A THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK FOR THE CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF IDEOLOGICALLY DRIVEN DISCOURSES

Isabela Anda Dragomir

PhD Student, "Lucian Blaga" University of Sibiu

Abstract: The present paper sets out to establish the guidelines of a discourse analytical approach for the investigation of ideologically driven discourse. The main goal of the theoretical exploration is to highlight the ideological role of the language in constructing representations of the social world. The idea that ideologies are created, maintained and practiced through language is not novel. Drawing on the achievements of critical discourse analysis as a qualitative method of linguistic investigation, the paper attempts to reconcile the critical view on discourse with the analysis of ideological values, following the guidelines established by T.A. van Dijk. The investigative approach used here is aimed at reinforcing the dialectical connection between language and ideologies.

Keywords: critical discourse analysis, theoretical framework, ideology, discourse

1. Introduction

The theory of ideology which substantiates the discourse analytical approach of this paper is treated from a multidisciplinary angle. The key term of the study, *ideology*, has been intensively exploited across a variety of disciplines, including history, philosophy, political economy, anthropology. Linguistics, more specifically the study of language as a social phenomenon, cannot be excluded from this enumeration. However, researchers and scholars are united in the belief that the concept of 'ideology' is quite a nuisance, since it has been used in a multitude of ways in the two hundred years of its existence. Jan Bloommaert (2005) poignantly declares:

> Few terms are as badly served by scholarships as the term ideology, and as soon as anyone enters the field of ideology studies, he or she finds him/herself in a morass of contradictory definitions, widely varying approaches to ideology, and huge controversies over terms, phenomena, or models of analysis (p. 158).

Exploring discourse from a critical perspective is looking at it as a codifying system that social institutions apply in taking their stance, by making use of concepts and assertions whereby they legitimize those assertions as being normal and natural. Under the umbrella of ideological enactments, such concepts and ideas act as a representation of reality and, on account of being firmly backed, claim uncontested veracity status.

The investigative paradigm proposed here is founded on the assumption that CDA is "the close study of language in use" (Taylor, 2001, p. 5) and that although its primary object of study is discourse, it may take excursions into many different connected fields (philosophy, psychology, sociology). Loosely defined, an analysis of the discourse will look at "how stretches of language, considered in their full textual, social and psychological context become meaningful and unified for their users" (Cook, 1989, p. ix). This idea was also developed in the works of J.R. Firth, the

BDD-A26490 © 2017 Arhipelag XXI Press
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:55:11 UTC)

founder of modern British linguistics, who saw language not an autonomous system, but as part of a culture, which is in turn responsive to the environment. Hence, discourse analysis represents a theoretical frame of understanding the cultural environment and the phenomena associated to it, as emerging in communication from the values and beliefs conveyed by means of language.

An investigation of ideologically-driven discourse presupposes the identification of points of intersection between language and the set of beliefs that regulate and control social representations of the world, i.e. ideologies. I strongly believe that CDA is the best suited method in the exploration of the negotiation and production of meaning of the social world. An analysis of ideology will consequently draw upon the importance of context and culture in structuring discourse. The chosen analytical framework provides a different way of theorizing language and focuses on the investigation of discourses specific to socio-cultural contexts form the entry point provided by the critical analysis of ideology.

2. The critical analysis of ideology

According to van Dijk (2006a), ideologies are manifested in the social practices of the group they define, and acquired, validated, altered and disseminated through discourse. A sound ideological analysis of the discourse explicitly relates ideologies and language, in virtue of the many similarities they share. The same author synthetizes the multidisciplinary lens (social, cognitive and discursive) through which ideological values should be explored:

> As 'systems of ideas', ideologies are sociocognitively defined as social representations of social groups, and more specifically, as 'axiomatic' principles of such representations. As the basis of the social group's self-image, ideologies organize its identity, actions, aims, norm and values and resources, as well as its relations to other social groups (p. 115).

From a socio-cognitive perspective, "ideologies are defined as basic systems of fundamental social cognitions and organizing the attitudes and other social representations shared by members of groups" (van Dijk, 1995b, p. 1). Language is also social, because its functions are social. Ideologies are conceptualized as a mental representation comprising different elements such as identity/membership, task, goal, norms, positions, all of which define and shape the values and beliefs shared by a group. Discourses are, in their turn, defined as "abstract structures of form, meaning and interaction" (van Dijk, 2006b, p. 133). The lexical items, syntactic structures, connotation and denotation mechanisms are discursive elements that cannot be observed directly, but are subject to interpretation. They become abstract objects of investigation for language theory and, at the same time, are mental constructs of language. Consequently, meaning has a cognitive nature and any analysis of discourse automatically implies cognitive notions: knowledge, beliefs, opinions and ideologies.

"The point of ideological discourse analysis is not merely to 'discover' underlying ideologies, but to systematically link structures of discourse with structures of ideologies" (van Dijk, 1995b, p. 143). In other words, a study of discourse, which is not based on a naïve knowledge of language, discourse, society and ideology, but rather on analytically explicit methods, needs to dissolve any intuition we may have about the meaning of language and target explicitly what patterns of discourse generate specific inferences or mental deductions.

To this aim, van Dijk (1995a) proposes the following levels of critical discourse analysis that connect ideologies and language from the socio-cognitive perspective:

BDD-A26490 © 2017 Arhipelag XXI Press
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:55:11 UTC)

Level 1 – Social analysis, proposing an investigation of overall societal structures (e.g. parliamentary democracy, capitalism, dictatorship), institutional/organizational structures (e.g. political parties, government, the military), group relations (e.g. discrimination, hegemony), group structures (i.e. identity, task, goals, norm, position, resources).
Level 2 – Cognitive analysis, which espouses social cognition and personal cognition as secondary levels of analysis. Social cognition explores sociocultural values (e.g. solidarity, loyalty, ethos), ideologies (e.g. racist, sexist, feminist), systems of attitudes (e.g. multiculturalism), sociocultural knowledge (e.g. society, groups, individuals, language, culture). In its turn, personal cognition is divided into general/context-free cognition, referring to personal values (personal selections from the pool of social values), personal ideologies (personal interpretations of group ideologies), personal attitudes (systems of personal opinions) and personal knowledge (biographical information, past experiences) and particular/context-bound cognition, integrating models (ad hoc representations of specific current actions, events), context models (ad hoc representations of the speech context), mental plans and representations of acts and discourse, mental constructions of text meaning and mental selections of discourse structures (style).
Level 3 – Discourse analysis, examining various structures of text and talk. At this level, the investigation specifically targets the linguistic dimension of discourse: phonological (stress, pitch, volume, intonation) or graphical structures (headlines, bold characters, layout); syntactic structures (word order, topicalization, clausal relations, split constructions); semantic structures (explicit vs. implicit, implications – insinuations, vagueness, presuppositions, allusions, symbolism, collective symbolism, figurativeness, metaphorism); pragmatics (intention, mood, opinion, perspective, relative distance); formal structures (idioms, sayings, clichés, set phrases, language patterns); logic and composition of the discourse (argumentation – strategy, types, cohesion, coherence).

Van Dijk's framework is instrumental in setting the background of a theoretical framework to be employed in order to identify the way in which ideologies are constructed, embedded and conveyed through language and to pinpoint the ideological role of discourse in constructing linguistic representations of the social world.

3. Ideology and discourse

The theory of ideology discussed in this context is articulated based on a conceptual framework connecting discourse and social cognition. Approached from a tripartite perspective, the notion of 'ideology' is further interpreted from cognitive, social and discursive angles, a triangulation that converges towards a multidisciplinary delineation of the term.

3.1. Defining ideology

Since the end of the 18th century, when French philosopher Destutt de Tracy devised the term, the notion of 'ideology' has received a myriad of definitions, forged and adapted to suit a number of different – and often divergent – domains of study, including mass media (Said, 1981; Schmid, 1982), politics (Rosenberg, 1988), and social sciences (Larrain, 1979; Thompson, 1984; Wodak, 1989; Eagleton 1991; van Dijk, 1995b). Although de Tracy defined ideology as 'the science of ideas', this slightly restricted approach to interpreting and analysing what we think, speak and argue has been long appreciated as obsolete, and modernist and postmodernist scholars have enlarged the scope of ideology, defining it as a 'system of beliefs' (van Dijk, 1995a), false

BDD-A26490 © 2017 Arhipelag XXI Press
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:55:11 UTC)

consciousness (Engels' interpretation of Marxism), social cognition (Fiske & Taylor, 1991; Resnik, Levine & Teasley, 1991; Chomsky, 1993), mental and social representations (Johnson-Laird, 1983; Farr & Moscovici, 1984) and ultimately simply as norms and values organizing individuals, groups and institutions.

Essentially, ideologies are defined as 'systems of beliefs', or collective structures of ideas, notions, norms and values. As system of ideas belonging to the same group, ideologies are the fundamental notions on which the social practices of the organization are based. As they most frequently emerge from opposition and conflict, linguistically manifested by the polarization between 'us' and 'them', 'ingroups' and 'outgroups', 'positive' and 'negative', ideologies monitor and control the attitude, behaviour and, in the long run, the actions of the organization in relation to the outside world.

Starting from the assumption that ideologies are neither personal nor private, but are socially shared in collectivity, we argue that ideologies can be further defined as mental representations that shape the social identity of a group, united by a system of commonly accepted values and norms embraced as fundamental and axiomatic, aimed at controlling and organizing the existence and the image of the organization. In this respect, one of the major functions of ideologies is to provide consistency to the philosophies of a group and promote a common background for their acquisition and use in daily contexts. More importantly, ideologies also stipulate what cultural values (viz., justice, equality, freedom, democracy etc.) are relevant for the organization and define their role and importance for the cohesion of the institution.

3.2. The social-cognitive function of ideology

The proposed theoretical approach to ideology is much in line with other contemporary approaches targeting a definition of the notion. Rosenberg (1988), Thompson (1990) or Eagleton (1991) also view ideologies as a 'system of ideas' attributing them both social and cognitive dimensions. Localized between societal organizations and configurations of the mind, ideologies are seen as basic frameworks of social cognition, having precise internal structures as well as social and cognitive roles. Flanked by cognitive representative images and processes essential for the materialization of discourse and action, on one hand, and socially-situated positions and goals of social groups on the other, ideologies often aim to validate command and authority, to articulate opposition in relationships of power or to promote basic guidelines for the behaviour of professional categories (scientists, journalists) and institutions (schools, the military).

Perceived through the lens of social cognition, ideologies cogently entail cognitive functions. In addition to organizing, monitoring and controlling the group's attitudes and behaviour, ideologies also regulate the enlargement, organisation and manifestation of sociocultural knowledge. Located at the intersection between the social and the individual, ideologies and the knowledge controlled by them influence the personal cognition of the members of the group, translating personal experiences and the mental representations associated to them into 'models' of social practice (van Dijk & Kintsch 1983). Defined as mental representations of events, actions and situations people have experience with, these models represent the personal and unique knowledge and opinions stemming from the biographical practice of the individuals. Nonetheless, these experiences are socially-controlled and intertwined in a nexus of collective social cognitions shared within the group, which makes them part of a combined personal and instantiated social information materialized into mental models. Their application to the interpretation of reality is essential in making explicit the relation between group ideologies and

BDD-A26490 © 2017 Arhipelag XXI Press
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:55:11 UTC)

discourse. In sum, the cognitive dimension of ideology explains how the shared mental models of social representations control text and talk and how individuals understand, interpret and apply the social practices specific to the group they belong to.

By and large, ideologies are shaped and defined by a set of social and cognitive functions. They consolidate and fundament the social representations the members of an ideological group share. They constitute the most substantiated origin of discourse and generate the social practices through which group members validate their affiliation and membership. Allowing group participants to coordinate and manage their actions and interactions towards accomplishing the ultimate goals of the organization, ideologies act as catalysts in channelling the joint efforts of the individuals on their path to becoming an entity adhering to the same values and principles. Lastly, ideologies perform the function of the missing tie between social structures and their discourses and actions, thus filling the void separating the cognitive and the social dimensions of individual representations of the world and forging them into durable collective models.

3.3. Discourse structures and structures of ideology

As an investigative entry point, ideological discourse analysis is concerned with discovering the ideologies inherent in discourse and, more importantly, with systematically connecting structures of ideology with structures of discourse. In order to explain the structure and properties of ideologies, van Dijk (2006c) has hypothesized a general ideological schema and postulates that "in order to be acquired and used, ideologies need some kind of organization" (p. 118). This assertion leads us to the idea that ideologies are not extensive, unordered, chaotic sets of beliefs, but are systematized according to a schemata, and have a structural organization. Since ideologies are complex cognitive representations, they are organized around a series of conventional categories allowing social actors to recognise, understand, construct, alter or even discard different beliefs. The categories that enter in the composition of the ideological schemata are derivative from the inherent characteristics of the social group and regulate the identity and identification of the members to the group. The same author has identified six categories reflecting the levels that compose the structure of ideologies: membership criteria, typical activities, overall aims, norms and values, position, resources (van Dijk, 2006a). These categories control and govern individual and collective actions and also mentally organize the representative models of ideology. Consequently, social groups can be defined in terms of identity and membership, specific actions, goals and beliefs.

This purely theoretical schemata becomes plausible if applied in practical research and used to explain social practices, such as discourse. If ideologies, as assumed above, are structured on the basis of a schematic representation, then it is only expected to infer that discourses are also structured under the influence of the specific ideologies they enact. Weiss and Wodak (2007) argue that discursive practices are at the same time structured and structuring actions, that is they organize ideologies and are, conversely, organized by them.

An analytically explicit examination of discourse needs to specify expressions and meanings embedded in linguistic materializations and investigate closely the mental representations displayed in communication. In discourse, ideologies are typically expressed in units of meaning, linguistically defined as clauses, symbolised as networks of conceptual nodes organizing mental representations of the world. They imply a certain syntax (topicalization, word order, clausal relations such as the relations main vs. subordinate, fronted vs. embedded), specific semantic structures (explicit vs. implicit, lexical polarizations, codes), rhetorical devices

BDD-A26490 © 2017 Arhipelag XXI Press
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:55:11 UTC)

(repetitions, euphemisms, litotes) and pragmatic aspects (self-congratulation vs. allegation, declaration vs rejection, boasting vs. derogation). In short, discourses and the language deployed in the production thereof have a wide array of structural mechanisms used to express ideologically controlled opinions. Discourse structures are connected to the structure of ideologies in that they enact the fundamental ideologies and promote favoured mental models, attitudes and ultimately ideologies.

A diversity of discursive strategies and structures are employed to express ideological beliefs as well as the consequent personal and social opinions. They allow the discovery of linkages between ideologies and discourse at a structural level. Ideological discourses, by extension, will characteristically be semantically concerned with specific themes, local meanings and implications in providing descriptions of: self-identity – membership, affiliation, origin, properties, history, boundaries; activities – tasks, activities, expectations, social roles; goals – objectives usually labelled as ideologically situated positive actions that are not necessarily factual (e.g. ensuring peace and stability, defending the interests of the country/alliance, peace-building etc.); norms and values – oppositions of good / bad, right / wrong, truth / lie, equality / inequality, tolerance / intolerance, democracy /oppression etc.; position and relations – group relations, conflict, power dynamics, polarization; resources – information, knowledge, expertise etc.

3.4. Ideology and discourse processing

The identification and deconstruction of the specific ideologies positioned in discourse can be operationalized by interpreting discourses from a linguistic and socio-cognitive perceptive, based on an articulated conceptual framework that connects knowledge, cognitive models and context. The processes involved in decomposing the explicit or often hidden meaning of communication start from the premise that ideologies are the foundation of discourse. Processing discourse actually resumes to processing ideologies, since the values, norms and beliefs of a group are acquired and expressed by spoken and written communicative instances and interaction. When the members of a group (institution, organization) legitimate their actions, they linguistically materialize them in the form of ideologically driven discourses.

As discussed in the previous section, the link between discourse and ideology is established on the basis of structures of discourse: syntactic structures (agency), polarized lexical items (pronouns such as *us* and *them*), metaphors, implications, argumentation, and others properties of discourse. However, Duranti and Goodwin (1992) argue that observing ideologically based linguistic devices used in the construction of discourses is not sufficient, but that it is critical to theorize discourse processing in terms of context structures. Contexts are actually the interface between the social situation and the communicative event, cognitively conceptualized as mental models, that is as specific representations through which social actors experience, understand, and represent the significant aspects of the circumstances they are part of. These mental models facilitate the connection between the discourse and the social/political/cultural context in which it is produced, in terms of subject (who), topic (what about), location (where), time (when), audience (to whom) etc. Such features are relevant for the comprehension of the communicative situation and control a wide range of discourse processing stages, while validating the social appropriateness of the discourse. Defined as “subjective participant definitions of communicative situations” (van Dijk, 2006a, p. 159), contexts may be ideologically biased, thus resulting in subjective discourses (for example, discourses that have a more or less respectful tone or lexical choices).

Contexts are equally instrumental in the processes of construction and reception of

BDD-A26490 © 2017 Arhipelag XXI Press
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:55:11 UTC)

discourses, since the information inherent in the context model (from a pragmatic perspective, for instance, in terms of the 'who is involved') controls the speech acts of the communicative event. One utterance can be at the same time perceived as an assurance or as a menace, depending on the dynamics of power regulating the relationship between the social actors, their position within the organization, their (expressed or hidden) intentions etc. In the same manner, semantic context models specifically locate and control the selection of information, the choice of the topic and the type of the information to be transmitted. Furthermore, context models regulate the style of the discourse, i.e. all grammatical choices (pronominalization, syntax) that define the situation, translated in the selection of the different levels of formality or registers specifically tailored to the circumstances. The format of the discourse is also influenced by these models, which ultimately control the mechanics of communication in terms of organization, structure, layout etc.

While mental contexts are personal and characterised by a high degree of subjectivity, the ideologies, attitudes and knowledge shared by the members of a group are more general and claim an uncontested status of legitimacy. As an essential instrument in controlling the production and the reception of discourses, knowledge is assimilated and normally presupposed by the majority of the individuals belonging to different communities (culture, city, nation, organization). This commonly-accepted, taken-for-granted knowledge makes it possible for discourse meanings to be decoded and interpreted on a mutual ground by the members of the same community. Since it is essentially defined as socially shared beliefs, knowledge is also ideological and consequently contributory to the creation of mental models and, implicitly, of the discourses founded on them. It acquires a wide-ranging dimension and receives a definition that is beyond the individual, and is situated at the level of the social group.

4. Anchoring the theoretical framework - categories of ideological discourse analysis

The above mentioned relation between structures of discourse and structures of ideologies is fundamental in defining various categories of ideological discourse analysis. Starting from van Dijk's (2006a) own conceptualization, I will briefly enumerate the domains of discourse analysis and the analytical implications that can be traced back to the ideologies expressed in discourse.

Argumentation is concerned with the manner in which conclusions can be reached with the help of logical reasoning. As a cognitive process, argumentation is based on a set of assumptions and premises, involves making inferences through informed methods of analysis and ultimately aims at constructing and supporting a point of view or a concluding statement. In discourse, argumentation is materialized by summoning authority, by using exemplifications and illustrations or with the help of the so called 'number game' strategy, that is the use of statistic and numerical backup information. In order to claim uncontested status for their ideological beliefs, the social actors involved in the production and dissemination of discourse often make use of authority (experts, moral leaders), which they mention in support of their statements. NATO, the United Nations, or the World Health Organization, as international bodies, the media, the church or the courts often assume that function, and their official endorsement is activated depending on the type of ideology that needs validation. Assertion or claims in argument become more credible when backed up with evidence. Various forms of evidentiality, such as citing a plausible source, offering concrete examples (easier decoded than abstract arguments), are more impactful and argumentatively more plausible. The practical culture nowadays heavily relies on statistics as the main resource to convincingly display impartiality, reliability and therefore credibility.

BDD-A26490 © 2017 Arhipelag XXI Press
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:55:11 UTC)

The analysis of meaning, as probably the vastest domain of study in CDA, transcends the traditional approach, limited at identifying the relationship between words, phrases and sentences in terms of their communicative purpose and takes a trip into the depths of an investigative procedure aimed at highlighting conceptual and associative relations between lexical units, by separating meaning based on the distinction between denotation and connotation, while examining the semantic features and roles of discourse. For instance, the ideological categories of meaning could be expressed by the way in which social actors are represented in discourses. Ingroup members are typically described in a neutral or positive way, while outgroup members receive a negative portrayal. This polarization is located in another classification of ideological discourse analysis, that of categorization, explicitly assigning specific features to antagonistic groups (us vs. them, our vs. their, oppositions such as good/bad, friend/foe etc.). The relationship between ingroups and outgroups is also expressed by means of comparison, a strategy whose main purpose is to oppose main characteristics, values, beliefs, attitudes and behaviours and ultimately the ideologies of the divergent categories. Moreover, due to a number of many contextual or pragmatic reasons, discourses do not render everything their producers know or believe. As a consistent portion of discourse is often implicit, such implications may be decoded by the recipients on the basis of the shared knowledge and beliefs (ideologies), which are located in the mental models constructed about the situation described in the discourse. In most discourses on controversial issues, for example, implicitness could be deliberately used so as to transmit meanings whose categorical expression could be otherwise understood as prejudiced. Closely linked to the notion of implicitness, various forms of vagueness are also to be expected in virtually all debatable contexts, where vague expressions lacking well-defined referents (nouns – thing, device; quantifiers – few, a lot; adjectives – high, low, big, small) are emblematic for such discourse.

Rhetoric has significantly evolved since its ancient development as the art of discourse. In linguistics, it is a category typically concerned with studying the principles and rules deployed in the construction of discourse as a means of persuasion. Whether materialized as surface structures, such as alliteration or rhyme, or as semantic figures, like irony, euphemism, metaphor, or hyperbole, rhetorical structures may represent a form of ideological control, underlying mental models and social beliefs and anchoring shared representations of the world in the discourse of a particular community of practice. Against the polarized background hosting the opposition between positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation, hyperboles are used as semantic rhetorical devices aimed at the enhancement of meaning. In ideological discourses constructed in support of divergent stances taken in relation to a specific issue, we expect that the assumed corrupt actions or features of the 'others' be rendered in hyperbolic terms, while 'our' bad actions are described in moderated terms. This last strategy directly links to the avoidance of forming a negative impression, as the negative acts of the ingroup are downplayed with the help of euphemisms. Observably, the use of euphemisms is justified not only in ideological terms (ingroup protection), but also in contextual terms, for instance personal context (mood), social context (formality, power relations) or sociocultural settings (sociolect, norms and values). The well-known semantic-rhetorical figure of metaphor is highly persuasive, and its use is directed to transforming unfamiliar, complex abstract meanings into more tangible and more familiar concepts.

As a component of style, lexicalization is an ample category of ideological expression, involving a selection of words and phrases employed in direct connection with the discourse genre or the pragmatic backgrounds mentioned above, which are typically ideologically controlled. Fundamental concepts and beliefs are expressed by specific lexical items, selected depending on

BDD-A26490 © 2017 Arhipelag XXI Press
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:55:11 UTC)

the goals, role, position, or opinion of the social actors, that is, as a function of context features. Overall ideological strategies are planted in discourse with the help of specific lexical choices, which, in the context of the prevalent polarization, are used to either glorify ingroup members' actions and characteristics or degrade the outgroup's manifestations and features.

The same linguistic opposition of negative other-presentation and positive self-presentation is articulated with the support of semantic macro-strategies, employed as a technique of discursive composition aimed at emphasizing mental models or social cognitions which control meaning by legitimizing, rationalizing, validating and universalizing ideologies. Ideologically controlled models representing various realities resort to semantic macro-strategies in order to transmit biased viewpoints or attitudes, in the construction of which the dichotomy implicit/explicit is highly instrumental. In essence, the categorization of individuals in ingroups and outgroups, the division between 'good' and 'bad' and the opposition between 'us' and 'them' are not at all value-free, but are impregnated with ideologically driven applicative manifestations of beliefs, values and norms.

5. Conclusions

Ideologically driven discourses could be deconstructed according to an analytical framework that relates structures of ideologies with the implicit structural organization of discourse, from a socio-cognitive perspective that espouses thought, action and communication. Since ideologies have social and cognitive functions, we may conclude that they conceptually influence, monitor and control the discursive manifestations characteristics to individuals, groups, organizations and institutions. Ideologies also have an extensive impact on the internal organization of the discourse as well on its external reception, stamping specific social practices that are visible through the influence ideologies have on social interaction, group coordination and cohesion, and the traditional activities of group members whose common effort converges towards the accomplishment of the same goals. Cognitively, ideologies manifested in discourse interact with personal and social frames of knowledge and are instrumental in constructing mental models of communicative contexts and events and in facilitating the construction and comprehension of text and talk.

The framework proposed in this paper shows that ideologically controlled discourse structures are populated with related configurations and strategies of management and expression of mental representations. Globally, we may assert that specific organizational patterns and syntactic and semantic structures emphasize and make prominent information that is typically self-serving and stable, while dispreferred information is downplayed and usually restrained. This divergence is normally localized in mental models that are not only conceptualizations of individual interests and values, but also participate in the shared construction of ideologies. However, since ideologies are rarely explicitly and directly expressed in discourse, their comprehension is typically achieved through general attitudes and specific group-based representations, which lie at the core of discourse production and reception.

The presented theory stresses the idea that ideologies are articulated in discourse and explains the many ways in which ideological discourses are constructed and diffused through language. We may conclude that ideological acquisition, validation and transmission is typically discursive and complemented by enactment through social practices. An adequate ideological analysis of any type of discourse should be located at the intersection between ideological structures and discourse structures and more generally between discourse, knowledge and society.

BDD-A26490 © 2017 Arhipelag XXI Press
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:55:11 UTC)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bloomaert, J. (2005). *Discourse (Key topics in sociolinguistics).* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Chomsky, N. (*1993).* A minimalist program for linguistic theory. In K. Hale & S. J. Keyser, (Eds.), The view from Building 20 (pp. 1-52). Cambridge: MIT Press.

Cook, G. (1989). *Discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Duranti, A. & Goodwin, C. (1992). *Rethinking context: Language as an interactive phenomenon.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Eagleton, T. (1991). *Ideology. An introduction.* London: Verso Eds.

Farr, S. & Moscovici, S. (1984). *Social representations.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fiske, S. T. & Taylor, S. E. (1991). *Social cognition*. McGraw-Hill.

Johnson-Laird, P. N. (1983). *Mental models*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Larrain, J. (1979). *The concept of ideology*. London: Hutchinson.

Resnick, L. B., J. M. Levine & Teasley, S. D. (1991). *Perspectives on socially shared cognition*. American Psychological Asociation.

Rosenberg, S. W. (1988). *Reason, ideology and politics.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Said, E. W. (1981). *Covering Islam: How the media and the experts determine how we see the rest of the world*. New York: Pantheon.

Schmid, A. P. (1982). *Violence as communication: Insurgent terrorism and the Western news media.* London: Sage.

Taylor, S. (2001). Locating and conducting discourse analytic research. In M. Wetherell, S. Taylor & S. J. Yates (Eds.), *Discourse as a data: A guide for analysis* (pp. 5-48). London: Sage Publications.

Thompson, J. B. (1984). S*tudies in the theory of ideology.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

van Dijk, T.A. (1995a). Discourse analysis as ideology analysis. In C. Schaffen & A. Wenden (Eds.) *Language and Peace.* (pp. 17-33). Aldershot: Darmouth Publishing.

van Dijk, T. A. (1995b). Discourse semantics and ideology. *Discourse and society*, *6*(2), 243-289.

van Dijk, T. A. (2006a). Politics, ideology, and discourse. In K. Brown (Ed.), *The Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics* (vol. 9) (pp. 728-740). Oxford, New York: Pergamon Press.

van Dijk, T. A. (2006b). Ideology and discourse analysis. *Journal of political ideologies*, *11*(2), 115-140.

van Dijk, T. A. & Kintsch, W. (1983). *Strategies of discourse comprehension*. New York: Academic Press.

Weiss, G. & Wodak, R. (Eds.). (2007). *Critical discourse analysis: Theory and interdisciplinarity*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Wodak, R. (Ed.). (1989). *Language, power and ideology: Studies in political discourse* (vol. 7). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.

BDD-A26490 © 2017 Arhipelag XXI Press
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.42 (2026-11-15 20:55:11 UTC)