

مراجعة لنهجين بارزين من نُهْجِ علم اللغة النقدي

A review of Two Prominent Approaches to Critical Linguistics

Bahaa Jamal Fadhil

بهاء جمال فاضل

Dr. Juma'a Qadir Hussein

د. جمعة قادر حسين

Assistant professor

أستاذ مساعد

University of Anbar-

College of Education for

جامعة الانبار - كلية التربية للعلوم

Humanities- Department of

الانسانية - قسم اللغة الانكليزية

English

ed.juma.qader@uoanbar.edu.iq

bah21h1016@uoanbar.edu.iq

الكلمات المفتاحية: علم اللغة النقدي، الاسلوبية النقدية، تحليل الخطاب النقدي،

الايدولوجية، الاسلوبية

Keywords: critical linguistics, critical stylistics, critical discourse, ideology, and stylistics

المخلص

تستعرض الدراسة الحالية نهجين بارزين في مجال اللغويات النقدية، تحليل الخطاب النقدي والاسلوبية النقدية من المعروف أن الاسلوبية النقدية والخطاب النقدي يكشفان عن الايديولوجيات التي تمثلها النصوص. وتستخدم هذه الأساليب على نطاق واسع لتشمل، قدر الإمكان، أنواعا مختلفة من الخطاب. تهدف هذه الدراسة إلى تقديم مراجعة نقدية لهذين النهجين كما هي مستخدمة في أنواع مختلفة من السياقات. كما تهدف الدراسة إلى إظهار الاختلافات والتشابه بين النهجين. وأوضحت المراجعة أن هذين النهجين يكملان بعضهما البعض على الرغم من وجود تباين كبير بينهما. بينما يجب تحليل الخطاب النقدي على تحليل اللغة من حيث أبعادها الاجتماعية والسياسية، توضح الأسلوبية النقدية بالأدلة أنها تستخدم النص المشترك (أي السياق اللغوي) عند الإشارة إلى مفهوم السياق. كلا النهجين ضروريان للمحلل النقدي للغة. ونتيجة لذلك، تتبع هذه الدراسة تنوع وفائدة هذين النهجين. تظهر النتيجة أن تحليل الخطاب النقدي يؤكد على علاقات القوة في مقابل الأسلوبية النقدية.

Abstract

The current study reviews two prominent approaches within the realm of critical linguistics, Critical Discourse Analysis and Critical Stylistics. It is known that Critical Stylistics and Critical Discourse unearth ideologies represented in the texts. These approaches are used in a wide manner to involve, as much as it is possible, various types of discourse. The present study aims to provide a critical review of these two approaches as used in different types of contexts. Also, it aims to show the differences and similarities between them. The review explained that these two approaches complete each other even though there is huge variation between the two approaches. While Critical Discourse Analysis answers to analyze language in terms of its socio-political dimensions, Critical Stylistics demonstrates with evidence that it uses the co-text (i.e., linguistic context) when referring to the concept of context. Both of these two approaches are necessary for the hand of the critical analyst to language. Due to that, this study traces the diversity and usefulness of those two approaches. The finding shows that Critical Discourse Analysis emphasizes power relations in opposition to Critical Stylistics.

Introduction

Style analysis is the most effective way to delve deeply into any work, whether it is literary or not. Linguists can enter the literary world and criticism through stylistics, which is limited to literary texts. Through stylistics, linguists can critique from a linguistic point of view rather than a literary one. Later on, their work moved from formalism toward functionalism, which was more concerned with language use, even if it was still done within the context of structuralism in the Prague school. However, new stylistic methods emerged as a result of the context's manifestation in textual meaning. Therefore, modern stylistics incorporates corpus, critical, cognitive, pedagogical, pragmatic gender, multimodal, and neuroscientific approaches in addition to rhetoric, poetry, structuralism, and functionalism (Burke, 2014).

Style in Literature is the first book that paves the road for stylistic analysis in prose literature. Before 1981, the majority of stylistic analysis was conducted on poems. The use of pragmatics in stylistic analysis arose from the thriving field of linguistic pragmatics during this time. The study of narrative theory, which views the objectives of the story and the points of view as being comparable to those of stylistics, has another influence on stylistics. Not only did the goals of stylistics and narratology overlap but so did the goals of empirical literary studies, which shared stylistics' emphasis on the processes involved in interpreting literary texts.

Another change occurred when "Stylistics" began to examine nonliterary texts in addition to literary texts. This is when CDA's effect on some of the analytical techniques found in CDA began to show up in stylistics. Simpson (2004) describes stylistics as a very active discipline in the twenty-first century. To create feminist stylistics, discourse stylistics and cognitive stylistics combine with theories of

discourse, culture, and society such as feminist theory, cognitive psychology, and discourse analysis. Furthermore, stylistics developed into pedagogical stylistics through teaching and learning processes. Within stylistics, critical stylistics is a relatively new field of study that falls within the category of current stylistics. Therefore, stylistics began to be studied critically as a result of the effect of CDA analytical techniques; a tendency that has led to the emergence of Critical Stylistics (CS) studies, hence Critical Stylistics.

In this paper, a critical review of two prominent approaches to Critical Linguistics will be carried out, CDA, and CS, showing the relationship between them and how CS has developed from CDA; views on both fields will be discussed by reviewing their definitions and views of genre theorists. Then, a review and discussion of some key features of each field are highlighted in terms of their similarities and differences.

Overview of Critical Discourse Analysis

Beginning in the early 1990s, critical discourse analysis was developed as a "synthesis of approaches to the study of discourse", "analyzing opaque as well as transparent structural linkages of dominance, discrimination, power, and control as manifested in language" (Wodak, 2001, p.2). One important aspect of CDA is its interdisciplinary nature rooted in several fields such as applied linguistics, sociolinguistics, anthropology, cognitive science, rhetoric, and philosophy (Wodak and Meyer, 2001). The critical theory of the Frankfurt School before World War II is where the foundations of CDA originated. But when critical linguistics emerged at the end of the 1970s, the emphasis moved to language and discourse (Fowler et al., 1979; Mey, 1985). Meanwhile, CDA is seen as a reaction to the social

or uncritical models of the 1960s and 1970s and is present in 'critical' advances in psychology, sociolinguistics, and social sciences (Van Dijk, 2015).

CDA, according to Fairclough (2014), is the application of critical social analysis traditions to language studies. Discourse and its relationship to social aspects such as power dynamics, ideologies, institutions, social identities, etc., are of particular importance to critical social analysis. On the one hand, this critical social analysis is normative because it does more than just describe the reality, it also assesses them. However, because it characterizes and clarifies these realities, it is an explanatory critique. Scholars believe that the broader discursive unit of text constitutes the fundamental unit of communication. They have adopted what is now known as a critical linguistic approach to language, or critical discourse analysis (Weiss & Wodak, 2003). Investigating spoken and written discourses is done through the use of CDA. Critical semiotics, critical linguistics, and sociopolitical discourse and communication serve as its foundations.

CDA is a critical method, as previously stated, rather than a field or sub-discipline. It mostly identifies with the study of social issues including racism, sexism, colonialism, etc. (Van Dijk 2015). For Fairclough (1995), CDA is a type of discourse analysis whose goal is to 'systematically' uncover often ambiguous relationships of causality and determination between (a) discursive practices, events, and texts, and (b) larger social and cultural structures, relations, and processes to investigate how these practices, events, and texts are shaped ideologically by power struggles and relations of power. Additionally, it looks at how maintaining power and hegemony is aided by the opacity of these connections between discourse and society. It is possible to replace CDA with CS. Yet, according to Fairclough and Wodak (1997), CDA is 'language as a social practice' (quoted in Wodak

& Meyer, 2001, p. 1). Moreover, CDA is utilized to discuss the relationship between language and power, according to Wodak 2001).

The critical linguistic method known as CDA is currently employed to demonstrate how the larger discursive unit of text is the fundamental unit of communication. Moreover, Meyer (2001) concludes that "neither the CDA protagonists nor any guiding theoretical viewpoint are consistently employed within CDA, nor do they move from the field of discourse to the area of theory and back again." (P.18). According to Chouliaraki and Fairclough (1999), CDA mediates between social and linguistic theories in its ideas, bringing about a diverse range of theories, whether linguistic or social. Conversely, Hart (2010) highlights that the critical discourse analyst uses theoretical tools to examine language use and communicate issues like ideology and manipulation that are not immediately apparent to the general audience.

According to Van Dijk (2015), CDA is not restricted to any one discipline, institution, or theory. Instead, because it seeks to comprehend these social concerns, it is motivated by them. Nonetheless, CDA does not disregard the use of intricate theories, without which this kind of comprehension would not be conceivable. Thus far, the multidisciplinary character of critical discourse analysis study has made it complex due to the relationships it examines between text, discussion, power, society, and culture.

Overview of Critical Stylistics

CS is a linguistic strategy grounded in critical discourse analysis and stylistics. Lesley Jeffries is credited with creating this method, which covers ideologies in texts by providing the necessary analytical linguistic skills that critical discourse analysis does not. CS, according to Jeffries (2010), is a technique for determining the ideology present in any writing, regardless of your personal opinion. This method can be applied to a wide range of writings, including literary, political, social, and so on. It is not restricted to any one kind of text.

It would be incomplete to examine this strategy without referencing Halliday's meta-functions, which were previously discussed in the article. Jeffries (2015) creates the textual conceptual model and renames these functions to replicate them. The linguistic meaning, which includes phonetics, phonology, morphology, syntax, and semantics, is the result of the textual meta-function. The ideational meta-function becomes the textual meaning that carries out the co-textual impact by defining the architecture of the language systems. The interpersonal meaning of the text is constituted by its pragmatics in the context of its scenario. Halliday's theory of the meta-functions of language, which maintains that meaning mediates between language in context and language structure, is the foundation of CS.

Language resources should be used at this level to reveal the worldview that the text creator has formed (Jeffries, 2014). According to Jeffries (2010), as viewed through the lens of the text creator, language is the world. She believes that all texts have an ideological foundation. According to her, ideologies may be identified through linguistic analysis, and they can be conveyed to the intended audience whether or not they share those ideas. This means that while some SMS recipients may not be impacted by certain ideals, they are nonetheless able to at least be aware of them.

Accordingly, Jeffries wants the recipient of any communication to understand the underlying ideology. Aside from that, the fundamental idea behind this method is to back up any assertion on the existence of a particular ideology in a text with linguistic proof. Furthermore, according to Jeffries (2010), her principal goals are in the same field as Simpson's (1993). Jeffries and Simpson both concur that textual analysis and stylistic decisions play a vital role in revealing the kinds of decisions the text creator takes. Additionally, Jeffries's goal is to convey an ideology to the text recipient through all texts—regardless of whether the recipient is persuaded by them or not. These texts are intentional.

Tools of Critical Stylistics

The tools of CS stand for the conceptual functions of the text and serve as the foundation for critical stylistics set apart from CDA. These roles, which are a component of language's ideational function, are taken from many models. Textual features or triggers are represented by the textual portion of textual conceptual functions. However, the ideational function is represented by the conceptual portion. Jeffries (2014). The set of fundamental analytical tools that Jeffrey (2010) has adopted for any kind of text is presented below:

1. Naming

The instrument that alludes to noun choices is this one. Since nouns and noun phrases are the entities used to name objects and people in a specific way rather than another, it is through these that ideas are packaged. Naming is the process of selecting a noun, whereby a particular noun is chosen to symbolize a certain referent. Additionally, it involves noun modification, where adjectives are employed to describe nouns in more detail. Lastly, nominalization can

be used to accomplish naming. It's the process of turning verbs into nouns.

2. Representing /Actions/Events/States

The utilization of transitive (verbal process options) is facilitated by this instrument. For this tool, Jeffries (2010) uses Simpson's (1993) transitivity model, which divides lexical verbs into the following four major categories: Human activities are a part of the material action process. It is divided into three subcategories: event, supervision, and intention. It can be recognized by its agent and goal. Verbalization is the process via which, while telling or reporting, actions are carried out using human language. It can be recognized by its verbiage, target, and sayers. The term "mental cognition process" describes what takes place inside of humans. It is made up of perception, response, and cognition. It is recognized by a phenomena and sensor. The fixed relationships between a carrier and an attribute are represented by the relational process. There are three types: situational, possessive relational, and intense relational.

3. Equating and Contrasting

1- Intensive relational equivalence x is y, x seems y, x became y, x appears y

2- Appositional equivalences x, y, (z)

3- Metaphorical equivalences: x is y, x is like y

The list that follows illustrates the potential realizations for opposition and contrast:

1- Negated opposition x not y

2- Transnational opposition turn x into y

3- Comparative oppositions more x than y

4- Replacive opposition x instead of y

- 5- Concessive opposition despite x, y
- 6- Explicit oppositions x by contrast with y
- 7- Parallelism He liked x, she liked y, your house is x, mine is y
- 8- Contrastive x, but y

Since the subtypes of the opposition model created by lexical semantics are helpful in the formation of ideologies, it is crucial to apply it at this point.

- 1-Complementaries: if you are not x, you must be y like alive/dead, girl/ boy;
- 2. -Gradable like hot/cold.
- 3. -Converses like buy/sell
- 4. -Directional or reversive the reverse of the action pack/ unpack.

4-Exemplifying and Enumerating

It is a listing and categorization tool. As an example, consider the situation when a category's list does not include every type in that category. On the other hand, a specific category is indicated while listing each type in the list. Linguistically, a list of related elements separated by commas in written texts and intonation in spoken texts, along with a conjunction *and* between the penultimate and final item, identify exemplification and enumeration. This kind of list consists of two, three, or four parts, each with a different effect. They overlap with the textual construction of opposites in the first two portions of the list. The elements on the list occasionally stand in contradiction to one another. A symbolically full list is shown by moving the three-part list. Ultimately, it is believed that the four-part lists are comprehensive.

5-Prioritizing

It is the sentence's emphasis on specific details. First, by placing the new information at the conclusion of the sentence, information structure can accomplish this. Second, the focus is always on the activity that the altered verb represents, as a result of the active verb becoming passive everywhere. Thirdly, there is the subordination, where the other material that isn't meant to be the major focus is put in the subordinate clause and the important information is put in the main clause.

6-Assuming and Implying

Using implicature with assumption is known as "assuming and implying." Presuppositions can be divided into two categories: logical and existential. Conversely, however, Grice's Maximus—quality, quantity, manner, and relation—is applied in implicature. There are language triggers associated with each sort of assumption, as listed below:

A. Existential presupposition

The + noun phrase

Demonstratives (this, that, these, those) + noun phrase

Possessive pronouns (my, your, our, their, her, his, its) + noun

B. Logical presupposition

The change in the state of verbs

Factive verbs (realize, know, etc.) + that + clausal element

Cleft sentence Iterative words (again, more, etc.) or iterative verbs (reconsider, reproduce, etc.)

Comparative structures

7. Negating

This application welcomes the creation of alternate universes inside a given text. In other words, if something does not escape in one reality, it does so in the other. The addition of a negative particle to the verb phrase is the first syntactic realization of negativity. Second, lexically through the specific lexicon's negative meaning. Third, morphologically by means of appendages. Lastly, pronouns like *nobody*, *no one*, *nothing*, *none*, etc. can be used to get negation, as can the modification of the pronoun by "no."

8. Hypothesizing

This tool alludes to text producers' fabrication of an alternate universe. Stated otherwise, this instrument is connected to the modality system in some manner. In this instance, Jeffries concurs with Simpson's modality model (1993). The modal auxiliary verbs *will*, *would*, *shall*, *should*, *can*, *could*, *may*, *might*, *must*, *ought*, *dare*, and *need* all have several meanings. These modal meanings can be boulomaic, which denote the expression of desirability, deontic, which refers to the expression of obligation, or epistemic (probability), which suggests the speaker's doubt as opposed to assurance. Lexical verbs like *think* and *suppose*, modal adverbs like *probably*, *maybe*, and "definitely," modal adjectives like *probable*, *possible*, *definite*, *sure*, and "certain," and conditional structures like *If*, *then* are further examples of modal expressions.

9. Presenting Others' Speech and Thought

Jeffries uses direct and indirect discourse by Short's (1996) paradigm. Moreover, additional classes are added, including the created Leech, Short, and Semanio classes. As a result, the following classes are part of this model: Direct speech (DS), Free indirect speech (FIS), Indirect speech (IS), Narrator's report of speech (NRS), and Narrator's report of speech act (NRSA). Since direct communication uses the author's or speaker's original words, it is the norm or standard. Nevertheless, there is a gap between the reader or listener and the actual words in various representations of speech, especially when it comes to being closer to direct speech. Comparably, the structure of a thoughtful presentation is similar to that of a verbal presentation: Direct thought (DT), Free indirect thought (FIT), Indirect thought (IT), Narrator's report of thought (NRT); and Narrator's report of thought act (NRTA).

10. Space, Time, and Social Representation

Jeffries relies on the application of deixis in this instrument. This indicates that the speaker or writer uses social, geographical, and historical factors to produce the text. When discussing deixis, it is important to emphasize the main varieties of deixis: *Place deictic* refers to the usage of adverbs *here* and *there*, demonstrative words like *this*, *that*, *those*, and *these*, as well as prepositional phrases like *in front of*, *opposite to*, and *next to*. Words such as *now* and *soon*, verb tenses, demonstrative, adverbials *later*, *earlier*, *immediately*, etc. are examples of time deictic language. The usage of first-, second-, and third-person pronouns as personal deictic; and using titles such as Mr., Dr., Your Majesty, Your Highness, etc. is a social deictic.

Critical Stylistics and Critical Discourse Analysis

The similarities between CDA and CS have already been established. One of these is their concern about the ideological baggage that discourse carries. Discourse, as used generally, is defined as "a stretch of language larger than a sentence" (Crystal, 2012, p. 148). Discourse can also be defined as communication that is "viewed linguistically" or as "language that is viewed communicatively" (Davies and Elder, 2004, p. 134). Additionally, a spoken or written text can be used to define discourse (Jeffries, 2010, p. 7). Even while CS and CDA may concur on these concepts, when they critically evaluate language, their points of emphasis typically diverge.

In terms of CDA, the social and political contexts in which texts are produced are the main focus. In other words, rather than being analyzed based on its linguistic units, language is largely examined in terms of its socio-political dimensions (Jeffries, 2010, p. 6). As observed in Fairclough's technique of language analysis, this concentration is important. He provides a model that consists of three factors that should be taken into account while evaluating a text critically. These dimensions begin with the formal study of a text and conclude with giving the "socio-historical context" of the text too much consideration (See Janks, 1997).

This demonstrates how CDA is primarily interested in the social, political, and even historical contexts of linguistic decisions (Jeffries, 2010, 6). In contrast to CDA, CS focuses on the way language portrays the world. In other words, it gives language analysts "a set of analytical tools" to utilize when examining language and how it affects the people it communicates with (ibid, 6). However, CS still values CDA and its perceptions of the connections between language, ideologies, power, and other factors. In actuality, CS borrows certain ideas from

CDA. For instance, Halliday divides language use into three metafunctions: ideational, interpersonal, and textual; the first metafunction is crucial to computer science. The method through which language can be used to name individuals, objects, or conjecture about future events is crucial to CS.

According to Jeffries (2014), CS generally uses the co-text (i.e., linguistic context) when referring to the concept of context. The focus on stylistic decisions and their co-text in CS makes it the perfect paradigm for the current investigation. According to Fairclough (1995), CDA is a type of discourse analysis that examines texts and talks from the perspective of the social and political context, analyzing elements such as power, dominance, and inequality. Van Leeuwen claims in Darma (2014) that to do a CDA, it is necessary to examine social actors and social action, time, distance, conditions, presentation style, setting, construction goals, and visual representation.

The social actors serve as the foundation for the analysis in van Leeuwen's CDA paradigm. Exclusion and Inclusion are two models. Fowler's CDA employs a paradigm for analyzing the word and phrase choices that will ultimately be perceived as the ideology that emerges (Darma, 2014). For example, the news writer's philosophy will be shown indirectly through the language and sentences he/she uses. A string of words and sentences are put together by news writers according to an ideology.

CS and CDA may agree on these definitions, but they usually focus on different aspects when they analyze discourse critically. As far as CDA concerns the social and political situations in which texts occur are the primary focus. Jeffrey (2010) notes that CDA does not provide a clear set of complete instruments to conduct a linguistic analysis as a result. Conversely, CS provides a more comprehensive analytical toolkit. This exemplifies CS analysis's strong point.

Why is Critical Stylistics Not Critical Discourse Analysis?

A subfield of linguistics called critical discourse analysis looks for ideologies. The absence of a systematic approach to analysis is referred to by Jeffries (2010a: 6) as "patchy in its coverage of linguistic structure," and the researchers "have not yet developed a full methodology or methodologies which students can easily try out for themselves." CS evolved as a means of revealing "the ideology in any text, whether or not you agree with it" in response to the biases and criticisms of CDA (Jeffries, 2010b:410). It was created in response to the dearth of systematic analytical techniques and offers a thorough systematic language examination. The main source of inspiration for Jeffries' (2010: 410) CS is Simpson (1993), as the latter created the methodology for text analysis aimed at revealing the ideologies of literary works. Since these functions construct world-views, CS builds upon a set of textual conceptual functions to represent a meaning level between language form and function. This aligns well with Halliday's (1985) ideational meta-function of language (Jeffries, 2014: 412).

Other difficulties also need to be addressed, which is why I prefer Critical Stylistics to Critical Discourse Analysis. Initially, it is claimed that Critical Discourse Analysis makes use of incomplete and illustrative data (Fowler 1996: 8; Widdowson 2004: 102). Therefore, rather than choosing the data based on a theory or critical stance, the data had to be chosen under interpretive positivism to achieve certain predetermined findings (Widdowson 2004: 102). Any language research ought to retain objectivity, and this selection process compromises that. Similarly, Koller and Mautner (2004: 218) say that if an example is uncommon for the analysis, it might be chosen. Furthermore, Widdowson draws attention to the charge that CDA uses material taken out of its textual context, which means that a significant quantity of data will remain unanalyzed.

The pragmatic significance of giving specific structures contextual weight is another argument in favour of CS CDA. When these structures conflict with the analyst's goals, they are disregarded because they serve the analyst's purpose. Unlike CDA, pragmatic significance is not a concern of CS, and this problem is resolved when data is analyzed utilizing C S methodologies. For instance, CDA may emphasize the positive qualities of love while ignoring its negative parts while analyzing poetry. When CDA subjectively chooses examples from the data as representative of a specific topic under investigation, they run the risk of making generalizations about typical speech in the lack of linguistic proof.

Stubbs (1997) notes that to minimize subjectivity, a significantly larger variety of data must be sampled before concluding the usual usage of language (p:111). The data will only be representative of the texts that fall within the boundaries chosen. Authors that use CDA frequently believe that being blatantly subjective is acceptable. CDA is derived from the analyst's political position, where the researcher's political viewpoint influences how the data is interpreted. This position encourages subjective interpretation, which scholars of CDA believe is acceptable. CDA will lead to analytical subjectivity since it aims to combat social inequalities and language abuse by the powerful (Hart, 2010: 39). By grounding the interpretation in the text, CS, on the other hand, informs objectivity and challenges our prejudices. To maintain impartiality, structures must be interpreted honestly, even when they run counter to the analyst's position. In contrast, CS presents a fully established textually grounded model and employs a variety of analytical techniques to help address the issues that CDA encounters. As a result, it is inspired by the issues raised by CDA and suggests several instruments.

Conclusion

From a critical point of view, both CDA and CS have distinct goals. The main focus of CDA is the interaction between language and societal power structures. It examines how language is employed to uphold or subvert social injustice, power relations, and ideologies. CDA frequently looks into how language is used to support or challenge prevailing social norms and power dynamics in the media, politics, and day-to-day interactions. CS, on the other hand, is primarily concerned with the linguistic elements of texts, such as syntax, vocabulary, and rhetorical techniques. It examines how these linguistic decisions affect how a book is understood and interpreted, with a focus on how language affects how we see social concerns and power relationships.

In conclusion, while CS and CDA both address language and power, CS explores the linguistic elements of texts and how they affect meaning and interpretation, whereas CDA concentrates on the more general social and ideological ramifications of language use. CS collects a variety of tools which make a clear analysis of the hidden ideologies in texts. In addition, we can conclude that CS addresses the objectivity and flexibility of the text, and CDA addresses the way the power of social and political groups shape ideologies. Conversely, CS examines any ideology found in any kind of text, regardless of its power. Consequently, this review provided a critical examination of the most well-known critical linguistics approaches to discourse. This review showed a variety of work conducted in this area and how various scholars tackled these two approaches. Overall, these two approaches are indispensable for the interpretation of spoken and

written discourse. Although there are variations in these two approaches, the review explained that both of them are complementary to each other. While CDA answers the role of transitivity, CS answers the role of tools proposed by Jeffries and considers them necessary in the hands of speakers/writers for controlling the directions of their speech.

References

- ❖ Burke, M. (Ed.). (2014). *The Routledge Handbook of Stylistics*. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.
- ❖ Crystal, D. (2012). *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics*. New York: Blackwell Publishing.
- ❖ Darma, A. Y. (2014) *Analisis Wacana Kritis dalam Multiperspektif*. Bandung: PT Refika Aditama
- ❖ Davies, H. & Elder, C. (2004) "The Practice of LSP", in *The Handbook of Applied Linguistics* ed. by A. Davies & C. Elder, Oxford: Blackwell, 672-694
- ❖ Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. New York: Longman.
- ❖ Fairclough, N. (2014). *Language and power*. New York/ London: Routledge.
- ❖ Fairclough, N. L. and Wodak, R. (1997). *Critical discourse analysis*. In T. A. van Dijk (ed.), *Discourse Studies. A Multidisciplinary Introduction*, Vol. 2. *Discourse as Social Interaction* (pp. 258–84). London: Sage
- ❖ Fowler, R. (1996) 'On critical linguistics', in Caldas-Coulthard, C. and Coulthard, M. (eds) *Texts and Practices*. London: Routledge. 3–14.
- ❖ Fowler, R., Hodge, B., Kress, G., and Trew, T. (1979). *Language and Control*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul
- ❖ Halliday, M.A.K. (1985). *An introduction to functional grammar*. London: Edward Arnold.
- ❖ Hart, C. (2010). *Critical discourse analysis and cognitive science*. United Kingdom: Palgrave Macmillan.

- ❖ Janks, H. (1997). Critical discourse analysis as a research tool. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 18(3), 329-342. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0159630970180302>
- ❖ Jeffries, L. (2010). *Critical stylistics: The power of English*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- ❖ Jeffries, L. (2014). Critical stylistics. In M. Burke (ed.), *The Routledge Handbook of Statistics* (pp. 408-420). Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.
- ❖ Jeffries, L. (2015). Textual meaning and its place in a theory of language. In *Topics in Linguistics*, 15(1).
- ❖ Koller, V. and G. Mautner (2004). Computer applications in critical discourse analysis. In C. Coffin, A. Hewings and K. O'Halloran (eds), *Applying English Grammar: Functional and Corpus Approaches*. London: Hodder and Stoughton. pp. 216–28.
- ❖ Mey, J. L. (1985). *Whose Language. A Study in Linguistic Pragmatics*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- ❖ Short, M. (1996) *Exploring the Language of Poems, Plays and Prose*. London: Longman.
- ❖ Simpson, P. (1993). *Language, ideology and point of view*. London: Routledge.
- ❖ Simpson, P. (2004). *Stylistics: A resource book for students*. London: Routledge.
- ❖ Stubbs, M. (1997). Whorf's Children: Critical comments on critical discourse analysis (CDA). In A. Ryan and A. Wray (eds), *Evolving Models of Language*. Clevedon: British Association for Applied Linguistics. pp. 100–16.
- ❖ Van Dijk, A. (2015). Critical discourse analysis. In D. Tannen, H. E. Hamilton, & D. Schiffrin, (Eds.), *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis* (2nd ed.), (pp.466-468). United Kingdom: Wiley Blackwell.

- ❖ Weiss, G., and Wodak, R. (Eds.). (2003). Critical discourse analysis: Theory and interdisciplinarity. New York/Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.
- ❖ Widdowson, H. (2004). The theory and practice of Critical Discourse Analysis, Applied Linguistics. 19(1): 136–51
- ❖ Wodak, R. (2001). What CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS is about - a summary of its history, important concepts and its developments. In Wodak R., & Meyer, M. (Eds.), Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis. London: Sage.
- ❖ Wodak, R., and Meyer, M. (Eds.). (2001). Methods of critical discourse analysis. London: Sage Publications.