Ideological Implications in Julia Gillard's Speech on Immigration: A Critical Discourse Analysis

Rajaa Mardan Flayih

English Department, College of Education, Al-Qadisiah University, Diwaniah, Iraq.

rajaa.flayih@qu.edu.iq

Abeer Ibrahim Taifoor

English Department, College of Education, Al-Qadisiah University, Najaf, Iraq.

abeer.alabudi@yahoo.com

Abstract

The production of any written or spoken text differs from one person to another as a result of personal motivations, political/social attitudes and ideologies. Each group seeks to express its ideological thoughts to convince others, using different strategies to achieve this aim. Implication is one of the ideological strategies used by Julia Gillard, the former Prime Minister of Australia. The present study is an attempt to detect implication in her speech. To accomplish this aim, the paper starts with a theoretical background that explains Critical Discourse Analysis, ideology and sociocognitive approach. It proceeds to analyze Gillard's speech depending on van Dijk's sociocognitive approach. The study concludes that Gillard tends to express her ideology implicitly. It also reveals that implication can be expressed through other ideological strategies mainly that of positive self-/negative other-presentation.

Key words: ideology, implication, CDA, political discourse, sociocognitive approach.

التضمينات الإيديولوجية في خطاب جوليا جيلارد حول الهجرة: تحليل الخطاب النقدي

الخلاصة

يختلف نتاج فكر أي نص مكتوب أو منطوق من شخص لآخر نتيجة لاختلاف الدوافع الشخصية والمواقف السياسية والإجتماعية والإيديولوجيات. تسعى كل مجموعة اجتماعية للتعبير عن ايديولوجيتها واقناع الآخرين بها بإستخدام إستراتيجيات مختلفة. إن إستراتيجية التضمين واحدة من هذه الاستراتيجيات الأيديولوجية التي استخدمتها جوليا جيلارد، رئيسة وزراء أستراليا السابقة.   ان الدراسة الحالية محاولة للكشف عن التضمين في خطابها قيد الدراسة. لتحقيق هذا الهدف تبدأ الدراسة بإطار نظري يشرح تحليل الخطاب النقدي والإيدولوجيا والنهج الاجتماعي المعرفي، ثم تشرع في تحليل خطاب جيلارد اعتمادا على نهج فان دايك الاجتماعي المعرفي. تخلص الدراسة إلى أن جيلارد تسعى للتعبير عن أيديولوجيتها ضمنياً. كما وتظهر الدراسة انه يمكن التعبير عن التضمين من خلال استراتيجيات اخرى خاصة استراتيجية عرض ايجابية الذات وسلبية الاخر .

الكلمات المفتاحية: الايديولوجيا، التضمين، التحليل النقدي للخطاب، الخطاب السياسي، النهج الاجتماعي المعرفي.

Introduction

The 'implication strategy' is studied at the pragmatic level of the semantic macrostructures theory. It can be seen as an ideological strategy to indirectly express the intended meaning of a discourse. Depending on event models, discourse producers can choose the appropriate expressions to express their underlying ideologies. Through context models, recipients can get the implied meaning of the discourse. These two types of models represent the discourse processing. The present study tries to answer the following questions:

1. How does Gillard express ideology concerning immigration?

2. What is the relation of ideological strategies to microstructures?

3. What is the impact of mental models on the ideologically biased discourse?

1. Theoretical Background

1.1 Discourse and Critical Discourse Analysis

As a social practice, discourse enables people to do things, such as blaming, apologizing, praising, positive self-presentation, etc.[1] Widdoson states that discourse "is the pragmatic process of meaning negotiation" because the effect of discourse is identified within the context[2]. More precisely, discourse is viewed as "language above the sentence or above the clause". Discourse is also viewed in relation to its topic/theme such as immigration, economy, education, health, etc.[3] For Fowler, it is a sort of ideology embedded socially and institutionally as a form of language. Thus, it is seen in an ideological sense.[4] Foucault states that discourses are "practices which systematically form the objects of which they speak".[5] In this regard, the political discourse can be conceived within the political context and covers the linguistic and semiotic aspects.[6] According to van Dijk, the linguistic aspect of discourse mainly includes syntactic, semantic, stylistic, pragmatic and rhetorical levels.[7]

In fact, Critical Discourse Analysis (henceforth CDA), as a form of analysis to study discourse, is a multidisciplinary framework based on functional systemic linguistics, critical linguistics, classical rhetoric, text grammar, literary theory, applied linguistics and sociolinguistics. It touches upon all areas that are related to the study of language.[8]

However, CDA tries to scrutinize the obscure relationships between discourse and events in practices conditioned by a sociocultural context.[9] These relationships are represented by cognition as a mediator between discourse structures and those of society. Mental models represent this cognitive mediation.[10]According to Fairclough, CDA is "a theory and method for studying language in its relation to power and ideology", where ideology is represented through the form and meaning of the discourse.[9]

For van Dijk, CDA is "a-critical-perspective on doing scholarship…with an attitude". Its criticality concerns addressing social problems which result from the misuse of power and control.[11] In this regard, Fairclough, Mulderrig and Wodak view CDA as a "problem-oriented interdisciplinary research movement", covering

various methods and theories.[12] However, its criticality is not conceived in the negative sense, but refers to discovering the relation "between ideas and their social conditions of possible existence",[13] or it may refer to the criticism of social practices such as discourse.[14]

The essential aim of CDA, thus, is to study discourse characteristics above the mere sentences to include "texts, discourses, conversations or communicative events".[15] It also aims at determining and discovering the underlying aspects such as hegemony, dominance, prejudices and power in discourse.[16]

Political Discourse (henceforth PD), in the broader sense, covers various talks and texts within the political context. Examples of PD are political campaign rallies, inaugural speeches, public speeches, and bills. In this respect, it is one type of discourse which is subjected to two criteria. The first one is functional. It refers to "the result of politics and it is historically and culturally determined" to accomplish different functions. The second one is thematic, i.e. the themes are fundamentally connected with political activities, ideas, relations, etc. [17] As such, the present study tries to analyze a political speech by Gillard.

Therefore, to study PD is to analyze it semantically and pragmatically. To achieve this goal, the present study depends on van Dijk's theory of semantic macrostructures (1980) and mental models theory (2003). Moreover, to analyze the polarized underlying ideology of Gillard's speech, van Dijk's theoretical concept of ideological square (1998) has been adopted. Accordingly, any choice of linguistic, semantic, stylistic or pragmatic properties is ideologically conditioned.[18]

Van Dijk's essential goal is to spell out the linkage among discourse, cognition and society. His approach aims at analyzing the macrostructures (theme or general meanings) and microstructures (lexicons, syntax, pragmatic level, rhetorical level; local meanings). The present study is mainly concerned with the pragmatic level of the microstructures. Pragmatically, it puts an emphasis upon mental models and their roles because they have components such as (knowledge, ideology and attitudes). [19]

1.2 Ideology

Ideology represents a collection of beliefs and ideas held by a person or a group of persons. It is "constructions of reality... which are built into various dimensions of the forms and meanings of discursive practices" to (re)produce or transform power relation.[20] For Wodak and Meyer , ideology is "an (often) one-sided perspective or worldview composed of related mental representations, convictions, opinions, attitudes, and evaluations". It is a self-serving phenomenon manifested in the structure of discourse.[21]

Fairclough states that ideologies are embedded in discourse, hence, they cannot be easily "read off" for "meanings are produced through interpretations of texts".[20] Ideologies are mentally as well as socially characterized.[22] They are related to a group of individuals and, thus, placed in the social mind. Therefore, CDA tries to show how a discourse "gains power when used by powerful people". This power is the result of the underlying ideologies of discourse producers.[8]

1.3 Sociocognitive Approach

Developed by van Dijk, the approach is concerned with discovering the link between discourse, cognition and society. The present study is based on the theory of mental models and semantic macrostructures theory, in addition to the strategy of ideological square.

1.3.1 Cognition as a Dimension of Sociocognitive Approach

Cognition generally refers to the mental activities connected with memory, thinking, knowledge, problem-solving and so on and represents the link between discourse and society. According to van Dijk, cognition is of two kinds: personal and social[23]. By means of the personal cognition, discourse is individually produced and understood, whereas the social cognition refers to the way the discourse is socially shared by group members. Knowledge and mental models are examples of personal cognition. Ideologies and attitudes are examples of social cognition.[23] Language users drive their personal cognition from that which is socially shared to produce and understand a discourse. [24]

Van Dijk assumes that macrostructures are the result of "cognitive principles operating in the ways we process this kind of highly complex information from the social situation". He focuses on the role of social cognition in discourse processing. Thus, the socio-cognitive mediation, represented by ideology, is fundamental to explain interaction and language use.[25]

In this regard, knowledge, as a category of context models, plays a vital role in the production and understanding of discourse. Depending on knowledge device, speakers/writers do not state everything they know, but leave some information implicit to be inferred by the recipients. Van Dijk, in his approach, tries to explain the way political knowledge, ideology and discourse are located in memory. To achieve this task, he theorizes the notion of mental models to spell out the discourse production and comprehension. [26]

1.3.2 Mental Models Theory

Mental models refer to the "representations in episodic memory and may simply be identified with people's experiences". Such models may be biased and hence cause a biased discourse. That is, discourse ideological features, such as themes, lexical style, syntactic style, and so on, may arise resulting from such biased models. [27]

The mental models (event and context models) theory is based on cognitive psychology of discourse processing. It states that these models are stored in the episodic memory just like any other personal experiences. These mental models are hierarchly structured in such a way that the main components come first and then the minor ones. These components are "a spatiotemporal setting, participants with different identities, roles and relations, aims, and an action or event" which are similar to discourse structures.[23] Mental models mediates between discourse and social representations such as attitudes, ideologies since they are not similar. Thus, there is an indirect relationship between them. They are affected by people's ideologies which in turn may be manifested in discourse processing.[27]

There are event models and context models. The first kind is called semantic models which refer to the representations of specific events or acts, in language users' mind, the discourse is about. These representations are symbolized through the language properties.[28] Every individual has an event model which is different from that of others. For this reason, there are no similar discourses.[27]

The second kind is context models or pragmatic models[24] of the situation in which language users engage. They depend on the knowledge of discourse participants. Thus, not all information is expressed in discourse. Some information is left implicit to be inferred by discourse recipients depending on their communicative knowledge. In other words, such a kind of mental models refers to the appropriateness of the selected information.[23]

According to van Dijk, analyzing discourse demands participants' general or particular knowledge "*of the communicative situation*" to comprehend its meaning. To do so, cognitive mediation, represented by mental models, plays a vital role to specify the knowledge kind needed to spell out the linkage and coherence of discourse. Knowledge is the main category in the context models to explain the meaning of discourse, especially implicit meaning. So, the appropriateness of discourse properties depends on the subjective interpretation of the communicative situation by participants.[25]

To manage the use of such knowledge, van Dijk assumes that the K-device in discourse is a pragmatic device according to which discourse properties are identified.[29] It is used to spell out connotations such as implicature, presupposition, or inferences. He states that:

Since knowledge of participants is crucial for all discourse processing as well as in all talk in interaction, its use is part of the communicative situation. Hence, context models have a special *knowledge device* (k-device), which at each moment of discourse processing 'calculates' what knowledge is (already) shared by the recipients, and hence is common ground that may be presupposed, and asserted.[10]

This K-device may be activated by sociocultural knowledge of persons in an epistemic community as an interface between discourse and society. It enables discourse participants to construct subjective personal event models through which they can produce and understand different kinds of discourse about different events they engage in.[23]

1.3.3 Semantic Macrostructures Theory

According to the Theory of Semantic Macrostructures, van Dijk assumes that discourse can be analyzed at two levels; macro and micro. The first analyzes the overall meaning of discourse such as themes or topics. The second deals with the linguistic levels of discourse such as semantic, syntactic, pragmatic, and rhetorical levels. The present study concerns the micro-levels of analysis, and especially the pragmatic one, to analyze the strategy of implication.[25]

At this level, discourse producers try to positively present themselves by explicitly expressing their good properties and the negative of others, on the one hand, and hiding their negative ones and the positive of others, on the other. Sometimes they implicitly express the bad properties of the others for the sake of face-keeping .[30]

This polarized representation stems from discourse participants' ideologies which van Dijk (1998) calls 'ideological square'. The implication is one of the sub-strategies used to express this ideological polarization.[18]

1.3.4 Ideological Square Strategy

Ideologies are polarized between a positive self-presentation of the ingroup members and a negative other-presentation of the outgroup.[31]

This overall strategy is the core of the other 25 ideological strategies. Van Dijk labels this strategy 'ideological square' because of its four fold formula which is illustrated in the following table: [31]

Table (1) Ideological Square

	Positive	Negative
Us/ Our	Emphasize our good properties/actions	Mitigate our bad properties/actions
Them/ Their	Mitigate their good properties/actions	Emphasize their bad properties/actions

As such, van Dijk assumes that "ideological discourse is generally organized by a general strategy of *positive self-presentation* (boasting) and *negative other-presentation* (derogation)".[32]

1.3.5 Other Strategies

Beside the overall strategy of ideological square, van Dijk sets out other ideological strategies including; actor description, authority, burden (topos), categorization, comparison, consensus, counterfactuals, disclaimer, euphemism, evidentiality, example/illustration, generalization, hyperbole, implication, irony, lexicalization, metaphor, national self-glorification, norms and values expression, numbers game, polarization, populism, presupposition, vagueness and victimization.[31]

The present study focuses on implication. According to van Dijk, the implication is related to the domain of meaning. It is the derivation of the implicit meaning from discourse words and phrases, depending on social knowledge as a part of mental models. Moreover, it can be expressed by utilizing other ideological strategies.[31]

2.1 Data Analysis:

Julia Gillard is the former Prime Minister of Australia 2010-2013. Her Speech "*Moving Australia Forward* ", was delivered on 6 July 2010 to the Lowy Institute on Labor's new asylum-seeker policy for Australia. The speech is to be analyzed according to van Dijk's approach with the focus on the strategy of implication.[#]

Throughout her speech, Gillard quotes Mr. Burnside's statement; *"Mr. Burnside said: I challenge Julia Gillard to point out to the public that at the current rate of arrivals it would take about 20 years to fill the MCG with boat people.' He went on to refer to certain Australians as: 'Rednecks in marginal seats"*, to be more reliable in

her speech. Then, she comments on the quoted speech saying that "*On the first point Mr. Burnside is very, very right...On the second point he is very, very wrong*". In this respect, she wants to show how Mr. Burnside describes her group members **negatively**. At the same time, she **implies** that her group has been **victimized** by Mr. Burnside by describing them as marginal rednecks.

In text like "*My opponent, Mr. Abbott, is good at slogans*", she **implies** that the member of others' group, Mr. Abbott, is not eligible to be a leader in the Australian government for his imaginary thoughts. For this reason, she **ironically** criticizes him as "*good at slogans*". Simultaneously, it is an **implication** to show that Gillard's party states only facts. It can be viewed as an implicit **positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation** strategy. She continues saying: "*The slogan is hollow and Mr. Abbott knows it. In his own policy document he says that the so-called turnaround of boats would only happen 'Where circumstances permit'* ", she intends to make clear that Mr. Abbott's government is unable to turn back the boats because he admits that this process is restrained with circumstances. Thus, she describes his slogan as "hollow". This is another indirect **negative presentation** of them. The same implication is expressed in her utterance "*It means respecting the anxieties that are held by many in our community, but basing our policy and our discussion on the facts, moving beyond the false promises and simplistic slogans*".

By saying: "*The facts are that this nation would then be confronted with a stark choice: either we could leave the scene in the certain knowledge people, including children would drown or we could rescue the asylum seekers from the water*" and "*our nation would not leave children to drown. We are Australians and our values will never allow us to embrace this kind of evil*", she **implies** that turning the boats back is the Other's policy. Gillard and her party reject such a policy and choose to help people seeking asylum as Australia's values demand. In this respect, she indirectly **presents** her group **positively** and the **others negatively**.

Through the strategy of **implication** expressed in; "*The other way, the path less travelled in recent times, is the path to move us forward together*", she tries to show that others hinder the moving of Australia forward. This can be seen as a **negative presentation** of the other political parties. Even though she rejects turning boats around, she **implies** that the arrival of boats is restrained by certain laws to allow fewer people to be accepted as asylum seekers. It can be viewed as a **positive self-presentation** which is expressed in; "*This number remained stable for many years and does not increase even when we face surges in boat arrivals. If more boats arrive, fewer people can be sponsored under our special humanitarian program*".

She **implies** the uselessness of the Pacific Solution to be followed in the present time. She says "*Australia was committed to the development of a sustainable, effective regional protection framework*". Thus, a regional framework is a better way to face the huge number of immigrants arriving at the Australian shores. Such a comparison can be viewed as a polarization to **negatively present** the Pacific Solution and **positively present** the regional framework.

The **implication** that the illegal arrival of immigrants would be prevented with the regional framework is found in; "*It is about stopping people getting in boats, but it is also about improving the protection outcomes for refugees by establishing a framework for orderly migration within the region*". It also **implies** that Gillard's

government mainly aims at saving people's lives by preventing people smuggling. Thus, it has an indirect **positive self-presentation** and **negative other-presentation**.

By means of **metaphor**, she **implies** that asylum seekers are dehumanized in the sense that they are seen as products, bought and sold. Thus, this text; "*The purpose would be to ensure that people smugglers have no product to sell. Arriving by boat would just be a ticket back to the regional processing centre*", can be viewed as an **implicit negative other-presentation** of the current policy. On the other side, the lexical item "*eligibility*", in the text like "*the UNHCR published its revised eligibility guidelines on Sri Lanka*", carries the **implication** of not allowing ineligible immigrants to settle in the regional center. Through such an implication, she **positively presents** the activities of her government for its fair policy of accepting immigration.

Concerning **the sustainable population policy**, she **implies** that Australia does not have the same resources of America, what makes Australia's population policy difficult to be legislated in comparison to America. This is expressed in the text *"We are very roughly the same size as America and we are a great country like America - but we are not America. We do not have the inland sprawling plains, fertile soils and cities for that kind of population*", where Australia is **compared** to America in size, but differentiated in terrain and population. Using the **hyperbolic** expressions "*In many faster growing parts of Australia*", to describe the fast growth of population, she **implies** that it is important to legislate sustainable population policy to avoid this disparity.

The text "*people would laugh if you told them population growth was intended to improve living standards*" has the **implication** that not all Australian people believe in sustainable population policy. Thus, it would take a long time to be achieved. She implies such a meaning through the use of rhetorical **irony**. By means of the **lexicalization** "*arbitrary*" in this text "*population policy should not be driven by an arbitrary single number*", she **implicitly** presents the current policy of population as a **negative** one for its arbitrariness. Thus, she implies to form a new policy that can run the present state of fast growth.

The main aim of her policy, in fact, is to protect the borders of Australia. Thus, the phrase "*Australia's border protection arrangement*", **implies** that Australia's borders are penetrated by the people's illegal entrance. So, it is crucial to put new rules for immigration to Australia for the sake of safety. This also implies that illegal immigration represents a threat to the country. The text; "*we are implementing the changes I have announced today based on the principles I have outlined. Moving forward means effective policy*", has the **implication** that only with the **effective policy** Australia can move forward.

As far as the **asylum seeker policy** is concerned, Gillard **implies** that the Australian parties are polarized. Some of them support it, others reject. Thus, she says "*the asylum seeker policy debate has been polarized by extreme, emotionally-charged claims and counterclaims*". This text "*a fundamental disrespect that I reject*" **implies** that Gillard is not with those who reject to support the asylum seeker policy. At the same time, she implies a **negative presentation** of those who refuse to support such a policy.

The dichotomy of Us/Them which is **implied** in the text "*I speak of the claim often made by Opposition politicians that they will, to quote: 'turn the boats back'* " refers to the disparity between Gillard's party and the other opposition parties respectively concerning the asylum seeker policy. In this text Gillard **implies** that the polarization between political parties is caused by the immigration issue. This is stated in; "*to an unedifying exchange of incendiary labels like 'red neck' and hollow slogans like 'turn the boats around', with nobody asking how we can move the nation forward*".

She indirectly criticizes Howard's government by means of **euphemistic** expressions "***only a handful***" in this text; "*Under John Howard, only a handful of boats were ever turned around*", to minimize the number of the turned back boats under his government. In her statement; "*Was it because the Howard Government suddenly lacked the resolve to turn the boats back?*", she **implies** that it is not easy to turn the boats back. Through the rhetorical question, she implies that Howard's government is not able to turn boats back.

Thus, in this text; "*the reality that to avoid being turned around boats are sabotaged raising safety of life at sea concerns for Australia's customs and border protection and defence personnel as well as the asylum*", she **implies** that saving the lives of immigrants is a social burden, and her government is responsible for keeping them saved.

Yet at the same time, she **implies** that helping asylum seekers should not mean distorting Australia's security and immigration policy, but to strengthen them because Australia's success depends on immigration policy success. This meaning is expressed in this text; "*but equally that there is nothing inconsistent between these decencies and our commitment to secure borders and fair, orderly migration*". In her saying: "*To stop the boats not at our shoreline, but before they even leave those far away port*", she **implies** that preventing more boats to arrive Australia can be accomplished with the regional help.

In this text; "*A regional solution with the participation of the UNHCR could prevent the piling up of authorised arrivals in detention in Australia*", she **implies** the important role of the regional solution in preventing the unauthorized arrivals to Australia. At the same time, she **implicitly** refers to preventing people smuggling

Gillard **implies** that immigrants, or more specifically refugees, are **categorized** into genuine and bogus. According to the regional framework, only genuine immigrants are allowed to stay in. Through an **implicit burden**, genuine refugees should learn the language of the hosting country, work hard and integrate their children in its schools. This text; "*I believe Australians are prepared to welcome those who are genuine refugees, but they also expect them to learn the rules under which we live and abide by those rules*", carries these meanings.

3. Conclusions

On the basis of the analysis of Gillard's speech, it is concluded that implication as an ideological strategy is pragmatic where Gillard and her recipients share the same knowledge about the policy of asylum seekers and population. The study concludes that Gillard expresses her ideology implicitly. It is also revealed that implication can be derived from other strategies such as hyperbole, irony, metaphor,

victimization, lexicalization, categorization, burden, euphemism, comparison, and positive self-/ negative other- presentation. The latter is the most used strategy. This explains the pragmatic nature of implication which suggests that implication is not stated in the discourse, but inferred from its context.

Reference

[1] R. Gill, "Discourse Analysis". In *Qualitative Researching with Test, Image And Sound*. M. Bauer, and G. Gaskell, Ed., London: Sage, 2000.

[2] M. Stubbs, *Discourse Analysis: The Sociolinguistic Analysis of Natural Language*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983.

[3] R. Fowler, *Language in the News: Discourse and Ideology in the Press*. London: Routledge, 1991.

[4] M. Foucault, *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. London: Tavistock, 1972.

[5] N. Fairclough , and R. Wodak, "Critical Discourse Analysis". In T. Van Dijk, *Discourse as Social Interaction*, vol. 2. London: Sage, 1997.

[6] T. Van Dijk, "Discourse as Structure and Process". In T. Van Dijk, Ed., *Discourse Studies: A Multidisciplinary Introduction*,vol.1. London: Sage, 1997b.

[7] R. Wodak, "What CDA is About: A Summary of its History, Important Concepts and Its Developments". In R. Wodak, and M. Meyer, Ed., *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Sage, 2001.

[8] N. Fairclough, *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language*. London: Longman, 1995.

[9] T. Van Dijk,. "Critical Discourse Studies: A Sociocognitive Approach". In Wodak, R. and M. Meyer, Ed., *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*, 3rd ed. London: Sage, 2015a.

[10] T. Van Dijk, "Critical Discourse Analysis". In D. Tannen, H. Hamilton and D. Schiffrin, Ed., *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*, vol.1 2nd ed. Chichester: Blackwell, 2015b. [Online]. Available: http://www.discourses.org/download/ articles. [Accessed: 14 April 14, 2017].

[11] N. Fairclough, J. Mulderrig, and R. Wodak, "Critical Discourse Analysis". In *Discourse Studies*, pp. 357-378, 2011.

[12] K. Halmkjaer, Ed., *The Linguistic Encyclopedia*. London: Routledge, 1991.

[13] M. Bloor, and T. Bloor, *The Practice of Critical Discourse Analysis: An Introduction*. London: Routledge, 2013.

[14] T. Van Dijk, *Discourse Studies*, vol.1.London:Sage, 2008.

[15] T. Van Dijk, "Critical Discourse Analysis". In D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen, and H. Hamilton, Ed., *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. 349-371. Cambridge: Blackwell, 2001.

[16] C. Schäffner, "Editorial: Political Speeches and Discourse Analysis". In C. Schäffner, Ed., *Analysing Political Speeches*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 1997.

[17] T. Van Dijk, "Discourse Analysis as Ideology Analysis". In *journal of Language and Pace*, pp. 17-36, Amsterdam: Harwood, 1995.

[18] R. Wodak and M. Meyer, "Critical Discourse Analysis: History, Agenda, Theory and Methodology". In R. Wodak, and M. Meyer, Ed., *Methods of critical discourse analysis*. 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks: Sage, 2009.

[19] N. Fairclough, *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1992.

[20] R. Wodak and M. Meyer, "Critical Discourse Studies: History, Agenda, Theory and Methodology". In R. Wodak, and M. Meyer, Ed., *Methods of Critical Discourse Studies*, 3rd ed. Los Angeles: Sage, 2015.

[21] T. Van Dijk, *Ideology : A Multidisciplinary Approach.* London : Sage, 1998.

[22] T. Van Dijk, "Discourse-Cognition-Society: Current State and Prospects of the Socio-Cognitive Approach to Discourse". In Hart and P. Cap, Ed., *Contemporary Studies in Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Bloomsbury, 2014. [Online]. Available: http:// www.discourses.org /download/ articles. [Accessed: April 14, 2017].

[23] M. Meyer, "Between Theory, Method, and Politics: Positioning of the Approaches to CDA". In R. Wodak, and M. Meyer, Ed., *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Sage, 2001.

[24] T. Van Dijk, *Macrostructures: An Interdisciplinary Study of Global Structures in Discourse, Interaction, and Cognition*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1980.

[25] P. Chilton, and C. Schaffner, "Introduction: Themes and Principles in the Analysis of Political Discourse". In P. Chilton, and C. Schaffner, Ed., *Politics as Text and Talk: Analytic Approaches to Political Discourse*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2002.

[26] T. Van Dijk, "Discourse, Ideology, and Context", vol.4, no.2., 2003.

[27] T. Van Dijk, and W. Kintsch, *Strategies of Discourse Comprehension*. New York: Academic Press, 1983.

[28] T. Van Dijk, "Contextual Knowledge Management in Discourse Production". In R. Wodak, and P. Chilton, Ed., *A New Agenda in (Critical) Discourse Analysis: Theory, Methodology and Interdisciplinarity*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 2005.

[29] T. Van Dijk, "What is Political Discourse Analysis?" In *Belgian Journal of Linguistics*, vol. 1, no. 11, pp. 11-52. , 1997a. [Online]. Available: https://scholars.google.com/citations? [Accessed: March 13,2017].

[30] T. Van Dijk, "Politics, Ideology, and Discourse". In R. Wodak, Ed., *Elsevier Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*. pp. 728-740, 2006a.

[31] T. Van Dijk, "Ideology and Discourse Analysis", *Journal of Political Ideologies*, vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 115-140, 2006b.

[#] http://www.theaustralian.com.au/archive/politics/julia-gillards-speech-to-the-lowy-institute-on-labors-new-asylum-seeker-policy-for-australia/story-e6frgczf-1225888445622 [Accessed at November 6, 2016]