

The Shifting Paradigms of Discourse Analysis: A Comparative Review of Major Schools and Approaches

Asst. Lect. Hala Hamid Hasan Alqaisi

Anbar University/College of Education for Women

hala.hamed@uoanbar.edu.iq

Dr. Afaf Sami Salih Al-Mihimdi

Anbar University/College of Education for Women

sami.afaf@uoanbar.edu.iq

Asst. Lect. Rola Fawwaz Hammad Al-Faragy

Tikrit University/ College of Education for Pure Sciences

rula.f.hammad@tu.edu.iq

التحوّلات في النماذج النظرية لتحليل الخطاب: مراجعة مقارنة لأهم المدارس والاتجاهات

م. م. مهاله حامد حسن القيسي

م. د. عفاف سامي صالح المحمدي

جامعة الانبار/كلية التربية للبنات/ قسم اللغة الإنكليزية

م. م. مرلى فواز حماد الفراجي

جامعة تكريت/ كلية التربية للعلوم الصرفة

Abstract

The paper is a review that examines the theoretical development and cross-disciplinary growth of Discourse Analysis (DA). It has surpassed the paradigmatic transformations of structural and functional linguistics, critical, multimodal and digital paradigms. The paper has identified the way discourse has been redefined as a linguistic object and then as a socially oriented, ideologically charged practice, by systematically exploring the major schools of theory such as structural, pragmatic, sociolinguistic, and critical approaches. The methodological orientations which define each of the paradigms are also discussed in the review with a particular focus on the paradigm shift between sentence-level analysis to contextual, ethnographic and multimodal perspectives. Recent trends in the field like corpus-assisted, computational and digital discourse studies are examined to demonstrate how the field has reacted to the technological change and global communication. The paper contends that the future of discourse analysis is in integrative models that bring together precision of linguistics, critical awareness and computational scalability. By this comparative synthesis, the work adds to the better comprehension of the role of discourse as a mirror, as well as a process of social transformation, in the balancing of linguistic form, social role, and digital mediation in modern communicative behaviour. **Keywords:** Discourse Analysis, Paradigm Shifts, Critical Discourse Studies, Multimodal Communication, Digital Discourse

المخلص

هذه الورقة هي مراجعة تستعرض التطور النظري والنمو بين التخصصات لتحليل الخطاب (AD). لقد تجاوزت التحولات النموذجية في اللغويات الهيكلية والوظيفية، والنماذج النقدية، متعددة الوسائط والرقمية. قامت الورقة بتحديد الطريقة التي تم بها إعادة تعريف الخطاب ككائن لغوي ثم كممارسة اجتماعية موجهة إيديولوجيًا، من خلال استكشاف منهجي للمدارس النظرية الرئيسية مثل المناهج الهيكلية، الدراغماوية، السوسولوجيا والنقدية. تم أيضًا مناقشة التوجهات المنهجية التي تحدد كل من هذه النماذج مع تركيز خاص على التحول النموذجي بين تحليل الجملة إلى المنظورات السياقية، الأثنوجرافية ومتعددة الوسائط. تم فحص الاتجاهات الحديثة في المجال مثل الدراسات المعتمدة على corpora، والدراسات الحسابية والرقمية للخطاب، لإظهار كيف تفاعل المجال مع التغيير التكنولوجي والتواصل العالمي. وتؤكد الورقة أن مستقبل تحليل الخطاب يكمن في النماذج التكاملية التي تجمع بين دقة اللغويات، والوعي النقدي، والقابلية للتوسع الحسابي. من خلال هذا التحليل المقارن، يساهم العمل في فهم أفضل لدور الخطاب كمرآة، وكذلك كعملية للتحول الاجتماعي، في موازنة الشكل اللغوي، والدور الاجتماعي، والوساطة الرقمية في سلوكيات التواصل الحديثة. **الكلمات المفتاحية:** تحليل الخطاب؛ تحولات النموذج؛ دراسات الخطاب النقدي؛ التواصل متعدد الوسائط؛ الخطاب الرقمي.

1. Introduction

1.1 Background and Rationale

Discourse Analysis (DA) has become a multidisciplinary branch that examines the role of language in social, cultural, and ideological interactions and processes. It is no longer limited to the time-honored scope of linguistics because it analyses the process of meaning formation via interaction, situation, and power relations (Schiffrin, 1994; Gee, 2014). In contrast to structural linguistics, which puts a heavy emphasis on syntax and sentence structures, discourse analysis treats language as a type of social practice- a means through which individuals and institutions build identities, with social hierarchies as well as negotiating relationships and reproducing or challenging them (Fairclough, 1992; van Dijk, 2008). Discourse analysis has, therefore, emerged as a key focus to not only linguistics, but also to other disciplines including sociology, anthropology, communication studies and psychology. Both fields have their theoretical assumptions and methodology, which gives rise to the emergence of various paradigms in the field of DA. The importance of the review of these paradigms is that it enables a researcher to realize how discourse theories have been adapted to larger intellectual trends and socio-political changes (Wodak and Meyer, 2016). Besides, the identification of paradigm shifts also demonstrates how the relationship between language, society and power has been redefined by scholars over time, starting with structuralist, functional, sociolinguistic, and critical models.

1.2 Research Objectives

The key aim of this review is to follow the historical and conceptual evolution of discourse analysis and compare the key schools of thought that have influenced the development of discourse analysis. Specifically, the paper aims:

- 1- To provide the historical background of the main foundations of DA and the methods of the early linguistic models that became more general and more critical.
- 2- To compare and contrast the significant paradigms, such as structural, pragmatic, sociolinguistic, and critical approaches, in order to outline their theoretical and methodological inclinations.
- 3- To determine the significant changes of direction of structural forms of language to more socially and politically oriented versions of discourse. By covering these goals, the paper will help to have a more integrated vision of discourse analysis both as a linguistic and social phenomenon, demonstrating its development in various fields.

1.3 Scope and Organization

In this paper, four major paradigms that have contributed to the evolution of the discourse analysis are reviewed:

- 1- The Structural paradigm which is concerned with the organization and coherence of texts.
2. The Pragmatic paradigm with an emphasis on a meaning in the situation and speaker intention
3. The Sociolinguistic and Ethnographic paradigm, moving discourse to the context of social and cultural activities.
4. The Critical paradigm, that associates discourses with ideology, power and social change.

The structure of the paper is as follows: section two describes the historical background of the discourse analysis; section three is the actual comparison of the major paradigms; section four is the explanations of the methodological orientations offered by these schools; section five is the realization of the modern tendencies and perspectives of the discourse studies.

2. Historical Foundations of Discourse Analysis

2.1 Pre-structural and Structural Roots

The origins of discourse analysis lie in the intellectual history of linguistic traditions of the early twentieth century, in the work of Saussurean structuralism, which introduced the principles of describing the language as a structured system of signs. The *Course in General Linguistics* (1916/1959) by Ferdinand de Saussure defined the difference between *langue* (the abstract system of language) and *parole* (individual acts of speech), and stressed the relational character of the meaning within the linguistic system instead of its referring to the outside world (Saussure, 1959). Though Saussure had not studied the discourse per se, his perception of linguistic meaning as emerging due to inner relationships and not referential correspondence offered the conceptual basis to subsequent studies of language as a set of rules. The Prague School developed a functionalist view of language, based on the structuralist ideas. The communicative functions of linguistic structures were stressed by linguists like Vilem Mathesius and Roman Jakobson who developed the concept of functional sentence perspective (FSP) the idea that it is the information structure in a sentence (theme and rheme) that makes the sentence communicatively dynamic (Firbas, 1992; Jakobson, 1960). This concentration on the functional structure of text predicted subsequent changes within discourse and text linguistics by emphasizing the contextual and communicative functions of linguistic forms. The next step in the foundations of discourse analysis was when Zellig Harris developed the discourse grammar. Harris (1952) in his seminal article *Discourse Analysis* suggested that linguistic analysis should be done past the sentence to analyze tendencies of cohesion and repetition across series of sentences. Harris (1952) pioneered the ways to establish structural relationships among sentences, which later became the subject of attention related to coherence, cohesion, and structure of texts. Even though the approach of Harris was rather formal and distributional, it was one of the first attempts to use the word discourse analysis in contemporary linguistics.

2.2 Transition to Contextual and Functional Approaches

Although structuralism had placed an emphasis on linguistic structure, future research changed its orientation and placed emphasis on the contextual and functional aspects of language. J. R. Firth, a British linguist, held that meaning could only be interpreted in the context of social and dialectical situations in which language is displayed. His concept of meaning as functional in context stressed that the linguistic forms could not be comprehensively understood without referring to the communicative context (Firth, 1957). This change was a transition to the description of language as a static entity to a more dynamic insight into the use of language in

real-life contexts. The works of Firth were further elaborated by Bronisaw Malinowski who was an anthropologist whose ethnographic works showed how meaning in language is entrenched in situational and cultural contexts. Malinowski (1935) proposed the context of situation concept and claimed that utterances get their meaning based on the social and pragmatic circumstances that give rise to the production of those utterances. His work had an impact on the later sociolinguistic and ethnographic modes of discourse, and he inspired anthropology and linguistics to interact. It in the contextual-functional approach came to its most systematic articulation in the Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) of Michael Halliday. Halliday (1978, 1985) conceptualized language as a social semiotic system which plays three simultaneous meta functions that include the ideational (representation of experience), interpersonal (enactment of social relations) and textual (organization of discourse) meta functions. SFL provided a great basis to the analysis of functional discourse by showing how the linguistic decisions imply the social purpose and contextual variable like field, tenor, and mode (Halliday and Matthiessen, 2014). It was based on the shift of the focus on the single linguistic structures to the functional analysis of the speech, creating the connection between the linguistic form and the social meaning. Overall, the historical precursors of discourse analysis developed into context-based theories of meaning, which were based on the structuralist theories of linguistic organization. This development can be seen as a response to an increase in the awareness of the need to study language as not only a formal system but also as a means of social interaction and meaning-making in certain cultural situations. The developments made on these foundations readied the future paradigms that incorporated social, pragmatic, and critical aspects of discourse.

3. Major Paradigms and Schools of Discourse Analysis

3.1 Pragmatic and Speech Act Approaches

The pragmatism paradigm was a significant change in the research of language, which is less about its abstract form and more about the functions of the utterances in its context. This strategy is based on research that was done by J. L. Austin and John Searle, whose Theory of Speech Acts repositioned language as an action as opposed to a medium of information transfer. Austin (1962) believed that individuals utter, that is, they do locutionary (saying something), illocutionary (doing something by saying) acts, and perlocutionary (producing effects) ones. By this framework Searle (1969, 1979) extended by classifying the various kinds of illocutionary acts assertives, directives, commissives, expressives and declarations, each of which is regulated by rules that couple linguistic form, intention, and social convention. In addition to the speech act theory, H. P. Grice proposed the theory of conversational implicature, which contributed by elaborating the various ways that speakers could convey meaning without use of explicit words in what he referred to as Cooperative Principle (Grice, 1975). Grice argues that effective communication depends on the ability of the participants to follow conversational maxims of quantity, quality, relevance and manner. In cases where these maxims are violated, hearers will come to other meanings and implicature is core to the interpretation of discourse in a pragmatic manner. Based on these premises, Conversation Analysis (CA) became a micro-level technique of discourse. The sequential structuring of talk-in-interaction is the subject matter of CA, developed by Harvey Sack, Emanuel Schegloff, and Gail Jefferson in the 1960s (Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson, 1974). It looks at the creation of meaning by the participants, as a form of co-construction when making turns, repairing, having adjacency pairs and using other turn-taking structures. In contrast to the speech act theory, which focuses on the intent of the speaker, CA focuses on the actual observation of the interaction, which is a methodologically strict way to study the naturally occurring discourse (Heritage, 1984).

3.2 Sociolinguistic and Ethnographic Approaches

The increase in the discourse analysis was focused on the social and cultural context of language usage, which was developed through sociolinguistic and ethnographic paradigms. *Ethnography of Communication* by Dell

Hymes proposed the model SPEAKING that defines communicative events in terms of setting, participants, ends, act sequence, key, instrumentalities, norms and genre (Hymes, 1972). His work emphasized the fact that the communicative competence is not limited to the grammatical correctness, but the ability to apply language in the social norms. *Interactional Sociolinguistics* (1982) by John Gumperz further emphasized the use of contextualization cues like intonation, code-switching and prosody by the speakers as a way of indicating social meanings and control during intercultural communication. His works in cross-cultural miscommunication depicted the use of minor elements of linguistics in the interpretation and the negotiation of identity. Another prominent personality is William Labov who introduced the study of variation and *narrative analysis* as a means of learning the discourse. Labov and Waletzky (1967) in their classic work on storytelling described the structure of the personal narratives, that includes; orientation, complication, evaluation, resolution and coda and demonstrated how speakers narrate their stories to construct social selves. His quantitative study of language variation (Labov, 1972) connected linguistic decisions with social classes, ethnicity and contextualization and showed the way discourse creates and reproduces social stratification. Combined, these sociolinguistic and ethnographic approaches preempt community norms, community identity and interactional meaning, shifting the discourse analysis to a more in-depth interpretation of language as the domain of social practice.

3.3 Critical and Post-Structural Approaches

A significant shift in discourse toward the ideological and political aspects is the Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) paradigm, which was created by Norman Fairclough, Teun A. van Dijk and Ruth Wodak. CDA considers discourse as constituted by, as well as constituting, power relations, and is concerned with the way in which language maintains or opposes social inequality. Fairclough (1992, 1995) understood discourse as a dialectics between text, discourse practice, as well as social practice. Van Dijk (1993, 2008) proposed a sociocognitive approach that links the discourse structures to the shared mental models and social thinking, whereas Wodak (2001) focused on the historical and contextual analysis using the Discourse-Historical Approach (DHA). The critical traditions that shape them are based on the influence of Michel Foucault, who viewed discourse as a knowledge/ power system that produces social reality (Foucault, 1972, 1980). The idea of discourse as a place of struggle and control by Foucault encouraged the scholars of CDA to associate the practices of language with ideology, hegemony and control over institutions. Besides this, feminist and postcolonial discourse analysis expanded the interests of CDA by examining how language recreates gendered and colonial relations of authority. Other scholars like Lazar (2005) and Pennycook (1998) explored the construction of identities, resistances and power imbalances with regards to discourse, thus coming up with an integration of the critical theory and intersectional themes. These methods supported the notion that discourse is not neutral but it is a medium through which social dominance and exclusion are acted or opposed.

3.4 Cognitive and Multimodal Approaches

More recently, discourse analysis has been extended into the cognitive and multimodal paradigms, as well as the diversification of the theoretical focus and the technological shift. The cognitive paradigm studies the way language users process, store and interpret discourse in the mind of users. The cognitive schema models of discourse comprehension have been proposed by such scholars as van Dijk (2008) and Kintsch (1998) who pay much attention to the role of knowledge, beliefs and context in interpretation. Mental models of linguistic expression were further connected to discourse meaning by Cognitive Linguistics embodied by Lakoff and Johnson (1980), who contended that conceptual metaphors and embodied cognition were related. In the meantime, with the emergence of multimodal discourse analysis (MDA) by Gunther Kress and Theo van Leeuwen, the scope of DA has been broadened to include images, gestures, sound, and digital media rather than verbal language (Kress and van Leeuwen, 2001, 2006). MDA explores the combination of various modes of semiotic meaning in the creation of meaning and more specifically in modern modes of communication like

advertisements, films or online communications. Lastly, the rise of digital discourse studies can be attributed to the growing significance of the technology-mediated communication. Other studies like those conducted by Jones, Chik and Hafner (2015) have investigated how social media, online discussion groups and multimodal spaces are changing discourse practices so much so that there is no differentiation between the written and verbal forms of communication. Together, the cognitive, multimodal and digital paradigms emphasize the multi-disciplinary transformation of discourse analysis to more wide-ranged, technologically-integrated concept of meaning-making.

4. Comparative Discussion of Paradigm Shifts

4.1 From Structure to Function and Context

The history of discourse analysis (DA) is a shift in paradigms towards more functional and contextualized descriptions of language, out of the structuralist descriptions of language. The structuralist approach to language of earlier models (like Saussure (1959) and Harris (1952)) saw language as a closed system of patterns and forms. Certainly, though, these models were not sufficient to explain the way in which meaning functions in actual communication. The functional turn with Halliday (1978, 1985), put language in a new light as a social semiotic system - as a resource to make meaning, not as a code. This movement was also supported by the rise of pragmatic linguistics, the focus of which was on the intent of the speaker and the application of utterances depending on the context (Austin, 1962; Grice, 1975). The study of language in practice as opposed to abstract linguistic competence began to be studied, as it is known that meaning is co-stigmatized in social interaction and situation-relevance. In this way, the discourse analysis left the sentence level and reached textual and interactional levels of communication forming the basis of modern discourse-oriented disciplines (Schiffrin, 1994).

4.2 From Context to Power and Ideology

The second significant change was that of scholars abandoning functional analyses in favor of ideological aspects of discourse. The late twentieth century saw the rise of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), which marked a clear step towards considering the manner in which discourse produces, maintains and criticizes power relations (Fairclough, 1992; van Dijk, 1993). CDA combines linguistic description and sociopolitical criticism because it claims that discourse not only describes social inequalities, but also recreates them. This form of critique was strongly informed by the understanding of Foucault (1972, 1980) that discourse can be seen as a power-producing and knowledge-producing system. CDA scholars including Wodak (2001) and van Dijk (2008) applied this theoretical knowledge to examine the phenomenon of racism, gender and ideology in institutional communication. This is what led to a shift in the field, as it moved beyond explaining how language works, to explaining whose interests it is beneficial to- putting discourse as a tool of domination and resistance (Lazar, 2005).

4.3 From Text to Multimodality and Digitality

The twenty-first century has seen the discourse analysis broaden past text and talk to visual multimodal and digital communication. The emergence of Multimodal Discourse Analysis (MDA), led by Kress and van Leeuwen (2001, 2006) proved that combination of various semiotic tools is used to create meaning: language, image, sound, gesture and layout. The changing nature of media-saturated spaces and the necessity to study the role of various modes in the meaning-making of globalized experiences as a response to the increasing popularity of media-rich space is a hallmark of this paradigm shift (Jewitt, 2014). At the same time, the scope of digital discourse studies has re-conventionalized the realm of DA as it currently deals with computer-mediated interaction and online communication. The works of scholars like Jones, Chik, and Hafner (2015) and Tagg (2015) have touched upon the transformation of linguistic practices, identity construction, and discourse

participation amid the social media. The digital turn does not just focus on the multimodality of the meaning, but also on the sociotechnical frameworks that mediate discourse in the modern world.

4.4 Interdisciplinary Convergence

The last and the most significant change is the interdisciplinary convergence in discourse analysis. DA has a history in linguistics, although it has recently become based on sociology, anthropology, cognitive science, and media studies. Such an overlap is a sign of the acknowledgment of discourse as a social practice and a cognitively oriented process, which demands theoretical instruments in the fields of various domains (Gee, 2014; van Dijk, 2008). It has been noted that hybrid frameworks are currently being used to integrate critical, cognitive, and multimodal knowledge on complex communicative phenomena (Wodak and Meyer, 2016). An example is that cognitive approaches describe how people mentally define discourse and critical approaches demonstrate how the representations of discourse are ideologically determined. These integrations are the indicators of the appearance of hybrid models of discourse study, which is able to cope with linguistic, social, and technological changes simultaneously.

5. Methodological Orientations Across Paradigms

5.1 Data Types and Sampling

Discourse analysis may take methodological orientations depending on the paradigm and theoretical focus. Traditional structural and functional methods had been based on textual or corpus data, frequently obtained through some written source or controlled sample (Harris, 1952). By contrast, the ethnographic paradigm and conversation paradigm place more emphasis on naturalistic data, including tape recordings of spontaneous conversation and observations in the field (Hymes, 1972; Sacks et al., 1974).

As digital discourse studies become more popular, scholars are increasingly using online corpora and multimodal data which combines text, image, and video (Jones et al., 2015). All these data sources allow discussing discourse practices in institutional, interpersonal, and digital settings, making them ecologically more valid.

5.2 Analytical Tools and Procedures

The tools of analysis used in discourse analysis are extensive, and this is based on the interest in the micro-level interaction or the macro-level social structure. Conversation analysis is sequential analysis used to analyse turn taking and repair (Sacks et al., 1974), whereas CDA is a combination of linguistic description and sociopolitical interpretation (Fairclough, 1995). Corpus-assisted discourse studies (quantitative traditions) rely on frequency analysis and patterns of collocation (Baker, 2006), whereas thematic categorization and interpretive coding are a focus of qualitative traditions. The systematic representation of spoken and visual data is still supported by the concept of transcription conventions (Jefferson, 2004) and multimodal annotation systems (Kress and van Leeuwen, 2006). All of these methodological frameworks enable the researcher to transition between the unprocessed linguistic data and the theoretically-based analysis.

5.3 Validity and Reflexivity

One of the major features of the modern discourse research is the dedication to reflexivity and moral consciousness. Researchers are urged to acknowledge their positionality and ideological concerns of their interpretations (Wodak and Meyer, 2016). Such reflexive position is particularly crucial to CDA and ethnographic methods, when the cultural background of the analyst might frame his or her perception of power relations or of communicative norms (van Dijk, 1993). Also, ethical concerns are related to the data consent, anonymization and sensitivity to the rights of the participants, especially in a digital environment where one is

publicly accessible and personally identifiable (Tagg, 2015). Accordingly, validity in discourse analysis is broader than methodological rigour which covers transparency, reflexivity, and ethical accountability.

6. Current Trends and Future Directions

6.1 Digital and Computational Discourse Analysis

The last few years have seen the fast-evolution of discourse studies due to the combination of digital and computational methodologies. The development of corpus-assisted discourse analysis (CADS) has enabled scholars to integrate the quantitative computing instruments with the qualitative interpretation systems (Baker, 2006; Partington et al., 2013). Scholars are now able to analyze discursive patterns in large-scale textual data, and determine the ideological trend, thematic clustering, and collocational networks (Baker et al., 2008). This process is consistent with the general trends in big data linguistics, which uses the tools of computational models and natural language processing (NLP) to analyze discourse in media, genres, and languages (Biber and Reppen, 2015). Simultaneously, discourse analysis is now applied to algorithmically mediated communication, automated speech, and online discourse ecologies due to the emergence of artificial intelligence (AI) and social media analytics (Zappavigna, 2012; Blommaert, 2018). These algorithms disrupt and stretch conventional limits of DA by preempting the scope, velocity, and interactivity of current communication. However, they also bring up new theoretical issues of authorship, agency, and ideological impartiality of algorithms. Therefore, digital discourse analysis is a step toward not only broadening the focus but also a restructuring of critical responsibility at the time of data-driven communication (Jones et al., 2015).

6.2 Interdisciplinary Collaborations

The other characteristic trend is the increased interdisciplinary cooperation. The field of discourse analysis has become more and more intertwined with psychology, sociology, political science, and media studies as a result of the common concern with language as a social, cognitive, and cultural phenomenon (Gee, 2014; Wodak and Meyer, 2016). As an example, discursive psychology research examines how talk constructs mental states and social actions (Edwards and Potter, 1992), whereas media discourse research studies examine the representation of ideology, identity and emotion in transnational media networks (Machin and van Leeuwen, 2016). Another effect of globalization has been the creation of the intercultural and transnational discourse studies, a branch of linguistic studies that studies how the linguistic practices mediate cultural and power inequalities in the global arena (Blommaert, 2010; Scollon and Scollon, 2001). This expansion in range promotes theoretical creativity as well as pluralism in methods and methods which enables Discourse Analysis to be receptive to new social facts.

6.3 Emerging Challenges

The discourse analysis field has various theoretical and methodological issues despite its growth. A major conflict is between social critique and linguistic rigor. Although critical approaches aim to unmask ideological set-ups and bring change, they are occasionally prone to eroding the accuracy of their analysis or interpreting too much (Billig, 2003; Widdowson, 1995). The need to balance empirical validity and critical insight therefore is also a long-standing issue. The other issue is the coherence of theory in a more and more interdisciplinary environment. Since Discourse Analysis integrates the knowledge of cognitive science, digital media, and cultural studies, it has to maintain the clarity of concepts and methodological responsibility. The future of discourse research, then, lies in the formation of integrative models that will maintain the linguistic profundity as well as social and political consciousness.

7. Conclusion

A historical overview of the discourse analysis is a process of paradigm shifts that have extended the conceptual and methodological scope of the field. DA began as structural linguistics, and it became functional and practical in focusing on language as an activity in context. It subsequently shifted to more critical approaches that prefigured ideology and power and then to multimodal and computational approaches that explain the modern media and digital interaction. These changes --- Structural → Functional → Critical → Multimodal/Computational ---- dynamic in that the field is continuously adjusted to suit emerging communicative realities. These paradigms have led to discourse being viewed as a dynamic social practice that is influenced by power, ideology, and multimodal mediation. Language is both a carrier of meaning, a place of struggle and a source of change. It is the combination of cognitive, sociocultural and technological approaches that leads to the importance of viewing discourse as a holistic entity, both symbolic and material, that is structured and yet fluid. In the future, discourse analysis seeks integrative and all-inclusive and technologically responsive ways forward. Integrative solutions will be used to balance linguistic acuity with interdisciplinary scope; frameworks that are inclusive will be used to give greater volume to the voices of a variety of cultures and epistemic practices; and technologically responsive solutions will be employed to harness the power of computational tools without losing the interpretative richness. Finally, the changing nature of discourse studies poses new challenges to scholars to reconsider the co-construction of meaning of language, power, and technology in the context of the globally networked world. With the digital communication serving as the new lingo frontier, discourse analysis has to change, but still preserve the critical core of it, extending its methodological horizons.

References

- Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to do things with words*. Oxford University Press.
- Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and social change*. Polity Press.
- Gee, J. P. (2014). *An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method* (4th ed.). Routledge.
- Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In P. Cole & J. L. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and semantics: Vol. 3. Speech acts* (pp. 41–58). Academic Press.
- Gumperz, J. J. (1982). *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge University Press.
- Harris, Z. S. (1952). Discourse analysis. *Language*, 28(1), 1–30. <https://doi.org/10.2307/409987>
- Hymes, D. (1972). Models of the interaction of language and social life. In J. J. Gumperz & D. Hymes (Eds.), *Directions in sociolinguistics: The ethnography of communication* (pp. 35–71). Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Schiffrin, D. (1994). *Approaches to discourse*. Blackwell.
- van Dijk, T. A. (1993). Principles of critical discourse analysis. *Discourse & Society*, 4(2), 249–283. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926593004002006>
- van Dijk, T. A. (2008). *Discourse and context: A sociocognitive approach*. Cambridge University Press.
- Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (Eds.). (2016). *Methods of critical discourse studies* (3rd ed.). Sage.
- Firbas, J. (1992). *Functional sentence perspective in written and spoken communication*. Cambridge University Press.
- Firth, J. R. (1957). *Papers in linguistics 1934–1951*. Oxford University Press.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1978). *Language as social semiotic: The social interpretation of language and meaning*. Edward Arnold.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1985). *An introduction to functional grammar*. Edward Arnold.
- Halliday, M. A. K., & Matthiessen, C. M. I. M. (2014). *Halliday's introduction to functional grammar* (4th ed.). Routledge.
- Harris, Z. S. (1952). Discourse analysis. *Language*, 28(1), 1–30. <https://doi.org/10.2307/409987>
- Jakobson, R. (1960). Closing statement: Linguistics and poetics. In T. A. Sebeok (Ed.), *Style in language* (pp. 350–377). MIT Press.
- Malinowski, B. (1935). *Coral gardens and their magic: Vol. II. The language of magic and gardening*. Allen & Unwin.
- Saussure, F. de. (1959). *Course in general linguistics* (W. Baskin, Trans.). Philosophical Library. (Original work published 1916)
- Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to do things with words*. Oxford University Press.

- Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and social change*. Polity Press.
- Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. Longman.
- Foucault, M. (1972). *The archaeology of knowledge*. Pantheon Books.
- Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings, 1972–1977*. Pantheon Books.
- Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In P. Cole & J. L. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and semantics: Vol. 3. Speech acts* (pp. 41–58). Academic Press.
- Gumperz, J. J. (1982). *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge University Press.
- Heritage, J. (1984). *Garfinkel and ethnomethodology*. Polity Press.
- Hymes, D. (1972). Models of the interaction of language and social life. In J. J. Gumperz & D. Hymes (Eds.), *Directions in sociolinguistics: The ethnography of communication* (pp. 35–71). Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Jones, R. H., Chik, A., & Hafner, C. A. (2015). *Discourse and digital practices: Doing discourse analysis in the digital age*. Routledge.
- Kintsch, W. (1998). *Comprehension: A paradigm for cognition*. Cambridge University Press.
- Kress, G., & van Leeuwen, T. (2001). *Multimodal discourse: The modes and media of contemporary communication*. Arnold.
- Kress, G., & van Leeuwen, T. (2006). *Reading images: The grammar of visual design* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- Labov, W. (1972). *Sociolinguistic patterns*. University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Labov, W., & Waletzky, J. (1967). Narrative analysis: Oral versions of personal experience. In J. Helm (Ed.), *Essays on the verbal and visual arts* (pp. 12–44). University of Washington Press.
- Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. University of Chicago Press.
- Lazar, M. M. (2005). *Feminist critical discourse analysis: Gender, power and ideology in discourse*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Pennycook, A. (1998). *English and the discourses of colonialism*. Routledge.
- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language*, 50(4), 696–735. <https://doi.org/10.2307/412243>
- Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language*. Cambridge University Press.
- Searle, J. R. (1979). *Expression and meaning: Studies in the theory of speech acts*. Cambridge University Press.
- van Dijk, T. A. (1993). Principles of critical discourse analysis. *Discourse & Society*, 4(2), 249–283. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926593004002006>
- van Dijk, T. A. (2008). *Discourse and context: A sociocognitive approach*. Cambridge University Press.
- 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. 1–13). Sage.
- Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to do things with words*. Oxford University Press.
- Baker, P. (2006). *Using corpora in discourse analysis*. Continuum.
- Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and social change*. Polity Press.
- Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. Longman.
- Foucault, M. (1972). *The archaeology of knowledge*. Pantheon Books.
- Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings, 1972–1977*. Pantheon Books.
- Gee, J. P. (2014). *An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method* (4th ed.). Routledge.
- Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In P. Cole & J. L. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and semantics: Vol. 3. Speech acts* (pp. 41–58). Academic Press.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1978). *Language as social semiotic: The social interpretation of language and meaning*. Edward Arnold.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1985). *An introduction to functional grammar*. Edward Arnold.
- Harris, Z. S. (1952). Discourse analysis. *Language*, 28(1), 1–30. <https://doi.org/10.2307/409987>
- Hymes, D. (1972). Models of the interaction of language and social life. In J. J. Gumperz & D. Hymes (Eds.), *Directions in sociolinguistics: The ethnography of communication* (pp. 35–71). Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Jewitt, C. (2014). *The Routledge handbook of multimodal analysis* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- Jones, R. H., Chik, A., & Hafner, C. A. (2015). *Discourse and digital practices: Doing discourse analysis in the digital age*. Routledge.
- Kress, G., & van Leeuwen, T. (2001). *Multimodal discourse: The modes and media of contemporary communication*. Arnold.
- Kress, G., & van Leeuwen, T. (2006). *Reading images: The grammar of visual design* (2nd ed.). Routledge.

- Lazar, M. M. (2005). *Feminist critical discourse analysis: Gender, power and ideology in discourse*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A., & Jefferson, G. (1974). A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language*, 50(4), 696–735. <https://doi.org/10.2307/412243>
- Saussure, F. de. (1959). *Course in general linguistics* (W. Baskin, Trans.). Philosophical Library. (Original work published 1916)
- Schiffrin, D. (1994). *Approaches to discourse*. Blackwell.
- Tagg, C. (2015). Exploring digital communication. *Routledge*.
- van Dijk, T. A. (1993). Principles of critical discourse analysis. *Discourse & Society*, 4(2), 249–283. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926593004002006>
- van Dijk, T. A. (2008). *Discourse and context: A sociocognitive approach*. Cambridge University Press.
- 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. 1–13). Sage.
- Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (Eds.). (2016). *Methods of critical discourse studies* (3rd ed.). Sage.
- Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to do things with words*. Oxford University Press.
- Baker, P. (2006). *Using corpora in discourse analysis*. Continuum.
- Baker, P., Gabrielatos, C., KhosraviNik, M., Krzyżanowski, M., McEnery, T., & Wodak, R. (2008). A useful methodological synergy? Combining critical discourse analysis and corpus linguistics to examine discourses of refugees and asylum seekers in the UK press. *Discourse & Society*, 19(3), 273–306. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926508088962>
- Biber, D., & Reppen, R. (2015). *The Cambridge handbook of English corpus linguistics*. Cambridge University Press.
- Billig, M. (2003). Critical discourse analysis and the rhetoric of critique. In G. Weiss & R. Wodak (Eds.), *Critical discourse analysis: Theory and interdisciplinarity* (pp. 35–46). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Blommaert, J. (2010). *The sociolinguistics of globalization*. Cambridge University Press.
- Blommaert, J. (2018). *Dialogues with ethnography: Notes on classics, and how I read them*. Multilingual Matters.
- Edwards, D., & Potter, J. (1992). *Discursive psychology*. Sage.
- Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and social change*. Polity Press.
- Foucault, M. (1972). *The archaeology of knowledge*. Pantheon Books.
- Gee, J. P. (2014). *An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method* (4th ed.). Routledge.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1978). *Language as social semiotic: The social interpretation of language and meaning*. Edward Arnold.
- Jones, R. H., Chik, A., & Hafner, C. A. (2015). *Discourse and digital practices: Doing discourse analysis in the digital age*. Routledge.
- Kress, G., & van Leeuwen, T. (2006). *Reading images: The grammar of visual design* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- Machin, D., & van Leeuwen, T. (2016). *Multimodality, politics and ideology: Applying multimodal critical discourse analysis*. Routledge.
- Partington, A., Duguid, A., & Taylor, C. (2013). *Patterns and meanings in discourse: Theory and practice in corpus-assisted discourse studies (CADS)*. John Benjamins.
- Scollon, R., & Scollon, S. W. (2001). *Intercultural communication: A discourse approach* (2nd ed.). Blackwell.
- van Dijk, T. A. (1993). Principles of critical discourse analysis. *Discourse & Society*, 4(2), 249–283. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926593004002006>
- Widdowson, H. G. (1995). Discourse analysis: A critical view. *Language and Literature*, 4(3), 157–172. <https://doi.org/10.1177/096394709500400301>
- Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (Eds.). (2016). *Methods of critical discourse studies* (3rd ed.). Sage.
- Zappavigna, M. (2012). *Discourse of Twitter and social media: How we use language to create affiliation on the web*. Bloomsbury.