to ensuring the smoothest possible Brexit.
But tonight 243 Labor MPs voted to try and block it–putting politics above the
national interest".

Appendix B

Brexit Central (Facebook)

"Withdrawal Agreement Bill clears final commons hurdle as MPs give it a Third Reading with a 99 majority"

"Boris Johnson's Withdrawal Agreement Bill passes its final stages in the commons".

Appendix C

Leave Means Leave (Twitter)

"We can no longer trust the government to deliver the results of the referendum. It is time for all those who voted to leave to speak out and make their voice heard". The second declaration follows "we must not allow the Remainers to betray the people".

Appendix D

Change Britain (Twitter)

"It's wrong of Mandelson to insult leave supporters as "nationalists" who "hate foreigners". We don't hate foreigners–what we don't like is our money being wasted, our laws being out of our control, and our trade being restricted by EU politicians like him".

Change Britain

Appendix E

East London for Europe/London East Anti-Brexit (Facebook)

"We've received this from "European by choice". They're a collective of

activists who firmly believe in going beyond the politics and boundaries of

Europe and celebrating its diversity! Standing for European ideals, but more

fundamentally standing for people reaching out and connecting with each other

irrespective of their religious and political views. In the light of Brexit, some

Europeans came together to create a farewell video for the Brits and we want

them to know that they will never walk alone. We want this message of

solidarity to reach as many of our European friends as possible."

Appendix F

Anti-Brexit Bristol Activists (Facebook)

"We formed in late May 2018 and have a wealth of experience of campaigning in the Remain movement. Our goal is to engage as many people as possible in direct action to stop Brexit. Our first event will be in collaboration with Swindon for Europe as part of the 'Remain at Festivals Campaign'-handing out crowdfunded Bollocks to Brexit stickers and asking festival goers to write a postcard to their MPs. We'll be dressing up as our namesake too. We can't wait!"

Appendix G

East London for Europe/London East Anti-Brexit

"If you fail to quarantine or lie on a quarantine form, you can now get up to 10 years in prison. If you lie to a country, mislead your citizens as an MP, nothing, no legal repercussions at all. This has to stop! Agree? Sign this petition".

Appendix H

The Very Brexit Problems Club (Facebook)

" A strange thought bothers me…did all these Tory brexiteers suppose Miss Thatcher was stupid or blind when she brilliantly managed to (struggle) to get the best pace (indeed) at the higher rank in the European Community? And how could they believe clowns as Farage and Johnson would be smarter?!!!? Or worstly naïve, defenders of?!!!"

Appendix I

The Very Brexit Problems Club (Facebook)

"No matter which way we all voted in the last General Eection and 2016 Referendum-I think it's fair to say that only a stupid person can't see that Johnson hasn't delivered the Brexit he promised, hasn't handled the pandemic ver well, broken several promises he made in his manifesto and now he is teling a bunch of lies to cover it all up."

Appendix J

Leave Means Leave on (Facebook)

"A points-based immigration system is fairer, less discriminatory and more in the interest of the British people than the EU immigration system. Let's invest in our own UK workforce, welcome the best & brightest from around the world and maintain full control of our borders."

Appendix K

Brexit Central on (Facebook)

"The UK finally leaves the EU after 47 years sparking, euphoric scenes as Boris

Johnson pledges to unleash UK's full potential."

Appendix L

Change Britain (Twitter)

"There is no mandate for a second referendum or a Brexit blocking Parliament. Labour MPs were elected on promises to deliver Brexit. They should stop making up excuses, vote for an election and face the voters with their new position".

Appendix M

Leave Means Leave (Twitter)

"Everyday @theresa_may stays in office = a year in the political wilderness for the @Conservatives. Why do her colleagues not see it, when everyone else in the country does? The fault now lies with the people keeping her here".

Appendix N

Change Britain (Facebook)

"They promised they would honour our votes. They promised it was a once-in-a-generation decision. They promised we could leave the EU. It's time that Remain politicians live up to their promises to voters and stop trying to block Brexit"

Appendix O

Leave Means Leave (Facebook)

The government and both major parties promised to leave the EU, the single market and the Customs Union. All of the options being presented, including PM's Withdrawal Agreement, lead to this commitment being overturned and a Brexit Betrayal. Leaving without a deal is now by far the best option. This would free us to make our own laws, free us from paying money and lower the cost of living by removing tariffs. Combined with making trade deals and taking back farming and fisheries our economy will boost as a result. It is time to leave with No Deal and deliver the will of the people. John Longworth, chairman of Leave Means Leave"

Appendix P

The very Brexit Problems Club (Facebook)

"Many British people who voted for the UK to leave the EU now regret their vote and feel they have been lied to about everything. If you also feel the same, just remember who it was that peddled all the lies? It was Boris Johnson And The Conservative Party, They Swindled All Of Us-Learn from Your Mistakes and Don't Ever Trust Them Again"

Brexit between EU-Remainers and Pro-Brexiteers' Communities

Résumé

Ce projet de recherche traite de la manière dont le Brexit est perçu au Royaume-Uni à la fois par les partisans pro-Brexit et les partisans de l'Union Européenne (UE) via le discours. Ce qui resurgit, c'est la polémique discursive en ligne. En fait, les communautés virtuelles sont devenues une caractéristique intrinsèque de cette ère numérique. Avec l'essor rapide des SNSs dans le monde, une nouvelle forme de représentation des connaissances partagées sur le monde et de détermination des relations de pouvoir et de domination entre les communautés en ligne a retenu l'attention dans une myriade de disciplines, notamment l'Analyse de Discours (A D). Dans cette étude, nous nous sommes lancés dans le but même d'appliquer la théorie de la cognition sociale (SC) orientée vers la CDA de Van Dijk en abordant de manière analytique les discours respectifs de certains Pro-Brexiteers sélectionnés aux côtés des communautés des restants dans l'UE sur Facebook et Twitter. Nous nous référons à des termes théoriques tels que discours, cognition, cognition sociale, représentations sociales (SRs), structures de pouvoir, idéologie et domination ; nous les déployons également dans le processus analytique. Les résultats ont révélé que le discours des communautés pro-Brexiteers est dominant sur les deux plates-formes, leurs implications idéologiques ayant des effets concrets dans la mesure où le Royaume-Uni est poussé vers un Brexit complet. Au même temps, les restants dans l'UE résistent discursivement et essayent de faire entendre sur la scène nationale leurs schémas communs d'idéologies favorables à l'UE. Ainsi, pouvoir et domination/lutte et résistance/statu quo/subversion sont à l'œuvre sur l'espace virtuel.

Mots clés : cognition sociale, discours, communautés pro-Brexiteers et EU-remainers, Facebook et Twitter.

Brexit between EU-Remainers and Pro-Brexiteers' Communities

ملخص

يتعامل هذا المشروع البحثي مع الطريقة التي يُنظر بها إلى خروج بريطانيا من الاتحاد الأوروبي (بريكسيت) في المملكة المتحدة من قبل مؤيده و كذلك أنصار البقاء ضمن الاتحاد الاوروبي عبر الخطاب. ما يبرز من جديد هو الجدل الخطابي على الإنترنت. في الواقع ، أصبحت المجتمعات الافتراضية سمة متأصلة في هذا العصر الرقمي. مع الارتفاع السريع لوسائل التواصل الاجتماعي (SNSs) في جميع أنحاء العالم ، أدى الشكل الجديد لتمثيل المعرفة المشتركة حول العالم وتحديد علاقات القوة والهيمنة بين مجتمعات الإنترنت إلى جذب الانتباه عبر عدد لا يحصى من التخصصات ، ولا سيما تحليل الخطاب. في هذه الدراسة، انطلقنا بهدف تطبيق نظرية فان دايك (Van Dijk) الموجهة نحو تحليل الخطاب النقدي (CDA) للإدراك الاجتماعي (Social Cognition) في الاقتراب التحليلي من الخطابات ذات الصلة لبعض المؤيدين لخروج بريطانيا من الاتحاد الأوروبي جنبًا إلى جنب مع مجتمعات الاتحاد الأوروبي على كل من Facebook و Twitter. نشير إلى المصطلحات النظرية مثل الخطاب، والإدراك، والإدراك الاجتماعي، والتصورات الاجتماعية (social representations)، وهياكل السلطة، والأيديولوجيا، والهيمنة؛ و نستخدمها في العملية التحليلية أيضًا. كشفت النتائج أن خطاب المجتمعات المؤيدة لخروج بريطانيا من الاتحاد الأوروبي هو المسيطر على كلا المنصتين مع آثارها الأيديولوجية التي لها آثار ملموسة في دفع المملكة المتحدة نحو خروج بريطانيا من الاتحاد الأوروبي بالكامل. في نفس الوقت، يقاوم الموالون للاتحاد الأوروبي بشكل استرادي محاولين جعل مخططاتهم المشتركة للأيديولوجيات المواتية للاتحاد الأوروبي مسموعة على الساحة الوطنية. وهكذا، فإن القوة والسيطرة / النضال والمقاومة / الوضع الراهن / التغيير تعمل على الفضاء الافتراضي.

الكلمات الرئيسية: الإدراك الاجتماعي ، والخطاب ،ومجتمعات أنصار البريكست وكذا المساندون للبقاء ضمن الاتحاد الأوروبي ، وفيسبوك ، وتويتر.