English Education Journal

SOCIOCULTURAL RELATIONS AMONG PARTICIPANTS IN ARTICLES ON TEACHER AS RESEARCHER AND TEACHER AS EDUCATOR

Ika Miranti✉Januarius Mujiyanto

English Language Education Postgraduate Program Universitas Negeri Semarang, Indonesia.

Article Info	Abstract
	This thesis is about sociocultural relations among participants in articles on teacher as researcher and teacher as educator. The aim of this research is explaining the sociocultural power in the opposing texts which are realized in the linguistic choices used by both authors. I choose this study because there is different role of teacher in two texts that brings out contrasting opinions about the importance of teachers becoming researchers. In this study, I used critical discourse analysis proposed by Fairclough (2001) both as research methodology and framework of the study. The findings show that sociocultural relations are realized in the lexical, grammatical and textual structures relations. From the lexical relation, both authors have different choice of words for assigning participants in the texts as well as their choices in rewording, formality, euphemism and the negative and positive evaluation. Next, from the grammatical relation, it can be seen from the tenses, the use of process types, ideological pronoun and the logical connectors. From the textual structures relation, both texts are argumentative ones and the authors use elements to persuade the readers to agree or disagree to the idea of teacher as researcher. Last, the sociocultural relation among the participants can be seen from the comparison of the types of process and participants used in both texts which show authors' different sociocultural backgrounds that influence their standpoints. It can be concluded that linguistic choices are indeed influenced by the sociocultural backgrounds of both authors. The text on teacher as researcher was written by an Indonesian lecturer who believes that a good quality teacher is a teacher who conducts research and publishes papers in order to develop their global competence. On the other hand, the text on teacher as educator was written by an American graduate of Harvard who believes that a good quality teacher is a teacher whose first concern is on students learning, not on research. Thus, different sociocultural backgrounds of both authors resulted in the opposing ideologies and those ideologies are realized in the linguistic choices throughout the texts.

© 2016 Universitas Negeri Semarang |

✉Correspondence:
E-mail: ikamiranti@gmail.com
Kampus UNNES Bendan Ngisor, Semarang, 50233

INTRODUCTION

In expressing opinions, people can have different views towards the same matter. For example, different views on the dual roles of a teacher. Before conducting this study, I was not really aware about the dual roles of a teacher. I thought teachers are merely teachers. The reality is nowadays teachers in Indonesia are expected to be researchers as well to develop their global competence. However, there might be people who do not agree to the dual roles of a teacher. These people prefer teachers as merely educators who focus on students learning rather than conducting research. These contrasting opinions on the dual roles of a teacher can be caused by different social and cultural backgrounds.

One of the pros and one of the cons can be seen from two opposing articles which are used as objects of this study. The first one is pro to the idea of teacher as researcher and the second one is con to the idea of teacher as researcher. The second article also emphasizes the role of teacher as educator who imparts knowledge to students and focuses on giving the lessons according to the time schedule as well as pays attention and builds communication/interaction with the students. In this study, I used Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) that suggests three stages of analysis (Fairclough, 2001). Three stages are description, interpretation, and explanation of the text. Description is the stage which is concerned with formal properties of the text. Interpretation is concerned with the relationship between text and interaction. Whereas explanation of the text is concerned with the relationship between interaction and social context.

I also had a thought on whether a teacher should be a researcher so that they can develop their global competence or merely an educator whose first concern is on students learning. The topic of the study is the use of education articles on a newspaper to exercise power in social discourse. I chose the articles on teacher as researcher and teacher as educator because I want to see the relation between sociocultural backgrounds and the linguistic choices used in the opposing articles about the dual roles of a

teacher. It is hoped that the findings in both articles using critical discourse analysis will be able to prove that linguistic choices produced by the writers of the articles realize their sociocultural backgrounds which influence the opposing ideologies in both texts.

Critical Discourse Analysis

CDA is a theory and method of analyzing the way that individuals and institutions use language. It focuses on relations between discourse, power, dominance and social inequality and how discourse (re)produces and maintains these relations of dominance and inequality (van Dijk, 1993:249). Hence, CDA does not only focus on linguistic aspects of the text but also focuses more on social issues which construct the text.

Fairclough asserts the relationship between language and power. Power and dominance can be seen in the area of media, where there always exists the dominant or ruling groups. From Fairclough's perspective, language serves to construct particular positions, which entail unequal relations of power. In other words, it can be said that language has function in the construction of power and ideology.

Sociocultural Relation

According to van Dijk (1996), social relation is defined as social power between groups or institutions, involving the control by a (more) powerful group or institution (and its members) of the actions and the minds of a less powerful group (and its members). Such power generally presupposes privileged access to socially valued resources, such as force, wealth, income, knowledge, or status. Social relation means that there is social power exercised by groups of people or institutions regarding social factors such as educational, political, familial, religious, and economic factors. Whereas for the cultural relation, it means that there is cultural power exercised by groups of people or institutions regarding cultural factors such as values, attitudes, norms, beliefs which are shared by those groups of people. Socially and culturally there are unequal relations which are

caused by common sense, or in other word, ideology. Fairclough (2001) states that ideology sustains power inequalities. That means there are inequalities in sociocultural relations due to the different ideologies of the authors. Therefore, a CDA proposed by Fairclough is the most appropriate tool to explain these inequalities in sociocultural relations. One of Fairclough's tools in CDA is the system of transitivity to show the hidden inequalities in sociocultural relations.

Transitivity

Transitivity is a system which realizes the ideational meanings. Here, the clause as representation is talked about. There are three semantic categories which explain how phenomena of the real world are represented as linguistic structures. They are 'processes' which are verbs, 'participants' which are nouns and 'circumstances' which are prepositional phrase. According to Mayr (2008:18-20), the reason in conducting the analysis of transitivity is to explore what social, cultural, ideological factors determine what process type (verb) is chosen in a particular type of discourse. Relations of power may implicitly exist in the relationship between actor and goal. Processes can be active, for example: 'Police (actor) shot demonstrators (goal)', or passive, for example: 'Demonstrators (goal) were shot by police (actor)'.

From the examples above, in media reports, agency and responsibility can be made clear or left vague. Such as, in news report of riot, if the agency is omitted, it means that responsibility of police may be systematically omitted. Thus makes news not a mere reflection of reality, but a product shaped by political, economic and cultural forces.

In this system of transitivity identified by Halliday in Gerot and Wignell's *Making Sense of Functional Grammar* (1994), there are seven types of process, which are divided into non-relational processes and relational processes. Non-relational processes are ones of doing. They are material, mental, behavioural, and verbal processes. Whereas relational processes are ones of being and having. They are relational, existential, and meteorological processes.

METHODOLOGY

The data are qualitative because they are displayed in the form of strings of words. It depends on how I analyze the data. I chose CDA because this is the most appropriate design to explain the relation between linguistic choice and ideology. CDA addresses social and cultural contexts that influence ideology behind the text. Therefore, it does not only focus on the linguistic aspects of the text but also focuses more on the social and cultural issues which construct the text. This study is aimed at explaining the sociocultural relations among the participants in two opposing articles in The Jakarta Post regarding teacher as researcher and teacher as educator. Fairclough's framework for CDA was used in this study.

The object of the study is two opposing articles on The Jakarta Post. The first article is "Professionalizing Teachers in Face of Global Competitiveness" written by Setiono Sugiharto and published on November 25, 2015. This first article concerns about teacher as researcher. Whereas the second one is "Professionalization of the Teaching Profession" written by Rebekah Nivala and published on December 9, 2015. This second article concerns about teacher as educator.

The unit of analysis is what I analyzed for this study. In this research, the unit of analysis is clauses in the opposing articles in The Jakarta Post in which the participants exist. To determine the participants, I used Halliday's theory on transitivity (in Gerot and Wignell, 1994) which is the realization of ideational meaning. Whereas for the analysis of relation (power), in which those participants construct sociocultural relations, I used the CDA framework proposed by Fairclough (2001).

The steps used in collecting the data of the study are as follows. First, I searched for articles regarding issues in education in Indonesia, then I chose a topic where there are pros and cons about whether a teacher should also be a researcher. Next, I chose opposing articles on teacher as researcher and teacher as educator

and reading both opposing articles which have been chosen thoroughly. Last, I conducted transitivity analysis to identify the participants in both articles.

After the data were collected, they were analyzed. The steps used in analyzing the data are as follows: First, I classified the linguistic data which are of lexical (rhetoric), grammatical, and textual structures relations based on Fairclough's first stage in CDA which is the description of the text (Fairclough, 2001). Next, I reduced the linguistic data as needed in order to have representative data which were used in the second and third stage of CDA. Then, I interpreted the clauses based on Fairclough's second stage in CDA which is the interpretation of the text (Fairclough, 2001). In this stage, I did the interpretation on lexical, grammatical and textual structures relations. The next step is investigating the sociocultural relations based on Fairclough's third stage in CDA (Fairclough, 2001). In this stage, I did the explanation on sociocultural context on why the texts are made that way by the authors. The last step is I drew an inference.

In this study, I used the triangulation of theory/perspective. In this type of triangulation, I used some theoretical perspectives to examine and interpret the data and I referred back to the theories of conducting CDA. Those theoretical perspectives are: critical discourse analysis by Fairclough (2001), systemic functional linguistics, especially the system of transitivity by Halliday in Gerot and Wignell (1994), a genre description of the argumentative text by Hyland (1990) and the theory on the influence of ideology on interpersonal meaning by Haig (2011). Therefore, corroborating the findings in this study with their perspectives and theories ensured that an account is rich and comprehensive.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

I found that the contrasting ideologies of both authors regarding the idea of teacher as researcher influence their linguistic choice throughout the texts. There are four relations realized in the linguistic choice that show authors' ideologies. First, rhetoric (lexical) relations among the participants in the opposing articles can be seen from the vocabulary or lexical choices used by the authors. Second, the grammatical relations among the participants in the opposing articles can be seen from the grammatical features used by the authors. Third, the textual structures relations among the participants in the opposing articles can be seen from the elements that exist in the genre of both texts. Both texts are argumentative ones because they are made to persuade the readers to agree or disagree to the idea of teacher as researcher.

Last, the sociocultural relations among the participants in the opposing articles can be seen from the comparison of the types of process and participants used in both texts which show authors' different social and cultural background that influence their standpoint of supporting or being against the idea of teacher as researcher.

Lexical Relation

The lexical relation refers to the power seen from the vocabulary or lexical choice. According to Fairclough (2001), vocabulary/words have three values. They are experiential, relational and expressive values. In experiential values, the power in lexical choice can be seen from the classification scheme drawn upon through the vocabulary. In both texts, there are word choices which are found to be ideological and those experiential values can also be seen in rewording.

For the rewording, the text on teacher as researcher (TAR) is much preoccupied with teachers' global competence, and this is evident in the vocabulary or lexical choice for this meaning, such as: performance, competence, research, teachers, development, and professional. Whereas for the text on teacher as educator (TAE), it is much preoccupied with education problems in Indonesia, and this is

evident in the vocabulary or lexical choice for this meaning, such as: Indonesia, education, students, and solution. As in TAR, some participants which bring out the ideological standpoint of the author are for example: the idea of teacher-researchers, global competitiveness and job markets, the rapidly changing information and contexts of pedagogy, teachers' professional development and competence, theory-practice gap, an ever-changing and increasingly competitive environment. On the other hand, in TAE, some participants which bring out the ideological standpoint of the author are for example: the idea of being a teacher, support systems for teachers, the long-term investment, the primary function of K-12 education, and response to this dismal situation.

The author of TAR gives his evaluation more by using positive lexical choice to persuade the readers to take a stand to his point of view, which is the idea of teacher as researcher. Whereas the author of TAE gives her evaluation more by using negative lexical choice to persuade the readers to take a stand to her point of view, which is against the idea of teacher as researcher due to many problems found in the education system in Indonesia.

Grammatical Relation

The grammatical relation refers to the power seen from the grammatical features. According to Fairclough (2001), grammatical features also have three values. They are experiential, relational and expressive values. In experiential values, the power can be seen from types of process and participant that predominate. For the types of process dominating the text, it can be seen from the participant list in TAR that the most processes are Material processes. Whereas in TAE, the processes mostly are Relational processes.

In relational values, it is seen from the modes of sentence which are used, whether they are declarative, grammatical question, or imperative. There are also important features of modality and the use of pronouns. Both texts mostly use declarative modes. From the point of

modality, the author of TAR expresses his judgment through his text. He ideologically conveys his message that teachers are expected for many aspects and that they need to develop their performance so that they can compete globally. That can only be done by persuading teachers to become researchers as well. From this explanation, it shows that the modality indicates the speaker's judgment of the probabilities or the obligations involved in what he or she is saying (Gerot & Wignell, 1994).

On the contrary, the author of TAE ideologically conveys her message that Indonesian government should provide good support systems for teachers to produce good quality student learning. The author of TAE implicitly persuades readers to not easily agree on the idea of teacher as researcher by looking at problems in Indonesian education system and how to solve them. From this explanation, it is obvious that modality shows relational values and as Fairclough (2001:127) states it, implicit power relations make relational modality as matter of ideological interest.

In TAR, the pronoun 'they' and 'their' are used to refer to refer to teachers. Whereas in TAE there are three pronouns which are used. They are 'I', 'their', and 'you'. 'I' is used when stating opposing opinion regarding the idea of teacher as researcher; 'you' is used when asking a question to the readers, and 'their' is used to refer to teachers.

From the use of logical connectors, the author of TAR places equal emphasis on every point made by using coordination. This makes the idea of teacher as researcher clear and consistent. Whereas by using subordination, the author of TAR ideologically divides information into relatively prominent and relatively backgrounded (in other words, relatively important and relatively unimportant) parts. Fairclough also states that in some cases, the content of subordinate clauses is presupposed. Therefore, it can be said that the subordinate clauses in TAR may be the author's presupposition. For example, pedagogical competence is the content in the main clause, which is followed by author's presupposition in

the subordinate clause telling the readers that this competence is something that a teacher must possess.

In TAE, the author also places equal emphasis on every point made when using coordination. On the other hand, by using subordination, it shows author's presupposition and she ideologically conveys her opinion against the idea of teacher as research through the use of subordination. For example, a teaching position is the content in the main clause, which is followed by author's presupposition in the subordinate clause telling the readers that this position is something that is often met with contempt in the society.

Textual Structures Relation

Textual structures relation refers to textual structures power or in Fairclough's term, it is the power seen from the textual structures. According to Fairclough (2001), it can be seen from the larger-scale structures that the text has. Both texts are argumentative texts because they have purpose to persuade the readers of the correctness of central statement (Hyland, 1990).

Sample 75 (TAR, Sentence 6):

Stage   Move
Thesis   Evaluation:

Motivated by this global competence, one thing is pretty obvious: the pendulum seems to have swung away from an emphasis on teaching to that of research.

Sample 76 (TAE, Sentence 7):

Stage   Move
Thesis   Evaluation:

In general, teachers are not expected to research and publish as part of their occupation.

TAR clearly states the emphasis on research rather than teaching, whereas TAE argues that teachers are not expected to research and publish. Such elements in the structure of both argumentative texts show the relation or ideological common sense exercised by the authors of the texts through their language in persuading the readers. It is expected of them to take a stand after reading the texts, whether they will agree on the idea of teacher as researcher or will be against it. As Fairclough (2001:138)

states it, such structures can impose higher levels of routine on social practice in a way which ideologically sets and closes agendas.

Sociocultural Relation

Social and cultural relations are relations of power and they have an ineluctably ideological dimension (Haig, 2011). The sociocultural relation can be seen from the comparison of the use of process types which involve the participants in the texts. This comparison shows the difference of social and cultural background that influences both authors in writing their texts.

From the comparison of the material process used, both authors convey their message differently to the readers. The author of TAR tells readers what teachers are expected to do to develop their global competence. By becoming researchers, they can help schools solve problems in teaching and learning and bridge the theory-practice gap. On the other hand, the author of TAE tells readers what Indonesia should do in order to solve problems in education system in Indonesia. Indonesia is assigned as Actor which exercises its power to solve problems by providing adequate support systems for teachers so that they can teach well.

From the comparison of the mental process used, both authors convey their message differently to the readers. For TAR, the Phenomenon in the examples are: global competence and teachers. They have the power to impinge on the consciousness of another participant. This ideologically tells the readers about how important the global competence and teachers are expected to be researcher as well. On the other hand, the author of TAE use the word suffering to express her opinion regarding the problems in the profession of teaching which should be taken care by the government.

From the comparison of the behavioural process used, the author of TAR tells readers that by doing research, efficient pedagogical practices will happen. On the other hand, the author of TAE asks the readers to realize the Phenomenon, which is the fact that research is

actually lacking in Indonesia because of inadequate support systems for teachers.

In verbal process, the assignment of teachers as Sayer in the example of TAR puts teachers in a powerful position because Sayer exercises their power to act semiotically (Haig, 2011). Ideologically, this power can be achieved when teachers do research and publish papers. This persuades readers to agree to the idea of teacher as researcher. On the other hand, the verbal process used in TAE puts students learning as the Sayer. This means that students learning exercise power to act semiotically. In this case, students learning should inform what and how teachers teach. Ideologically, this persuades readers to agree with the idea of teacher as educator.

The relational process in TAR is used to assign what teachers should possess for global competence and research is something to do to achieve such global competence. This persuades readers to support the idea of teacher as researcher. On the other hand, TAE assigns teaching industry branding in Indonesia as ineffective. This relational process is used to tell about the problems in education system in Indonesia. In addition, the assignment of student learning as the end goal of all institutions of education identifies the importance of successful student learning. Ideologically, this persuades readers to support the idea of teacher as educator.

From the comparison of the existential process used, both authors convey their message differently to the readers. In TAR, the existence of increasing demands for global competence is asserted. There is no power assigned to it but it can be used to tell readers that there is existence of some entity and that readers need to realize that. Ideologically, this persuades readers to support the idea of teacher as researcher. On the other hand, TAE tells the readers the existence of several claims in TAR regarding the idea of teacher as researcher which may mislead or confuse. Ideologically, this persuades readers to support the idea of teacher as educator.

The sociocultural background of both authors is different. This leads to the differences in the way they convey their message to the readers through their texts. The author of TAR is Setiono Sugiharto, an Indonesian lecturer and researcher. He believes that conducting research and publishing papers are what teachers in Indonesia should do to develop their competence. He believes that in order to produce successful learning and teaching process, teachers need to be classroom researchers as well. By also publishing papers, he believes that it will develop teachers' performance in global competence because teachers can then communicate across cultures and languages through their researches and papers. Setiono's sociocultural background influences his language in the text which persuades the idea of teacher as researcher.

The author of TAE is Rebekah Nivala, an American graduate of the Harvard Graduate School of Education. She believes that adequate support system is what is needed by the teachers in Indonesia in order to produce successful students learning. Her sociocultural background influences her language in the text which is against the idea of teacher as researcher. She believes that teachers should be good educators who concern more on students learning.

CONCLUSION

The comparative critical discourse analysis of TAR and TAE clearly shows the opposing ideology of the authors which is realized in the lexical relation, grammatical relation, textual structures relation, and sociocultural relation.

First, the lexical relations among the participants in the opposing articles can be seen from the vocabulary or lexical choices used by the authors. They are: the choice of words for assigning participants in the texts, rewording, euphemism, formality, and the negative and positive evaluation of the authors which are expressed in their lexical choices.

Second, the grammatical relations among the participants in the opposing articles can be seen from the grammatical features used by the authors. They are: the dominating process types

used in the opposing texts, modes of sentence, the use of modal verbs, pronouns such as 'I', 'they' or 'you', types of tenses used, and the logical connectors which are realized in coordination and subordination.

Third, the textual structures relations among the participants in the opposing articles can be seen from the elements that exist in the genre of both texts. Both texts are argumentative ones because they are made to persuade the readers to agree or disagree to the idea of teacher as researcher.

Last, the sociocultural relations among the participants in the opposing articles can be seen from the comparison of the types of process and participants used in both texts which show authors' different social and cultural backgrounds that influence their standpoint of supporting or being against the idea of teacher as researcher.

Fairclough's CDA framework is a useful tool for identifying the sociocultural differences of both texts studied in this thesis. The two representations of teacher are shown differently and completely opposed to each other. TAR persuades the readers to agree to the idea of teacher as researcher in order to develop their performance in global competence. On the other hand, TAE is opposed to TAR, by being against the idea of teacher as researcher. It persuades the readers to disagree to that idea by arguing against points made in TAR.

These differences in representation of teacher are the products of contrasting ideologies of both authors: teacher as researcher versus teacher as educator. Furthermore, the ideologies are the products of sociocultural differences of both authors. This leads to the differences in the way they convey their message to the readers through their texts.

The author of TAR is Setiono Sugiharto. His sociocultural background as a lecturer and researcher influences his language in the text which persuades the idea of teacher as researcher as a way to develop performance in global competence. Whereas the author of TAE is Rebekah Nivala. Her sociocultural background in civil rights, social action, human rights, and education influences her language in the text which is against the idea of teacher as researcher. She believes that teachers should be provided with adequate support system and to be good educators who concern more on students learning.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

REFERENCES

Al-Faki, I. M. 2014.Political Speeches of Some African Leaders from Linguistic Perspective.*International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 4 (3), 180-198.

Almeciga, E. 2013. Identity-Forming Discourse: A Critical Discourse Analysis on Policy Making Processes Concerning English Language Teaching in Colombia. *PROFILE*, 15 (1), 45-60.

Anwar M., Ullah R., Ahmad N., Ali M. 2015. Critical Discourse Analysis of Quaid-e-Azam Muhammad Ali Jinnah's Speech in the First Constituent Assembly of Pakistan.*Asian Studies: A Research Journal of South Asian Studies*, 30 (1), 159-173.

Appel, J. 1995.*Diary of a Language Teacher*. Oxford: Heinemann English Language Teaching.

Bayram, F. 2010. Ideology and Political Discourse: A Critical Discourse Analysis of Erdogan's Political Speech. *ARECLS* 7, 23-40.

Cochran-Smith, M. & Lytle, S.L. 1999. The Teacher ResearchMovement: A Decade Later. *Educational Researcher*, 28 (7), 15-25.

Coulthard, M., Moon, R., Johnson, A., Caldas-Coulthard, C. M. & Holland, B. 2000.*Written Discourse*. Birmingham: The University of Birmingham.

Del Vecchio, M. 2015. A Study in Critical Discourse Analysis: The Prince and "the missus". *Studies in International Relations*, 36 (1), 53-65.

DeNeen, J. 2013. 25 Things Successful Educators Do Differently. Retrieved from *http://www.opencolleges.edu.au/informed/features/25-things-successful-educators-do-differently*.

Denzin, N. K. 1978. *The Research Act: A Theoretical Introduction to Sociological Methods*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Fairclough, N. 1995a.*Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language*. New York: Longman.

Fairclough, N. 1995b.*Media Discourse*. London: Edward Arnold.

Fairclough, N &Wodak, R. 1997.Critical Discourse Analysis. In T.A. van Dijk (ed.). *Discourse as Social Interaction*. London: Sage.

Fairclough, N. 2001.*Language and Power*. London: Longman.

Gee, J. P. 2005. *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis: Theory and Method (2ⁿᵈed.).* New York: Routledge.

Gerot, L &Wignell, P. 1994. *Making Sense of Functional Grammar*. Sydney: GerdStabler.

Gill, S. K., Keong, Y.C., Bolte, S., Ramiah, S. 2012. Ideological Features of Vocabulary in News Reports of Malaysia's Medium of Instruction Change.*GEMA Online Journal of Language Studies*, 12 (3), 765-787.

Haig, E. 2010.The Influence of Ideology on Aspects of Interpersonal Meaning in a Radio News Bulletin about Youth Crime. 名古屋大学大学院国際言語文化研究科2, 61-86.

Haig, E. 2011.A Critical Discourse Analysis and Systemic Functional Linguistics Approach to Measuring Participant Power in a Radio News Bulletin about Youth Crime.*Studies in Media and Society* 4, 45-73.

Haig, E. 2013.Ideological Aspects of Cohesive Conjunction in a Radio News Bulletin about Youth Crime.名古屋大学大学院国際言語文化研究科 5, 69-87.

Halliday, M. A. K &Hasan, R. 1976.*Cohesion in English*. New York: Longman.

Hoey, M. 2001.*Textual Interaction - An Introduction to Written Discourse Analysis*. New York: Routledge

Horvath, J. 2009. Critical Discourse Analysis of Obama's Political Discourse. In M. Ferencik and J. Horvath (ed.). *Language, Literature and Culture in a Changing Transatlantic World, International Conference Proceedings*.Presov: University of Presov, 45-56.

Huckin, T. N. 1997. Critical Discourse Analysis. In T. Miller (ed.). *Functional Approaches to Written Text: Classroom Applications*. Washington D. C.: United States Information Agency, 78-92.

Hyland, K. 1990. A Genre Description of the Argumentative Essay.*RELC Journal,* 21 (1), 66-78.

Javed, S &Mahmood, R. 2011.A Critical Discourse Analysis of the News Headlines of Budget of Pakistan.*Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business*, 3 (5), 120-129.

Jie, Z. 2006. Construction of China's National Identity in an Australian Travel Brochure: A Critical Discourse Analysis Perspective. *Canadian Social Science*, 2 (1), 47-53.

Loughran, J., Mitchell, I., Mitchell, J. 2002. *Learning from Teacher Research*. New South Wales: Allen &Unwin.

Mayr, A. 2008.*Language and Power: An Introduction to Institutional Discourse*. London: Continuum International Publishing Group.

Mercer, N. 2004. Sociocultural Discourse Analysis: Analysing Classroom Talk as a Social Mode of Thinking. *Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 1 (2), 137-168.

Merriam, S. B. 2002. *Qualitative Research and Case Study Application in Education*. San Fransisco: Jossey-Bass.

Mocini, R. 2005. The Verbal Discouse of Tourist Brochures.*AnnalSS* 5, 153-164.

Nawaz, S., Bilal, H. A., Kalsoom, M., Fayyaz, Z., Nayyar, H. 2013.Media Discourse and Their Implicit Ideologies.*Asian Journal of Social Sciences & Humanities*, 2 (2), 328-337.

Ng'ambi, D. 2008. A Critical Discourse Analysis of Students' Anonymous Online Postings.*International Journal of Information and Communication Technology Education*, 4 (3). Hershey, Pennsylvania: IGI Publishing.

O'Keeffe, A. 2006.*Investigating Media Discourse*. London: Routledge.

Olowe, J. 1993. *Language and Ideology in Nigerian Newspapers in the English Medium*.An Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, ObafemiAwolowo University Ile-Ife.

Perveen, A. 2015.Critical Discourse Analysis of Moderated Discussion Board of Virtual University of Pakistan.*Open Praxis*, 7 (3), 243-262.

Phakdeephasook, S. 2009. Discourse of Femininity in Advertisements in Thai Health and Beauty Magazines.*MANUSYA: Journal of Humanities Regular*, 12 (2), 63-89.

Polito, R. 2011. Language and Power in Blogging: A Critical Discourse Analysis. *International Conference on Humanities, Society and Culture IPEDR 20*. Singapore: IACSIT Press.

Qiu, J. 2013. A Critical Study of English Eco-hotel Profiles. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 3 (10), 1879-1886.

Richardson, J. E. 2007. *Analysing Newspapers: An Approach from Critical Discourse Analysis*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Stenhouse, L. 1975. *An Introduction to Curriculum Research and Development*. London: Heinemann.

Stubbs, M. 1983. *Discourse Analysis: The Sociolinguistic Analysis of Natural Language*.

Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Tahir, M. 2013. A Critical Discourse Analysis of Religious Othering of Muslims in the Washington Post.*Middle-East Journal of Scientific Research*, 14 (6), 744-753.

Tahmasbi, S &Kalkhajeh, S. G. 2013. Critical Discourse Analysis: Iranian Banks Advertisements. *Asian Economic and Financial Review*, 3 (1), 124-145.

Vahid, H. 2012. Advertisement Discourse in Focus.*International Journal of Linguistics*, 4 (4), 36-51.

vanDijk, T.A. 1993. *Elite Discourse and Racism*. London: Sage.

vanDijk, T.A. 1995. Discourse, Power and Access. In C.R. Caldas-Coulthard& M. Coulthard (ed.). *Texts and Practices: Readings in Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Routledge.

vanDijk, T.A. 1996. Power and the News Media. In D.L. Paletz (ed.). *Political Communication in Action: States, Institutions, Movements, Audiences*. New York: Hampton Press.

vanDijk, T.A. 1998. *Ideology: A Multidisciplinary Approach*. London: Sage.

Wenden, A. 2005. The Politics of Representation: A Critical Discourse Analysis of an Aljazeera Special Report. *International Journal of Peace Studies*, 10 (2), 89-112.

White, P. 1997. Death, Disruption and the Moral Order: the Narrative Impulse in Mass-Media "Hard News" Reporting. In F. Christie & J.R. Martin (ed.). *Genre and Institutions*.London:Cassell.

Wodak, R. 1999. *The Discursive Construction of National Identity*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Wodak, R. & Meyer, M. 2001.*Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Sage Publications.