INTERROGATING THE PLACE OF CONTEXT IN DISCOURSE ANALYSIS: A CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS OF LANGUAGE USE AND POWER DYNAMICS

Prisca O. BOB & Ugochi P. KWEKOWE, PhD
Department of English Language
Evangel University, Akaeze, Ebonyi State
Email address: odiiprisca@gmail.com

Abstract

The relationship that exists between context and discourse is that of mutual exclusivity. Context is the totality of environment in which participants interact. It helps in the interpretation of meanings which do not rely solely on the grammaticality of the utterance but also on the communicative situations governing such an utterance. That being the case, context plays a fundamental role in determining meaning. This highlights the idea that meaning does not exist in a vacuum but is rather a function of the environment of discourse, which include but is not limited to the social, cultural and linguistic environment. This study examines the crucial role of context in shaping the meaning and interpretation of discourse, with a focus on language use and power dynamics. Through a critical discourse analysis of a discourse extract, this research reveals how context influences the construction of meaning and how language use reflects and shapes social and political inequalities. The findings highlight the importance of contextual analysis in uncovering the complex relationships between language, power, and context. This study contributes to our understanding of the ways in which language use perpetuates dominant discourses and reinforces social and political inequalities, and underscores the need for critical discourse analysis in challenging these inequalities. The study's recommendations emphasize the importance of critical language awareness, contextual analysis, and inclusive language use in promoting social and political change.

Keywords: Critical Discourse Analysis, Context, Language Use, Power Dynamics, Social Inequality, Political Inequality.

Introduction

The success of any communicative function is situated between linguistic choices and contextual features. Discourse analysis, as a field of study, has long grappled with the complex and multifaceted concept of context (Fairclough, 1992; van Dijk, 1993). Context is widely acknowledged as a crucial factor in shaping the meaning and interpretation of discourse (Gee, 1999; Halliday, 1978), and is often defined as the "social and cultural environment in which language is used" (Blommaert, 2005, p. 15). However, the precise role and scope of context remain a subject of debate among scholars (Wodak & Meyer, 2009). Discourse analysis, as a field of study, has its roots in linguistics, sociology, and anthropology. It emerged in the 1960s and 1970s as a response to the limitations of traditional linguistics, which focused primarily on the structure of language and ignored its social and cultural context (Halliday, 1978). Discourse analysis sought to rectify this oversight by examining language use in social contexts, and exploring how language shapes and is shaped by social and cultural factors (Gee, 1999).

One of the key insights of discourse analysis is that language use is always situated in a specific social and cultural context (Hymes, 1974). This context shapes the production and reception of language, and influences the meaning and interpretation of discourse (Duranti & Goodwin, 1992). Moreover, context is not just a static backdrop for language use, but is itself shaped by language and discourse (Fairclough, 1992).

Discourse analysts are constantly faced with the challenge of navigating the intricate web of contextual factors that influence the production and reception of language (Hymes, 1974). These factors can include the physical setting, social relationships, cultural norms, and power dynamics that shape the communicative event (Duranti & Goodwin, 1992). Moreover, context is not just a static backdrop for language use, but is itself shaped by language and discourse (Fairclough, 1992).

Despite its importance, context is often treated as a taken-for-granted or secondary consideration in discourse analysis (Blommaert, 2005). This oversight can lead to oversimplified or decontextualized analyses that fail to capture the richness and complexity of discourse in its natural setting (Cicourel, 1992). Moreover, the neglect of context can result in the perpetuation of dominant discourses and the marginalization of alternative perspectives (Foucault, 1972).

One of the key insights of discourse analysis is that language use is always situated in a specific social and cultural context (Hymes, 1974). This context shapes the production and reception of language, and influences the meaning and interpretation of discourse (Duranti & Goodwin, 1992). Moreover, context is not just a static backdrop for language use, but is itself shaped by language and discourse (Fairclough, 1992).

Despite the importance of context in discourse analysis, it remains a complex and multifaceted concept that is often difficult to define and analyze (Blommaert, 2005). Some scholars have argued that context is too broad a concept to be useful, and that it should be broken down into more specific categories, such as social context, cultural context, and historical context (Wodak & Meyer, 2009). Others have argued that context is not just an external factor that influences language use, but is also shaped by language and discourse itself (Fairclough, 1992).

Discourse analysis draws heavily on context which explores the totality of environment in which participants in a talk exchange interact. This paper discusses the centrality of context in the comprehension and interpretation of a text and aims to interrogate the place of context in discourse analysis, exploring its various dimensions, and examining the methodological and theoretical implications of prioritizing context in our analyses. By critically examining the role of context in shaping discourse, this study aims to contribute to a more nuanced understanding of language and its role in shaping our social worlds.

Statement of the Problem

The concept of context is a crucial aspect of discourse analysis, as it plays a significant role in shaping the meaning and interpretation of language use (Fairclough, 1992; van Dijk, 1993). However, despite its importance, context remains a poorly understood and often neglected component of discourse analysis (Blommaert, 2005). This oversight can have significant consequences, including oversimplified or decontextualized analyses that fail to capture the richness and complexity of discourse in its natural setting (Cicourel, 1992). By neglecting the complex and multifaceted nature of context, discourse analysts risk oversimplifying or decontextualizing their analyses, which can lead to a lack of depth and nuance in their findings (Gee, 1999). For example, an analysis of a political speech that neglects the historical and cultural context in which it was delivered may miss important insights into the ways in which language use shapes and is shaped by social and cultural factors (Foucault, 1972). Furthermore, the neglect of context can also result in the perpetuation of dominant discourses and the marginalization of alternative perspectives (Halliday, 1978). By failing to account for the contextual factors that shape language use, discourse analysts may inadvertently reinforce existing power dynamics and social inequalities (Hymes, 1974). For instance, an analysis of gender and language use that neglects the social and cultural context in which language is

used may perpetuate dominant gender stereotypes and marginalize alternative gender identities (Butler, 1990). Additionally, the neglect of context limits our understanding of language use and its role in shaping social relationships, cultural norms, and power dynamics (Bourdieu, 1991). By failing to account for the complex and dynamic nature of context, discourse analysts may miss important insights into the ways in which language use shapes and is shaped by social and cultural factors (Gumperz, 1982).

Several studies have addressed the importance of context in discourse analysis (Fairclough, 1992; van Dijk, 1993; Blommaert, 2005). However, these studies have primarily focused on the role of context in shaping the meaning and interpretation of language use, and have not fully addressed the methodological implications of prioritizing context in discourse analysis.

There is a significant gap in the literature on discourse analysis, as few studies have addressed the methodological implications of prioritizing context in discourse analysis. This gap is particularly notable in the areas of data collection, analysis, and interpretation, where the neglect of context can have significant consequences for the validity and reliability of research findings. By addressing this gap, this research aims to contribute to a more comprehensive and contextualized approach to discourse analysis, one that takes into account the complex and multifaceted nature of context and its role in shaping language use and social relationships.

Objectives of the Study

1. To analyze how context influences language use, communication and social relationships.
2. To investigate the different types of context and their interrelationships.
3. To explore the methodological implications of contextual analysis for discourse research.
4. To develop a comprehensive framework for understanding the place of context in discourse analysis.

Research Questions

1. To what extent does context influence language use, communication and social relationships?
2. To what degree do the different types of context interrelate?
3. What are the methodological implications of contextual analysis for discourse research and how can researchers incorporate context into their analyses?

Significance of the Study

This study has significant implications for various fields and areas of research:

- Advancing Discourse Analysis: This study contributes to the development of discourse analysis by providing a deeper understanding of the role of context in shaping meaning and interpretation.
- Improving Communication: By examining the importance of context in communication, this research can inform strategies for effective communication, helping individuals and organizations to convey their messages more successfully.
- Enhancing Cross-Cultural Understanding: The study's focus on cultural context can promote cross-cultural understanding and empathy, fostering more effective interactions in diverse social and professional settings.

- Informing Policy and Practice: This research can inform policy and practice in fields like education, healthcare, and law, where understanding the impact of context on communication is crucial.
- Interdisciplinary Insights: The study's interdisciplinary approach can bridge gaps between fields like linguistics, sociology, anthropology, and communication studies, promoting a more comprehensive understanding of context and discourse.
- Methodological Advancements: The research's methodological implications can enhance the quality and validity of discourse analysis research, providing new approaches and techniques for data collection and analysis.
- Empowering Critical Thinking: By highlighting the significance of context in shaping meaning, this study can promote critical thinking and media literacy, encouraging individuals to consider the context of information and communication.
- Contributing to Social Justice: The research's focus on power dynamics and social relationships can inform strategies for promoting social justice and challenging dominant discourses.

The study's significance extends beyond academia, with practical applications in various fields and areas of social life, ultimately contributing to a deeper understanding of the complex role of context in shaping our communication and interactions.

Literature Review

Language in use may be spoken or written, no wonder the modern concept of discourse as both spoken and written stretch of language beyond the sentence level. This aligns with Pustejovsky (2006) in his definition of discourse as a stretch of spoken or written language larger than a sentence, often constituting a coherent unit.

Prior to contemporary times, the term refers to speech, but in modern times, its meaning extends the boundaries of speech to include every instance of language in use. In the study of language, discourse often refers to the speech patterns and usage of language dialects and acceptable statements, within a community. Language is a system of communication that consists of a set of rules, conventions, and symbols that are used to convey meaning (Halliday, 1978). However, language is not just a neutral tool for communication; it is a social and cultural practice that is shaped by the social and cultural contexts in which it is used (Fairclough, 1992). Discourse, which refers to the use of language in social contexts, is a key concept in understanding how language shapes and is shaped by social and cultural factors (Gee, 1999). Discourse is not just a simple reflection of social and cultural contexts; it is an active participant in shaping and maintaining social and cultural relationships and power dynamics (Foucault, 1972).

Discourse analysis, a multidisciplinary field of study, has long recognized the significance of context in shaping the meaning and interpretation of language (Fairclough, 1992; van Dijk, 1993). Context is not merely a passive backdrop for language use but an active participant in the construction of meaning (Halliday, 1978). Scholars have explored the role of context in discourse analysis from various perspectives, yielding a rich and complex understanding of its influence.

One prominent thread of research has focused on the linguistic aspects of context. Gumperz (1982) and Hymes (1974) pioneered the ethnography of communication, emphasizing the importance of contextual factors such as setting, participants, and purpose in shaping language use. Similarly, speech act theory

(Austin, 1962; Searle, 1969) highlights the role of context in determining the illocutionary force of utterances.

Another significant area of inquiry has examined the social and cultural dimensions of context. Bourdieu (1991) and Foucault (1972) have explored how context is shaped by power relations, social structures, and cultural norms. Critical discourse analysis (Fairclough, 1995; van Dijk, 1993) has also investigated how context influences the relationship between language and power. Furthermore, researchers have investigated the cognitive aspects of context, exploring how individuals interpret and construct meaning in discourse (Goffman, 1974; Grice, 1975). This line of inquiry has led to a deeper understanding of how context influences the production and interpretation of language.

Studies have also examined the role of context in specific discourse domains, such as education (Cazden, 1988; Heath, 1983), law (Conley & O'Barr, 1990), and media (Fowler, 1991). These studies have demonstrated the significance of context in shaping language use and meaning in various social settings.

The Place of Context in Discourse Analysis

The place of context in discourse analysis can be better appreciated if participants in a discourse situation realize that both linguistic features and extralinguistic features, such as cultural influence and social variables create and sustain people's linguistic behaviour.

Discourse extends beyond the sentence to its environment in its communicative approach. Every discourse situation is expected to possess cohesive and coherent elements for meaningful interpretation of messages with the relationship between language and its environment (Partridge 2006).

Context means the totality of the environment, situation, and world of participants in linguistic interaction. It is the circumstance in the environment which must be considered for actual understanding of the message of the text.

The concept of context is fundamental in discourse analysis for several reasons. Jinadu (2006) outlined three important points in Discourse Analysis to include the following:

(i)   The notion of the sentence as the basic level from which grammatical or semantic meanings derive

(ii)   Message and shared experience become interactive.

(iii)   Meaning of discourse can be validated from the context rather than from the sentence alone.

Consequently, Jinadu (2006) validates the place of context in discourse analysis which arises from the communicative role of context in a talk exchange. Context is a crucial concept in discourse analysis, and refers to the surrounding circumstances that shape the meaning and interpretation of language (Halliday and Hassan, 1976). Linguistic context, in particular, plays a significant role in determining the meaning of words and phrases, as it provides the linguistic environment that helps to disambiguate their meaning (Halliday and Hassan, 1976). For instance, the word "bank" can have different meanings depending on the linguistic context in which it is used, such as a financial institution or a riverbank (Halliday & Hassan, 1976).

Situational context, on the other hand, refers to the physical and social environment in which communication takes place (Malinowski, 1923). This includes factors such as the setting, the participants involved, and the purpose of the communication (Malinowski, 1923). For example, a conversation between two friends in a coffee shop would have a different situational context than a conversation between a doctor and a patient in a hospital (Malinowski, 1923).

Cultural context is also essential in shaping the meaning and interpretation of language (Geertz, 1973). Culture provides a shared framework of beliefs, values, and practices that influence how language is used and understood (Geertz, 1973). For instance, gestures and body language can have different meanings in different cultures (Geertz, 1973). Similarly, social context, which refers to the social relationships and roles of the participants involved in communication, also plays a crucial role in shaping the meaning and interpretation of language (Gumperz, 1982).

Historical context is another important aspect of context that shapes the meaning and interpretation of language (Foucault, 1972). Language and communication are shaped by the social, political, and cultural conditions of a particular time and place (Foucault, 1972). For example, language used during a political speech in a particular historical period would have a different meaning and interpretation than the same language used in a different historical period (Foucault, 1972).

Finally, discursive context, which refers to the language and social practices that shape communication and meaning, is also essential in understanding the role of context in discourse analysis (Fairclough, 1992). Discursive context includes the language and social practices that shape how we think, communicate, and understand the world around us (Fairclough, 1992). For instance, the language and social practices of a particular discourse community, such as a scientific community or a political party, shape how members of that community communicate and understand the world (Fairclough, 1992).

In conclusion, the literature on context in discourse analysis reveals a complex and multifaceted understanding of its influence. Context is not a fixed or static entity but a dynamic and interactive construct that shapes language use and meaning. Understanding the role of context is essential for analyzing language and discourse in real-life situations.

However, despite the progress made in the area of context in discourse analysis, the gap to fill is in the area of methodological implications of prioritizing context in discourse analysis.

Theoretical Framework

Based on the research objectives and scope, Fairclough's (1992) theory of context as a social construct is most suitable for this study. This theory emphasizes that context is not just a physical or environmental factor, but is also shaped by social and cultural norms and power dynamics. It highlights the importance of considering the social and cultural context in which language use and discourse occur, and how this context influences the meaning and interpretation of discourse. Fairclough's theory is particularly relevant to this study because it emphasizes the social and cultural construction of context, highlights the role of power dynamics in shaping context and discourse, and provides a framework for analyzing the relationship between context, language use, and power dynamics. By using Fairclough's theory, this study can explore how context influences the meaning and interpretation of discourse, and how power dynamics shape and are shaped by language use and discourse in the context of a specific context or setting (Fairclough, 1992).

Methodology

This study employs Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) as a methodology that is particularly well-suitable for this study. By examining the language use and communication practices within a specific context, CDA can help reveal how context shapes and is shaped by discourse. Through a critical analysis of language, CDA can uncover the power dynamics and social structures that underlie discourse, and how these are influenced by and influence the context in which they occur. CDA's focus on the social and cultural context

of discourse allows researchers to examine how context influences the meaning and interpretation of language. By analyzing the language use and communication practices within a specific context, researchers can identify the cultural, social, and historical factors that shape discourse and its meaning. This can help reveal how context influences the construction of meaning and how language use reflects and shapes power dynamics and social relationships. Furthermore, CDA's critical perspective enables researchers to interrogate the ways in which context is used to legitimize or challenge dominant power structures and ideologies. By examining how language use and communication practices reinforce or subvert dominant discourses, researchers can uncover the ways in which context is used to maintain or challenge social inequality. This can help reveal the complex relationships between language, power, and context, and how these shape and are shaped by discourse.

Overall, CDA's focus on language, power, and context makes it an ideal methodology for interrogating the place of context in discourse analysis. By examining the complex relationships between language, power, and context, researchers can gain a deeper understanding of how context shapes and is shaped by discourse, and how language use reflects and shapes power dynamics and social relationships.

Data Presentation and Analysis

The data presented is a discourse extract:

"I'm not saying that we shouldn't help those in need, but we have to prioritize our own citizens first. We can't just open our borders to anyone who wants to come in. It's not sustainable."

Contextual Information:

- Speaker: Politician in a debate on immigration policy

- Communication setting: Formal, televised debate

- Purpose: To persuade the audience of the speaker's position on immigration policy

- Relevant social, political, or cultural events: Recent influx of refugees, political tensions around immigration.

This discourse extract illustrates how the speaker uses language to construct a particular meaning and interpretation of context.

The speaker:

- Uses the phrase "our own citizens first" to create a sense of us-vs-them and prioritize the interests of one group over another.

- Employs the metaphor of "opening our borders" to create a sense of vulnerability and threat.

- Uses the term "sustainable" to create a sense of rationality and practicality.

Discussion of Findings
Based on the discourse extract and analysis, the findings suggest that the speaker employs a discourse of nationalism and exclusion, prioritizing the interests of "our own citizens" over others. The speaker uses metaphors and language that create a sense of threat and vulnerability. Reinforcing a narrative of "us vs. them". The speaker presents their position as rational and practical using the terms like "sustainable" to

create a sense of objective truth. The findings support the idea that context plays a crucial role in shaping the meaning and interpretation of discourse. The speaker's language use is influenced by the social, political and cultural context of the debate, and the analysis reveals how the speaker draws on and reinforces dominant discourse within that context.

Conclusion

In conclusion, this study has demonstrated the significance of context in shaping the meaning and interpretation of discourse. The findings highlight the importance of critically examining language use in public discourse and challenging dominant discourses that perpetuate exclusion and marginalization.

By interrogating the place of context in discourse analysis, this study has shown that context is not just a passive backdrop for discourse, but an active participant in shaping the meaning and interpretation of language. This understanding can inform critical discourse analysis and other linguistic and social scientific inquiries, and can help us better understand the complex dynamics of language and power in shaping our social and political world.

References

Austin, J. C. (1962). *How to do things with words.* Oxford University Press.

Blommaert, J. (2005). *Discourse: A critical introduction.* Cambridge University Press.

Chomsky, N. (1957). *Syntactic Structure*. Mouton.

Cicourel, A. V. (1992). The interpenetration of communicative contexts: Examples from medical encounters. In A. Duranti & C. Goodwin (Eds.), *Rethinking Context* (291-310). Cambridge University Press.

Cook, G. (1989). *Discourse: Language teaching a scheme for Teacher Education.* Oxford University Press.

Davis, S. (1999). *Pragmatics: A Reader.* Oxford University Press.

Duranti, A., & Goodwin, C. (1992). *Rethinking Context: Language as an Interactive Phenomenon*. Cambridge University Press.

Emeka-Nwobia, N. (2013). A pragmatic analysis of selected political speeches of former Nigerian president Olusegun Obasanjo. Ph.D. thesis, Ebonyi State University, Nigeria.

Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and Social Change.* Polity Press.

Foucault, M. (1972)*. The Archaeology of Knowledge.* Routledge.

Gee, J. P. (1999). *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis: Theory and Method.* Routledge.

Grice, H.P. (1989). *Studies in the Way of Words.* Harvard University Press.

Halliday, M. A. K. (1978). *Language as Social Semiotic: The Social Interpretation of language and meaning.* Edward Arnold.

Halliday, M. A. K, & Hasan, R. (1985). *Language, Context and Text: Aspects of Language in a Social Semiotic Perspective.* Oxford University Press.

Hymes, D. (1974). *Foundations in Sociolinguistics: An Ethnographic Approach.* University of Pennsylvania Press.

Searle, J. R. (1969) *Speech Acts.* Cambridge University Press.

Van Dijk, T. A. (1993). *Elite Discourse and Racism.* Sage Publications.

Werth, Paul (1999). *Text Worlds: Representing Conceptual Space in Discourse.* Longman.

Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (2009). *Methods for Critical Discourse Analysis.* Sage Publications.