

International thematic proceedings
FUNDAMENTAL RESEARCHES

International thematic proceedings
FUNDAMENTAL RESEARCHES

Publisher

The Institut for Serbian Culture, Pristina – Leposavic

Co-publisher

**International Association of Social Science Methodologists, Belgrade
MB University, Belgrade**

For the publisher

**Professor Dragan Tancic, PhD, director
Academician Professor Nedjo Danilovic, PhD, president
Professor Milija Bogavac, PhD, founder and owner**

Edited and prepared by

**Academician, Professor Nedjo Danilovic, PhD
MB University Belgrade**

**Professor Dragan Tancic, PhD
Institute for Serbian Culture, Pristina – Leposavic**

Reviewers

**Academician professor Dževad Termiz, PhD
University of Sarajevo, Faculty of Political Sciences, Sarajevo, Bosnia and Hercegovina
Akademician Professor Wolfgang Rohrbach, PhD
Regular member of the European Academy of Sciences and Humanities (AASA), in Salzburg
Professor Alexander Halmi, PhD
University of Zadar, Department for Tourism and Communication Sciences, Zadar, Croatia
Professor emeritus Ljubiša Mitrović, PhD
University of Nuš, Faculty of Philosophy
Prof. dr Venelin Terzijev
Ministry of Culture Republic of Bulgaria, Sofia**

Proofreading

Jelena Vojinović Kostić

Technical preparation and graphic design of the text

Miodrag Panić

The press

GID „Pi-press“, Pirot

Circulation

150

ISBN 978-86-89025-86-6

The holding of the international thematic scientific conference and the publication of this Proceedings were organizationally and financially supported by the Ministry of Education, Science and Technological Development of the Republic of Serbia, Academy of Sciences and Arts of Serbian, Institute for Serbian Culture from Pristina - Leposavic and MB University from Belgrade.



ИНСТИТУТ ЗА СРПСКУ КУЛТУРУ ПРИШТИНА – ЛЕПОСАВИЋ
INSTITUTE FOR SERBIAN CULTURE PRISHTINA – LEPOSAVIC



The Institute for Serbian Culture, Priština – Leposavić
International Association of Methodologists of Social Sciences, Belgrade
The MB University, Belgrade

International thematic proceedings
FUNDAMENTAL RESEARCHES

Leposavić, 2023.

CONTENT

Begrüßungsrede des Akademikers Prof. Dr. Wolfgang Rohrbach, Mitglied der Europäischen Akademie der Wissenschaften und Künste aus Salzburg	9–10
FOREWORD	11
INTRODUCTION	17
1. Dragan Lj. Tančić Vanda B. Božić BASIC RESEARCH ON VIOLENCE IN SPORTS FROM THE ASPECT OF METHODOLOGY OF SOCIAL, POLITICAL AND CRIMINAL-LEGAL SCIENCES	21
2. Ljubiša R. Mitrović THE POSITION OF SOCIAL AND HUMANISTIC SCIENCES AND THEIR ROLE IN DEVELOPING CRITICAL AWARENESS AND BUILDING ALTERNATIVE PROJECTS OF SOCIAL CHANGE (Marginalia on the importance of fundamental and transdisciplinary research and deontology of the profession of a scientist)	41
3. Neđo S. Danilović FUNDAMENTAL RESEARCH ON WAR AND ITS SIGNIFICANCE FOR THE PROGRESS OF GLOBAL COMMUNITY AND PROSPEROUS DEVELOPMENT OF MODERN COUNTRIES	61
4. Dževad R. Termiz SPECIFICITY OF MODELING THE SUBJECT OF JOURNALISM SCIENCE RESEARCH AS A RESULT OF ITS FUNDAMENTAL RESEARCH	91
5. Aleksandar A. Halmi SOCIOCYBERNETIC AND CHAOS THEORY: A NEW POSSIBILITIES FOR FUNDAMENTAL RESEARCH	103
6. Boris Đ. Krivokapić FUNDAMENTAL RESEARCH IN THE SCIENCE OF INTERNATIONAL LAW	117

7. **Nevad H. Kahteran**
 PROMOTING COMPARATIVE PHILOSOPHY AS A GENERAL
 CROSS-TRADITION ENGAGING WAY OF DOING PHILOSOPHY
 TOWARD WORLD PHILOSOPHY 153
8. **Dušan B. Regodić**
Damir D. Jerković
 MODELING AND SIMULATION OF DYNAMIC SYSTEMS
 IN THE FUNCTION OF BASIC RESEARCH IN TECHNICAL
 AND TECHNOLOGICAL SCIENCES 171
9. **Wolfgang R. Rohrbach**
 BEDROHUNG DER MENSCHHEIT DURCH VIER
 MEGA-SCHOCKWELLEN 205
10. **Venelin Terziev Krastev**
 СТРАТЕГИЧЕСКОЕ УПРАВЛЕНИЕ В УСЛОВИЯХ
 ГЛОБАЛЬНОГО КРИЗИСА 221
11. **Vojislav R. Babić**
Siniša Đ. Zarić
 THE ESSENCE OF FACTOR ANALYSIS AND ITS
 APPLICATION IN ECONOMIC SCIENCES 229
12. **Artur Gennadievich Bezverkhov**
Svetlana Vyacheslavovna Elekina
 LAW IN THE DIGITAL AGE 245
13. **Milosav V. Milosavljević**
 PERSPECTIVES OF BASIC RESEARCH 255
14. **Momčilo J. Sakan**
 THE SCIENTIFIC ROLE OF HYPOTHESIS
 IN FUNDAMENTAL RESEARCH 269
15. **Ivan B. Petrović**
Miodrag L. Gordić
 EVALUATION OF CRITERIA FOR SELECTION OF WEAPONS
 SYSTEM USING TRIANGULAR INTERVAL TYPE-2 FUZZY SETS
 IN PROCESS OF MULTI-CRITERIA DECISION MAKING 285
16. **Srđan V. Starčević**
Srđan M. Blagojević
 FUNDAMENTAL RESEARCH IN SOCIAL SCIENCES
 AND PUBLIC INTEREST 297
17. **Nataša N. Stanojević**
 THE CONTEMPORARY PROCESSES IN THE GLOBAL
 ECONOMY AND METHODOLOGY OF ECONOMIC SCIENCES 307

-
18. **Olja M. Arsenijević**
Nenad N. Perić
 INTERDISCIPLINARYNESS AND DIFFERENT APPROACHES
 OF CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS 319
19. **Ermin H. Kuka**
 DESIGN OF SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH OF PUBLIC POLICY
 AS A RESULT OF FUNDAMENTAL RESEARCH IN THE
 METHODOLOGY OF POLITICAL SCIENCE 333
20. **Detlev H. Baumgarten**
 NEW DEVELOPMENTS IN THE CARE SECTOR
 NURSING ROBOTS AND THEIR USE IN
 THE PATIENT ENVIRONMENT 347
21. **Marko M. Parezanović**
 ПРИМЕНЕНИЕ АНАЛИЗА СОДЕРЖАНИЯ ДОКУМЕНТА
 В ИССЛЕДОВАНИИ ПОЛИТИЧЕСКИХ ПЕРЕВОРОТ 363
22. **Dragana J. Janjić**
Goran M. Janićijević
 CONTEXTUALIZATION OF MEDIEVAL MONUMENTS
 OF CULTURE AS A METHODOLOGICAL STARTING POINT
 WITHIN THE FRAMEWORK OF THEIR INTERPRETATION
 ON SELECTED EXAMPLES FROM KOSOVO AND METOHIJA 379
23. **Gerhard Wilfinger**
 LIVING STANDARD AND QUALITY OF LIFE IN URBAN 407
24. **Milivoje G. Pajović**
 FUNDAMENTAL RESEARCH AS A STARTING POINT
 APPLIED AND OTHER RESEARCH 421
25. **Goran M. Džafić**
Aleksandar M. Damnjanović
 FUNDAMENTAL RESEARCH OF NETWORK COMMUNICATION
 IN CRISIS MANAGEMENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF SERBIA 433
26. **Vesna S. Zarković**
 THE SERBIAN ISSUE IN THE CONTEXT OF THE SUFFERING
 OF SERBS IN KOSOVO AND METOHIJA AT THE END OF THE
 19TH AND THE BEGINNING OF THE 20TH CENTURY 451
27. **Ena S. Mirković**
 KOSOVO AND METOHIA IN THE DOCUMENTS
 OF THE PRIME MINISTER BLAGOJE NEŠKOVIĆ (1945–1952)
 AS AN EXAMPLE OF METHODOLOGICAL ANALYSIS
 OF HISTORICAL SOURCES 471

28. **Jovan D. Simijanović**
TREPČA IN THE ECONOMY OF YUGOSLAVIA(1927–1956) 485
29. **Ivana Ž. Ivanovik**
THE IMPORTANCE OF SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH PROJECTS
FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF MODERN COUNTRIES 505
30. **Gordan B. Bojković**
SERBIAN MEDIEVAL STUDIES ABOUT KOSOVO
AND METOHIA, THE PREVIOUS THIRTY YEARS 513
31. **Vlado N. Radić**
Nikola V. Radić
IMPACT OF THE CRISIS ON ENERGY SECURITY
AND AVAILABILITY OF STRATEGIC MATERIALS 525
32. **Nikola P. Jović**
Katarina Bogičević
Andrej Naumović
CITIZENS' PERCEPTION OF SERBIA'S FOREIGN POLICY
THROUGH THE PRISM OF CULTURAL AFFILIATION
TO THE EAST/WEST 549
33. **Jovan M. Gordić**
Predrag M. Gordić
IMPLEMENTATION OF METHODS, TECHNIQUES AND
INSTRUMENTS IN FUNDAMENTAL RESEARCH OF LAW 563
34. **Teodora G. Deljanin**
THE ASSOCIATION OF LOW SOCIAL STANDARD OF THE
FAMILY AND FAMILY PARTICIPATION IN THE LIFE OF
ADOLESCENTS WHO USE PSYCHOACTIVE SUBSTANCES 577
35. **Alojz A. Riegler**
THE GREEN CITY – PREVENTING OVERHEATING
NATURALLY 593
36. **Petar R. Ristanović**
HISTORY AND/OR PROPAGANDA: THE BOOKS BY
TIM JUDAH, NOEL MALCOLM AND MIRANDA VICKERS
ON KOSOVO AND METOHIA 609

*Olja M. ARSENIJEVIĆ**

*Nenad N. PERIĆ***

Institut for Serbian Culture Priština – Leposavić

INTERDISCIPLINARYNESS AND DIFFERENT APPROACHES OF CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS***

Abstract: Critical discourse analysis cannot be defined as one-way, nor as a specific branch of linguistics that deals with discourse studies. In the paper, the authors advocate the thesis that critical discourse analysis is not a discipline or a theory, but that eclecticism is significant for it, as it is characterized by a non-unique theoretical framework and methodological apparatus. Or, on the other hand, it can be pursued within or in combination with any approach or sub-discipline of the humanities or social sciences. The paper presents the approaches of different world authors (Vezovnik, Meyer, van Dijk, Wodak, Rasmussen, Ager, etc.) to critical discourse analysis, and through their analysis it is pointed out that critical discourse analysis is used by epistemological theories, general social theories, theories of the middle range and microsociological, social-psychological, discursive and linguistic theories. Approaches that are critically determined according to the analyzed texts are grouped under this name. Critical analysis is a key element by which critical discourse analysis approaches differ from linguistic style analyses, which do not consider language in relation to society, and therefore do not thematize the relationship between language, power and ideology. CDA critically approaches social problems by using language to expose power relations that are often hidden, while at the same time trying to reach practically relevant conclusions.

Key words: qualitative methodology, content analysis, standard of objectivity, standard of subjectivity, latent constructs.

1 BASIC STARTING POINTS

Critical discourse analysis originates from the field of critical linguistics (CL), but at the same time it is increasingly asserting itself as the successor of the theory that was known under this name (Wodak 2004). CDA views language

* Full Professor, Institut for Serbian Culture – Priština, Leposavić, arsnijevicolja@gmail.com

** Full Professor, Institut for Serbian Culture – Priština, Leposavić, nesaperic@hotmail.com

*** This paper was written as part of the scientific research work of NIO under the Contract concluded with the Ministry of Education, Science and Technological Development Republic of Serbia, number: 451-03-47/2023-01/ 200020, date 03.02.2023

as a social practice (Fairclough, Wodak, 1997) and attaches key importance to the context in which certain language use occurs, and is particularly interested in the relationship between language and power. The term critical discourse analysis has recently been more specifically used to name that approach of critical linguists, which takes a longer discursive unit of text as the basic unit of communication (Wodak 2004).

The roots of CDA go back to the period before the Second World War, that is, to the critical theory of the Frankfurt School (van Dijk 2001:352). CDA's current focus on language and discourse was developed by the so-called critical linguists who emerged in the late 1970s mainly in Great Britain and Australia. Somewhere in this period, other sciences also began to develop their branches of criticism, such as sociolinguistics, psychology and social sciences. Van Dijk attributes the emphasis on criticality in the mentioned disciplines to a reaction to the dominant official (often „non-social“ or „non-critical“) paradigms of the 1960s and 1970s.

Criticism of CDA therefore derives from the ideas of the Frankfurt School, especially from the work of Jürgen Habermas (Wodak 2004), but today in a broader sense it means the discovery of practical connections between social and political engagement and the sociologically informed composition of society (Wodak 2004), as recognized. that in social issues, mutual connections and chains of cause and effect are often obscured and that it is criticality that draws our attention to these connections (Wodak 2004). One of the tenets of CDA is that all discourses are historically conditioned and therefore can only be fully understood in relation to their context (Meyer 2004).

Thus, the critical component in discourse analysis indicates a distancing from language-oriented discourse researchers who only analyze the choice of vocabulary, without placing it in a wider social context and without problematizing power relations in discourse and analyzing the potential charge of discourse for social change. Critical linguistics and critical discourse analysis are mostly interested in the analysis of hidden but also transparent relationships between structures that express dominance, discrimination, power and control in language. In short, CDA tries to critically investigate social inequality, how it is expressed, indicated, constructed, legitimized, etc. in the use of language or in discourse (Vezovnik 2008; Bulatović, Bulatović, Arsenijević 2012).

Unlike other paradigms of discourse analysis and textual linguistics, KL and CDA do not focus only on written or spoken text, but are interested in the wider process of text creation. A complete critical treatment of a particular discourse therefore requires theorization and description of both those social processes and structures that enable the creation of a text, as well as those within which individuals or groups as socio-historical subjects create meanings in their interaction with texts (Bulatović, Bulatović, Arsenijević 2010). Accordingly, the following three concepts are present in all critical analyzes of discourse:

- power,
- history and
- ideologies (Vezovnik 2008; Fairclough 2010; Kress, Leeuwen 1996).

Unlike some approaches of pragmatics and traditional sociolinguistics, in which, according to critical linguists, contextual variables are too simply connected to language as an autonomous system (Wodak 2004:3), KL and CDA try not to make simple deterministic connections between texts and society. They assume that discourse is constructed according to dominance, that every discourse is historically created and interpreted - ie. located in time and space, and that the ideologies of powerful groups justify structures of domination. Conjunction in Habermas's sense assumes that every speech situation is distorted by power structures, especially in contrast to his utopia of an ideal speech situation in which rational discourse becomes possible (Vezovnik 2008). The complex approach offered by critical discourse analysts enables the analysis of pressures from above and the possibilities of resistance to the unequal distribution of power in society, which appear as social conventions. Dominant structures enforce conventions and naturalize them, that is, in the process of creating meaning, the effects of power and ideology are blurred and take on stable and natural forms – those that are self-evident. Rebellion therefore manifests itself in breaking these conventions and established discursive practices, or in other words – in creative actions (Kairclough 2010).

2 INTERDISCIPLINARITY AND DIFFERENT APPROACHES OF CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS

2.1 Interdisciplinarity

Critical discourse analysis cannot be defined as just another direction, school or specific branch of linguistics dealing with discourse studies. Its aim is to give a different way or a different perspective to the formulation of theories, analysis and utility of the whole field of linguistics (van Dijk 2001:352). Therefore, with more or less critical perspectives, he intervenes in very different fields, for example in the field of pragmatics, conversation analysis, rhetoric, stylistics, sociolinguistics, media analysis, etc. CDA is not a discipline or a theory, it is characterized by eclecticism, as it is characterized by a non-unique theoretical framework and methodological apparatus (Vezovnik 2008:84). Or, put another way: CDA can be conducted within or in combination with any approach or sub-discipline of the humanities or social sciences (van Dijk 2004:96).

In CDA we find epistemological theories, general social theories, middle-range theories and micro-sociological, social-psychological, discursive and linguistic theories. Approaches that are critically determined according to the analyzed texts are roughly grouped under this title. Critical analysis is a key element in which CDA approaches differ from language-style analyses, which, unlike CDA, do not treat language in relation to society, and therefore do not thematize the relationship between language, power and ideology. In short, CDA critically approaches social problems using language to expose power

relations that are often hidden (Miljković, Arsenijević, Trnavac 2018), while at the same time trying to reach practically relevant conclusions (Meyer 2004:15).

Interdisciplinarity or transdisciplinarity, as Fairclough calls it, is one of CDA's research strengths. It aims to explain the subject of study from a very wide range of perspectives, while at the same time constantly working from feedback during analysis and data collection (Meyer 2004:16). In addition to interdisciplinarity, which presupposes the integration of different research approaches and methods, Fairclough uses the term transdisciplinarity to emphasize the simultaneous development of all participating sciences. Namely, it is about the cooperation of different disciplines, in which joint work helps them in their (individual) development. Disciplines develop through a collaborative research process, in which each accepts the logic of the other to help advance its research approach, for example, social theory can be developed with the help of some insights from linguistics (Fairclough 2005:53). Since the relations between language and society are so complex and diverse, it is impossible to explain them with only one linguistic science.

Let's take for example politics in the narrower sense, or politicians as a specific but by no means homogeneous group of elites. We can see them as creators of specific public opinions and interests, as well as seismographs that reflect, predict and react to possible changes in public opinion and the expression of changed interests of certain social groups. The relations between the media, politics and the people are so complex that social scientists have not until now could get clear answers about who influences whom and in what way (Wodak 2004:64; Bulatović, Bulatović, Arsenijević 2011). Therefore, only an interdisciplinary approach can make these complex connections more transparent. CDA is only one component of the combination of state-of-the-art approaches in this type of research, as we must not limit ourselves to discursive practices, but also examine a wider range of material and semiotic practices. Therefore, research in CDA must be multi-theoretical and multi-method, critical and self-reflective.

2.2 Different approaches

There are different approaches within CDA, but they mostly have common theoretical and methodological starting points. They deal with power, dominance, hegemony, inequality and the discursive processes of their proclamation, concealment, legitimation and reproduction (Vezovnik 2008:84). Critical discourse analysts rely on Halliday's systemic functional grammar, Bernstein's sociolinguistics, as well as the works of literary critics and social philosophers such as Pessault, Foucault, Habermas, Bakhtin and Voloshinov (Wodak 2004). In principle, CDA procedures are defined as a hermeneutic process, although this characteristic is not always clearly visible due to the positions some authors have taken in their work (Meyer 2004). If we compare hermeneutics with the causal explanations of the natural sciences, it can be

understood as a method that deals with explanations of meaning. However, we must note that the hermeneutic circle - which implies that the meaning of a part can only be understood in the context of the whole, which, on the other hand, is the sum of individual parts - indicates the problematic nature of hermeneutic interpretation. Therefore, it is absolutely necessary to document the analysis process itself in detail.

A common characteristic of CDA approaches is, last but not least, that they do not include the analysis of a large number of linguistic categories, but mostly choose to study only some linguistic devices, for example agents, metaphors, sentence processes, sentence inflection (Fairclough 2001, 2004, 2005; van Dijk 2001, 2004, 2005; Meyer 2004; Wodak 2004), which they connect with the wider social context.

From the point of view of diversity within CDA, the difference between the approaches of Norman Fairclough and Theun van Dyk is most often highlighted, and one of the more important is the approach of Ruth Wodak (Meyer 2004; Wodak 2004). Fairclough defines the relations between language and society according to Halliday's systemic functional grammar and sees concepts of discursive orders based on Foucault. Van Dijk and, to a lesser extent, Wodak also introduce the sociocognitive level, because as a component of text interpretation they use a social-psychological model of the process of social cognition, whereby the context is understood as a mental model that serves as a link between discourse and society (van Dijk 2001, 2004, 2005; Wodak 2004). The essence of this approach is to determine how cognitive models influence the understanding and production of texts, whereby the concept of cognition serves as a link between discourse structure and social structure..

Wodakova is the originator of the discursive-historical approach and is mostly linguistically oriented. Unlike the other two, she, together with Martin Reisigl, is explicitly focused on discourse theory. They understand discourse as a complex bundle of simultaneous and sequential, interconnected linguistic actions, which manifest as thematically connected semiotic - spoken or written - signs within and through social spheres of action (Reisigl, Wodak 2017). Very often they appear as texts belonging to certain semiotic types, i.e. genres. The discursive-historical approach describes and classifies the connections between acts, genres, discourses and texts. Although this approach is committed to critical theory, compared to discourse and historical analysis, social theory does not play a significant role in this, as the context is viewed predominantly from a historical perspective. The historical dimension of discursive actions is analyzed or the ways in which certain genres of discourse are subject to temporal changes are studied..

Wodak supports Mouzelis' conceptual pragmatism because she believes that social science theory is in crisis and needs a new impetus (Wodak 2015). Therefore, the researcher should not exhaust himself in theoretical labyrinths, nor should he try too hard with the applicability of useless grand theories, but should develop conceptual tools that will be useful for concrete social problems (Wodak 2015).

The central point of research of the discursive-historical approach is the political field, where an attempt is made to develop the conceptual framework of political discourse. Vodak tries to fit linguistic theories into his model of discourse, using argumentation theory or the topic list. However, it is not necessary that the concepts arising from the findings of argumentation theory be in perfect harmony with other research questions. For Vodakov, the most important thing is a pragmatic approach.

Fairclough, unlike van Dijk, does not place much emphasis on the cognitive processes that take place in the production and understanding of discourse, but instead focuses on social conflicts according to the Marxist tradition and tries to discover their linguistic manifestations in discourses, where he is particularly interested. for the elements of dominance, difference and resistance. According to Fairclough, every social practice has its own semiotic element (Fairclough 2001). The process of creation, means of production, social relations, social identities, cultural values, consciousness and semiotics are dialectically connected elements of social practice, or CDA represents the analysis of dialectical relations between semiotics and other elements of social practice (Meyer 2004; van Dijk 2004; Wodak 2015).

This approach oscillates between a focus on structure and a focus on action, both of which deal with a specific problem, since CDA must pursue emancipatory goals and face the problems of losers or losers in certain forms of social life.

Fairclough's model of analysis represents a fusion of three different theoretical traditions:

- linguistic analyses,
- interpretive or microsociological traditions, which observe social practices as products of social actors, and
- macrosociological traditions of analyzing social practices in relation to social structures.

At each level, it is a different form of analysis and a different subject of research. The first level is descriptive and refers to the linguistic analysis of the text, based on critical linguistics and Halliday's systemic functional grammar. Ways of naming, use of metaphors, sentence processes, etc. are analyzed.

At another level, Fairclough's approach interprets the relationship between text and interaction. Empirically, it focuses on the analysis of discursive practice that includes the processes of text production, distribution and consumption. In addition to the study of the linguistic means used, it is determined which ideology is expressed by bordering neo-modern discursive elements with elements of political discourse.

At the highest level, it is an explanation of the relationship between interaction and social context. Here, Fairclough deals with social practice, so he is interested in the study of discourse in relation to ideology, hegemony and power.

Critical discourse analysis is essentially connected with certain concepts on which Fairclough's method is based.

Fairclough starts from the realization that language or semiotics is an inseparable element of all material social processes. Social life can be seen as interwoven networks of different types of social practices (economic, political, cultural, family, etc.). The reason Fairclough puts the concept of social practice at the center of social science research lies in the fact that it allows him to combine the perspective of the social structure of a particular practice and the social action that this practice achieves - both perspectives are indeed necessary in social science research and analysis. Thus, by the term social practice, Fairclough means a relatively stable form of social activity (Fairclough 2004 : 205). Every practice is a practice of production, it is the articulation of various social elements within a relatively stable configuration of which discourse is an integral part. The act of production, means of production, social relations, social identities, cultural values, consciousness and semiotics are dialectically intertwined elements of social practice. So these are different elements, but they are not completely separate, unconnected. They exist in a way that each internalizes the others, without changing them in any way or limiting their functioning (Fairclough 2004; 2001). In other words: all social relations, social identities, cultural values and consciousness are partly semiotic (Fairclough 2004 : 206).

Discourse as an uncountable noun or semiotics, according to Fairclough, generally appears in three forms in social practices.

First, it appears as part of the social activity within the practice. For example, one part of performing a profession (eg, president of a country) is using language in a certain way (Fairclough 2004 : 206).

Second, semiotics appears in performances or presentations. Social actors within any practice during their activity, according to their role, create presentations about other practices, as well as „reflexive“ presentations of their own practice. In short, they „recontextualize“ other practices, ie. they include them in their own (Fairclough 2004 : 206). Presentation can therefore be defined as a process of social creation of practices, which also includes feedback on one's own creation - presentations enter social processes and practices and change them.

Thirdly, semiotics appears in ways of being, in the creation of identity - for example, the identity of a political leader, which is partly a discursively created way of being (Fairclough 2004: 206).

Semiotics as a part of social activity forms genres. Genres are the semiotic result of the way of acting and creating social life. Examples: everyday conversation, meetings in various types of organizations, political and other interviews, etc. Semiotics forms discourses in the representation and self-presentation of social practices. Discourses are different presentations of social life, in accordance with assigned roles - differently positioned social actors see and represent social life in different ways, in different discourses. For example, the lives of the poor and neglected are represented through different discourses in the social practices of governance, politics, health and social sciences,

and through different discourses within each of these practices, depending on the different roles of social actors. Finally, semiotics as a way of being creates styles. Fairclough states that one can talk about the styles of businessmen or political leaders (Fairclough 2004: 207).

Social practices, networked in a specific way, form a social order (Fairclough 2001, 2003, 2004). Fairclough calls the discursive or semiotic part of the social order the discursive order. Discursive order tells us how different genres, discourses and styles are interconnected, or in other words: discursive order shows semiotic differences within and between social orders. Different ways of creating meaning, ie. different discourses, genres and styles, namely, reveal what kind of relations prevail in a certain society (Fairclough 2004:124).

One aspect worth studying in these relationships is dominance. It turns out that in a certain discursive order, some ways of creating meaning are dominant, while others are marginal, opposite or alternative. For the analysis of discursive orders, the political concept of hegemony can be very useful. The establishment of semiotic differences in a certain social field can become hegemonic. In other words, in a certain social order there are discourses that have won a hegemonic position and become part of common sense. This further means that these discourses support the supremacy of some people over others. On the other hand, we must not forget the fact that at the same time hegemony is always, to a greater or lesser extent, under attack from the struggle for supremacy. Therefore, the discursive order cannot be seen as a strictly closed and unchanging system, but as an open system, which always depends on what happens in real interactions (Fairclough 2004)..

Dialectical connection between discourse and other elements of social practice

The relationship between discourse and other elements (actions and means of production, social relations, social identities, cultural values, consciousness) of social practice is dialectical and is internalized in other elements without changing each other. If we look at the dialectic of discourse from a historical point of view, that is. from the point of view of the process of social change, the question arises as to how the processes of internalization take place (Fairclough 2004).

We will illustrate the answer by explaining the terms „knowledge economy“ and „knowledge society“. The mentioned concepts assume that rapid changes in economic and social processes are directed by knowledge - that is, that these changes occur due to the production, circulation and realization of knowledge in economic and social processes. Of course, knowledge (science, technology) has always played an important role in economic and social change, but, in this case, the desire is to indicate a dramatic increase in that importance. Indeed, „knowledge management“ essentially also means „discourse management“: knowledge is created and circulated as discourses, and the process through which discourses are realized in economies and societies is precisely the process of the dialectics of discourses and other elements of social practices.

Discourses include representations of how things were and are, as well as imaginations of how things could or should be. Knowledge in the knowledge economy and knowledge society are in that sense imaginary images, that is, projections of multiple states of affairs of „possible worlds“. These imaginary images can be enacted as real networks of practices, i.e. depicted activities, subjects and social relations that are real. In this case, it is the materialization of discourse – economic discourses become materialized, for example, in the tools of economic production, including hardware and software.

Fairclough also uses the term inculcation in the context of discourse processing, namely that discourses as imaginary images can be imposed as new ways of being, new identities. It is common knowledge that new economies and social forms depend on new subjects - for example, „Taylorism“ as a system of production and management depended on changes in the way of being, identity, workers, etc. The process of „changing the subject“ can be viewed from the point of view of the imposition of new discourses. Imposition refers to people beginning to „own“ discourses, positioning themselves within them, in short, beginning to act, think, speak and see themselves in terms of new discourses. Imposition is a complex process and, in Fairclough's view, generally less rigid than enactment. A step on the road to imposition is the spread of rhetoric, but we must note that although people can learn new discourses and use them for certain purposes, they can at the same time consciously maintain a distance from them.

On the other hand, one of the mysteries of discursive dialectics is the process in which what started with the conscious introduction and spread of some new rhetoric, eventually becomes „inextricably linked“ with the practice itself - people do not even know when they have become an integral part of a certain discourse (Okado Gough 2017). In other words: if the workers heard about flexibility, liberalization and similar terms with the advent of neoliberalism, they realized only after the shutdown of the factory where they worked for twenty or more years that they became an indivisible part of the discourse about new opportunities, challenges, as the neoliberal discourse calls job loss.

However, the dialectical process does not end with implementation and imposition. Social life is reflective. This means that people not only act interactively within networks of social practices, but at the same time interpret and represent to themselves and to each other what they do. These interpretations and presentations, in turn, shape and transform their actions. People constantly interpret and represent other people, and various experts and scholars in the field of social sciences (including discourse researchers) are no exception. All of these affect how modes of action and interaction, as well as modes of being (including discursive aspects, genres and styles) are represented in discourses. For example, the public speaking of experts on climate change significantly influenced the fact that politicians became aware of this problem and began to include it in their speeches and agendas. At the same time, this has encouraged

at least some people to start living in a more environmentally friendly way. And this additionally contributes to the creation of new imaginary images, which can then be implemented and imposed. In short, it is a dialectic that involves movements through different social elements, including shifts between material and immaterial, and shifts within semiotics between discourses, genres and styles (Cap, Okulska 2013).

In modern social science, there is an established belief that social entities (institutions, organizations, social agents) are constructed through social processes. Since people have accepted these processes, it shows the effectiveness of discourse: social entities are in a sense the effects of discourse. But social constructivism can prove to be a problematic subject if the relative fragility and impermanence of economic entities and their resistance to change are not taken into account. Indeed, even powerful discourses, such as new governance discourses, can encounter levels of resistance that can prevent both their application and their imposition. Therefore, Fairclough repeatedly points out that when using the dialectical theory of discourse in social science research, it is necessary to take into account the circumstances in which the actors created the discourse on a case-by-case basis. Indeed, it depends on these circumstances whether social subjects will resist the new discourses and, accordingly, what level this resistance will reach.

3 CONCLUSION

Critical discourse analysis has become a well-established social science discipline in the last twenty years. At the same time, this has led critics to scrutinize her research approaches.

Sometimes implicitly, sometimes explicitly, CDA claims that its work has a demystifying and emancipatory effect (Fairclough 2001, 2004, 2005; Meyer 2004; Wodak 2015). In doing so, the question arises as to whether scientific effort can lead to social and political motivation at all. Some authors express doubts about the credible effectiveness of CDA as a means of social justice (Chilton 2005:21).

For Widdowson, the very concept of critical discourse analysis is contradictory, because it is an ideological interpretation and therefore cannot be called analysis. The mentioned author is convinced that the CDA is doubly biased: first it takes the side of some ideological belief, and then it selects for analysis texts that confirm the favored interpretation. Analysis should involve studying different interpretations, which is not possible with CDA, because it forms its own opinion from the very beginning (Widdowson 2004).

Грег Фило (Philo 2007) указује на тематизацију контекста у КДА. КДА критикује да се фокусира само на анализу текста, а заборавља на важне утицаје које његова производња и пријем код публике имају на текст. КДА пречесто аналитички остаје на нивоу текста и не показује одакле потичу појединачни конкурентски дискурси и како су повезани са различитим

друштвеним интересима. Ерјавец (2004) истиче да КДА схвата дискурс првенствено као текст и занемарује производњу и рецепцију овог текста. Из овога следи и тешкоћа у препознавању различитих спољашњих, посебно идеолошких фактора репрезентације и недостатак анализа које би показале како различита публика тумачи поједине текстове (Philo 2007:185).

Although in van Dijk's approach cognition acts as a link between the structure of discourse and the structure of society, according to some critics, one of the most neglected aspects of CDA is precisely the psychological and cognitive side of receiving and creating discourse. Chilton argues that CDA ignores the insights of psychology and cognitive science, that it avoids not only generative linguistics but also cognitive linguistics (Chilton 2005:21). Namely, the aforementioned author believes: if CDA deals with human understanding and knowledge, then it should first of all be interested in what happens in a person's head. Language is created and interpreted in the human brain, therefore it cooperates with other cognitive capacities and motor systems (Chilton 2005:23). So, if the use of language (discourse) is related to the creation of knowledge about social objects, identities, processes, etc. then this creation can only take place in the brains of the participants of the interaction.

Chilton is also critical of CDA from the point of view of social effects. Namely, he doubts her theoretical contributions to the social sciences, more precisely to linguistics (2004: 22).

If CDA sets scientific research goals, then - according to the tradition of Western scientific research - it must necessarily be separated from social and political goals.

Based on the analyzed scientific texts of CDA critics, we can say that they criticize the shortcomings, which are mostly recognized by the critical discourse analysts themselves. The most justified criticism seems to be the biased selection of material for analysis or its inadequate processing, since the discourses that CDA members deal with in their work most often confirm the ideological theses set at the beginning of the research (Fairclough 2001, 2003, 2004, 2005; van Dijk 2002, 2004, 2005 ; Wodak 2004, 2015).

To some extent, we can agree with the criticisms about theoretical deficiency, but we cannot fully agree with Chilton that CDA completely ignores the knowledge of cognitive sciences and psychology, since van Dyck's model of critical analysis is based on cognition. It could be said that CDA theoretically sets research approaches decently. A good CDA should include the best works of different people, famous or not, from different fields, countries, cultures and lines of research. What is visible later in the research process itself is the fact that CDA is bad at incorporating theories about the socio-economic and political conditions in which verbal communication is produced, or in certain places the practical findings of the analysis lack a decent theoretical treatment.

That CDA sets itself emancipatory goals is part of the essence of its mission, so we cannot treat it like other traditional social sciences, as Widdowson does, and accuse it of a lack of scientificity in its research.

As we have seen in previous chapters, CDA itself recognizes its pragmatic orientation and the introduction of more modern approaches, i.e. those who give useful results and can positively contribute to changes in society and do not imagine that they meet the traditional criteria of scientific research. Essential to researchers using CDA methods is their awareness of the role they play in society. They are convinced that science and discourse are particularly indivisible parts of the social structure, because they arise in social interaction and are therefore sometimes subject to social influences. Rather than denying these relationships between science and society, CDA researchers seek to study them, evaluate them, and then use the findings to establish new practices of scientific study.

REFERENCES

- Arsenijević Olja, Bulatović, Ljiljana, Bulatović, Goran (2010) „Managing Journalistic Research: Scientific Models in Journalistic Research Practice“, *Technology, Education and Development (INTED)*, pp. 4542 – 4551
- Cap Piotr, Urszula Okulska, (2013) „Analyzing genres in political communication: Theory and practice“. Vol. 50. John Benjamin Publishing
- Fairclough Norman (2001) *Language and power*. Pearson Education
- Fairclough Norman, Wodak Ruth (1997) „Critical Discourse Analysis. *Discourse as Social Interaction (Discourse Studies: A Multidisciplinary Introduction)*. London: Sage.
- Kress Gunther, Van Leeuwen Teo (1996) *Reading images: The grammar of visual design*. Psihology Reader
- Meyer Michael (2004) „Between theory, method and politics: positioning of the approaches to CDA“. *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. 15-31. London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi: Sage Publications.
- Miljković Ljubomir, Arsenijević Olja, Trnavac Dragana (2018) „Political Communication with Population through Social Media“, *Башњина*, Институт за српску културу Приштина - Лепосавић, no. 45, pp. 121 – 135
- Okado-Gough Damien (2017) „Critical Discourse Analysis: Current Approaches and the Advent of Multimodality“ *Mulberry*, No 67(2017)
- Reisigl Martin, Wodak Ruth (2017) „The Discourse – Historical Approach (DHA)“ https://www.researchgate.net/publication/251636976_The_Discourse, posećeno 15. 9. 2022.
- Van Dijk Teun (2001) „Critical Discourse Analysis“ *Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. 352-371. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Van Dijk Teun (2004) „Multidisciplinary CDA: a plea for diversity“ *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*, 63-94. London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi: Sage Publication
- Van Dijk Teun (2005) „Contextual knowledge management in discourse production“ *New agenda in Critical Discourse Analysis: Theory, Methodology and Interdisciplinarity*, 71 – 100. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Menjamin Publishing Company.
- Vezovnik Andreja (2008) „Kritična diskurzivna analiza v kontekstu sodobnih diskurzivnih teorij“ *Družbenoslovne razprave* 24 (57): 79-96
- Widdowson Henry (2004) *Text, Context, Pretext, Critical Issues in Discourse Analysis*, Wiley Blackwell

- Wodak Ruth (2004) „The discourse – historical approach“, *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*, 63-94. London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi: Sage Publication
- Wodak Ruth (2015) „Critical Discourse Analysis, Discourse – Historical Approach“, In book: *The International Encyclopedia of Language and Social Interaction*. (pp.14pp), First Edition John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Wodak Ruth (2015) „Critical Discourse Studies: History, Agenda, Theory and Methodology“. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (eds), *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis* 3 rd edition (pp. 1-22). London: Sage
- Bulatović Ljiljana Bulatović Goran, Arsenijević Olja (2012) „MMP u pedagoškoj praksi u postmodernizmu“, *Tehnika i informatika u obrazovanju*, Vrnjačka Banja: SATcip
- Bulatović Ljiljana, Bulatović Goran, Arsenijević Olja (2011) „Medijska pismenost – osnovna učenja u vremenu digitalnih tehnologija“, *Elektronski zbornik radova naučno-stručnog simpozijuma TIO 6 – Tehnologija, informatika i obrazovanje – za društvo učesa i znanja*, Čačak: Tehnički fakultet

Оља М. АРСЕНИЈЕВИЋ

Ненад Н. ПЕРИЋ

ИНТЕРДИСЦИПЛИНАРНОСТ И РАЗЛИЧИТИ ПРИСТУПИ КРИТИЧКОЈ АНАЛИЗИ ДИСКУРСА

Резиме

Критичка анализа дискурса не може се дефинисати као једносмерна, нити као посебна грана лингвистике која се бави проучавањем дискурса. У раду аутори заступају тезу да критичка анализа дискурса није дисциплина или теорија, већ да је за њу значајна еклектицизам, јер се одликује нејединственим теоријским оквиром и методолошким апаратом. Или, с друге стране, може се пратити у оквиру или у комбинацији са било којим приступом или поддисциплином хуманистичких или друштвених наука. У раду су приказани приступи различитих светских аутора (Везовник, Мејер, ван Дајк, Водак, Расмусен, Агер и др.) критичкој анализи дискурса, а кроз њихову анализу се указује да критичку анализу дискурса користе епистемолошке теорије, општег. друштвене теорије, теорије средњег домета и микросоциолошке, социјално-психолошке, дискурзивне и лингвистичке теорије. Под овим називом груписани су приступи који се критички одређују према анализираним текстовима. Критичка анализа је кључни елемент по коме се приступи критичкој анализи дискурса разликују од анализа лингвистичких стилова, које не разматрају језик у односу на друштво, па самим тим не тематизирају однос између језика, моћи и идеологије. ЦДА критички приступа друштвеним проблемима користећи језик да разоткрије односе моћи који су често скривени, док у исто време покушава да дође до практично релевантних закључака.

Кључне речи: квалитативна методологија, анализа садржаја, стандард објективности, стандард субјективности, латентни конструкти