COMMUNICATION & SOCIETY

Ana Caballero Mengibar
ana.mengibar@uwc.edu
Assistant Professor of Political Science. University of Wisconsin-Rock County, WI. USA.

Submitted
September 20, 2014
Approved
February 17, 2015

© 2015
Communication & Society
ISSN 0214-0039
E ISSN 2386-7876
doi: 10.15581/003.28.2.39-54
www.communication-society.com

2015 – Vol. 28(2),
pp. 39-54

How to cite this article:
Caballero Mengibar, A. (2015). Critical discourse analysis in the study of representation, identity politics and power relations: a multi-method approach. *Communication & Society 28*(2), 39-54

Critical discourse analysis in the study of representation, identity politics and power relations: a multi-method approach

Abstract

This article sheds light on the principles of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) as an approach for uncovering power relations in the study of identity politics. To evaluate this approach, I draw from my experience investigating the role of language use and the meaning contained in the discourses reproduced in two main newspapers in Spain when referring to Spaniards in relation to immigrants from the Global South. Drawing from this case study, I argue that CDA is an invaluable approach when used to expose patterns of language use which allows for uncovering, vis-à-vis critical evaluation, the production of knowledge in society. However, using CDA involves developing a creative research design. A multidisciplinary and multi-methodological approach, I argue, is desirable when researching in CDA to seek explanation, to fully uncovering and explaining obscured exploitative/unequal social power relations, and to enact social change.

Keywords

Critical discourse analysis, representation, Spain, identity politics, power relations

1. Introduction

According to Martin and Wodak (2003: 6), critical discourse analysis (CDA) is 'fundamentally interested in analyzing opaque as well as transparent structural relationships of dominance, discrimination, power and control as manifested in language' (Wodak, 2001). The analysis of discourse therefore relates to the concept of power and its relationship with knowledge, as well as the construction of identity and societal knowledge, and thus offers the means to describe or narrate 'reality' in a particular way. The term CDA has been used in multiple ways. In this paper CDA is used as a broad approach that aims to uncover the relationship between discourse and power.

Analyzing the meaning contained in discourses requires both a cognitive and social approach. Chilcote (2005, p. 21) argues that cognitive linguistics, which has for the most part been neglected by mainstream CDA, is centrally concerned with uncovering meaning. As a

cognitive science, CDA views discourses 'as the flow of knowledge—and/or all societal knowledge stored—throughout all time' (Jäger, 2001, p. 34). CDA accepts that discourse and social structure are mediated by social cognition (Hart, 2008) and that discourse and social structures are dialectically related. Language and power are also therefore dialectically related. Power does not derive from language, but language can be used to change perceptions of reality, ultimately affecting social change (Wodak, 2013).

Social change implies movement and action. CDA, which according to Wodak (2013: 187) aims to investigate critically 'social inequality as it is expressed, constituted, legitimized, and so on by language use (or in discourse),' is then concerned with using language (or the meaning contained in discourse) as a vehicle for social change. Although language can be seen as a vehicle of change, we need to ask: Can social change take place without addressing the reasons for why social injustice takes place in society? Examining the meaning contained in the language use, facilitates identifying the existence of unequal social relations in society; yet, I argue that although this is an important first step for fighting social inequality, it is not sufficient to enact social change. A change on language use capable of enacting social change requires first identifying why social inequality occurs in the first place.

Collins and Jones (2006) argue that as it pertains to its methodology, CDA 'remains deeply problematic. It claims that communicative practices play a crucial role in processes of social and political change, yet, at the same time, it eschews the kind of engagement with "history and context" which might allow that claim to be demonstrated' (p. 52). Collins and Jones are concerned with the extent to which a researcher may be accurately capturing the meaning contained in the language used outside the context and historical moment in which the event described takes place. I would further argue that to fully unveil the meaning contained in the discourses at any time in history, present or past, the researcher must above all understand the context at its fullest. To unveil meaning and enact social change, the researcher must uncover the sources of production of meaning. This is not an easy task. It is here where I find CDA methodologically a challenge. It is important to remember that "CDA has never been and has never attempted to be or to provide one single or specific theory. Neither is one specific methodology characteristic of research in CDA. Quite the contrary, studies in CDA are multifarious" (Wodak & Meyer, 2001: 5). To further interrogate CDA's power to uncover power relations and to enact change, this paper interrogates broader questions: What can be accomplished with CDA? And what methods better serve the purpose of CDA? Drawing from my investigation on the case study of Spain, this paper emphasizes the advantages and limitations of using various methods to critically analyze language use and to their ability to explain and uncover the socially constructed machinery of power following CDA tradition.

In interrogating CDA and searching for methodologies suitable for uncovering power relations, and agreeing with Chilcote (2005), this study suggests that CDA needs to be reevaluated. Chilcote (2005), who has interrogated CDA's cognitive abilities, has more recently questioned the difficulties of undertaking explanatory questions. Chilcote's critique points out some of the limitations of using CDA as an explanatory paradigm. His critique, though, has remained mostly at the linguistic-cognitive and individual-psychological theoretical levels.

If, as Goffman (1974) argues, the individual is a social construct, a research method must view cognitive and social relations as being part of one interaction in order to uncover knowledge production. In other words, Chilcote's critique of CDA is valid; however it is limited in scope because it fails to integrate cognitive and social developments. I do not mean to suggest that finding answers to any questions is easy and/or fully attainable, for finding comprehensive explanations usually involves the use of a wide range of methods and

ISSN 2386-7876 – © 2015 Communication & Society 28(2), 39-54

techniques. This is precisely my argument. In searching for explanatory answers to questions of why social power relations are unequally distributed in a particular way and to effectively advocate for social change following CDA, researchers have to use multiple methods of inquiry. I seek to provide a substantial illustration—although given constraints of space not a fully detailed account—of my experience with CDA and various methods while investigating the representation of immigrants from the Global South in the printed media in Spain.

This paper first explores some of the theoretical claims put forward about CDA to expose its definitional call for finding methods of inquiry that seek to find explanations for uncovering unequal social groups. It then addresses some of the limitations encountered when designing and conducting a research involving CDA with particular focus on the lack of concise guidelines for its use. These limitations inspired me to create a multidisciplinary methodology to investigate language and power in Spain.

2. Questioning theoretical assumptions of CDA: a theoretical framework

Central to critical discourse analysis research is that language can be defined in terms of its use in a discourse, and therefore as an array of 'diverse representations of social life which are inherently positioned—differently positioned social actors "see" and represent social life in different ways' (Fairclough, 2001: 123). Cultural institutions, such as the media in the form of newspapers, 'reproduce ideas by identifying which ideas are valuable, which are not, and which should not be heard at all. It follows that ideas of privileged and powerful social groups are routinely heard, whereas ideas of groups who are disadvantaged are silenced' (Anderson & Collins, 2001: 224).

The development of critical discourse analysis can be traced back to a variety of studies ranging from critical theory, including work by Foucault, to critical linguistics. CDA is, to a certain extent, the product of an amalgam of certain types of social theory and linguistics (Chilcote, 2005). Some of these studies are grounded in formal linguistics while some are more concerned with the use of language as a form of social justice. This paper builds upon some of the claims made from those proponents of critical context analysis (or CDA) who assert that this paradigm or 'school' (Wodak & Meyer, 2009) is intimately related to critical social theory, and more specifically those who understand knowledge as a form of power (Foucault, 1980). The former assumes that the flow of knowledge presented in the discourses can reveal societal power relations that are not explicitly stated.

According to Fairclough and Wodak (1997), CDA has three central tenets: '1. Discourse is social action (or "social practice"); 2. Social action constructs social reality (objects, situations, identities, social relations ...); 3. Discourse is the use of language' (pp. 258–284). It follows, as Chilcote argues, that discourse (or use of language) constructs social reality. Further, as proponents of CDA contend, 'language use (discourse) is, as the tenets of CDA assert, connected to the "construction" of knowledge about social objects, identities, processes, etc.' (Chilcote, 2005: 37). If power and knowledge are highly interrelated, then uncovering the source of knowledge production about reality will reveal the source of societal power.

The importance of using CDA as a form of uncovering knowledge and power also relies partly on discovering whether in human matters, interconnection between cause and effect may be intentionally and/or unintentionally obscured (Meyer, 2001; Wodak & Meyer, 2001) by recognizing the interdependence of ideas. In so doing, CDA assumes that 'critique' is essential to make visible such obscured interrelations. Ideas expressed in texts vis-à-vis narrations and language use in their various forms help disseminate and reproduce particular ways of viewing the world, which in turn facilitates certain political actions as

ISSN 2386-7876 – © 2015 Communication & Society 28(2), 39-54

well as the reproduction of a certain type of knowledge. The analyses of discourses, if viewed in this way, once again relate to the concept of power and its relationship with knowledge, for they offer the means to describe or narrate 'reality' in a particular way. Yet, if power, as Foucault (1990: 93), describes it, 'is everywhere; not because it embraces everything, but because it comes from everywhere' then it follows that to more comprehensively deconstruct the knowledge contained in discourses—as an effort to uncover power relations—it is also imperative to investigate additionally uncovered structural sources of power.

Critiquing texts therefore does not, in itself, uncover all hidden power relations that may be present in a society. In other words, texts as objects of investigation are not sufficient to fully unmask unequal power relations and social inequalities. A fully 'critical' account of discourse would additionally require the 'theorization and description of the political, economic and social processes and structures responsible for the production of such texts' (Fairclough, 1998). This fundamental theoretical claim inevitably calls for using a multitude of interdisciplinary methods.

In addition, discourses relate to history and ideology; discourses cannot be viewed as ahistorical productions. They are historical fabrications that contain certain types of ideologies as part of the flow of knowledge they contain. Uncovering the flow of knowledge facilitates uncovering the ideologies behind such productions as well as finding patterns that may signal the existence of unequal power relations in society. CDA, as an approach, provides a valid theoretical avenue for uncovering the knowledge flow emerged in the discourses as well as a gateway to uncovering social injustice in a given society. What is not imminently deduced from CDA is why social injustices persist in society and/or why they originated in the first place.

Chilcote (2005) argues that to find answers to the question of why language users continue to construct certain groups as excluded, the researcher needs to consider finding explanations by borrowing from cognitive and evolutionary psychological theories and scholarships. Chilcote's suggestions are not very helpful to assess CDA if one understands this approach as being grounded in social critical theory. Machiavelian as well as determinist biologically driven theories are limited when investigating why unequal power relations prevail in society. Following the tenets of CDA, it is difficult to infer that the psychology of an individual as grounded in 'intuitive biological' (Chilcote, 2005) and nature can determine the causes and effects of language use. To seek explication, I suggest interrogating CDA and its ability to explaining language use as forms of power by drawing from its relationship with critical theory and particularly with the social power (or dominance) approach (see DeFrancisco, 1997).

In following this approach, the research focus is directed to the concept of power or rather the 'magnitude of the concept of power' (DeFrancisco, 1997: 41). This approach allows for interpretation of language use—and its problems—as causes of the 'unequal hierarchical positions that [different groups] hold in society' (p. 40). The enormity of what 'power' is, inhibits the ability to use only one method to 'fully capture its essence or to describe all of its manifestations' (p. 40). In suggesting that our efforts should be directed toward power, I am not suggesting that researching individual behavioral psychological inferences should be ignored in finding more comprehensive explanations between the cause and effect of using discriminatory language and the unequal hierarchical position of groups in society. My suggestion is rather directed toward the limitations presupposed by the vagueness inherent in the concept of power —if defined as proposed by Foucault (1980) or as being larger than individuals' actions— for it is thus impossible to use one method of investigation and/or the individual as the unit of analysis as vehicles to discover 'the multiple interrelated structures of power' (DeFrancisco, 1997: 42).

ISSN 2386-7876 – © 2015 Communication & Society 28(2), 39-54

By definition, therefore, analysis of language use in texts as the only method of inquiry is insufficient to uncover unequal power relations in society, and hence is not satisfactory to explain why social injustices persist in society. Drawing from my experience using CDA's framework for the case study of Spain, I examine the advantages as well as limitations of its use, and suggest that multiple methods of inquiry might be needed when designing a research project framed within CDA.

3. CDA and methodological inquire: strengths and limitations

Since the mid-1990s, globalization has caused Spain to become the destination and new home of immigrants from the Global South, reversing historical migratory patterns. This international immigration has inevitably altered the ethnic composition of Spain presenting a unique historical opportunity to explore issues of representation in identity formation. I was confronted in 2008 with making a decision on what method to use to investigate identity formation and social change vis-à-vis immigration in Spain. Ultimately I chose to first investigate discursive representations of these two groups using the theoretical and methodological frameworks given by CDA. My decision was partly guided by the fact that CDA can be broadly defined as an approach which is primarily used for investigating language use and the context of language use (Wodak & Meyer, 2001). In undertaking the case study of Spain, I investigated whether, how, and why the discursive representation of immigrants from the Global South has helped re-imagine contemporary Spanish national identity.

The research design of my study on Spain was aimed partly at investigating the role of representation as manifested by language use in the Spanish media as well as its role in re-imagining a Spanish national identity. My first methodological goal was to approach the problem by examining the type of discourses produced—viewed as practices of representation—about Spaniards and the so-called Third World immigrants, or immigrants from the Global South, in two major Spanish newspapers, *El Mundo* and *El Pais*, for the years 1994 and 2004. My second goal was to uncover whether binary processes of exclusion of immigrants and belongingness of Spaniards embedded in practices of representation were present. To obtain the most comprehensive list of articles, I initially collected all articles between the specified dates that included the topic immigration. The searches yielded a total of 1900 articles. All articles were obtained from the newspapers' own online archives and included texts from news and opinion. For this investigation, I chose *El Pais* and *El Mundo* because both newspapers are sold in all nineteen regions of Spain. They have the first and second highest circulation ranks of all Spanish national newspapers, respectively. *El País* covers all aspects of news and culture. It is renowned for its quality journalism with liberal leaning ideology. *El Mundo* is also known for its quality coverage of national and international affairs with a moderate-conservative leaning ideology. For this study, my objective was to stay away from the far right and the far left perspectives.

The goal of investigating language varies with the field, from literature to social sciences. CDA's basic assumption is, nevertheless, that language is a social practice and as such, language helps to shape reality for its users. CDA's wide spectrum of applications is enhanced by its ability to adapt to inherently different investigations. Such flexibility presents a unique advantage; it allows for variation and creativity when designing a research project. I believed that all of these qualities were of great use for my research. In accepting CDA, I agree with its proponents that representations are central to the study of nation formation and racial formations. Representation is an inherent and important aspect of global political life and therefore particular representations articulated in metaphors and narratives elucidating constructions of belongingness and otherness rest at the heart of

ISSN 2386-7876 – © 2015 Communication & Society 28(2), 39-54

political actions (Doty, 1996). Most often a nation and its identity are defined in terms of who 'belongs' and who does not. Notions of belongingness and otherness embedded in practices of representation vis-à-vis language use nevertheless change in accord to an array of dynamic historical, economic, political, global, and local conditions. In using this approach, I assume that practices of representation—as expressed by language use—contain 'discourses of truth' (Foucault, 1978: 97). Following Chatterjee, I presume that 'identity' is constructed as a relational positioning between the 'us' and 'the other'; therefore, 'the sciences of society become the knowledge of the Self and the Other. Constructed in terms of rationality, it necessarily also becomes a means to power of the Self over the Other' (Chatterjee, 1986: 14–15).

My decision for using CDA to investigate the role of language-use was partly guided by my drive to inquire about whether binary discursive representations elucidating discourses of inclusion of Spaniards and exclusion of immigrants from the Global South were present in some major Spanish newspapers and whether elucidations of the Self and the Other were present. My methodological objective was to deconstruct discourses, or rather their contextual meanings, disseminated by the media to find out specific forms of truth with the goal of reflecting on these questions: What are 'the most immediate, the most local power relations at work? How did they make possible these kinds of discourses—and conversely—how were these discourses used to support power relations?' (Chatterjee, 1986: 97).

My next decision was how to operationalize my research. I knew what the approach of CDA could do but I did not know how to do it. Despite its many qualities, CDA does not offer a plausible way of conducting research. It is a broad approach and can leave the researcher 'not knowing how to start' (Collins & Jones, 2006: 52). Following CDA presents several limitations: the lack of guidelines to follow to uncover language use, the high levels of subjective interpretation required for contextualizing language-use, and the difficulties of operationalizing large sets of data from texts, just to name a few. Wodak (2012) has acknowledged this problem and has aimed to concretize some of the principles of critical discourse analysis to help investigators with the task of critically contextualizing language use. But clearly there is no rule on how to best investigate how society and discourse shape each other. Using multiple methods may be necessary when attempting such task.

4. Overcoming CDA's broadness: a multi-method design

The lack of guidelines and the high levels of subjectivity involved in interpreting the contextual meaning of language use in discourse production require creating a highly creative, multi-methods research design. Before interpretation can take place, the researcher must uncover the economic, political and social forces in which the discourses are produced. To this end, prior to using CDA, this study used primary, semi-structured interviews of Spanish politicians, governmental organizations, and nongovernmental organizations. I interviewed personnel working for the following NGOs, among others. 1) ACULCO- *Asociación sociocultural y de cooperación al desarrollo por Colombia e Iberoamérica en España* in Madrid (Socio-cultural association and of cooperation for development in Colombia and Latin America in Spain); 2) ATIME- *Asociación de trabajadores e inmigrantes marroquíes en España* (Association of workers and Moroccan immigrants in Spain); 3) ARI-PERU- *Asociación de refugiados e inmigrantes Peruanos* (Association of Peruvian refugees and immigrants); 3) AESCO- *América-España solidaridad y cooperación* (America-Spain solidarity and cooperation); 5) Caritas; and 4) Director of nationwide Spanish Red Cross Program for Immigrants and Refugees. While conducting interviews, I observed similar complaints. One of the main complaints of Spanish NGOs interviewed was that the Spanish media represented and reproduced "*estereotipos de immigrante pobre que viene a quitar el puesto de*

trabajo. Esto genera alarma social y rechazo a la inmigración" (Jesús Álvaro, Personal Interview, 2007). (Stereotypical images of immigrants as being the poor who come to Spain to take away jobs from Spaniards. These views generate social alarm and rejection of immigration) (My translation).

During field work, I also learned that the Spanish government was developing *programas de sensibilizacion.* These programs were designed to integrate immigrants. In examining *programas de sensibilizacion*, I discovered that the Spanish government was confused about the meaning and practices of integration. Competing ideologies of assimilation and multiculturalism, also referred by the Spanish government as *la interculturalidad,* were often used erroneously and simultaneously in the discourse of nation building. The difficulties associated with the arrival of immigrants from the Global South were clearly visible.

Critical interrogation of the historical context revealed that fear of a perceived 'avalanche' of immigrants coming to Spain, spread by the media and government officials, was becoming of increasing concern in Spain at the time. As immigration continued to grow, immigration laws changed as well. The ruling Spanish Socialist Workers' Party (PSOE) created the first immigration law in 1985, but it only served to 'placate the other members of the EU that were concerned that it would serve as the entry point into Europe for unwanted immigrants' (Jeram, 2013: 1777). This law was already very restrictive; it did not provide a legal avenue of immigration into Spain and imposed sanctions against irregular immigration. The increased arrival of immigrants to Europe via Spain from Latin America and Africa gave rise to a debate that led to the creation of the law 8/2000, a more repressive immigration reform law. The new and much more restrictive law 8/2000 was approved immediately after the center-right political party PP won the general elections in March 2000 with an absolute majority.

This new law aimed to deal with immigration and its imminent threat by prohibiting the fundamental civil liberties of right to association, demonstration, and unionizing for all legal immigrants in Spain. It was not until 2007 that these provisions were found unconstitutional and corrected in the new law 2/2009, while the left-center PSOE controlled the government. In addition, the law 8/2000 reintroduced the expulsion of immigrants as punishment for staying without a permit and increased the requirement from two to five years that an 'irregular migrant had to spend in Spain in order to regularize their stay permit' (González-Enríquez 2009: 144). During this time, the attitudes of Spaniards toward immigration were increasingly becoming more adverse "the main variables that explain[ed] this increase… [were] on the one hand, the threat defined by the number of perceived immigrants [allegedly by the media] and the loss of national identity and, on the other hand, the competition for the economic and social resources and the state investment destined to immigration' (Checa Olmos & Arjona Garrido 2013: 1).

The above preliminary findings and the socio-political and economic context aforementioned, among others, greatly informed my interpretation of language-use and reinforced my decision for having used CDA as part of a multi-method research design approach. To contextualize language use, following Wodak and Meyer's (2001) argument on what CDA can do, implies finding the language to be contextualized as well. Undoubtedly one cannot contextualize all words showing up in all texts dealing with large data sets, such as it is the case in this study with 1900 articles. The research design of any investigation must exhibit sufficient plausibility to allow for its replication. Indiscriminate contextualization of the meaning of all words, themes, and/or paragraphs—to name just a few of the many 'recording units' available in the sample materials (Johnson & Joslyn, 1995: 245)—in selected texts would be impossible and would be of no social scientific value.

To operationalize the large sets of data from all texts selected for my investigation, I first used content analysis to identify key words to guide my finding of relevant discourse to contextualize in the selected newspapers. As explained by Reinharz (1992: 159), using content analysis before context analysis allows the researcher to 'apply an inductive, interpretative framework to cultural artifacts.' Content analysis, as a method, can help identify patterns in language in the selected texts, and later it can be used to critically interpret them. At first glance the two methods seem antithetical; yet, I later found them to be highly complementary. Using content analysis, I selected key words first according to the frequency in which words appeared in the newspapers used for this investigation. To select relevant high-frequency keywords, I used two more methods: fieldwork and interviews. The knowledge and expertise gained during extensive fieldwork in the form of semi-structured interviews and field observations helped immensely in selecting and, later, contextualizing words. In sum, prior to critically interpreting the meaning of the language in the texts, three other methods were simultaneously employed: content analysis, semi-structured interviews of key officials working for governmental and non-governmental organizations, and field observation.

By using all these methods, I was able to successfully select the words that would guide my finding of the discourses to be critically analyzed: *los inmigrantes* (immigrants), *los irregulares* (those without illegal status), and *los sin papeles* (those without legal paperwork). After key words were located in the texts by using content analysis, I critically analyzed, uncovered, and interpreted the meaning of the news. Applying CDA translates into using a qualitative-interpretative approach, for I aimed to uncover the contextual meaning of the words rather than the words themselves. Let me emphasize that the selection and further contextualization of the news in which the words *los inmigrantes, irregulars,* and *los sin papeles* appeared was guided, and moreover was only possible, as shown above, by using the knowledge gained during intense field work in Spain.

Deconstructing texts for the purpose of uncovering the meaning elucidated by the context in which words appear needs to follow a systematic approach and must be of scientific use in social science. With this objective in mind, my goal was to design a research that would be replicable and from which I could more easily analyze any patterns that appeared in the language use contained in the texts. After critical interpretation of the context in which the selected key words appeared, I tallied them to create categories according to the meanings displayed. I did not assume that these categories were fixed entities; categories were rather created from texts in motion:

Texts that produce moments of life … from archives … enable us to study that production. The archive can tell us a great deal about the production of lives, about the way discourse is drawn on in that production, and shapes that production. It cannot give us a fixed or fixable truth about particular identities or particular categories or particular social world, though it can, paradoxically, tell us about the complex processes of producing oneself [or other-self] and being produced as 'having an identity' and 'belonging to a particular category.' (Davies & Davies, 2007: 1154)

If understood in this manner, categories complemented critical interpretation of language use in texts and allowed me to be aware of potential mobility and changes of meanings of words and of relational identities.

After identifying the categories of *Spaniards* and *Third World immigrants*, of primary importance was to identify first whether the language used in the selected media referred to Spaniards as positive-selfs and/or Third World immigrants as negative-others. However, as explained above, with my use of categories, I did not assume that the language used could refer only to these two groups. In other words, when for instance the word *inmigrantes*

appeared in the texts, I noted whether the language referred to immigrants from the Global South, other European Union countries, Eastern European countries, and/ or other areas of the world. Instances of language not referring exclusively to Third World/Global South immigrants were tallied in a separate category. Below I offer an example of the interpretation process for contextualizing and categorizing the meaning of the word *immigrants.*

> Al menos siete personas han muerto y otras 14 han desaparecido al naufragar frente a la costa de Tánger (Marruecos) una patera en la que viajaban 24 ***inmigrantes*** ilegales (*El País*, Februrary 23, 1994).
>
> At least seven persons have died and another 14 have disappeared due to the shipwreck of a *patera* (small ship) in Tangier's coastlines (Morocco) in which 24 illegal immigrants were traveling aboard (My translation).

The news above may at first glance appear language-neutral; however, the high volume of news narrating fatal incidents of immigrants coming to Spain from Africa helps construct an image of vulnerability and weakness around the figure of immigrants from the less developed countries. The word *inmigrantes* above was tallied under the category Vulnerable-weak. I created the category after its meaning kept repeating in various news. For this reason I find important to interpret the meaning of words in relation to their frequency as well. In contrast, consider the following example of news in which the word immigrants also appears.

> El día 17 detuvo a 63 chinos, entre ellos el jefe de la red, y desmanteló ocho talleres clandestinos de confección. Solo unos días después, capturó a otros 467 inmigrantes orientales que trabajaban en cinco talleres (El País, May 20, 1994).
>
> The 17th, he [after reading the entire article, I understand that the subject pronoun "he" refers to a Spanish policemen] arrested 63 Chinese (immigrants), among them the boss of this Chinese mafia. In addition, he dismantled eight illegal textile workshops. Only a few days after, he captured some other 467 oriental *immigrants* who worked in five illegal textile workshops (My translation).

In the news above for the same year and the same newspaper, the word *inmigrantes* appears within a very different context. In this case, immigration is used to narrate the heroic action of a Spanish policeman. In narrating the above action in such manner, which level of sensationalism is only comparable to that used in a Hollywood science fiction movie, it is obvious that a positive-heroic image about this Spanish policeman becomes reinforced when narrated against immigrants. Immigration above is represented in three ways: 1) Illegal immigrants as victims, which I count in the category of weak-vulnerable, for it is implied that the immigrants in the news do not have any means and/or power to resist their own mafias; 2) Immigrants as criminals; and 3) "Race-discrimination." The third category emerges from the quote above, for the word *orientales* (Orientals) has a negative connotation, and it is used to discursively construct and show differentiation between Spaniards as positive and "*orientales*" as negative by placing emphasis on immigrants' physical traits and place of origin.

Following this criteria, I count the amount of times that the target word repeats individually for each category after conducting contextual interpretation. For instance, the word *inmigrantes* repeats 92 times for a particular category named as vulnerable-weak, and which refers to Third World immigrants for the source in *El País* the year 2004. After contextual interpretation, I keep track of the number of times the target word repeats in

every category by using an electronic notebook SIL. All three words, *inmigrantes, los sin papeles,* and *irregulares* for all the times the words repeat in the newspapers *El Mundo* and *El País* during the years 1994 and 2004 and for the fields of Third World immigrants and Spaniards are classified into different categories according to the meaning of the paragraph in which they appear. This method allows enumerating the interpreted contextual meanings of the words, and it allows for simplicity of large data sets when reporting findings.

My contextualization of the language use after interpretation yielded the categories shown in Tables 1 and 2. These categories express the knowledge contained and reproduced in Spanish discourses about immigrants from the Global South and Spaniards as relational representations disseminated by the media. These categories are essential in exploring further social relations and meanings, but they do not explicate social inequality between Spaniards and immigrants from the Global South. However, the findings can be used to further investigate the type of power relations present in Spanish society as expressed in the texts. In this sense, analysis of language use can be very useful in directing further inquiry about certain findings.

Table 1. Third World migrants year 1994 absolute negative and positive other (TW immigrants).

	El País - 1994			El Mundo - 1994				
Negative- Other Third World Immigrants	**Inmigrantes**	**Sin papeles**	**Irregulares**	**Inmigrantes**	**Sin papeles**	**Irregulares**	**Totals year**	**% Totals year**
Criminals TW immigrants	63	0	0	33	0	0	96	18.18%
TW complaints of discrimination	56	0	0	20	0	0	76	14.39%
Religion TW immigrants	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0,00%
Physical/ identity Threat	50	0	0	34	0	0	84	15.91%
Vulnerable Weak TW immigrants	47	0	0	34	0	0	81	15.34%
Ignorant TW immigrants	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0,00%
Biological-Race/discrimination of TW immigrants	15	0	0	58	0	0	73	13.83%
Class TW immigrants	26	0	0	14	0	0	40	7.58%
Gender TW immigrants	10	0	0	4	0	0	14	2.65%
Unspecified Negative- Other TW immigrants	37	0	2	20	0	0	59	11.17%

ISSN 2386-7876 – © 2015 Communication & Society 28(2), 39-54

Total All categories Negative-Other TW immigrants	**304**	**0**	**2**	**217**	**0**	**0**	**523**	**99.05%**
Positive-other (TW immigrants)	4	0	0	1	0	0	5	0.95%
Total TW Migrants	308	0	2	218	0	0	**N=528**	100%
Total no meaning for Spaniards and TW immigrants (*4)	24	0	0	120	0	5	149	
(*1)	532	0	4	535	0	5	1076	
(*2)	450	0	2	526	0	5	983	
(*3)							927	

Source: Enumeration by Concordance content analysis computer program, with context analysis compiled by author from *El País* , *El Mundo* internet edition in the year 1994 (March, 2008)

(*1) = It designates the total number of enumeration of a word (after using context analysis).
(*2) = It is the word frequency as counted by the computer (content analysis)
(*3) = Of the total interpretation 1076, 149 no meaning and 399 total Spaniards and 528 Third World immigrants
(*4) = It includes all references made to immigrants from the so-called developed countries or the Global North.

Table 2 . Third World migrants year 2004 absolute negative and positive other (TW immigrants)

	El País - 2004			**El Mundo - 2004**				
Negative- other Third World Immigrants	**Inmigrantes**	**Sin papeles**	**Irregulares**	**Inmigrantes**	**Sin papeles**	**Irregulares**	**Totals**	**% Totals**
Criminals TW immigrants	0	0	0	10	0	0	10	0.90%
TW complaints of discrimination	131	3	4	1	0	0	139	12.48%
Religion TW immigrants	31	0	0	2	0	0	33	2.96%
Physical/identity Threat	272	32	31	106	11	7	459	41.20%
Vulnerable Weak TW immigrants	92	11	3	0	0	0	106	9.52%
Ignorant TW immigrants	24	0	2	7	0	0	33	2.96%
Biological-Race/discrimination of TW immigrants	93	2	4	33	17	8	157	14.09%
Class TW immigrants	59	5	0	8	1	0	73	6.55%
Gender TW immigrants	33	1	1	6	1	0	42	3.77%

Unspecified Negative- Other TW immigrants	21	0	1	6	0	1	29	2.60%
Total All categories Negative-Other TW immigrants	756	54	46	179	30	16	1081	97.04%
Positive Other (TW immigrants)	29	1	0	3	0	0	33	2.96%
Total TW immigrants	785	55	46	182	30	16	**N=1114**	100%
Total no meaning for Spaniards and TW immigrants (*4)	90	0	0	8	1	0	99	5.28%
(*1)	1341	93	80	286	49	25	1874	
(*2)	1319	90	76	283	40	19	1827	
(*3)								

Source: Enumeration by Concordance content analysis computer program, with context analysis compiled by author from *El País*, *El Mundo* internet edition in the 2004 years (March 2008).

(*1) = It designates the total number of enumeration of a word (after using context analysis).
(*2) = It is the word frequency as counted by the computer (content analysis)
(*3) = Of the total interpretation 1874, 99 no meaning and 661 total Spaniards and 1114 Third World immigrants.
(*4) = It includes all references made to immigrants from the so-called developed countries or the Global North.

5. From evidence to finding answers of how and why

It has by now been well established and demonstrated that analysis of language use is an invaluable descriptive method for its methodological ability to find answers to questions of how language users establish particular exclusionary practices vis-à-vis language use. Categories denoting exclusion toward certain groups continue to appear throughout a wide range of studies (Chilcote, 2005). Using content analysis as a guide to operationalize critical discourse analysis in large sets of data from newspapers, I was also able to discover how Third World immigrants and Spaniards were constructed in the discourses analyzed. The use of these two methodologies together, in conjunction with semi-structured interviews and field observation, revealed patterns in language use as well as the social practice of representation. Moreover, the critical interpretation of language use in texts exposed that 'Third World immigrants' are indeed represented for the given years, 1994 and 2004, the majority of the time as 'negative-other(s).' This means that the language used when referring to 'Third World immigrants' has, in most instances, negative connotations of otherness and of not belonging to Spain. However, I discovered that Spaniards were mostly, in relation to 'Third World immigrants,' constructed in the texts as 'positive-us' or belonging to Spain for the same years. More specific patterns of representation for both Spaniards and Third World/Global South immigrants were also apparent. For instance, the language used in the Spanish newspapers was highly masculinized. Immigrant women from Third World countries, and essentially women as a category, were excluded from the immigration discourse produced about 'us' and 'the other' in relation to immigration.

Moreover, in further investigating the contextual meaning of all instances alluding to negative rhetoric about 'Third World immigrants' appearing in the newspapers, I discovered that this group was largely constructed as a threat; construction of a negative-other or

ISSN 2386-7876 – © 2015 Communication & Society 28(2), 39-54

Third World/Global South immigrant often had the additional significance of posing a threat, not necessarily just physical, but to Spain as a nation, or to being Spanish.

The critical contextual interpretation of language use also revealed that Third World immigrants were not constructed in terms of class difference. The use of language relating to the category of class—the representation of 'us' and 'the other' as belonging to either superior and/or lower social classes—was quite small. This interesting finding would be worth further exploration using other methods of analysis. In my original research, class was further investigated by using an economic analysis.

Using discourse analysis allowed me to uncover patterns of language use and categories denoting discriminatory/exclusionary practices of language use against immigrants from the Global South in Spain. Critically exploring the patterns in language use found using all of the methods above therefore, may reveal which groups in society are constructed as inferior and which suffer from discursive social injustice. Finding processes of exclusion, vis-à-vis language use, is only possible by critically questioning the use of language. CDA therefore facilitates discovering patterns of language use. Further investigation of these patterns allows the researcher to inquire more deeply about power relations in a given society. Analysis of language use in texts can be an invaluable descriptive guide to finding social injustice.

The discourses produced about Spaniards and Third World immigrants as presented here are not a simple amalgam of ideas, for these discourses reproduce and contain the seed of societal knowledge. Finding that immigrants are mostly discursively constructed as 'negative-others' and as a 'threat' to Spanish society shows that Spaniards, and more specifically those with the power to produce such discourses, view and perceive immigrants from the Global South as not belonging, as different, and as an excluded group. The knowledge contained and reproduced in the discourses under investigation alluding to multiple forms of exclusion denotes that unequal hierarchical structures are in place in Spanish society. Discourses reveal, therefore, that knowledge and power are joined together (Escobar, 1984-5: 379). I accept that the examination of discourses provides analytical tools to help illuminate how the creation of discourses by Spaniards as disseminated by the media seek to effect and maintain domination over other groups, in this case regarding immigrants from the Global South. However, critical analysis of language use on its own does not provide a framework to help explain why hierarchical power relations exist between these two groups in Spanish society.

In suggesting that uncovering societal power is a tedious project, I suggest that a full account of the forces behind the production of these discourses, or in other words why these discourses are produced, is necessary for a complete understanding of what type of power relations exist in a given society. For instance, finding that class issues are not easily identified in the analyzed Spanish discourses allows the researcher to further investigate whether class issues in the discourses of immigration are intentionally obscured to mask exploitative practices and/or unequal power in Spanish society. However, investigating discourses does not allow for finding explanations of why inequality exists and/or originated. In other words, from my findings on the category of discursive-class, I cannot conclude that the lack of class issues in discourses about immigrants from the Global South and Spaniards is solely because immigrants occupy the lower classes and/or are exploited in Spanish society.

Similarly, from my findings on discursive representations of gender, I cannot explain why language use when referring to immigration is highly masculinized in Spain. Is it because there are not enough immigrant women in Spain? Or is it because immigrant women in Spain do not have a voice to express themselves as a consequence of unequal

ISSN 2386-7876 – © 2015 Communication & Society 28(2), 39-54

power in society? To further find explanations to the question of why the immigration debate is masculinized in Spain, I would need to use further methods of inquiry to investigate the following questions, among others: How many immigrant women are there in Spain? Where do these immigrant women come from? What types of jobs do they occupy? What are their salaries and how do they compare with their male counterparts?

6. Conclusion

CDA allows for the expression of knowledge as the 'basis of action and formative action that shapes reality,' not only for the analysis of discursive practices but also for the basis of subsequent analysis of 'non-discursive practices and so-called manifestation/ materializations as well as relationships between these elements' (Jäger, 1999: 38). In this sense, a major advantage of critical discourse analysis is that it facilitates, via the deconstruction of texts and analysis of language use, discovery of patterns of inequality and/or misrecognition. The patterns found with analysis of language and the knowledge flow they contain can be further analyzed, using multiple methodologies, to find out whether and why these particular productions of knowledge materialize. A multi-methodological approach is inherent to CDA and therefore necessary toward identifying inequality and social injustice. In this context, critical language use can reveal the existence of misrecognition, and inequality and/or discrimination.

For the particular case of Spain, CDA guided my multi-method research design, and was useful in uncovering how and whether the language used in the discourses produced in the Spanish media of *El Mundo* and *El País* for the years 1994 and 2004 reproduces a certain type of ideas about Spaniards and so-called Third World immigrants. In addition, CDA is useful for uncovering, via the identification of obscured patterns in language use (which are only visible after their critical interpretation), what type of knowledge is produced and reproduced through language-use. In this sense, CDA, when used with multiple methods, is useful to critically describe and identify patterns in language use and the flow of knowledge they contain; however, CDA does not provide an intuitive framework for uncovering why certain type of patterns are produced or reproduced, and continue to be so potent in society. However, the use of different methods of investigation helped me understand the local as well as the larger socio-cultural and political contexts in which the language under investigation was produced in the media.

Drawing from the study of language use in Spain, I argue that to uncover why these particular productions of knowledge contribute to the structuring of unequal power relations, it is necessary to use multiple interdisciplinary methods. Finding inequality helps denouncing inequality. To enact social change via language use partly requires de-legitimizing certain expressions and choices of language use in society; yet, finding the roots of the problems causing social inequality is an imperative, for it helps legitimizing the production of competing alternative discourses aiming to empowering those disadvantaged in society.

ISSN 2386-7876 – © 2015 Communication & Society 28(2), 39-54

References

Anderson, M., & Collins, P.H. (2001). Rethinking institutions. In M. Anderson & P. H. Collins, *Race, class and gender: An anthology* (pp. 213–228). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thompson Learning.

Chatterjee, P. (1986). *Nationalist thought and the colonial world: A derivative discourse.* New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Chilcote, P. (2005). Missing the links in mainstream CDA: Modules, blends and the critical instinct. In R. Wodak & P. Chilcote (Eds.), *A new agenda in (critical) discourse analysis* (pp. 19–52) Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Collins, C., & Jones, P.E. (2006). Analysis of discourse as a form of history writing: A critique of critical discourse analysis and an illustration of a cultural-historical alternative. *Atlantic Journal of Communication*, *14*(1-2), 51–69.

Checa Olmos, J. C., & Arjona Garrido, A. (2013) 'Los immigrantes vistos por los españoles: Entre la amenaza y la competencia (1997–2007), *Revista de Estudios Sociales 47*, 118–132.

Davies, B., & Davies, C. (2007). Having, and being had by, 'experience': Or, 'experience' in the social sciences after the discursive/poststructuralist turn. *Qualitative Inquiry, 13*(8), 1139–1154.

DeFrancisco, V. (1997). Gender, power and practice: Or, putting your money (and your research) where your mouth is. In R. Wodak (Ed.), *Gender and discourse* (pp. 37–56). London: Sage Publications.

Doty, R. (1996). *Imperial encounters.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Escobar, A. (1984-5). Discourse and power in development: Michael Foucault and the relevance of his work to the Third World. *Alternatives 10*, 377–400.

Fairclough, N. (1998). Political discourse in the media: An analytical framework. In A. Bell & P. Garret (Eds.), *Approaches to media discourse* (pp. 1–45). Oxford: Blackwell.

Fairclough, N. (2001). Critical discourse analysis as a method in social scientific research. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (pp. 121–138). London: Sage Publications.

Fairclough, N., & Wodak, R. (1997). Critical discourse analysis. In T. A. van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse studies: A multidisciplinary introduction: Vol. 2. Discourse as social interaction*. London: Sage Publications.

Foucault, M. (1978). *The history of sexuality, Vol. 1.* New York: Vintage.

Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings, 1972–1977*. New York: Pantheon.

Foucault, M. (1990). *The history of sexuality: The use of pleasure, Vol. 2*. New York: Random House.

Goffman, E. (1974). Fame analysis: An essay on the organization of experience. New York: Haper & Row.

González-Enríquez, C. (2009) 'Spain, the cheap model. Irregularity and regularisation as immigration management policies,' *European Journal of Migration & Law 11*(2), 139–157. Academic Search Premier, EBSCOhost (accessed January 8, 2014).

Hart, C. (2008, May). Critical discourse analysis and metaphor: Toward a theoretical framework. *Critical Discourse Studies, 5*(2), 91–106.

Jäger, S. (1999). Language–knowledge–power. Victor Klemperer's contribution to the analysis of language and ideology of fascism. London: Society for German Language (GfdS).

Jäger, S. (2001). Discourse and knowledge: Theoretical and methodological aspects of a critical discourse and dispositive analysis. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (pp. 32–62). London: Sage Publications.

ISSN 2386-7876 – © 2015 Communication & Society 28(2), 39-54

Jeram, S. (2013) 'Immigrants and the Basque nation: Diversity as a new marker of identity, *Ethnic and Racial Studies 36*(11), 1770–1788.

Johnson, J., & Joslyn, R. (1995). *Political science research methods*. Washington, D.C.: CQ Press.

Martin, J.R., & Wodak, R., Eds. (2003). *Re/reading the past: Critical and functional perspectives on time and value*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.

Meyer, M. (2001). The discourse-historical approach. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of critical discourse analysis*. London: Sage Publications.

Reinharz, S. (1992). *Feminist methods in social research*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Wodak, R. (1997). *Gender and discourse*. London: Sage Publications.

Wodak, R. (2001). What CDA is about: A summary of its history, important concepts and its developments. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (pp. 1–12). London: Sage Publications.

Wodak, R. (2012). Critical discourse analysis: An example. In S. Becker (Ed.), *Understanding research for social policy and social work* (pp. 346–348). Bristol: Policy Press.

Wodak, R. (2013). Analyzing meetings in political and business contexts: Different genres, similar strategies. In P. Cap & O. Okulsa (Eds.), *Analyzing genres in political communication. Discourse approaches to politics, society and culture, Vol. 50* (pp. 187–221). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Wodak, R., & Chilcote, P. (2005). *A new agenda in (critical) discourse analysis: Theory, methodology and interdisciplinarity*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.

Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (Eds.) (2001). *Methods of critical discourse analysis*. London: Sage Publications.

Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (Eds.) (2009). *Methods of critical discourse analysis*. London: Sage Publications. Second edition.

ISSN 2386-7876 – © 2015 Communication & Society 28(2), 39-54