

*Journal of Nusantara Studies* 2019, Vol 4(1) 422-444  
 Universiti Sultan Zainal Abidin  
 ISSN 0127-9386 (Online)  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.24200/jonus.vol4iss1pp422-444>



**Journal of Nusantara  
 Studies (JONUS)**

**THEORIZING CRITICAL POPULIST DISCOURSE ANALYSIS: A NEW  
 PLAUSIBLE PARADIGM**

\*<sup>1</sup>Raed Awad Al-Ramahi & <sup>2</sup>Radzuwan Ab Rashid

<sup>1</sup>Department of English Language & Literature, Faculty of Languages, University of Jordan,  
 Amman, Jordan

<sup>2</sup>Department of English Language, Faculty of Languages and Communication, Universiti  
 Sultan Zainal Abidin, Gong Badak Campus, 21300 Kuala Nerus, Terengganu, Malaysia

\*Corresponding author: [r.ramahi@ju.edu.jo](mailto:r.ramahi@ju.edu.jo)

Received: 03 February 2019, Accepted: 30 May 2019

**ABSTRACT**

*As deeply related to Critical Theory, CDA has been established to deconstruct the hegemonic objective reasoning of elites and to construct an influential subjective rationality that contributes to generating a free human sense. Though CDA impartially centers on revealing power relations, its agenda is still politically detained. Discourse- historical approach, for example, has been employed by Wodak (2015) in the analysis of right-wing populist ideology in Europe; it proves to be deconstructive, revealing only those radical discursive strategies existing in the right-wing populist discourses. Thus, it is essential to initiate a new paradigm in CDA which constructs a comprehensive framework that critically studies the different forms of populist discourses through analyzing their innate ideologies, emancipatory tactics, anti-elitist values, and sentimental attitudes toward people. This newly suggested paradigm, namely critical populist discourse analysis (CPDA) is expected to cause a ground-breaking step in critical studies as it provides a critical mapping for the multi arguments in populist discourses. This article, thus aims to argue about this proposed paradigm in CDA that provides a critical account on the insights of populist projects of emancipation. The article also highlights the*

*interest of CPDA in interpreting the transformation of populist discourses from rationalism into radicalism. This suggested paradigm addresses all populist movements in the world, including those in Nusantara territories as CPDA's main interest is to objectively analyze and value the core concepts of emancipatory discourses. This paradigm is also applicable to analyze the discourses of liberation movements against the colonial power in these territories.*

**Key words:** Critical realism, critical theory, discourse analysis, methods in qualitative inquiry, qualitative evaluation

**Cite as:** Al-Ramahi, R. A. & Ab Rashid, R. (2019). Theorizing critical populist discourse analysis: A new plausible paradigm. *Journal of Nusantara Studies*, 4(1), 422-446. <http://dx.doi.org/10.24200/jonus.vol4iss1pp422-444>

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

Critical Discourse Analysis has been set to critique the discourse of dominance. Agger (1991) points out that the core aim of CDA is to give analysis of power. According to Kress (1990), CDA has an openly political agenda, which sets it off from other kinds of discourse analysis. As said by Fairclough (1992), CDA aims to systematically explore the relationships between discursive practices, texts and events and wider social and cultural structures, relations and processes. It seeks to analyze those power relations that perpetuate social injustice, power imbalances and non-democratic practices. However, CDA provides limited number of analytical techniques that assist analyzing the multi forms of populist discourses. Thus, decreasing the hegemonic effect of the elites and initiating populist power has not yet been fully explicated in CDAs. In fact, the discourses of those common people and their actors construct systems of beliefs expressing their emancipatory projects. Those beliefs are intended to cause the hegemonic fluctuation and so the power supply can meet the increasing demands of those people. Though the current approaches to CDA have largely contributed to deepening its insights, including Wodak, Fairclough, and Van Dijk's CDAs, they have not yet developed a framework that thoroughly examines those populist discourses with their multi political agendas. Moreover, CDAs have not yet fully detailed on the growing ideological strategies enhanced in the discourses of those common people, which contributes to helping them construct their power. In other words, CDA has not voiced clearly the arrays of various populist ideologies.

CDA has been intended to critically function in order to release the normalized hegemonic relations; moreover, it has been set to mobilize the power from the elites to common people. CDA has been expected to reveal the elites' normalization of reality that creates what Marcuse (1964) refers to as a society based on mono dimension. In fact, CDA distinguishes itself by its ideological power that critically analyzes those intrinsic ideologies of racism, gender inequality and cultural ignominy. Yet, the populist strategies leading to empower those common people and help them construct their multi emancipatory projects have not been fully outlined in CDA.

In this vein, it is crucial to refer to Wodak's (2015) model of discourse-historical approach (DHA) used in analyzing the right-wing populist discourses in Europe and America. In this model, Wodak's argument on populism has fundamentally put emphasis on the right-wing populist parties. She has analyzed the discursive strategies implied in their discourses, stressing their ways of producing and reproducing their extreme ideologies and exclusionary agendas in everyday life. She also studies the meaning of their narratives and establishes the commonalities of these discourses, referring to them as politics of fear that are based on popular fears. Hence, it can be noticed that Wodak's (2015) view of populism as an extreme ideology is a direct consequence of her deep review to the radical right-wing populist discourses.

It is vital to realize that populist discourse exists with multi forms, and thus such a discourse cannot be only measured by its extremist pole. Wodak's (2015) given analysis of right-wing populism in Europe and partially America can make an ideal analytical sample and thus it cannot be an inclusive approach applicable to all forms of populism. Therefore, establishing a framework of critical populist analysis starts by constructing the totality of populist ideologies; instead of jumping to the end line of right-wing parties' ideologies and the extremist aspects of such ideologies (e.g. anti-globalization, anti-migration, anti-Semitism and Islamophobia). In this sense, critical analysis should take place with no prior ideological and political stand when deciding on points of analysis and types of populism (right-wing or left-wing) to be analyzed. Also, disregarding the diversity of socio-cultural rationales of populist discourses leads into limitations in critical analysis. Thus, partiality in theorization might occur and therefore lead analysts into devaluing and demonizing the core doctrines of populisms.

Wodak's ideological standpoint toward populism reflects the political stances that most critical discourse theorists take toward populism in that it accentuates the deconstructive side of populist ideology without leaving a room for reviewing the positivity of such an ideology. It is also worth noting that Wodak's argument on the black image of populism has not taken

into account the essential reasons for the existence of such extreme forms of populism. Those pure people who are either excluded or marginalized due to the elites' extreme policies are ready to adopt radical populist ideologies since they deeply believe that those elites cannot be distanced easily by the rational sense of populism.

Theorizing a new paradigm within CDA that details on those ideological strategies employed in the anti-elitists' emancipatory discourses is quite necessary. This helps revealing those cultural, social, and political aspects of such discourses, which supports the construction of their rational subjective reality. Hence, the creation of a new world full of equity can take place. In this vein, it is essential that critical discourse theorists review the core principles of populism in order to construct ideological frames that assist populist discourse analysts to recognize the archetypal doctrine of populism. In doing so, it makes the analysts easily identify, explain and stigmatize those extreme populist ideologies that might exist in radical right-wing populist discourses.

Reviewing the counter-ideologies as well as the rhetorical aspects of the discourses produced by those common people and their populist leaders can make the essence of the newly recommended paradigm in CDA, namely critical populist discourse analysis (CPDA). Since power relations can be enacted, shaped and reshaped in discourse, the voice of those common people can change the shape of power relations and produce new types of relations that create their own subjective rationality. CDA's ideological categorizations include multi discursive strategies, such as technologized discourse and ideological square. Thus far, these strategies seem not sufficient to analyze and label the peculiarity of common people and their leaders' innovative populist discourses that envision the newly created social, political and cultural identities, people's imaginaries for better life, and people's proposals of eliminating elites.

Ideologically speaking, the general framework of CDA has been criticized for its keen focus on deconstructing the world of dominance, paying little attention to the construction of a free world. Martin (2004) recognizes the deconstructive side of CDA, naming it 'CDA realis', which is related to 'exposing language and attendant semiosis in the service of power' (p. 179). In this vein, Martin has questioned the rare use of constructive social action, naming it 'CDA irrealis' (Martin, 2004, p. 179). As said by Martin (2004), 'we need a complementary focus on community, taking into account how people get together and make room for themselves in the world – in ways that redistribute power without necessarily struggling against it' (p. 186). In a related vein, Luke (2002) claims that it is essential for CDA not to limit its scope within the ideological critique; instead it must be involved in establishing the 'emancipatory discourse'

(p. 98). It could be inferred that CDA's high interest in dialectical analysis and little interest in forming new social realities negatively affect CDA's development of categories, concepts and ideologies deeply related to the subjective rationality constructed by populists.

Moreover, CDA has been criticized for its prominent dependence on linguistic concepts and grammatical analysis in its argument about populist politics, which is considered 'a very bad method' (Jones & Collins, 2006, p. 25) employed by critical analysts to make decisions about certain doctrinaire issues. Fairclough and Wodak (1997) point out that discourses 'are partly realized in ways of using language, but partly in other ways' (p. 261). O'Halloran (2003) criticizes Fairclough's placing SFL as the underpinning of CDA. Relying on abstractions of SFL cannot fully reveal the communicated deep ideologies within the discourse. Additionally, Blommaert (2005) associates the 'linguistic bias' (p. 34) with the overuse of SFL in CDA. Widdowson (2004) does not compete with CDAs, he only doubts its ways of analysis; therefore, he refuses the analysis via SFL as the meaning is textually conditioned.

In effect, this argument does not imply that CDA has no full access to political analysis; on the contrary, CDA is a framework of analysis that is politically oriented and ideologically directed. According to Fairclough (1995), critical-political discourse analysis is concerned with the reproduction of political authority and control through adopting numerous practices of resistance against such forms of discursive dominance. Thus, the core argument in this article is deeply related to CDA's lack of familiarity with those peculiar discursive ideologies that make the main pillars in the populists' discourses of emancipation.

Such a shortage in CDA's framework of specific frames that reveal the innate ideologies existing in the many versions of populist discourses lays it only interested in labeling the deconstructive strategies of resistance without constructing the totality of populist emancipatory senses. CDA, in fact, is in need to include those ideological frames of populism that are highly idealized by populists as they contribute to providing them with power. Having a detailed theoretical platform concerned with populist discourses of emancipation is necessary to critical discourse analysts; it is thus considered the ideological thermometer that measures radicalism in these discourses. As a result, those far radical right or left populist discourses are discernibly recognized and thoroughly examined.

## **2.0 CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS AND ITS THEORITICAL APPROACHES**

Critical Discourse Analysis brings linguistic analysis and ideological critique together. In fact, CDA's basic purpose is to reveal the implicit ideologies and power relations. According to

O'Halloran (2001), CDA is an interdisciplinary set of approaches which attempt to describe, interpret and explain the relationship between language, power and ideology manifested in a discourse. In CDA, critical is usually taken to mean studying and taking issue with how dominance and inequality are reproduced through language use (Wodak, 2009; Van Dijk, 2001; Rogers, 2004). “Critical” implies showing connections and causes which are hidden; it also implies intervention, for example providing resources for those who may be disadvantaged through change’ (Fairclough, 1992, p. 9). As said by Wodak (2001), CDA is fundamentally interested in analyzing opaque as well as transparent structural relationships of dominance, discrimination, power and control when these are manifested in language.

Van Dijk (2001) indicates that CDA is a type of discourse analytical research that primarily studies the way social power abuse, dominance, and inequality are enacted, reproduced, and resisted by text and talk in the social and political context. With such dissenting research, critical discourse analysts take explicit position, and thus want to understand, expose, and ultimately resist social inequality. The analysts of CDA take the text or talk as a tool to explain them in terms of social structure and power relation. On the other hand, Fairclough (2001a) defines CDA as:

*A form of critical social science geared to illuminating the problems which people are confronted with by particular forms of social life, and to contributing resources which people may be able to draw upon in tackling and overcoming those problems (p. 125).*

There are several approaches to CDA. In this context, three of these will be briefly discussed, mainly Fairclough, Van Dijk, and Wodak’s approaches. Fairclough (1995) points out that ‘discourse is the use of language seen as a form of social practice, and discourse analysis is analysis of how texts work within sociocultural practice’ (p. 7). As also indicated by Fairclough (1995), there are basic suppositions that stand behind the selections of discourse and these selections are ideologically determined. Thus, the discursive aspects of discourse affect ideologically the entire discourse since they keep producing unequal power relations between social classes, gender groups and minorities through the ways the discourse position those groups. Fairclough (1989) affirms that ‘the exercise of power, in modern society, is increasingly achieved through ideological workings of language’ (p. 9). Fairclough, moreover,

comments on the relation between the order of discourse and the created power relations in discourse by saying:

*An order of discourse is a network of social practices in its language aspect. The elements of orders of discourse are not things like nouns and sentences (elements of linguistic structures), but discourses, genres and styles (Fairclough, 2003, p. 24).*

Van Dijk, on the other hand, adopts the socio-cognitive approach that recognizes discourse as a system of social practices. In fact, Van Dijk gives high attention to social cognition to mediate between discourse, cognition and society. Cognition, as indicated by Van Dijk (2009), is recognized in collective mental models as a result of harmony; it is the interface between societal and discourse structures. As stated by Van Dijk (1998), 'CDA specifically deals with the study of the discursive reproduction of power abuse, with forms of domination and social inequality' (p. 87). Van Dijk (2001) further emphasizes that it is essential for CDA to explain the many practices of social cognitions that are shared by the social collectivities. Furthermore, Van Dijk (2003) classifies two parts of discourse analysis. The first one is micro, which is concerned with discourse, verbal interaction and communication. The second part includes power, dominance and inequality between social groups. Van Dijk mainly focuses in his arguments on actor description, including the positive 'we' in-group and the negative representation of out-group (ibid). In addition, Van Dijk (1993) claims that CDA cannot be considered as a clear method, but rather as critical state of mind or attitude to a matter, therefore CDA encompasses many methods depending on the researcher's needs.

Wodak's discourse-historical approach is based on the fact that there must be a deep relation between the discourse and the historical context within which such a discourse has been produced. One critical view of CDA is 'that all discourses are historical and can therefore only be understood with reference to their context' (Wodak, 2009, p. 20). Moreover, Wodak (2001) indicates that shaping the identity continually involves combining the experiences of the past and the present as well as the future conceptions. This, however, includes examining and clarifying the connection between multifarious historical practices, hegemonic descriptions and CDA methodologies. Wodak (2018) argues that:

*This approach provides a vehicle for looking at latent power dynamics and the range of potentials in agents, because it integrates and triangulates knowledge about historical, inter-textual sources and the background of the social and political fields within which discursive events are embedded (p. 8).*

### **3.0 POPULISM AND POPULIST DISCOURSE**

Defining populism has been a controversial issue for long time. Ionescu and Gellner (1969) have observed populism as a ‘spectre haunting the world’ (p. 1), suggesting that it is vague and terrifying. Populism claims to represent the public against corrupt elites or leaders (Aslanidis, 2015). It is repeatedly ‘equated with simple-mindedness, lack of sophistication, and an overly emotional and moralistic approach to politics’ (Salgado & Zu’quete, 2017, p. 242). According to Mudde (2004), populism is:

*An ideology that considers society to be ultimately separated into two homogeneous and antagonistic groups, ‘the pure people’ versus ‘the corrupt elite’, and which argues that politics should be an expression of the general will of the people (p. 543).*

Hence, Mudde’s definition of populism sheds light on the thinness of populist ideology (the will of people) when compared to the thickness of the elites’ ideology that makes (the power). It also appears thin when compared to full ideologies like conservatism or liberalism. Thin ideologies denote a rather limited set of ideas about the world (Mudde, 2004). In reference to populism, these limited populist ideas are related to the constructions of power in the world (Albertazzi & McDonnell, 2008). Populist ideology is similar to a mental map that provides individuals with an account of political actuality, but it still ‘lacks the capacity to put forward a wide-ranging and coherent programme for the solution to crucial political questions’ (Stanley, 2008, p. 95). Arter (2010) also indicates ‘there is general agreement in the comparative literature that populism is confrontational, chameleonic, culture-bound and context-dependent’ (p. 489). Populism is, moreover, defined as a strategy, or more accurately, ‘a political strategy through which a personalistic leader seeks or exercises government power based on direct, unmediated, uninstitutionalized support’ (Weyland, 2001, p. 14). According to Ostiguy (2009), populism is schematized around a vertical, up/down axis that refers to power, status and hierarchical position. Stavrakakis and Katsambekis (2014) argue that populism is a claim to



represent the people against elites, and constructs its political demands as representing the will of people. In keeping with Moffitt (2016), 'it is the leader that should be our main focus when studying the phenomenon, given that they are the figures that ultimately "do" populism' (p. 51). Moffitt views all forms of populism in the same manner with no distinction between the right and the left (Moffitt, 2016, p. 51).

Defining populism according to Laclauian Approach (see Judis, 2016) centers on the demands that arise within the social context. If the demands are satisfied by the institutions they are addressed to, then we come up with the *logic of difference*. When the fragmented demands are still not satisfied, they may tend to aggregate themselves even though they are different. This is called the *logic of equivalence*. According to this definition, these demands when collected together in an *equivalential chain* lead to separating society into two groups, the demanders -the people and the deaf addressees -the elite. The existence of populism refers to the expansion of logic of equivalence on account of logic of difference.

In a related vein, Pankowski (2010) argues that 'populist movements have been successful where they manage to make a connection with a culture of the 'common sense ordinariness' (p. 37). Moreover, populism has been referred to as pathology of democracy (Weyland, 2001). In fact, populists defend democracy because they believe that people have the right to rule themselves by themselves away from the corrupted leaders. In a related vein, Müller (2014) thinks that the study of populism frequently reflects anxieties both by liberals about democracy and by democrats about liberalism. Based on Müller's view, it seems that democratizing populism helps supporting the essence of this ideology (populism) since the process of democratization places common people in power.

Philosophically speaking, the epistemology of populism is rooted in common people's knowledge, which is gained through everyday life experiences. This knowledge has been termed by Saurette and Gunster (2011) as epistemological populism. On the basis of Saurette and Gunster's model of epistemic authority, it could be inferred that the knowledge of common people can be developed to form counter beliefs standing against the general knowledge, beliefs and practices. Such knowledge constructed by common people is backed up by their shared religious, cultural, and national backgrounds. However, this newly established knowledge that goes against the common sense- mainstream authoritative ideology- will be refused by the dominant ideology. As said by Lewandowsky, Ecker, Seifert, Schwarz, and Cook (2012), if the results of a belief lead to political implications that run counter to what you and your peer group believe is right, those beliefs tend to be rejected even in the face of hard

evidence. In this vein, Baumann (2007) indicates that since common people cannot live their lives based on self-researched evidence-based knowledge, they must rely on epistemic authorities.

As populism reflects the politics of common people, the analysis of populist discourses requires establishing deep insights of the mass politics, which aim at transforming the reality dominated by authoritative ideologies through empowering the mass ideology. The many versions of populist discourses argue about the negativity of elites' ideologies. As said by Mudde (2004), corruption repeatedly makes a milestone in any populist argument. The essence of populist argument is the uncorrupt people against the corrupt elite. However, numerous critical issues exist in the populist arguments, such as immigration, minorities' lack of rights and economic degrading conditions. According to Jagers and Walgrave (2007), for political communication to be considered populist:

*it always refers to the people and justifies its actions by appealing to and identifying with the people; is rooted in anti-elite feelings; and considers the people as a monolithic group without internal differences except for some specific categories that are excluded (p. 322).*

The agenda of populist discourses centers on the desire of common people to reconstruct the reality and reproduce a new one that is based on the mass ideology. Thus, populist discourses discursively include frames that initiate the 'we' and 'they' opponent relation. According to Benford and Snow (2000), political industrialists give high importance to the strategic framing in order to persuade audiences to tune into their own representation of reality.

In this context, it is necessary to emphasize that the existence of various forms and styles of populism has caused multi understandings of such a concept. Right-wing populist parties define people on a cultural base while left-wing populist parties define people on a class basis (March, 2011). Whereas left-wing parties concern themselves with the economic issues and seek to protect the public from the corruption of the capitalists, right-wing populist parties support nativism (Mudde, 2007), looking for saving 'the nation from dangerous others' (Rooduijn & Akkerman, 2017, p. 196). Moreover, left-wing populist parties are inclusive in their view to the society while the right-wing populist parties are exclusive (Katsambekis, 2017). Right-wing populist parties totally oppose extending the political participation rights to minorities, considering themselves the true voice of people (Mudde & Kaltwasser, 2013).

What complicates the political scene in Europe and Asia is the rebirth of racism by the far right populists. The racist discourse of those neo-racist far right populist parties has recently appeared, and thus it reflects the fears of radical right populists from those minority groups who are viewed as groups powered by the elites. Researchers have noticed the relation between the increase of anti-minority attitudes and the support of new racist discourses (Lubbers, Gijsberts, & Scheepers, 2002). The identity politics of radical right populism is the expansion of a cultural distinction between natives and aliens (see Mudde, 2007). In fact, the label 'radical' denotes the outspoken position at the far end of the political spectrum on issues related to immigration and ethnic diversity (Akkerman, De Lange, & Rooduijn, 2016). Radical right populists accentuate ethnic identity, which is a result of nativism that makes a basic pillar in their ideology. Nativism 'holds that states should be inhabited exclusively by members of the native group ('the nation') and that nonnative elements (persons and ideas) are fundamentally threatening to the homogenous nation-state' (Mudde, 2007, p. 19).

The critical transformation of populist movements from seeking to meet the demands of people's will into establishing new dictatorships that replace the elites causes the real threat to the essence of populism. Horkheimer (1993) highlights the development of powerful right-wing populist trends in Europe in the late nineteenth century that led to successful fascist movements in several European countries. Recently, the ascendance of right-wing Populist Party led by Trump in the United States of America creates a new type of authoritarian populism that is concerned with economic change (anti-privatization) and exclusion of minority groups. Also, the recent ascendance of right-wing Populist Party in Philippines has left a drastic change on some policies, for instance, the extreme drug policy. This type of populism produces leaders with authoritarian personalities (Adorno, 1950) who can establish authoritarian personal power that is able to punish others, exclude minority groups and take individual decisions a way from people's will. In this vein, it is essential to highlight the critical effect of populists' power expansion. Owning ultimate power can turn those populists with their exclusionary policies into dictators who reproduce the hegemony of elites, and thus threaten the people's will.

#### **4.0 RATIONAL FOR THEORIZING A NEW PARADIGM IN CDA**

Though CDA has chiefly contributed to revealing the ideologies embedded within the discourses that reflect the prejudice, domination and discrimination of elites, it has not yet developed sufficient ideological frames produced in the discourse of common people. Those

frames generated by those people normally anticipate their proposals of emancipation and visualizations of transformed reality. In fact, Van Dijk's (1998) ideological square, for example, has established the positive representation of self and negation of the other. In principle, this technique has offered a large number of moves (e.g. polarization and actor description) that can build up such a positive-self representation of 'Us' and a negative-other representation 'Them'. Yet, Van Dijk's ideological square cannot fully help interpreting the liberal counter hegemonic culture that structures the populists' project of emancipation. Therefore, this technique seems deconstructive more than constructive. In other words, it operationalizes effectively in deconstructing the ideologies that perpetuate the domination.

In addition, Fairclough's technologized discourse can effectively reveal the normalization of dominant ideologies and critique the social order embedded within the discursive structures of discourse. Fairclough's (2001b) notion of technologized discourse denotes that the discourse does not only carry information, but it also carries social and racial structures as well as power relations. Accordingly, both techniques (ideological square and technologized discourse) cannot construct convenient ideological frames that reveal the populists' strategies in constructing power, which leads into making the emancipatory project a reality. These ideological frames related to social identity construction, counter hegemonic cultural industry, and proposed economic and political transformation are expected to fully support the analysis of such type of emancipatory discourses.

It can be argued that CDA in its current framework is still mediating between three elements, namely, the discourse, cognition and social context. In other words, current CDA's total business is to investigate the dialectical relationship between these three elements in order to reveal the effect of social practices on the discourse and its cognitive representations. Lo Bianco (2009) criticizes the limitation of CDA, referring to the excessive optimism of the change that CDA could make. Since CDA effectively reveals the influence of discourse on shaping new realities, this requires that CDA develop new techniques in order to uncover and value those populist ideologies that anticipate the new constructed realities.

Yet, there is a huge need to move beyond the dialectical phase of analysis into a type of critical analysis that elaborates more on the forthcoming transformed reality, unsettledness of hegemons, and deep insights of emancipatory projects. Critical populist discourse analysis is expected to create an analysis that envisions the transformed reality and explains the multi populist agendas. Widdowson (1998) has questioned the theoretical foundation of CDA that debates about issues related to social justice and domination, considering the credibility and

accountability of CDA as more than a method. Critical populist discourse analysis is intended to provide CDA with a set of ideological frames that contribute to critically interpreting the many manifestations of emancipatory prophecies existing in emancipatory discourses. Therefore, this newly recommended paradigm should establish peculiar frames and approaches that can trace those discursive ideological structures which construct the frameworks of populist emancipatory projects in their moderate and radical forms.

The discourse of anti-migration, for instance, has been largely criticized by critical analysts since it is considered a revival of racist discourse. On the other hand, right-wing populist parties deeply believe that migration causes a real threat to the social, cultural and economic scenes. In this vein, the ideological dispute between those critics and right-wing populists is a consequence of their different ideological perspectives. Right-wing populists view migration as the main cause of cultural clash taking place between the original citizens and those migrants that belong to different ethnicities, which negatively affects the cultural integration. Therefore, many ideologies that make the basic pillars in the populist emancipatory projects are viewed in a deconstructive way by critical analysts.

## **5.0 INTEGRATING CDA WITH POPULISM: CRITICAL POPULIST DISCOURSE ANALYSIS (CPDA)**

Integrating both CDA's theoretical framework with populist ideologies can generate a new approach that deliberately scrutinizes the liberating concepts in the populists' emancipatory discourses. Thus, theorizing such a type of critical analysis requires conceptualizing certain moves through which the revelation of populist counter-ideological framework can take place. This suggested approach is similar to CDA in that it is an extension of the critical theory. In fact, the critical theory seeks to 'create change, to the benefit of those oppressed by power' (Lincoln, Lynham, & Guba, 2011, p. 102). In this sense, Honneth (1995) stresses the significance of struggle for recognition, which best characterizes the fight for emancipation by social groups, and this fight represents a subjective negative experience of domination. Moreover, the idea of emancipation is to 'help eliminate the causes of unwarranted alienation and domination and thereby enhance the opportunities for realizing human potential' (Klein & Myers, 1999, p. 69).

Thus, the epistemological foundation of CPDA is based on the view that the critical analysis of discourse should not only pay high attention to reveal the elites' objective reasoning ideologies, but it should also examine the new subjective voice of change created by the

discourses of those common people, populist leaders, parties and movements in their act of transforming reality. On the other hand, the ontology of CPDA describes the constructionism of the discourses of change. In the following subsection, the theoretical framework of CPDA is presented.

## **6.0 CPDA SUGGESTED FRAMEWORK**

Constructing a framework for the newly theorized paradigm in CDA involves generating moves that help uncovering those counter-ideologies existing within the left-wing and right-wing populist discourses. In order to uncover and appreciate those populist ideologies, critiquing language structure with all its semantic, syntactic and phonological features must be taken into account. The CPDA's framework thus needs to develop highly subtle techniques that make an asset in recognizing those populist ideologies. It is necessary to mention that the suggested ideological moves should create critical analysis that takes no prior political stand. Accordingly, these moves lead the analyst to examine those populist ideologies and highlight their prominent roles in constructing emancipatory discourses. The following moves are expected to help uncovering those discursive populist ideologies. Those include:

### **6.1 Position Shifting**

This argues about the ideologies that refer to the newly created positive images of common people in populist discourses. This move also reveals the ideological shift that takes place, which contributes to improving the negative stereotypes of common people and populist leaders' doings, ways of thinking and positions (social and political). The common people, in fact, have been reduced and accused of being naïve by the elites for long periods of time.

### **6.2 Multicultural vs. Anti-multicultural Models**

The multicultural model denotes the existence of society with multi authoritative cultures living all together in harmony. Thus, the recognition of cultural multiplicity by all members of society is a must. It also refers to the end of one dimensional cultural hegemony. This model is inclusionary and normally adopted by left-wing populists. They believe that the emancipatory project can include multi cultures. As for the anti-multicultural model, right-wing populists consider pluralism and multiculturalism as not very close to the essence of populism. They believe that those minor cultures must be excluded since they pollute the mainstream popular culture and hinder the advance of populist emancipation. Also, they believe that minor cultures

are very close to the elites' culture. Moreover, right-wing populists strongly believe that those minority groups 'dangerous others' (Rooduijn, 2013, p. 726) can be easily stimulated by the elites and be part of elitism. In fact, the refusal of multicultural model by populists can create cultural clash with those minority groups, which makes the elites in safety. In this vein, the hyper use of exclusionary policies by certain versions of populist parties generates 'nativism' that can empower the elites instead of deconstructing their power. In general, populists deeply believe in excluding the elite culture and replace it with the popular culture.

### **6.3 Single Hegemon Diversion (Mobilization)**

This move designates that the elites' hegemony is no more existent. The concept of elite hegemony, leading the society through dominating those common people becomes archaic. The appearance of populist hegemony (leaders) can replace the solo elite hegemony. In line with this move, the imagined reality is controlled by those populist leaders who represent the will of common people. Also, this move is concerned with the true representation of those populist leaders to the will of common people through associating the power of those leaders with the power of those pure people. Otherwise, the reproduction of elitism could happen, particularly if those populist leaders gain ultimate power. Many historical right-wing leaders turned to be dictators with their gain of authoritative sense and ultimate power, such as Hitler. This move is basically concerned with analyzing those discursive structures that signify the development of populist hegemony.

### **6.4 Substitutions**

It represents the projected alternatives of reality, including the change that is expected to take place in different aspects of common people's life. Substitutions cover the anticipated economic, social, cultural and political reestablishment. This move, thus, is concerned with analyzing the imageries included in various emancipatory discourses deeply related to the expected emancipated reality. Populist discourses normally contain multi agendas that make alternatives to the corrupted elite policies. While right-wing populist discourses are with cultural revival as a priority, left-wing discourses give the economic restoration high attention.

### **6.5 Human Kernel**

This move focuses on the essence of life. All people are created free, and so practicing ultimate authority of an individual or a group over others is feasibly illegitimate. This move also

envisions the positivity of human beings when they appreciate the universal values of humanity. Thus, the removal of dehumanizing common people can be attained. In fact, all forms of populism emphasize the human sense and consider it a priority. In this vein, it is essential to refer to the essence of populist ideology that is based on liberating common people's human sense from the elites' evil ideology and politics that are based on desensitizing pure people. In fact, the homogeneity of people can only be manifested through the collective human sense.

### **6.6 Identity Reclamation and Cultural Industrialization**

These two integrated moves mean recollecting the memories and shared experiences deeply related to common people's cultural heritage. Accordingly, industrializing popular culture helps people to attain their repressed identities. These two moves are considered the essence of common people's identity recreation. The elites, in fact, have controlled the shape of common people's identity and produce people who have no tactics to challenge their cultural hegemony. One of the basic features of emancipatory project is to reconstruct people's collective popular identity that reflects their own true cultural values and remove the strong effect of elites' cultural values on popular culture. It is worth mentioning that true identity and pure culture are immensely emphasized in right-wing populism as they make an essential part of their emancipatory vision.

### **6.7 Populist Emancipatory Project**

The main interest of this move is to trace the multi tactics employed by populists to structure their emancipatory project, which truly reflects people's will. Moderate presentation of cultural, religious and gender issues that contribute to strengthening this project is adopted by left-wing populist parties while right-wing parties view that the radical presentation of these ideological issues can be more effective in empowering the populist project. Critical analysts should take into account the significance of anti-globalization and anti-migration in the construction of far right-wing populist emancipatory project. Critically analyzing these issues out of their context will be incomplete, and thus misshape the right-wing populism. Left-wing populist parties, on the other hand, see economic issues as the best way to structure their emancipatory project. They are radical with issues related to economy, but they are moderate with cultural issues. Populists choose their directions to build up their power that can challenge the elites' ultimate power. Critical discourse analysis should map the different directions



through which the emancipatory sense is constructed within populist discourses and not feel sufficient with referring to the deconstructive aspects of right-wing or left-wing populisms.

### **6.8 Reviewing the Corrupted Elites' Discursive Strategies**

This move is interested in analyzing the total hegemonic ideologies of the elites that cause their full control over common people. The elites who make their evil image in the minds of pure people keep producing corrupted policies through their own political, economic, intellectual, legal and cultural institutionalized systems. Before analyzing the ideologies of various populist movements, it is worth examining the elites' corrupted systems and policies naturalized in common people's life. This leads into better understanding of populist discourses that appear extreme sometimes. As the elites have established an advanced institutionalized discourse, they own their means to misshape the populist discourses. They are also able to accuse the populists of being conspirers, irrational activists and enemies to nation. Accordingly, critical analysis is expected to deeply scrutinize those aspects in the elites' discourses that view the emancipatory projects of populists as conspiracies.

### **6.9 Sentimentality of Populist Discourse**

The basic purpose of this move is to examine the emotional effect of populist discourses on common people. In fact, common people, in their struggle with the elites, live the *demand* and *supply* process, which makes them highly stimulated by the populist discourses as these types of discourses represent their own imaginaries. The more the demands of those people are not satisfied by the institutions, the more they are attracted to the populist discourses. Thus, populists stimulate the will of people through the content and style of their discourses. Most populist discourses include issues that touch the daily suffrage of people from the elites' corrupted policies (e.g. anti privatization). As for the style, populists implement rhetorical styles in their discourses that address both the minds and emotions of those people. Metaphorical structures always exist since metaphors normally leave strong effects on the collective consciousness of people. Moreover, populists select both contents and styles that contribute to constructing people's power. In this sense, radicalism in some populist discourses is a reaction to the elites' powerful discourses that normalize the corrupted reality. Such radical populist ideologies also reflect the irritation of common people to cause a fundamental change.

These moves make the essence of the suggested CPDA's analytical framework. Therefore, critical analysts are expected to objectively implement these moves in synthesizing

those discursive strategies that contribute to constructing the populist ideology and its politics. These moves are proposed to articulate the populist ideological framework that makes the seeds of populist emancipatory project.

## **7.0 THE INFLUENCE OF CPDA ON THE ANALYSIS OF POPULIST AGENDAS**

CPDA is expected to thoroughly examine the populist agendas that seek to value the voices articulating common people's will and to exclude elitism. Such agendas sometimes look radical as they represent the revolutionary sense that people and their actors adopt against the evil elites. In this sense, CPDA operationalizes through examining those populist agendas that are intended to initiate the seeds of emancipation. Consequently, the several moves mentioned earlier can lead the analysts to reveal those ideological frames and construct the anticipated transformed reality. Also, the moves emphasize the exclusion of evil elites (hegemons). It can be argued that the critical analysis conducted within the framework of CPDA helps revealing the many alternates suggested by the subjective reason of populists.

Establishing this paradigm in CDA can help exploring the populist discourses and so the revelation of the constructive populist agendas can be competently accomplished. In effect, the scope of CPDA is expected to enable the critical analysts to familiarize themselves with populists' agendas. This means that those analysts can build relations between the textual and semiotic representations with the anticipated reality visualized by those common people and their populist leaders. Thus, the shift in the nature of critical analysis that CPDA can cause gives the analysts a keen vision, which makes them fully recognize the multi populist ideologies of emancipation.

## **8.0 CONCLUSION**

CDA is considered an essential program due to its critical nature, which enables discourse analysts to link the discourse with the social, cultural and political realities. Thus, the revelation of ideologies hidden in the discourse shaped by such realities is made accessible by CDA. However, CDA is still a general framework; it mainly deconstructs the elites' hegemonic ideologies normalized within the discourse. Accordingly, there appears a critical need to establish an approach that can reveal those populist ideologies existing in the discourses of common people and their actors. Moreover, this suggested approach is expected to examine those populist ideologies that anticipate new realities where common people play the roles of hegemons. This research suggests a number of moves that can constructively examine the

populist ideologies of emancipation. Future research is expected to add more moves that facilitate the process of objectively analyzing populist discourses.

## REFERENCES

- Adorno, T. W., Frenkel-Brunswik, E., Levinson, D. J., & Sanford, R. N. (1950). *The authoritarian personality*. New York: Harper & Brothers.
- Agger, B. (1991). Critical theory, post structuralism, postmodernism: Their sociological relevance. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 17(1), 105-131.
- Akkerman, T., De Lange, S. L., & Rooduijn, M. (2016). *Radical right-wing populist parties in Western Europe: Into the mainstream?* London: Routledge.
- Arter, D. (2010). The breakthrough of another West European populist radical right party? The case of the true Finns. *Government and Opposition*, 45(4), 484-504.
- Albertazzi, D. & McDonnell, D. (2008). Introduction: The sceptre and the spectre. In D. Albertazzi & D. McDonnell (Eds.), *Twenty-first century populism: The spectre of Western European democracy* (pp. 1-11). Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- Aslanidis, P. (2015). Is populism an ideology? A refutation and a new perspective. *Political Studies*, 64(1), 1-17.
- Baurmann, M. (2007). Rational fundamentalism? An explanatory model of fundamentalist beliefs. *Episteme*, 4(2), 150-166.
- Benford, R. D. & Snow, D. A. (2000). Framing processes and social movements: An overview and assessment. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 26(1), 611-639.
- Blommaert, J. (2005). *Discourse: A critical introduction*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and power*. London: Longman.
- Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and social change*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. London: Longman.
- Fairclough, N. (2001a). Critical discourse analysis as a method in social scientific research. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (pp. 121-138). London: Sage.
- Fairclough, N. (2001b). The discourse of new labor: Critical discourse analysis. In Margaret Wetherell, Stephanie Taylor & Simeon Yates (Eds.), *Discourse as data: A guide for analysis* (pp. 229-266). London: Sage.

- Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analyzing discourse: Textual analysis for social research*. New York: Routledge.
- Fairclough, N. & Wodak, R. (1997). Critical discourse analysis. In Teun A. van Dijk, (Ed.), *Discourse as social interaction* (pp. 258-84). London: Sage.
- Honneth, A. (1995). *The struggle for recognition: The moral grammar of social conflicts* (trans. by Joel Anderson). Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Horkheimer, M. (1993). Egoism and freedom movements: On the anthropology of the Bourgeois Era. In G.F. Hunter, M.S. Kramer, & J. Torpey (Eds.), *In between philosophy and social science: Selected early writings* (pp. 49-110). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Ionescu, G. & Gellner, E. (1969). *Populism: Its meanings and national characteristics*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson.
- Jagers, J. & Walgrave, S. (2007). Populism as political communication style: An empirical study of political parties' discourse in Belgium. *European Journal of Political Research*, 46(3), 319-345.
- Judis, J. B. (2016). Rethinking populism. *Dissent Magazine*, 63(4), 116-122.
- Jones, P. E. & Collins, C. (2006). Political analysis versus critical discourse analysis in the treatment of ideology: Some implications for the study of communication. *Atlantic Journal of Communication*, 14(1-2), 28-50.
- Katsambekis, G. (2017). The populist surge in post democratic times: Theoretical and political challenger. *The Political Quarterly*, 88(2), 202-210.
- Klein, H. K. & Myers, M. D. (1999). A set of principles for conducting and evaluating interpretive field studies in information systems. *MIS Quarterly*, 23(1), 67-94.
- Kress, G. (1990). Linguistic and ideological transformations in news reporting. In H. Davis & P. Walton (Eds.), *Language, Image, Media* (pp. 120-139). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Lewandowsky, S., Ecker, U. K. H., Seifert, C. M., Schwarz, N., & Cook, J. (2012). Misinformation and its correction: Continued influence and successful debasing. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, 13(3), 106-131.
- Lincoln, Y. S., Lynham, S. A., & Guba, E. G. (2011). Paradigmatic controversies, contradictions, and emerging confluences, revisited. In N. K. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 128-97). Los Angeles: Sage.
- Lo Bianco, J. (2009). Critical discourse analysis (CDA) and language planning (LP): Constraints and applications of the critical in language planning. In T. Le, Q. Le & M.

- Short (Eds.), *Critical discourse analysis: An interdisciplinary perspective* (pp. 101-118). New York: Nova Science Publishers.
- Lubbers, M., Gijsberts, M., & Scheepers, P. (2002). Extreme right-wing voting in Western Europe. *European Journal of Political Research*, 41(3), 345-378.
- Luke, A. (2002). Beyond science and ideological critique: Developments in critical discourse analysis. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 22(5), 96-110.
- March, L. (2011). *Radical left parties in contemporary Europe*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Marcuse, H. (1964). *One-dimensional man: Studies in ideology of advanced industrial society*. London: Routledge.
- Martin, J. (2004). Positive discourse analysis: Solidarity and change. *Revista Canaria de Estudios Ingleses*, 49(1), 179-202.
- Moffitt, B. (2016). *The global rise of populism: performance, political style and representation*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Mudde, C. (2004). The populist Zeitgeist. *Government and Opposition*, 39(4), 542-563.
- Mudde, C. (2007). *Populist radical right parties in Europe*. Cambridge and New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Mudde, C. & Kaltwasser, R. (2013). Exclusionary vs. inclusionary populism: Comparing contemporary Europe and Latin America. *Government and Opposition*, 48(2), 147-174.
- Müller, J.-W. (2014). The people must be extracted from within the people: Reflections on populism. *Constellations*, 21(4), 483-493.
- O'Halloran, K. A. (2001). Critical discourse analysis. In J, Simpson (Ed.), *The Routledge handbook of applied linguistics* (pp. 445-459). New York: Routledge.
- O'Halloran, K. A. (2003). *Critical discourse analysis and language cognition*. Edinburgh, UK: Edinburgh University Press.
- Ostiguy, P. (2009). The high-low political divide: Rethinking populism and anti-populism. Retrieved from [nd.edu/~kellogg/publications/workingpapers/WPS/360.pdf](http://nd.edu/~kellogg/publications/workingpapers/WPS/360.pdf).
- Pankowski, R. (2010). *The populist radical right in Poland: The patriots*. London: Routledge.
- Rogers, R. (2004). *An introduction to critical discourse analysis in education*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Rooduijn, M. (2013). The mesmerising message: The diffusion of populism in public debates in western European media. *Political Studies*, 62(4), 726-744.
- Rooduijn, M. & Akkerman, T. (2017). Flank attacks: Populism and left-right radicalism in Western Europe. *Party Politics*, 23(3), 193-204.

- Salgado, S. & Zu 'quete, J. P. (2017). Portugal: Discreet populisms amid unfavorable contexts and stigmatization. In T. Aalberg, F. Esser, C. Reinemann, J. Stro "mba"ck, & C. Vreese (Eds.), *Populist political communication in Europe* (pp. 235-248). London & New York: Routledge.
- Saurette, P. & Gunster, S. (2011). Ears wide shut: Epistemological populism, argutainment and Canadian conservative talk radio. *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, 44(1), 195-218.
- Stanley, B. (2008). The thin ideology of populism. *Journal of Political Ideologies*, 13(1), 95-110.
- Stavrakakis, Y. & Giorgios, K. (2014). Left-wing populism in the European periphery: The case of Syriza. *Journal of Political Ideologies*, 19(2), 119-142.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1993). Principles of critical discourse analysis. *Discourse & Society*, 4(2), 249-283.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1998). *Ideology: A multidisciplinary approach*. London, Sage.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2001). Critical discourse analysis. In D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen & H.E. Hamilton (Eds.), *The handbook of discourse analysis* (pp. 352-371). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2003). Critical discourse analysis. In D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen, & H. E. Hamilton (Eds.), *The handbook of discourse analysis* (pp. 352-371). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2009). Critical discourse studies: A socio-cognitive approach. In Ruth Wodak & Michael Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis* (pp. 62-86). London: Sage.
- Weyland, K. (2001). Clarifying a contested concept: Populism in the study of Latin American politics. *Comparative Politics*, 34(1), 1-22.
- Widdowson, H. G. (1998). The theory and practice of critical discourse analysis (Review article). *Applied Linguistics*, 19(1), 136-151.
- Widdowson, H. G. (2004). *Text, context, pretext. Critical issues in discourse analysis*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- 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). London: Sage.
- Wodak, R. (2009). Critical discourse analysis: History, agenda, theory, and methodology. In R. Wodak & Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (pp. 1-33). London: Sage.

- Wodak, R. (2015). *Politics of fear: What right-wing populist discourses mean*. London: Sage.
- Wodak, R. & Meyer, M. (2018). Critical discourse analysis: History, agenda, theory, and methodology. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (p. 1-32). London: Sage.