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Abstract
This paper is an endeavour to show social constructionism as a paradigm aligns with critical discourse analysis methodology when the researcher aims to study how media discourse of a guerrilla in the Middle East frames and represents its identity, or when the researcher aims to identify the codes of media discourse and interpret the meaning.

The paper traces the history and meaning of social constructionism, paradigms, discourse, discourse analysis and critical discourse analysis. It argues that social constructionist should utilise the axiology of critical theory in order to be aligned with critical discourse analysis.

Meanwhile, the paper outlines the historical and contemporary contributions to the studies in discourse analysis discipline and distinguishes among three approaches of critical discourse analysis to conclude the most suitable version to study guerrillas’ media discourse.
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Introduction
The media represents a vital mainstream for guerrillas whether they were classified terrorists or not. In this regard, the former British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher warned media from giving a space to the Irish Republican Army arguing, “Publicity is the oxygen of terrorism” (Qureshi 2009, 237). Similarly, some guerrillas in the Middle East consider using the media effectively is crucial in winning the war (Hollander, 2006; Qureshi, 2009).

In this vein, the study of guerrillas’ media might be qualitative if the researcher intends to study the discourse as a representation of identity, for example. Also, the research might be quantitative if the researcher focuses on measurement, frequency and analysis between variables in the discourse (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005).

The Characteristics of the Basic Paradigms
In conducting a research, it is crucial that the researchers are knowledgeable about the ontological and epistemological assumptions concerning their chosen research (Bustis & Gregson, 2001). Ontology and epistemology can be described as belief systems or paradigms (Guba and Lincoln, 1994).

According to Guba and Lincoln (1994) the paradigm is “a set of basic beliefs (or metaphysics) that deals with ultimates or first principles. It represents a worldview that defines, for its holder, the nature of the “world,” the individual’s place in it, and the range of possible relationships to that world and its parts” (p. 107). Similarly, Bryman (1988) defines paradigm as “a cluster of beliefs and dictates which for scientists in a particular discipline influence what should be studied, how research should be done, how results should be interpreted and so on” (p. 4). Both definitions imply that paradigm guides the entire process and provides the researcher with directions regarding the approach, methods and techniques of carrying out research within its philosophical premise.

There are many paradigms. As noted previously, every paradigm has its own ontological and epistemological assumptions, and it is traditionally associated with a certain research methodology. The term ‘ontology’ is concerned with the nature of reality (Holden & Lynch, 2004), while ‘epistemology’ is concerned with the knowledge itself in terms of its origin (Hofer, 2002). So, the researcher views the world in an ontological framework which postulates specified epistemological questions, and these questions need to be examined in a methodological way (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005).

Guba and Lincoln (1994) distinguish between four basic paradigms (positivism, post-positivism, critical theory and constructivism) as shown in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paradigm</th>
<th>Ontology</th>
<th>Epistemology</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positivism</td>
<td>Naïve realism—“real” reality but apprehendable</td>
<td>Dualist/objectivist; findings true</td>
<td>Experimental/manipulative; verification of hypotheses; chiefly quantitative methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-positivism</td>
<td>Critical realism—“real” reality but only imperfectly and probabilistically apprehendable</td>
<td>Modified dualist/objectivist; critical tradition/community; findings probably true</td>
<td>Modified experimental/manipulative; critical multiplicity; falsification of hypotheses; may include qualitative methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Theory et al.</td>
<td>Historical realism—virtual reality shaped by social, political, cultural, economic, ethnic, and gender values; crystallized overtime</td>
<td>Transactional/subjectivist; value mediated findings</td>
<td>Dialogic/dialectical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constructivism</td>
<td>Relativism—local and specific constructed realities</td>
<td>Transactional/subjectivist; created findings</td>
<td>Hermeneutical/dialectical</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Positivism
The history of positivism can be traced in Western culture more than 2000 in Pythagoras’ mathematics and David Hume’s assumptions about reasoning. However, the term positivism created by Auguste Comte in 19th century (Grant & Giddings, 2002).

The ontology of positivism assumes there is an existed, real and independent reality, based on a scientific law. However, the epistemology of this paradigm requires from the researcher to be objectivist, because any bias has a negative impact on the validity of the truth. In this vein, the methodology is primarily quantitative and experimental to test the proposed hypotheses (Guba & Lincoln, 1994).
Between 1920s and 1960s, the term logical positivism has emerged when positivists started depending widely on mathematics and statistics to test the hypotheses and to ensure extreme objectivity (Grant & Giddings, 2002).

**Post-positivism**

As the result of extreme objectivity of logical positivism, Thomas Kuhn and Karl Popper modified positivism in the late 1960s when they postulated post-positivism as a new paradigmatic assumption, acknowledging that the reality may be affected by the researcher’s views (Grant & Giddings, 2002).

The ontology of post-positivism called critical realism, because the reality requires more examination to be verified. However, the epistemology of this paradigm allows researchers’ subjectivity, because they are affected by their social and political context. In this sense, the findings may be falsified (Guba & Lincoln, 1994).

The methodology of this paradigm allows using qualitative and mixed methods such as triangulation to obtain improved findings (Grant & Giddings, 2002).

**Critical Theory**

The ontology of critical theory suggests that different factors such as historical, social, economic and political factors shape the reality. However, the epistemology of this paradigm is subjectivist and methodology requires from the researcher to use appropriate techniques and tools uncover all the elements which shape the reality (Guba & Lincoln, 1994).

Critical theory can be named a radical paradigm, because it is related to two stages. The first stage was before the world wars which accompanied by critical research theory. The second stage was after the emergence of feminist theories by the mid of last century. These two stages shape the assumption of critical theory as a paradigm aims to change the social reality (Grant & Giddings, 2002).

**Constructivism**

The roots of constructivism go back to the theories of Jean Piaget, Lev Vygotsky and John Dewey. However, the influence of constructivism has increased in the early eighties of the last century as a trend against objectivist epistemology (Kanselaar, 2002).

The ontology of constructivism assumes that there are multiple and dependent realities. However, the epistemology of this paradigm is subjectivist, where the researcher is visible and the findings are linked to his or her understanding. In this vein, the researcher focuses on the methods which allow producing the understanding hermeneutically (Guba & Lincoln, 1994).

**Social Constructionism**

Social constructionism emerged in sociology in the mid-sixties of the last century when postmodernism has been prevailed in qualitative researches (Andrews, 2012). Alvesson & Skoldberg (2009) point out that there are two waves of social constructionism. The first wave was introduced by Peter Berger and Thomas Luckmann. The two researchers were inspired by the philosophers Karl Marx, Friedrich Nietzsche, Max Scheler and Karl Mannheim who argued that knowledge is a process linked to ideology and power as well as by Max Weber’s subjective view to social actions and Emile Durkheim’s objective view to social facts. However, the second wave was introduced by Kenneth Gergen and Bruno Latour, who affected by the ideas of the French scientist Louis Pasteur assert the influence of social micro level processes in constructing the knowledge.

Due to multidisciplinary sources and roots of social constructionism as well as due to the fact that some authors use constructionism and constructivism interchangeably, the term is ill defined (Haar, 2002). However, De Koster et al. (2004) argue it is widely accepted that despite both paradigms “hold the notion that people create a construct of reality in common, their theoretical background and focus are different. Whereas constructivism has its roots in the biological and physiological characteristics of individual perception and consequently has a very individual focus, social constructionism is a community-philosophy in which the group and the interaction between the group members is the sole focus” (p.75).

Similarly, Young and Collin (2004) point out the differences between constructivism and social constructionism stating that, “Constructivism is distinguished by its focus on the individual cognitively engages in the construction of knowledge from social construction which claims that knowledge and meaning are historically and culturally constructed through social processes and action” (p. 373). Hence, unlike constructivism, social constructionism takes into consideration the influence of cultural and social contexts on the meaning-making.

In this context, Crotty (1998) argues that “it is useful then to reserve Constructivism for epistemological considerations focusing exclusively with the meaning-making activity of the individual member”, and to use Constructionism where the focus includes ‘the collective generation [and transmission] of meaning” (p. 58). Moreover, Niekerk (2005) notes that social constructionists share constructivists’ belief about the existence of multiple realities, but they are not concerned to validate all of them. This means that the social constructionist focuses on the processes of construct knowledge not the reality itself (Shadish, 1995). Furthermore, Andrews (2012) argues that social constructionism is not concerned with the nature of reality but rather with the nature of knowledge and how it is constructed. Despite the differences, both paradigms consider deconstruction as an analytical tool (Patton, 2002).

The lack of a precise definition about social constructionism does not impede some scholars from making an attempt to outline the characteristics of this paradigm. The main premise of this paradigm is the rejection of an absolute knowledge. Jørgensen & Phillips (2002) argue that social constructionists assert “reality is what we say it is. If we say it is different, then it is different… it is through ascribing meanings to ourselves and the surrounding world that we can understand and act in the world, and in that sense both ourselves and our world are the meanings we ascribe to them” (p.178). Moreover, they maintain that because researchers cannot see “things as they really are, [their knowledge construction] is productive- it creates reality at the same time as representing it” (ibid, p.175). Thus, “there is no possibility of achieving absolute or universal knowledge since there is no context-free, neutral base for truth-claims” (ibid, p. 175).

Furthermore, Crotty (1998) argues that “social constructionism emphasizes the hold our culture has on us: it shapes the way in which we see things (even in the way in which we feel thing!) and gives us a quite definite view of the world” (p. 58). According to Burr (1995), the social constructionists’ philosophical assumptions entail “a critical stance toward taken-for-granted knowledge…. historical and cultural specificity [as well as that] knowledge is sustained by social processes [and] knowledge and social action go together” (p. 2-4). Thus, the ideology underpinning social constructionism perceives knowledge as socially constructed through peoples’ daily interactions with each other. In this vein, “Knowledge exists in the interactions that take place among individuals… [and] meanings are generated by communication between persons” (De Koster et al., 2004, p.73).

As noted by Jørgensen & Phillips (2002) social constructionism has been developed around the notion “that there is nothing natural or given about the taken-for-granted world” (p.190). Moreover, they point out that the taken-for-granted worldview “delimits the field of possibilities for thinking and acting” (ibid, p.186). Thus, social constructionism is “often concerned with the unmasking of the taken-for-granted and, as such, it has the ambition of ‘getting behind’ peoples everyday understandings” (ibid, p.210). Explaining further the paradigm, Jørgensen & Phillips (2002) maintain that the “premise of the cultural and historical specificity of knowledge entails that people who are positioned differently in time and space also view the world differently and have varying taken-for-granted understandings” (p.190).

As illustrated above, social constructionists maintain that all knowledge results from the interactions among individuals. In their interactions, language plays a critical role as enable people “to share knowledge or develop shared constructs [and] describe ‘what is out
there’, as opposed to what is ‘in here’. From the moment we try to describe ‘what is’, we enter the world of discourse, of ‘talking about’” (De Koster et al., 2004, p.75). As noted by Spicer & Fleming (2001), the reality for social constructionists is constructed through language. In similar vein, Patton (2002) argues that, “The purpose of language is to communicate the social construction of the dominant members of the group using the language” (p. 101).

The social constructionist cannot ignore also the notions of hegemony and power in the discourse. The former notion goes back to the Italian theorist Antonio Gramsci and was amended by Ernesto Laclau and Chantal Mouffe who argue that the ultimate struggle of discourses is to achieve hegemony through asserting a certain meaning in the language (Jørgensen & Phillips, 2002). The latter notion goes back to the French Philosopher Michel Foucault who argues that power produces discourse and knowledge (ibid).

Social constructionism, as any paradigm, has its proponents who associate their worldviews about reality and knowledge construction with philosophical assumptions of this paradigm. However, it has its opponents who criticize the philosophical stance of social constructionism. Indeed, Ratner (2005) criticizes social constructionism for its extreme subjectivity and its opposition to the reform in the society. Ratner’s criticism faced by Dey (2008) who points out that Ratner himself validates his account of reality and uses social constructionism to criticize this paradigmatic stance.

Jørgensen & Phillips (2002) also outline some critics of social constructionism. They point out that the critiques claim that social constructionism is unusable scientifically and politically. Scientifically, because it does not argue what is true or false and, politically, because it does not argue what is bad or what is wrong.

Jørgensen & Phillips (2002) argue that these critiques are too pessimistic, because to social constructionism the “truth is seen as intertwined with power and the truths which are produced (including those of the researcher) are seen as historically and socially contingent” (p. 179 & 180).

Paradigm choice

If the aim of the research is to categorise, identify and interpret the codes of guerrillas’ media discourse, or to explore how media discourse of a certain guerrilla frames and represents its identity, this means that the research will be interpretative in nature. Such interpretation and exploration will pay attention to the used language and the notion of power in the discourse, taking into consideration historical, social, cultural and political processes and the context in which all work together to shape the meaning of guerrillas’ media discourse.

Positivism and post-positivism do not align with the nature of such research which will be interpretive to explore the meaning, not to propose and test hypotheses. Also, the critical theory aims to change and challenge the status-quo and this paradigm does not align with such research.

Moreover, constructivism does not align with such research, because it disregards the political elements which play a role in understanding and constructing the meaning. However, social constructionist paradigm, which has emerged as an extension of constructivism, might fit such research guerrillas’ media discourse. Social constructionist should use critical theory axiology in order to be aligned with critical discourse analysis. The new axiology of social constructionism allows merging between social and political contexts to understand the power relations and the ideological practices (Merkl-Davies et al., 2011). Such alignment is crucial to interpret in depth guerrillas’ media discourse. It allows taking into consideration all the factors that shape the discourse and its meaning. Thus, social constructionism paradigm aligns with a qualitative approach, which is critical discourse analysis.

Qualitative Research

As it has been discussed about the research paradigm, social constructionism is aligned with the qualitative approaches, because its epistemology considers researchers’ subjectivity and their roles in validating the reality. Denzin & Lincoln (2005) point out that, “The word qualitative implies on emphasis on the qualities of entities and on processes and meanings that are not experimentally examined or measured (if measured at all) in terms of quantity, amount, intensity or frequency. Qualitative researchers stress the socially constructed nature of reality, the intimate relationship between the researcher and what is studied, and the situational constraints that shape inquiry” (p.10).

Due its various features, Tesch (1990) outlines a list of 46 terms about perspectives, traditions, methods and approaches aligned with qualitative research.

Denzin & Lincoln (2005) indicate that qualitative research ‘involves an interpretive, naturalistic approach to its subject matter. This means that qualitative researchers study things in their natural settings, attempting to make sense of, or interpret, phenomena in terms of the meanings people bring to them. Qualitative research involves the studied use and collection of a variety of empirical materials – case study, personal experience, introspection, life story, interview, observational, historical, interactional, and visual texts – that describe routine and problematic moments and meanings in individuals’ lives” (pp. 3&4).

Every qualitative approach has characteristics and historical roots. So, the proposed qualitative approach on guerrillas’ media discourse, which is critical discourse analysis, should be clarified, because there are different versions of this approach and every founder sets different ways for analysis. However, it is important initially to define discourse, discourse analysis, and outline the contributions to this field.

Discourse

The term discourse does not have a common definition, despite it is old and classified historically in rhetoric as an art of speech for persuasion (Dijk, 1985). However, many scholars define discourse as a term associated with language (Potter & Wetherell, 1987). Eldaly (2010) outlines some definitions of discourse related to their different usages, pointing out that some researchers use the terms ‘discourse’ and ‘text’ interchangeably and others use the term discourse only for the spoken language. He (ibid) initially defines the term discourse as mass and count nouns,

“‘Discourse’, used as a mass noun, means roughly the same as ‘language use’ or ‘language-in-use’. As a count noun (a discourse), it means a relatively discrete subset of a whole language, used for specific social or institutional purposes. More specifically, ‘discourse’ as a mass noun and its strict linguistic sense, refers to connected speech or writing occurring at suprasentential levels” (p. 248).

However, the development of sciences and aspects of social life makes every topic has its own language-in-use. This leads to the emergence of different discourses associated with different fields of knowledge and practices, such as media discourse, medical discourse and political discourse (Jørgensen & Phillips, 2002). In this context, Hall (1997a) defines discourses of every field as “ways of referring to or constructing knowledge about a particular topic of practice” (p. 6).

Such construction of knowledge makes discourse at the heart of social practice between people who speak the same language or groups who share the same ideas (Dijk, 2000; Fairclough, 1995).

In this sense, discourse represents all features and shapes of language which can be categorised semantically, or it represents a social status-quo and features which can be viewed from different perspectives and compared to other categories (Fairclough, 2005). This means that discourses go beyond description, because they categorise the social world and shed light on issues and turn them into objects (Gilbert & Mulkay, 1984; Parker, 1992).
The notion that discourse constitutes its object goes back to Michel Foucault who gave discourse a profound meaning. Foucault (1972, 1981) traces the history of discourse, its discursive formations, categories, practices and systems which can falsify it, pointing out that true discourse holds power and contributions to the future.

However, Chouliaraki (2008) in her discussions the meaning of discourse attempts to give a broad definition, “The term discourse refers precisely to the capacity of meaning-making resources to constitute social reality, forms of knowledge and identity within specific social contexts and power relations” (P. 674).

In summary, discourse can be viewed, based on all definitions, as a term refers to several functions and features. It is:

1- Expressing and creating social reality
2- Representing identity
3- Making knowledge
4- Holding power
5- A language or series of statements viewed linguistically (and semantically)

In this vein, the media discourse of any guerrilla in the Middle East might have all these elements or most of them. However, the researcher in this field should outline, initially, the elements which constitute the guerrilla’s media discourse.

**Discourse Analysis**

The discipline of discourse analysis is not contemporary. It was related to study of literature, language and public speech more than 2000 years ago (Dijk, 1985). However, the study of discourse as an interdisciplinary discipline in humanities and social sciences has emerged in the mid-sixties of the last century (Dijk, 2007).

The first scholar who used the term discourse analysis was the American linguist Zelling Harris in early fifties of the last century. Harris (1952) states in an academic paper “Discourse Analysis” his method for speech or text, which goes beyond descriptive linguistics, acknowledging the cooperation of Noam Chomsky, A. F. Brown and earlier investigation of Fred Lukoff (1948) through his master thesis “Preliminary Analyses of the Linguistic Structuring of Extended Discourse”.

Harris (1952) postulates what would seem a sociolinguistic method when he takes into account the social context of the discourse to analyse the meanings of its morphemes. He (ibid) points out that his method considers grammar, because it “states the distributional relations among elements [of the discourse]” (p. 5).

As the discourse has become widely used in several patterns in humanities, social sciences and even in medicine, discourse analysis means the analysis of these domains through various approaches (Jørgensen & Phillips, 2002). These approaches are correlated to the historical development of discourse analysis, paradigmatic stances and methodological views of the researchers (Dijk, 1985).

After Harris, there are other scholars who contributed to the development of discourse analysis and critical discourse analysis as well. The basic scholars are: Ferdinand de Saussure, Roland Barthes, Michel Foucault, Norman Fairclough, Teun Van Dijk and Ruth Wodak. The ideas of those scholars, besides to Michael Halliday’s systematic functional grammar and Jacques Derrida’s notion of deconstruction, may benefit any researcher to utilise some of their techniques in studying guerrillas’ media discourse.

**De Saussure and Peirce… The Notion of Sign**

Ferdinand de Saussure (1959) is the founder of semiology and the structure of sign in the language as a combination between the signifier (sound or image) and the signified (concept). He (ibid) outlines the characteristics of language inside and outside discourse, or in other words between what he called syntagm (syntax is a part of syntagm) and associative relations. He points out that the relations of words inside discourse depend on the language. However, he indicates that the co-ordinations of words “formed outside discourse differ strikingly from those formed inside discourse. Those formed outside discourse are not supported by linearity. Their seat is in the brain; they are a part of the inner storehouse that makes up the language of each speaker” (p. 123).

In parallel to de Saussure’s work and what would seem a more development trend in understanding the combination of the sign, there was the American linguist Charles Sanders Pierce, who considered one of the major figures in modern semiotics. Pierce points out that the sign in a tradic relation: the form or perception of the sign (representamen), what does that form make sense (interpretant) and the object (relevent) of the sign (Nørl, 1996).

In applying de Saussure and Pierce models on guerrillas’ media discourse, the analysis of the used words, for example, can reveal the first order of meaning.

**Roland Barthes… the Developed Semiotics**

The French semiotican Roland Barthes (1964) has widened de Saussure linguistic model of sign, in order to be applied into other fields such as cinema, images and other aspects of social life, culture and entertainment.

However, he (ibid) inverts de Saussure’s understanding of linguistics as a part of the general science of signs to argue that semiotics “is a part of linguistics: to be precise, it is that part covering the great signifying unities of discourse” (p. 3).

Barthes’s semiotic approach, which is contextual, has contributed to discourse analysis, especially in its extension from texts to cover fields such as images and footages. However, this approach depends on the analysts themselves and their ways and abilities of decoding the messages of the discourse. It postulates an assumption that the researchers should go beyond language or scene to discover the core meaning of discourse which has been shaped socially or ideologically.

In de Saussure’s linguistic model, the researchers can only discover the first level of meaning of language (written or spoken) of the discourse. However, the researchers in Barthes’s model are able to discover more levels of meaning of images, fashions, food and other cultural aspects.

Barthes’s approach is crucial in studying guerrillas’ media discourse. It can go beyond the language to discover and analyse other aspects which constitute the elements of guerrillas’ media discourse.

**Foucault… The notion of power/ knowledge**

Michel Foucault has contributed widely to discourse analysis and many scholars in this field have referred to his studies and calling his analytical way Foucauldian discourse analysis (Jørgensen & Phillips, 2002). Foucault (1972) defines discourse as a set of statements in a certain discipline, where every statement constitutes its atom.

As Saussure, Foucault (ibid) acknowledges the notion of the sign in the discourse, but he differs from Saussure through focusing more on the production of knowledge as a discursive practice in a discipline, pointing out that the discourse should be analysed historically and contextually, because the context plays a major role in the formation of the meaning.

Graham (2011) alludes that, “The main aim of a Foucauldian approach to discourse analysis is to trace the relationship between words and things: how the words we use to conceptualise and communicate end up producing the very ‘things’ or objects of which we speak” (p. 668).

However, Whisnant (2012) illustrates that, according to Foucault, there are four functions of the discourse: it creates a world, it says something about the people who speak it, it generates knowledge and truth, and it reveals the network of embedded power.
The last two functions are crucial in Foucauldian discourse analysis where the knowledge and power are linked together as each function assumes the existence of another. Foucault (1972), who affected by his teacher Louis Althusser, utilises Nietzsche’s notion of power, but he gives the power a positive sense in the production of the discourse. Jørgensen & Phillips (2002) point out that, according to Foucault, “Power provides the conditions of possibility for the social. It is in power that our social world is produced and objects are separated from one another and thus attain their individual characteristics and relationships to one another” (p. 13).

Foucault (1972) argues that the discourse has constituted by power which reveals what is not said, and the role of the analyst is to uncover the power relations and its impact, or by another word to discover the truth. Meanwhile, Foucault (1981) has never ignored in the analysis the role of the author, but he focused more on the discourse. In this sense, Foucault was criticized because he paid more attention on the discourse and ignored other factors which have an impact on the power relations (Hall, 1997b).

Apart from this criticism, Foucault approach can be applied on guerrillas’ media discourse to discover how such discourses hold and impose power.

Critical discourse analysis
Critical discourse analysis (CDA) has emerged as a new discipline from discourse analysis. It can be traced to the work of Robert Hodge and Gunther Kress who aimed to study the language in a wider context and as an ideology in 1970s (Hodge, 2012). However, some researchers do not distinguish between critical discourse analysis and discourse analysis (Powers, 2007), between critical discourse analysis and critical linguistics (Wodak, 2001), and others called this new discipline a modern discourse analysis (Tesch, 1990). There are many approaches in critical discourse analysis related to the key scholars in this field, namely Norman Fairclough, Teun Van Dijk, Ruth Wodak, Gunther Kress and Theo Van Leeuwen who established a critical discourse analysis network in 1991 (Wodak, 2001).

The research on discourse to be critical should be better than other researches as an explanatory, focusing on social problems and power relations in the structure of the discourse (Dijk, 2003).

However, Dijk (ibid) quotes Norman Fairclough and Ruth Wodak’s summary of the main eight premises of critical discourse analysis,

1. CDA addresses social problems
2. Power relations are discursive
3. Discourse constitutes society and culture
4. Discourse does ideological work
5. Discourse is historical
6. The link between text and society is mediated
7. Discourse analysis is interpretative and explanatory
8. Discourse is a form of social action” (p. 353).

These principles do not mean that they should be included in every critical discourse study, because every scholar focuses on some principles align with his/her analytical approach and paradigmatic stance. In this sense, it is important to shed light on the main scholars in critical discourse analysis and their premises, namely Fairclough, Dijk and Wodak, before outlining the main characteristics of the proposed critical discourse analysis approach.

Fairclough... Discourse as a Social Practice
The British scholar in linguistics Norman Fairclough considers one of the key scholars in critical discourse analysis. He (2005) uses the term semiosis to point out that the discourse represents a social practice in a particular way. Fairclough (2001) argues that the discourse can be a social activity, or a representation, or a way of shaping the identity which called a style such as the styles of political leaders.

He (ibid) points out that, “Critical discourse analysis is analysis of the dialectical relationships between discourse (including language but also other forms of semiosis, e.g. body language or visual images) and other elements of social practices” (p. 1).

Fairclough (1989) illustrates that, “Critical is used in the special, sense of aiming to show up connections which may be hidden from people - such as the connections between language, power and ideology” (p. 5). Fairclough (ibid) outlines three stages of his approach into discourse: description of the used language, linguistic choices and identity, interpretation of the ideological and semiological features, and explanation of the elements which affect the process of production. He (1995) argues that the critical analysis of media discourse includes the analysis of the communicative events and the order of discourse. Fairclough (ibid) points out that the analysis of the communicative event is the analysis of three elements: text, discourse practice and sociocultural practice, clarifying that, “Texts’ may be written or oral, and oral texts may be just spoken (radio) or spoken and visual (television). By ‘discourse practice’ I mean the processes of text production and consumption. And by ‘sociocultural practice’ I mean the social and cultural goings-on which the communicative event part of” (p. 57).

However, Fairclough (2001), who affected by Foucault’s notion of power, Gramsci’s notion of hegemony and Halliday’s systemic functional grammar in analysing media discourse, means by order of discourse the semiotic nature of discursive practices as a “way in which diverse genres and discourses and styles are networked together” (p. 2).

Fairclough (1995) defines a genre as a “use of language associated with and constituting part of some particular social practice” (p. 56).
On the other hand, it is important to shed light on Fairclough’s textual analysis and the meaning of his used terms: recontextualization and intertextuality.

Fairclough (2003) argues that textual analysis aims to show the connections between the internal and external relations of a text. The internal relations are the interdiscursive relations such as the relations between vocabulary, grammar and semiotic elements. Meanwhile, the external relations are the relations between the text and the social context or the relations between the text and other texts served in its formation. The external relations between the text and other texts mean the intertextual relations between texts. It is called intertextuality. However, recontextualization means how different voices framed in a text or how elements of a social practice redistributed. Fairclough (1992) points out that there are two axes of intertextuality. The horizontal axis is related to the production dimension of the text such as the relation between the author and audience. Meanwhile, the vertical axis is the context dimension of the text such as historical relations with other texts.

However, Fairclough (ibid) distinguishes between manifest intertextuality when the relation between the text and other texts is clear, and constitutive intertextuality when the focus is on the production of the discourse. He uses sometimes the term interdiscursivity instead of constitutive intertextuality “to underline that the focus is on discourse conventions rather than other texts as constitutive” (p. 104). Fairclough (ibid) outlines that the dimensions of the framework of discourse analysis are “manifest intertextuality, interdiscursivity [or constitutive intertextuality], textual ‘transformations’ [such as text production and distribution] and how texts constitute social identities” (p. 105).

Dijk’s Socio-Cognitive Model

The Dutch scholar Teun Van Dijk has developed a multidisciplinary approach of critical discourse analysis called sometimes ‘socio-cognitive’ discourse analysis. Dijk (2001) explains the elements of his discourse-cognition-society triangle and gives a broad meaning for every element. He means by ‘discourse’ the language in use of ‘communicative event’, by ‘cognition’ the personal and social beliefs and attitudes, and by ‘society’ the groups or institutions and their social, political and cultural systems.

Dijk (ibid) points out that critical discourse analysis, “Focuses on social problems and especially on the role of discourse in the production and reproduction of power abuse or domination” (p. 96).

In this sense, Dijk (2000) focuses on the racist discourse and how they represent their and others ideologies. Such groups have developed (mentally) their in-group schema, which focuses on positive self-representation, and out-group schema, which labels the others, generally under the category of enemies, negatively. This polarization (such as Us vs. Them) can be viewed clearly in the discourse of two groups who are in conflict.

Dijk (1988) points out that the analysis of media discourse is textual and contextual. In textual level, structure analysis should take into consideration all the micro elements which form the meaning of the text, where the analysis is not limited to linguistics, grammar, syntax and lexical cohesion. However, the contextual analysis is the analysis of the processes of production and comprehension.

Dijk (2001), who applied this model on news, outlines the steps of his approach which include micro and macro description of the communicative event elements, studying the meaning of the words to find the elements of representation and ideological objectives, relevance to determine the aims of the author, determining the properties of the context, determining the event models, summarizing forms of social cognition, and showing the relation between discourse and society.

Wodak’s Discourse-Historical Approach

The Austrian discourse studies scholar Ruth Wodak has developed a discourse-historical approach when she examined with a team of five researchers from three different disciplines in history, psychology and linguistics the discourse of the Austrian presidential campaign of Kurt Waldheim in 1986. The background of the team leads to the emergence of this triangulatory approach (Wodak, 2001).

In her approach, Wodak has affected by Dijk’s socio-cognitive approach (Wodak & Busch, 2004). She (ibid) distinguishes between discourse and text, arguing that, “Discourse as a form of knowledge and memory, whereas text illustrates concrete oral utterances or written documents” (p. 109).
Wodak (2001) outlines eleven characteristics of her approach. The approach is interdisciplinary (and interdisciplinarity in theories and practices), problem-oriented, theories and methodologies are eclectic, abductive, includes field work and ethnography, applies recontextualization process, integrates the analysis of historical context to allow better interpretation, defines the categories and the analytical tools, uses generally middle range theories and believes that the practice is the aim where the results should be disseminated. She (ibid) points out the basic procedures of analysis of specific texts such as sampling about the content and context, categorizing the topics, sampling more ethnographic information, exploring related fields for more explanation to answer the precise research questions, turning the questions into linguistic categories, applying these categories to interpret the text or texts, relating the specific text with the fields of actions in the context level, and interpreting in depth to answer the research questions.

Wodak (2002) prefers to call critical discourse analysis a school or a research programme due it interdisciplinary nature, and refuses to call it a methodology.

Characteristics of the Intended CDA Approach

After reviewing the major ideas about critical discourse analysis, it seems that there is congruence in approaches, where Fairclough, Dijk and Wodak use generally the same techniques in analysing the discourse, especially media discourse. They believe in the use of linguistics as a way of analysis and the notion of power in the discourse as they affected by Foucault thoughts about discourse and power. However, they differ in the structure of their approaches, ways of analysis and which elements are dominants the approach. Fairclough’s approach is transdisciplinary and he focuses more on analysing dialectically linguistics, semiotics and social relations in the discourse, Dijk’s approach is multidisciplinary and he focuses more on analysing ideology in the discourse and Wodak’s approach is interdisciplinary and she focuses more on analysing the historical context of the discourse.

On the other hand, the researchers should develop their approaches which depend on the nature of their studies and factors which shape the discourse; because there is no unique approach gives a road map of critical discourse analysis (Dijk, 2001).

The intended critical discourse analysis approach about the media discourse of guerrillas is interdisciplinary. It may utilise various techniques from different disciplines, such as history, sociology, linguistics, semiotics, ideology. Also, it allows using different theories may relevant in the analysis.

Critical discourse analysis aligns with social constructionist paradigm where the focus is on the role of language in shaping the reality and the importance of context in analysing the discourse (Merkl-Davies, Brennan, & Vourvachis, 2011). The language gains the power from the people who use it (Wodak & Busch, 2004). The power can be verified through exploring the language used to describe the self and the other.

The intended interdisciplinary approach, which may utilise, as well, some theories to obtain good findings, can take from Fairclough his description of the communicative events and the order of discourse, and his explanation of intertextuality and recontextualization, from Dijk his way of analysis of the communicative events and from Wodak her focusing on the historical context in interpreting the discourse.

In the following table 2, there will be a brief outline of the difference between four approaches: Grounded Theory, Content Analysis, Discourse Analysis and Critical Discourse Analysis.

![Table 2: Major Differences among Grounded Theory, Content Analysis, DA & CDA](image)

However, the following table 3 may clarify the link between CDA and social constructionism, the system of coding, results and quality criteria. This table is based on “Figure 3: Comparison of methodological principles and evaluation criteria” in (Merkl-Davies et al., 2011, p. 29).

![Table 3: Approach, Paradigm, Coding and Quality Criteria of the intended Research](image)

Validity

As it has been discussed previously about the intended paradigm, social constructionists do not validate all the realities and they create one reality and represent it. Subjectivity aligns with this paradigm and the researcher should justify the choices and the reason of choosing such kind of research at the beginning. However, subjectivity does not prevent the researcher from looking after related elements of validity which help in revealing the truth (Jørgensen & Phillips, 2002).

On the other hands, the background of the researcher plays a role in the findings of observations. The results of these observations require explanation from the researcher in order to be validated, because it is the role of the researcher, who adopts social constructionism paradigm and critical discourse analysis approach, to argue what is true.

Conclusion

This paper has shown that there is an alignment between social constructionism and critical discourse analysis, in order to study guerrillas’ media discourse in the Middle East and reveal how a guerrilla’s media discourse frames and represents its identity. It traced the meaning of social constructionism, difference among paradigms, the meaning and elements of discourse, discourse analysis and critical discourse analysis. Also, it outlined the key contributors to critical discourse analysis, their ideas and different ways of analysis.
The social constructionists take into consideration the social and political context of the discourse. They are subjectivists, but they do not validate all accounts of reality.

The paper argued that an interdisciplinary approach of critical discourse analysis allows the researcher to use different techniques and relevant theories to analyse guerrillas’ media discourse. However, the researcher should explain the elements of the analysed discourse and the used techniques in analysis. Such premises are crucial to obtain authentic findings.
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