

Literature Review

Fairclough 3 Dimensional Model of Discourse

Discourse means how individuals identify and relate to spoken and written communications. Talking about discourse in terms of analysis and semantics, this is the generalized conversation. Placing our argument on in the arena of social practice and inquiry, it is a language that has been codified to investigate a particular subject (Marks, Larry June 2001), i.e. religious discourse, medical discourse, and legal discourse, etc. According to Micheal Foucault, a French Philosopher, it means to have statements that talk about a particular idea. It facilitates a language intending to represent knowledge about a specific subject matter at one specific historical event and discuss how Fairclough came up with the three-dimensional models of discourse.

He came up with three aspects of the model, mainly discussing the critical analysis of any text. The three main dimensions are the socio-historical conditions processes and how they are governed, the study of the object (containing visual texts, verbal or visual, verbal) and how the thing is produced and received, and its processes. The relationship between contexts, interactions, and texts in Fairclough's three-dimensional model, which we will expound, includes the following. The explanation is based on how commerce and social context share a relationship, with the social determinants of production and interpretation processes, and their social effects (Fairclough, 2015). Formal properties of the text are mainly catered for by the description of the stage. On the other hand, interaction and text relationship are concerned with interpretation.

The critical analysis of discourse is clearly defined as the study of speech that deals with social practice on an interdisciplinary level (Wodak, Chilton 2005). Researchers who work with CDA usually argue that linguistic and social approach complement each other and are mainly focused on finding out how relations based on societal power are formed and established through

language use (Fairclough, Norman 2013). We realize that discourse analysis carries on issues of exploitation, manipulation, structural inequities, and contradictions in areas such as politics, media and education. This methodology allows assessment to be carried out successfully when language is needed to explain and describe. Due to the development of the methodology, there is an increase of terms that are reflective and influence the critical discourse analysis.

Representation and CDA Studies

Over the past two decades, CDA has been known as an arena of academic-based activity where students and scholars from different fields come together. It also analyses discourse on the grounds of power relations, social structure, and practices. During the past and current decades, many scholars have established CDA and identified it with poetry, for example, the critical discourse of analysis of Marsiya-e-Hussain (Rizwan, Saeed 2014).

It is important to note that there are set principles that govern CDA, according to Wodak and Fairclough. They include statements such as the mediated link between society and text, in terms of social action discourse is regarded as being one. Lastly, discourse also follows culture and society. In Social Semiotics, “real efforts were made to understand systems of representation other than language— visual images, music, and performance. This understanding is then ‘turned back’ on language in new theorizations of the characteristics of language” (Kress, 1990, p.46).

Semiotic Analysis

Semiotics analysis deals with the study of symbols and cultural signs. It deals with the unconscious cultural patterns and mainly deals with the shaping of consumer behavior and the approach to thematic content and textual messages (Berger, A. A. 2004). The semiotic analysis primarily focuses on the elements responsible for the effects that correspond with the underlying structure since it looks past the letters’ surface. The importance of the study and semiotic analysis

is that we must be aware of what is happening around the sign as we continue to discover the movement itself. Semiotics is vital to ensure that the concerned audience well understands the needed meaning.

The frequent view of semiotics is usually known to have sociological and anthropological dimensions. Some scholars on semiotics mainly focus on the dimensions that deal with the logic of science. However, they look at life science-related areas, for example, how organisms are well adapted to their semiotic environment. In general, the active site of study is the sign system; communication between living organisms is usually covered in biosemiotics (JESSOP*, B. O. B.2004). The use of semiotic analysis associated with models and concepts that deal with semiotics is to understand, interpret and understand signs the views on the commentary on the use of symbol and sign as part of the sign system. A sign system and the sign use, and because of this reason, the system will affect individual sign content. The analysis usually focuses on both interpretative and qualitative content that deals with terms and concepts.

Reference

- Berger, A. A. (2004). Semiotic analysis. *Media analysis techniques*, 3.
- Coulthard, M. (2014). *An introduction to discourse analysis*. Routledge.
- Catalano, T., & Waugh, L. R. (2020). *Critical Discourse Analysis, Critical Discourse Studies and Beyond*. Springer.
- Fairclough, I., & Fairclough, N. (2013). *Political discourse analysis: A method for advanced students*. Routledge.
- Fairclough, N. (2013). *Critical discourse analysis*. R. Wodak (Ed.). Los Angeles: Sage.
- Fairclough, N., & Fairclough, I. (2015). Textual Analysis: Chapter 13.
- Hall, S. (1997). The work of representation. *Representation: Cultural representations and signifying practices*, 2, 13-74.
- JESSOP*, B. O. B. (2004). Critical semiotic analysis and cultural political economy. *Critical discourse studies*, 1(2), 159-174.
- Kress, G. (1990). Critical discourse analysis. *Annual review of applied linguistics*, 11, 84-99.
- Rizwan, S., Saeed, T., & Fayyaz, R. (2013). Religious Ideology and Discourse: A Critical Discourse Analysis of Marsiya-e-Hussain. *Journal of Arts and Humanities*, 2(1), 124-139.
- Wodak, R., & Chilton, P. (Eds.). (2005). *A new agenda in (critical) discourse analysis: theory, methodology and interdisciplinarity* (Vol. 13). John Benjamins Publishing.