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Abstract
The main objective of this study is to present the most common and uncommon approaches regarding the main paths of Critical discourse analysis (CDA) and Critical discourse studies (CDS). This study covers the guidance towards finding the most reliable scientific publications on each approach for CDA and CDS. In addition, this study also summarizes current knowledge on these topics and suggests necessary future investigations. In other words, this study aims to identify the novel trends for the researchers to focus on in future studies. Some parameters were used to measure the occurrence of these studies in the international publications using the search-engines of various databases and search options.
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1. Introduction

Critical discourse analysis (CDA) can be considered one of the branches of discourse analysis proposed by a group of scholars in the UK and Western Europe in the late 1980s[1, 2]. Thereafter, the CDA has turned out to be one of the most prominent and influential paths of discourse analysis[2] and became a prominent field in the social sciences[3]. Generally, the CDA emerged from critical linguistics (henceforth CL), critical semiotics and from a socio-politically conscious and appositional way of investigating language, discourse and communication. More specifically, CDA attempts uncovering implicit ideologies in texts. Nowadays, CDA is mainly used to evaluate talk and text. In principle, CDA can be considered for any type of topic.

Apart from the CDA, some researchers prefer the term critical discourse studies (CDS) to extend the scope of the CDA using the phrase “studies”. For example, several directions can be considered for critical literacy[4], education[5], social media/communication [6,
7], and gender studies[8, 9]. In other words, the scope of critical research may not necessarily be tied with the linguistic analysis of texts. In fact, the aim of using CDS has been defined in several sources[5, 6, 10-14]. For example, the journal of the critical discourse studies [15]mentioned that their goal is to identify how discourse works in social change, social processes and social structures.

After an extensive review, the results show that there are many studies on the global scope of the CDA[16-27]and CDS[5-9, 28-33]. Nevertheless, studies regarding the scope of both CDS and CDA are very scarce[1, 34, 35], and most of them have not made a systematic review. As shown above, both CDA and CDS have been used for the same goal except the fact that CDS can be used for extending some scopes related to social science. This means that a global review can be made only by considering both CDS and CDA in order to complete the bigger image of the mentioned scopes.

In order to overcome the above issues, this study made a systematic and global review on CDS and/or CDA from 1980 (its first application [1, 2]) until the current time. For that purpose, this study first focused on the roots of CDA/CDS (section 3), common frameworks/approaches to CDA/CDS (section 4) and their limitations, trans disciplinary directions in CDS/CDA (section 5), and suggestions for future applications (section 6). Thus, this study encourages more researchers to work on the CDS/CDA, namely by showing what has been/must be done on these topics. Apart from introducing the most paths/trendson both CDS and CDA, this study also focuses on the limitations (critical issues) and future required investigation for these scopes to be foundation for coming studies.

2. Methodology

As mentioned before, the current work is made to present a systematic and extensive review paper concerning the past and future of the CDA/CDS. Accordingly, this review study is made considering the search-engines of various databases and search options (Figure 1). In addition, the same search options for “each or combined” keywords shown below (e.g. i-xiii) were made for each database shown in Figure 1. For each study found from the mentioned process, its citation and bibliography list were also checked in order to find more studies on the scope of this study namely CDA/CDS.

i. CDA and/or CDS;
ii. Critical approaches;
iii. Critical discourse analysis/studies;
iv. Critical discourse analysis;
v. Critical discourse studies;
vi. Critical discourse;
vii. Critical Linguistics
viii. Critical study;
ix. Discourse analysis;
x. Linguistics/ Critical Linguistics;
xi. Multimodal Critical Discourse Analysis;
xii. Pragmatics;
xiii. The title of the sections and sub-sections of the next two sections (§4-5);

![Search options and databases](image)

**Figure 1 - Search options and databases**

One of the most important parts of any reliable review study can be related to its cited studies. Thus, some strict parameters were considered to cite any study: (i) The paper must be published in the ISI (web of science) or Scopus journal; (ii) The scope of the study must be related to the CDA and/or CDS. This is due to the fact that many scholars do not differentiate between the CDA and discourse analysis; (iii) If the relevant study was not published in any ISI or Scopus journals, it must have at least 4 citations (Figure 2); (iv) The recent publications are prioritized more than the older studies.

Accordingly, 182 studies published from the late 1980s to the current time were collected in this study. Most of them are either journal papers or books. In some cases, the author cited more than one study to stress the fact that the path has been considered by many researchers.
3. Roots of Critical Discourse Analysis

It is important to understand the meaning of the discourse analysis (DA) before defining the root of the CDA. In general, the DA is the evaluation of language in use. In other words, DA is the examination or review of the action and meaning we consider when we use language in certain contexts[16]. As shown in Figure 3, there are multiple approaches proposed by scholars to be used for DA such as multimodal DA, discourse-oriented ethnography, mediated DA, interactional sociolinguistics and DA, DA and linguistic anthropology, corpus-based DA, narrative analysis, Systemic functional linguistics, conversation analysis, discursive psychology and DA, gender and DA, multimedia and DA, and CDA developed/propoised by Kress [36], Smart [37], Scollon and de Saint-Georges [38], Jaspers [39], Richland [40], Flowerdew [41], Hornborrow[42], Schleppegrell[43], Clayman and Gill [44], Potter [45], Coates [46], Lemke [47], and Fairclough [20], respectively. The scope of this study mainly relates to the CDA. Thus, the next paragraph mainly focused to the roots of CDA.
Both terms CDA and critical Linguistics have been used by scholars for the same objectives. Nowadays, scholars prefer to use the term CDA only[13]. In general, the root of CDA lies in text linguistics, systemic functional linguistics, sociolinguistics, Marxism, classical rhetoric, pragmatics and Foucauldian discourse[48] (see further detail in Table 1). Some of the tenets regarding the CDA can be seen in Aristotle's rhetoric. Then, after two millennia, similar tenets can be seen in the critical-theory of Frankfurt school, specifically before the 2nd world war[49, 50]. In the late 1970s, the critical Linguistics studies which emerged mostly in Britain and Australia were focused on the discourse and language[51, 52]. Apart from the critical Linguistics, CDA has also performed in critical developments to the social sciences, psychology and sociolinguistics[53-61], as well as a reaction against the dominant form (asocial) paradigms tended at 1960-1970s[35].
Table 1-Main roots of CDA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>CDA Roots</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Critical Linguistics</td>
<td>Critical Linguistics was proposed in the late 1960s at the University of East Anglia, with a manifesto created by Bob Hodge and Gunther Kress which summarized linguistics in an activist, Marxist framework, in a post published in 1968. This can be considered as a first attempt regarding the critical Linguistics. Almost after two decades, specifically in January 1991, a two-day workshop on the critical linguistics was hosted by van Dijk in Amsterdam where Norman Fairclough, Gunther Kress, Theo van Leeuwen, van Dijk himself, and Ruth Wodak (further detail regarding each of the mentioned scholars are given in [48]) are among the most popular participants. This workshop was very significant since it was the beginning of a new approach of DA which is called CDA [62]. So, critical linguistics can be regarded an antecedent of CDA which has been very much discussed by scholars recently. For example, Rahimi and Sahragard[63] reported that critical linguistics can be considered as a foundation of CDA that grabs numerous attention since the 1980s. Wodak[64] also emphasized the communality between critical Linguistics and CDA. The major problem of critical Linguistics is its difficulty to understand other parameters such as whys and wherefores for textual choices than ideology and for its inability regarding the way how audiences make sense of texts diversely. For that purpose, critical linguistics has been largely subsumed with social semiotics and CDA. Further limitations regarding critical Linguistics can be seen in the study of Fairclough [65]. Overall, the objective of the Critical Linguistics is to disclose the “angles of representation” and biases in “transparent” language use [66-70] and show how these biases can baffle the actual-nature of the events in a certain discourse. Although, the Critical Linguistics approach focuses in a way that how agency for a certain action is characterised in the discourse, the perspective in Critical Linguistics on how “language” can be used to baffle (mystify) responsibility for social-action is still a mending of CDA.</td>
<td>UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Frankfurt School and</td>
<td>This school tried to study the case of an irrational society in which people are excluded from the mainstream of power</td>
<td>Austria/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Critical Theory</strong></td>
<td>[63]. The original source of the mentioned school is Critical Theory [71]. Critical theory has been defined as a theory that can provide the analytical and ethical foundation needed to uncover the structure of underlying social practices and to reveal the possible distortion of social life embodied on them. This idea is particularly associated with Frankfurt school, founded in 1923 at Frankfurt University in exile in the United States, the university in which Jorgen Habermas was a lecturer during the 1960s [72]. Habermas was the most popular figure in this school. His proposed utopia is based upon the fact that all humans are language users. Humans are symbol-using animals, and living and working together. This indicates that there is an ideal situation in which communication is free, but distorted by social inequalities, oppression and discrimination, [73]. One can conclude that CDA may have got benefit from the ideas and the vocabulary used by scholars from Frankfurt School, especially those used by Habermas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Marxism</strong></td>
<td>There are elements in Marx's economic and political writings that are relevant to contemporary CDA. Though Marxism, politically and economically, has proved to have many shortcomings, Marx's critique of capitalism was influential and remains influential. The common and shared ground for both Marx's political and economical model and CDA are that they both criticize capitalism as a system. While the former focuses on economic manipulation, the latter focuses on language abuse. If one looks at language as an element of the material social process which is dialectically interconnected with other elements, one can argue that there are insights that are taken from Marxism, which are of theoretical and/or methodological value in developing a critical analysis of language or CDA as part of the contemporary critique of capitalism[74]. CDA and Marxism are interrelated in many aspects. Like the case in Marxism, three concepts are vital in all CDA: (i) the concept of power, (ii) the concept of history, and (iii) the concept of ideology. Some trace the notion of critique which is inherent in CDA to the Frankfurt school, others to a notion of literary criticism, some to Marx's notions[17]. For CDA language is not powerful on its own, but it gains power by using it by powerful people. Language is interwoven in social power. In this respect, CDA resembles Marxism, since language indicates power and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Germany/United States</strong></td>
<td><strong>UK</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
expresses power.

| 4 | Foucauldian Discourse | The French philosopher, Michael Foucault, has played a central role in the development of DA through both theoretical work and empirical research. In almost all discourse analytical approaches, he has become a figure to quote, relate to, comment on, modify and criticize. Under his influence, a more recently evolved branch of discourse analysis is introduced which is called Foucauldian Discourse Analysis. It shares the critically engaged focus of CDA but presents itself as more directly formed by the work of Michel Foucault [75]. Further details regarding the function of this approach can be found in these studies [76-78]. |
| France |

| 5 | Systemic Functional Linguistics | Systemic Functional Linguistics is an influential theory of language founded by M.A.K. Halliday. It emphasizes the function of language rather than its form, and analyses language in terms of a large number of categories that perform different functions. Terms such as coherence, cohesion, ideational function and textual function belong to this theory [79]. Most researches on CDA and discourse analysis can be linked to the work of Halliday, namely Systemic Functional Linguistics. Thus, it is essential to understand the basic idea of the Halliday's theory and his grammar to linguistic analysis of any CDA study. In general, Halliday emphasis on the correlation between the grammatical system of language and personal and social demands that language is needed to assist. Additionally, Halliday joined rhetoric and argumentation theory with his approach. Thus, Halliday divided the language use for 3 meta functions: (i) interpersonal, (ii) textual and (iii) ideational functions [17]. There is no doubt that many CDA studies make use of Systemic Functional Linguistics and some of the systems and concepts within Halliday's framework, such as transitivity, modality, thematic development and grammatical metaphor. This means that SFL provides CDA with the technical devices for talking about language, but it is not the only framework of CDA. |
| Systemic Functional Linguistics | UK |
4. **Most Common frameworks/approaches to Critical Discourse Analysis and their limitations**

In this section, the author of this study mainly focused on the common approaches that are often cited in the CDA/CDS literature, namely (i) Dialectical–Relational, (ii) Dispositive Analysis (Foucauldian Analysis), (iii) Socio-Cognitive, (iv) Discourse-Historical, and (v) Social Actors approaches, and each of them follows one or two theories (Figure 4). As a brief history regarding the most common approaches, it is worth to mention a workshop held at the Netherlands with the support of the Amsterdam University where the main CDA founding members such as Norman Fairclough, Ruth Wodak, Teun van Dijk, Theo van Leewen, Gunther Kress participated and spent two days together in order to discuss theories and methods of Critical Linguistics and discourse analysis. Thus, this workshop can be considered as a birthplace of CDA and these scholars can be honoured as the founders of CDA. As discussed in the study of Waugh et al. [1], the mentioned approaches have many similarities, e.g. all of them have a similar interest in power and demystifying-ideologies through the “systematic investigation” of semiotic data such as spoken, written and visual modes[80, 81]. Apart from the commonalities shown by Waugh et al. [1], the research program of the CDA/CDS can be substantially varied based on the theoretical influence and scientific methodology [80]. Thus, in order to show the similarity and differences between the mentioned approaches (i-v), the current study outlined their roots, scholars who considered as a prominent figure and research focus along with central concepts/novelty features. In addition, the definition of “discourse” was given to the approaches due to their differences regarding the main structure. Whereas it is not claimed that these were the merely approaches to CDA, it is argued that they were the best completed approaches (further details on each approach have been shown in section 4.1-4.5). More recent trends are briefly mentioned later in Section 5.
4.1 Dialectical–Relational approach

There is a consensus that Norman Fairclough is a leading scholar in the realm of CDA, specifically in the dialectical–relational approach [1, 48, 76]. In fact, his book[82], namely “Language and Power” published in 1989 is the pioneering work regarding the mentioned area. Since then he has been continuously working on this realm and proposed many new ideas from that realm to CDA [1]. In the mentioned book, Fairclough generally focused on the whyness and howness (e.g. why and how writers/speakers choose certain forms or expressions) of the text-description instead of whatness ([82], P:56-9). Fairclough believes that for every cases of language use is a communicative-event composing of 3 dimensions, namely text (writing, speech, visual image or a combination of these), discursive practice (production and consumption of text), and social practice (Figure 5).
As mentioned before, during the past three decades, he published many works on CDA. For example, he published a book under the title “CDA: The critical study of language” in 1995 (first edition: collected 10 papers published in 1983-1992 [83]), and in 2010 (second edition: collected 23 papers published in 1983-2008 [84]). In both editions, he focused on the (i) language, ideology and power, (ii) discourse and sociocultural change, and (iii) language and education. Fairclough also studied media discourse [85-87], language and power [20, 82, 88], language awareness [89], social change [65], linguistic and intertextual analysis [90], description of CDA in practice [91], the critical study of language [20, 83], critical awareness and global capitalism of language [92], new languages[93], how to analyze talk [94], textual analysis for social research [95], language and globalization [96], and CDA in general [74, 97-99].

4.2 Dispositive Analysis (Foucauldian Analysis) approach

This approach was oriented by Siegfried Jäger and Florentine Maier in 2009 where they follow Michel Foucault’s discourse theory on CDA [1]. Jäger and Maier [100] reported that the dispositive analysis mainly focused on the cultural sciences, specifically linguistic/structural/grammatical features of a text, and also macro-level of text [101]. In addition, the dispositive analysis roles as an essential analytical strategy for most CDA experts that study the complex and multiple pathes of power demonstrated in the dynamic-relationship of objects actions and discourses[100, 102-104].

In fact, the main idea of the dispositive analysis can be seen in other studies even before 2009 such as Foucault’s work, namely History of Sexuality[105] and Discipline and Punish[106], and Klempner’s diaries [107]. In addition, there are other works that relate with the dispositive analysis published before 2009, i.e., Jäger[108-110], Graham [111],
Jäger and Jäger[112], Link [113], McGrath[114] and Graham and Slee[115]. Nevertheless, as reported in the study of Jäger and Maier [100], in the mentioned works [105-107], the dispositive analysis method was implicitly applied by consulting statistics, assembling knowledge, analyzing the discourses, etc. In other words, Klemperer [116] and Jäger and Maier [100] believe that the mentioned studies “can be read as a dispositive analysis”.

4.3 Social Actors approach

In this approach, Theo van Leeuwen regarded as one of the contributors of the development of CDA, specifically in the social actors approach [62]. He has broadly published in the areas of CDA, multimodality and social semiotics [13, 80]. He believes that individuals are social actors. They are influenced by policies and decisions of powerful organizations which either exclude or include the individuals from the centres of power. Similar to studies of Fairclough, Van Leeuwen focused on the social practices, as socially regulated ways of doing things, in his book titled 'Discourse and Practice' [117]. According to his ideas, all actually performed social practices include participants, locations, resources, performance modes, times, eligibility conditions, presentation styles and actions. Less details regarding this approach are given in this section due to the fact that it has been extensively described in the previous studies [1, 48, 117-122].

4.4 Socio-Cognitive approach

Teun van Dijk is considered as one of the prominent figures of socio-Cognitive approach in which he mainly followed Serge Moscovici’s theory[123]. In his book entitled Discourse and Context: A Sociocognitive Approach [124] focused on the essential parameters of the study of cognition in the critical analysis of communication, interaction and discourse. Dijk’s early works were related to psychology, text grammar and generative poetics. After that, specifically after 1980, his work takes a more critical perspective and deals with news in the press, context, discursive racism, knowledge and ideology [62]. In his recent works[124, 125], he mainly focused on the power and discourse, and the role of context in discourse. These recent studies are applied van Dijk’s sociocognitive approach, i.e., Peyroux[126], Clarke et al. [127], Foluke[128], Olausson [129] and Isbuga-Erel[130].

In general, as reported in study of Sherwani ([48]: p.46), “Teun van Dijk is criticized for not presenting texts at random from a corpus of speeches made within the context of a specific issue; instead he selects texts produced by members of conservative or far-right parties and politicians. This criticism is unfair; at least for someone examined CDA in all its dimensions, since CDA like modern linguistics, is descriptive. It tries to describe how
these speeches made by certain people are bias”. Further details regarding this approach can be seen in the study of Sherwani [48] and Waugh et al. [1].

4.5 Discourse-Historical approach

Similarly to other scholars, Ruth Wodak can be also considered as the prominent figures of CDA, namely for his significant role regarding discourse historical approach. Ruth Wodak’s publications are mainly in the areas of discourse and discrimination, organizational research, gender studies, identity politics, interdiscursive, transtextual and sociopolitical[48, 64, 108, 110, 113, 131].

According to study of Reisigl and Wodak[132], discourse historical approach can be characterized for several main principles such as (i) problem oriented, (ii) combination of the various theories and methods, (iii) interdisciplinary, (iv) research-moves recursively between empirical data and theory, (v) research incorporates ethnography and fieldwork. Further main examples can be also seen in study of Waugh et al.[1].

Wodak emphasizes the importance of taking into account the wider context of discourse. For her, context has four levels (i-iv). Her research seeks to identify the operation of power and dominance in discourse across these four contextual levels ([133]: 138)

(i) The actual or immediate use of text or language;
(ii) The relationship among texts, utterances, genres and discourses;
(iii) The extra-linguistic sociological and institutional context of discourse;
(iv) The historical and socio-political contexts.

The following recent studies are also followed discourse historical approach in which they focused on the discursive construction of national identities [134], a context-sensitive approach to analysing talk in strategy meetings [127], political campaigningmediatization and right-wing populism[135], a call to arms at the end of history [136], ask each pupil regarding her methods of cleaning[137], American computer war gamesand Arab [138], and the discursive construction of European identities [139].

5. Transdisciplinary directions in critical discourse analysis/studies

Apart from the common approaches shown in section 4, there are other trends that can be also considered for the CDA/CDS. Nevertheless, they are not well known by researchers or they have not been frequently used as an independent approach. In other words, they have not effectively been affected by the critique of CD, and triggered by the creation of CDS/CDA.
5.1 Multi-model Approach

Multi-model is a recent CDA approach that considers the relationship between image and text[140, 141]. This trend works on the different semiotic-resources, namely image, language, music and sound in communicative events and texts [142-144]. Thus, it can be considered as a phenomenon instead of a method. Theo van Leeuwen and Gunter Kress can be considered as the prominent figure of this trend. The main theoretical attractor of this trend is Critical Theory and Michael Halliday. Most of the main footsteps related to this trend can be seen in a study prepared by Theo van Leeuwen in 2014 [145]. In addition, a study of Waugh et al. [1] summarized new paths on the Multimodality that the scholars are now working on it.

5.2 Feminist approach (gender and discourse)

Feminist approach in CDA aims to analyse the relationships between gender, language use and power[146, 147]. Construction of gender identity, appreciation of gender as a dynamic construct and sexism are key foci analysing discourses within this approach.

5.3 Positive Discourse Analysis

According to the initiator of the Positive Discourse Analysis (PDA), James Martin, the objective of this trend is to understand how power relations and power produce, and reproduced based on the critical perspective. Another point of this trend is to look at the mentioned topics from a positive standpoint. James Martin is a prominent figure in this trend and published several works regarding this path [148-150]. Since 2004, his work has considered a new trend in CDA. Further details on the application of this trend can be seen in a study, and also some critiques addressed against PDA can be seen in the study of Bartlett [151] and Macgilchrist[152].

5.4 Other trends

Apart from the trends given above (sections 5.1-5.4), there are other trends that relate to the CDA/CDS such as Cognitive Linguistics[153-159], Rhetoric[160-163], Education[164-166], Anthropology/Ethnography[167-171], Sociolinguistics[172-174], Culture[24, 175-178], Corpus[179-182]Studies. As a new research work to follow, Waugh et al. [1] identified the most promising paths for each of the mentioned paths. Many of the promising paths can be seen in the cited studies of this sub-section.

6. Conclusions and Suggestions for Future Applications/studies

The main purpose of this study is to show the most common and uncommon approaches/trends regarding the most paths of the CDA/CDS, and guideresearchers to find the most reliable studies on each trend/approach. Another purpose of this study is to
show what has been done and what must be done regarding the mentioned area (CDA/CDS). In other words, this research aims to identify the novel trends in order to help the researchers to focus on them in future studies. According to this study discourse studies are still developing and CDA/CDS as a new branch of DA is the most widespread one, which has many applications in the fields of politics, media, education, etc. There are also other new trends that can be regarded as sub-branches of CDA, which are now developing very fast. The most important conclusions of this paper can be summarized in the following points:

I. Generally, the CDA emerged from critical linguistics, critical semiotics and from a socio-politically conscious and appositional way of investigating language, discourse and communication.

II. Apart from the CDA, some researchers prefer the term critical discourse studies (CDS) to extend the scope of the CDA using the phrase “studies”, since the scope of critical rather common approaches that are often cited in the CDA/CDS literature, namely (i) Dialectical–Relational, (ii) Dispositive Analysis (Foucauldian Analysis), (iii) Socio-Cognitive, (iv) Discourse-Historical, and (v) Social Actors approaches search may not necessarily be tied with the linguistic analysis of texts.

III. This study classifies the common approaches that are often cited in the CDA/CDS literature into (i) Dialectical–Relational, (ii) Dispositive Analysis (Foucauldian Analysis), (iii) Socio-Cognitive, (iv) Discourse-Historical, and (v) Social Actors approaches.

IV. There are new trends in the field of CDA/CDS that are now in the course of developing, such as, feminist approach of discourse, multimodal discourse analysis and positive discourse analysis.
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