Critical Discourse Analysis: An Effective Tool for Critical Peace Education Informed by Freirean Dialogue

Gülistan GÜRSEL-BİLGİN[1]

Boğaziçi University

Abstract

This study emphasizes that research and practice regarding employing dialogue as transformative pedagogy should be investigated and cultivated by peace educators in ways relevant to various contexts. In this regard, Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) has a valuable potential to contribute to the development of this relatively new scholarly field by providing effective tools to problematize and analyze social practices. This paper explores critical peace education as it is informed by the dialogical method of emancipatory education, and scrutinizes the promising potential of CDA as an essential tool for on-going research in the field. Towards this goal, this paper includes two subsections. The first section discusses Freirean dialogue and his six preconditions (i.e., love, humility, faith, hope, trust, and critical thinking) as fundamental constructs for critical peace education. The second section explores how the theories, goals, and methods of CDA in current discourse studies connect to constructs in Freirean dialogue and peace education. This section concentrates on four prominent approaches developed by Scollon, Gee, Kress, and Fairclough to underline their key aspects from a Freirian dialogic perspective. The final section discusses the possible affordances and limitations for employing CDA in the study of critical peace education.

---

[1] Assist. Prof. Dr., Faculty of Education, Boğaziçi University, Istanbul, Turkey, ORCID: 0000-0002-9987-7982

Correspondence: gulistan.bilgin@boun.edu.tr

Introduction

Any situation in which some individuals prevent others from engaging in the process of inquiry is one of violence. The means used are not important; to alienate human beings from their own decision-making is to change them into objects. (Paulo Freire, Pedogogy of the Oppressed, 1970, p. 66)

Peace education, despite growing corpus of critical literature particularly over the past three decades (Page, 2008), still lacks a succinct conceptualization (Reardon, 2001; Harris and Morrison, 2003). The absence of an undisputed consensus on common definitions of peace, culture of peace, and peace education makes the practitioners' and researchers job slippery. Apart from this, the priority of form over content is more prominent in teaching peace than other subjects partially because in teaching peace "the medium is the message" (Navarro-Castro and Nario-Galace, 2010, p. 185). In peace education, learners frequently remember the informal and "hidden" lessons, not from the overt or stated curriculum, but from the attitudes, values, and actions of the teachers themselves within and outside of the classroom. Given that peace educators' medium must match their message, the way they address complexities of peace as well as their qualities and skills become crucial. Nevertheless, this aspect of peace education stays overlooked in the literature. New tools are needed in evaluating peace education practices in different contexts and developing research procedures towards achieving the goals of (critical) peace education.

Critical peace education refers to "issues of structural inequality and empirical study aimed towards local understandings of how participants can cultivate a sense of transformative agency" (Bajaj, 2008, p. 135). This relatively recent approach to peace education which has occurred as a result of employing critical pedagogy to realms and issues of peace education rests strongly upon the work of Paulo Freire in the field of critical pedagogy among other several notable scholars (e.g., Christoph Wulf, 1974; Lourdes Diaz Soto, 2005; Carl Carl Mirra, 2008; Ken Montgomery 2006). Freire's primary contribution to the field of critical pedagogy, and without doubt to critical peace education, are his core tenets. Besides dialogue and critical consciousness, these key concepts include, but not limited to, education as a political act, banking versus problem-posing education, teacher-student relationships, and praxis (Bartlett, 2008).

In an attempt to draw attention to the complexities of peace education research and practice in the existing schooling system, and to contribute to educational and social transformation, this paper explores critical peace education as it is informed by the dialogical method of emancipatory education, and scrutinizes the promising potential of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) as an essential tool for on-going research and evaluation in the field. Towards this goal, this paper includes particular subsections. The first section discusses Freirean dialogue and his six preconditions as fundamental constructs for critical peace education. The next section explores how the theories, goals, and methods

of CDA in current discourse studies connect to constructs in Freirean dialogue (e.g., six preconditions of effectual dialogue – namely, love, humility, faith, hope, trust, and critical thinking) and peace education. The following section concentrates on four prominent CDA approaches to underline their key aspects from a Freirian dialogic perspective. The final section discusses possible affordances and limitations for employing CDA in the study of critical peace education.

Freirean Dialogue for Critical Peace Education

This study advocates a reclaimed *critical peace education* that addresses issues of structural inequality and calls for empirical study aimed towards "local understandings of how participants can cultivate a sense of transformative agency" (Bajaj, 2008, p. 135). For the purposes of this paper, peace education is defined as educational policy, planning, pedagogy, and practice aiming the transformation of educational content, structure, and pedagogy to address direct and structural forms of violence at all levels (Harris, 2004; Reardon, 1988; Bajaj, 2008). Underscoring the call for renewed attention to and exploration of a critical peace education (Bajaj, 2008; Diaz-Soto, 2005; Mirra, 2008; Montgomery, 2006; Wulf, 1974), this part of the paper first examines the work and pedagogy of Paulo Freire as a powerful basis for critical peace education, and then discusses Freire's core tenet of dialogue as a tool to cultivate a nonviolent way of human existence for which peace educators strive.

Critical peace education, an evolving field of peace education, has occurred as a result of employing critical pedagogy to the realms and issues of peace education. This relatively recent approach to peace education rests strongly upon the work of Paulo Freire in the field of critical pedagogy among other several notable scholars (e.g., Christoph Wulf, 1974; Lourdes Diaz Soto, 2005; Carl Carl Mirra, 2008; Ken Montgomery 2006). Freire's primary contribution to the field of critical pedagogy, and without doubt to critical peace education, is his core tenets. Besides dialogue and critical consciousness, these key concepts include, but are not limited to, education as a political act, banking versus problem-posing education, teacher-student relationships, and praxis (Bartlett, 2008). Given that it is not within the scope of this paper to give a comprehensible analysis of the influence of Freire's work on critical peace education, his notion of dialogue and his six preconditions are briefly discussed below due to their fundamental potential to further critical peace education theory and practice.

Dialogue, an "overused and underexplained word ricocheting off the walls of the academia (Miller, 1998, p. 76), has a specific meaning in Freire's view. Paulo Freire, the Brazilian educator and dialogic theorist, describes dialogue as "the encounter between men, mediated by the world, in order to name the world" (Freire, 2013, p. 155). In his perspective, individuals in dialogue reflect on their reality to make and remake it. Thus, it is important to consider this moment a part of individuals' historical nature. Freire, as Cissna and Anderson (1998) suggest, illustrates skillfully how dialogue is a relation of co-constituted mutuality existing in a matter of moments when he writes,

> To the extent that we are communicative beings who communicate to each other as we become more able to transform our reality, we are able to know that we know, which is something more than just knowing. . . . Knowing is a social event with nevertheless an individual dimension. What is dialogue in this moment of communication, knowing and social transformation? Dialogue seals the relationship between the cognitive subjects, the subjects who know, and who try to know. (Shor & Freire, 1987, pp. 98-99)

Dialogue includes separate individuals; yet, it must be considered a non-individualistic process. Although it consists of transitory moments, experienced immediately, these moments cannot be ahistorical because they are reality defining, and even world making, for participants (Cissna and Anderson, 1998).

For Freire, individuals can engage in dialogue by establishing a horizontal relationship; he strongly contrasts dialogue with anti-dialogue, a vertical, unloving, acritical relationship as he associates anti-dialogue with the suppression of the other and its reduction to the status of an object (Rule, 2004). Given this, he decidedly identifies particular values that underpin the process of dialogue; namely, love, humility, faith, mutual trust, hope, and critical thinking (Freire, 1972; 1998c; 2013). These values are briefly explained below.

Love

Profound love for the world and for others, for Freire, is vital for dialogue to exist. Freire is convinced that true revolutionaries must perceive the revolution as an act of love for its creative and liberating nature. Therefore, as he efficaciously describes, "the naming of the world, which is an act of creation and re-creation, is not possible if it is not infused with love" (Freire, 2013, p. 158). Thus, love in Freirean dialogue is not only the basis of dialogue but also the foundation of other conditions for dialogue.

Given the prominence of love for dialogue, and thus for critical peace education, it is crucial that the way the process of naming the world by creating and re-creating everyday realities be thoroughly examined. Thank to its help in examining discourses in their broad social and historical contexts, CDA is exceptionally relevant to struggles for peace and justice.

Humility

In Freire's understanding, human beings' constant naming of the world to create and re-create that world cannot be an act of arrogance. That is because if the participants of dialogue lack humility, it is no longer dialogue. Individuals who lack humility cannot engage in dialogue because they cannot be partners with other individuals in naming the world. For those people who engage in acts of

arrogance, Freire's criticism is sharp. "Someone who cannot acknowledge himself to be as mortal as everyone else still has a long way to go before he can reach the point of encounter" (2013, p. 158).

An individual's "constant" naming of the world suggests renaming; thus, naming can never be completed. Therefore, it is vital to scrutinize what lies in the depths of each moment of naming and renaming of the world. At this point the role of CDA as a tool for organizing inquiry and guiding practice is indispensable (Karlberg, 2012).

Faith

Freire's concept of dialogue also necessitates an intense faith in humankind that involves faith in the power of human beings to make and re-make, to create and re-create. Faith is "a priori" condition for dialogue through which the humankind seeks to be more fully human (Freire, 2013, p. 158). In his understanding, the dialogical believes in others even before seeing them. Love indisputably "grounds these people as ends-in-themselves and makes faith possible" (Miller, 1998, p. 78). As the author maintains, faith is a facet of love as human beings can have faith only when they love. Given the eminence of faith in dialogue, and so in critical peace education, CDA can be an effective device in interpreting implicit structures of discourse (Karlberg, 2012).

Mutual Trust. For Freire, when dialogue involves the qualities of love, humility, and faith, mutual trust is an expected outcome. Otherwise, it would be a contradiction. Thanks to this climate of mutual trust, dialoguers can develop closer partnership in the naming of the world. The vertical or hierarchical banking concept of education, on the other hand, does not allow the establishment of mutual trust. Trust can be nourished when one party's words coincide with their actions; talking down or at people does not result in trust (Miller, 1998). However, given CDA's claim that social practices are shaped by power relations, the tools CDA provides can be helpful in analyzing and examining the complexities and challenges regarding building mutual trust.

Hope

Hope, tied into the incompleteness of human beings and their constant search for wholeness, is another central aspect of Freirean dialogue (Miller, 1998). For Freire, this search for wholeness can be carried out only in communication with others, in dialogue. Hopelessness, however, is denying the world, and fleeing from it. In this regard, dehumanization due to an unjust order can be a cause only for hope, not despair. Accordingly, "the encounter of men seeking to be more fully human," cannot be done in hopelessness (Freire, 2013, 159). That is because such an encounter will be "empty and sterile, bureaucratic and tedious" (p. 159). Thus, dialoguers cannot cross their arms and wait. As long as they struggle, they must be moved by hope. Analyzing and examining the complexities and challenges of establishing and maintaining critical dialogue involves hope because the tools of CDA can be helpful

in gaining awareness of the present difficulties, which should precede the transformation of present realities.

Critical thinking

The final attribute of true dialogue is critical thinking. Dialoguers must engage in critical thinking; otherwise, dialogue cannot exist. In Freire's understanding, critical thinking is "thinking which discerns an indivisible solidarity between the world and the people and admits of no dichotomy between them" (Freire, 2013, p. 159). In this type of thinking, reality is perceived as reality as process, as transformation, rather than as a static entity. Critical thinking cannot be separated from action as it "constantly immerses itself in temporality without fear of the risks involved" (p. 159). The critical thinker, therefore, values the transformation of reality in his seeking of becoming fully human.

Freire's notion of dialogue constitutes an effective pedagogy to achieve the goals of critical peace education. Thus, his six preconditions of dialogue are of profound significance for everyone, especially (peace) educators, aspiring for becoming more while helping others to become more through dialogue. In Freire's words, education should strive for establishing "a world in which it is easier to love" (2005, p. 40). Hence, Freire's six preconditions for dialogue are a foundational capacity for peace educators who strive for a peaceful world. Despite its extraordinary potential to further critical peace education, employing Freirean dialogue efficiently is a challenging process. It must be understood as an authentic way of being rather than simply as a technique or type of communication (Rule, 2004). Hence, dialogical teaching inherently strives for creating a process of learning, and knowing that consistently involves theorizing the experiences shared in the dialogue process (Macedo, 2005). As Macedo (2005) cautions, educators who lose sight of this fact mistakenly transform Freire's notion of dialogue into a method only. In this regard, Freire's stand bears no ambiguity at all. He underlines the epistemological relationship of dialogue, and suggests that "dialogue is a way of knowing and should never be viewed as a mere tactic to involve students in a particular task" (Freire and Macedo, 1995, p. 379). In order to understand the meaning of dialogical practice, it is essential to put aside the simplistic understanding of dialogue as a mere *tactic for socializing*.

At this point, CDA stands out as a powerful tool to help realize the full potential of Freirean dialogue towards transforming education to create a non-violent world. Hence, a brief discussion of four major theories, goals, and methods of CDA in current discourse studies is provided below in order to illustrate its affordances for critical peace education practice.

Four CDA Approaches for Critical Peace Education

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), emerging in the early 1990s, is now an established paradigm which aims to investigate a linguistic unit as a social phenomenon (Wodak and Meyer, 2009). In most general terms, CDA scrutinizes social inequality as it is expressed, legitimized, and

(re)produced by language use (Wodak and Meyer, 2009). Within different approaches of CDA, the concept "discourse" is used to refer to different notions. It is often used for both written and oral text (i.e., in the English-speaking world) while it is distinguished from text in particular contexts (e.g., Central Europe) (Wodak and Meyer, 2009). For example, particular scholars who define "discourse" as structured forms of knowledge but "text" as concrete oral utterances or written documents (van Dijk, 1998; cited in Wodak and Meyer, 2009). In the most general sense, discourse may refer to a wide range of notions from a historical monument, a policy, text, talk, a speech, to topic-related conversations. To illustrate in relation with this paper's goals, we can suggest *peace discourse*, or *dialogue discourse*.

Given its perspective of language as social practice (Fairclough and Wodak, 1997), CDA considers language use in speech and writing (i.e., discourse) dialectically in relation with its context. Thus, a particular discursive event is inevitably shaped by the social structures surrounding it while it shapes them simultaneously. This perspective of discourse implies that discourse can potentially serve two distinct ends: it can either contribute to the reproduction of social status quo, or transform it (Fairclough and Wodak, 1997). The way it approaches status quo makes CDA particularly substantial for the goals of critical peace education and Freirean dialogue.

Another significant feature of CDA that makes it inherently valuable for critical peace education is its focus on power issues. Since discourse is so consequential, it gives rise to important issues of power. Discursive practices may have major ideological effects – that is, they can help produce and reproduce unequal power relations between individuals. Hence, the notion of power and the dynamics causing inequalities, status quo, domination and exploitation are central for CDA. As a result, CDA researchers explore how discourse produces and reproduces social domination (Wodak and Meyer, 2009). In this regard, Michel Foucault's (1975) ideas about how power is exercised continuously in daily social relations are foundational within CDA. Given that discourse is manifestation of social practice that is regulated by social structures, it is crucial to study the notion and dynamics of power that are mostly invisible.

CDA, since its emergence in 1990s, has grown into a wide, scholarly field to include a number of approaches. Despite their common goal of social analysis of discourse, each of these approaches varies in its theory, methodology, and perspective (Fairclough, 2012; Fairclough & Wodak 1997, Pêcheux M 1982, Wodak & Meyer 2001). The most prominent of these are the approaches developed by Scollon, Gee, Kress, and Fairclough. Each of these can contribute to employing Freirean dialogue for critical peace education from different aspects. Therefore, these approaches are briefly discussed below. Each of these approaches present particular tools and procedures in order to guide analysis. As it is not within the scope of this paper to discuss in detal all sets of tools and procedures suggested by

all four CDA approaches presented in this paper, only the tools and procedures suggested by dialectical-relational approach are briefly discussed as an example at the end of this section.

Mediated Discourse Analysis

Mediated Discourse Analysis (MDA), developed by Ron Scollon, seeks to develop a theoretical remedy for discourse analysis that operates without reference to social actions on the one hand, and social analysis that operates without reference to discourse on the other. Towards this goal, MDA focuses on social actors as they are acting because these are the moments in social life when the discourses in which we are interested are instantiated in the social world as social action, not simply as material objects (Scollon, 2001).

Concerned about discourse and human action in social change, MDA focuses on the mediated action as its unit of analysis. Drawn from neo-Vygotskian sociocultural psychology, mediated action is an action taken by a social actor through the use of mediational means (or cultural tools). MDA looks at actions with two questions in mind: What is the action going on here? and How does discourse figure into these actions? Essentially, MDA takes the position which social action and discourse are inextricably linked on the one hand (Choularaki and Fairclough, 1999). On the other hand, Scollon (2001) argues, "these links are sometimes not at all direct or obvious, and therefore in need of more careful theorization" (p. 1). As the problem MDA tries to engage is how we are to work out a way to understand the relationships among actions and the Discourse, its focus is on real-time, irreversible, one-time-only actions rather than objectivized, categorical analysis of types of action or discourses and texts. According to Scollon (2001), MDA links social practices to other practices, discursive and non-discursive, over time to form nexus of practice. Within this nexus of practice, a mediated action produces and reproduces social identities and social structures. Also, mediational means are multiple in any case and inevitably carry histories and social structures with them. This perspective of MDA framework is essential in order to analyze the social identities and social structures together with the histories social actors of a classroom because the practices of learners and their teachers are reproduction of their social identities and histories.

Sociocultural Approach

Drawing on three traditions – namely, American anthropological linguistics and narratives (Gumperz, 1982; Hymes, 1974; Labov & Waletzky, 1967; Scollon & Scollon, 1981); social discourse theories (Foucault, 1972, 1977; Latour, 1987); and cognitive psychology (Holand & Quinn; 1987; Lakoff & Johnson, 1980; Strauss & Quinn, 1997) – Gee's (1990) sociocultural approach to language suggests that when people speak or write, they are building social relationships, figured worlds, and identities. Thus, the question for the discourse analyst to ask is "What sign systems are being used to accomplish social goals?" Gee presents social languages, figured worlds and identities – among others

– as "tools of inquiry." As he asserts, these are the social and cultural frameworks to understand the way people utilize language to accomplish social goals. "Social languages" as an inquiry tool refers to grammar and function of language as a social practice. As such, grammar is something which people design to create certain identities and social relationships (Rogers, 2011). Another significant term in this approach is "figured worlds," which Gee (2011) views as the narratives and images that different social and cultural groups of people use to make sense of the world. Integrating Gee's perspective in the process of peace-making allows us to approach a moment in a peace studies classroom with larger lenses. This way, we can connect the study of peace education to the global social, economic, cultural, religious, and political issues, and see what stands beyond the walls of the classroom.

Multimodality

Kress, a preeminent scholar of visual and multimodality studies, provides his definition of mode. In his dynamic view of this notion, ''. . . mode is a matter for a community and its social-representational needs. What a community decides to regard and use as mode is mode. [. . .] Formally, what counts as mode is a matter of what a social-semiotic theory of mode requires a mode to be and to do'' (Kress, 2010, p. 87, emphasis, in original). Thus, communication is inevitably multimodal. He also asserts that each mode offers particular potentials and limitations for communication. These two attributes of each mode make it essential to consider all modes that are active in a given moment of communication (Kress & van Leeuwen, 1996; 2001). Given that language is one mode of meaning-making, it is crucial to study all resources available in a given social group at a given time because each of these equally contributes to the process of meaning-making. Therefore, he takes multimodality as the normal state of human communication. Among a number of dimensions of mediated meaning-making, he particularly emphasizes visuals and language as two central modes. He differentiates between the analysis of images and analysis of artistic images. In his understanding, linguistic text and images are both fundamental systems of meaning making but each has its own specific forms. Therefore, they are independent form each other (Kress & van Leeuwen, 1997). Interested in the pedagogic dimensions of multimodality, Kress' work draws attention to meaning, meaning-making, the agency of meaning-makers and the constant (re-)constitution of identity in sign- and meaning-making. He questions the (social) limitations faced in the process of meaning-making. He explores how knowledge is produced and reproduced through various modes and by whom (Kress, 2011). Kress' work, particularly his emphasis on how structures of multimodal communication are representations of ideologies and power relations, has an outstanding potential to help critical peace education address what lies beneath the visible.

Dialectical-Relational Approach

Norman Fairclough, considering the various senses the term *discourse* is used to refer to, prefers the term *semiosis*. He finds the latter more advantageous as it suggests that discourse analysis addresses several semiotic modalities which include not only language but also visual images and body language (Fairclough et al., 2004). According to Fairclough (2009), semiosis (discourse), as an element of social process, is *dialectically* related to other elements in the sense that semiosis, like other elements of social process, is different but not discrete or fully separate. As Harvey (1996) puts it, each of these elements internalizes the others but is not reducible to them. For example, social relations, beliefs and cultural values, power, and institutions are partially semiotic; they internalize it but cannot be reduced to it. In parallel with this, Fairclough (2009) suggests that semiosis internalizes all the other elements without being reducible to them.

Given that CDA inherently addresses how semiotic and other social elements are related, dialectical-relational approach to CDA proposes a transdisciplinary research by bringing disciplines and theories together to conduct effective research. In this approach to CDA, several frameworks are integrated to form a dialogue to foster theoretical and methodological improvement of each of them. Towards this goal, the general question the dialogical-relational approach is to address is "what is the particular significance of semiosis, and of dialectical relations between semiosis and other social elements, in the social processes (issues, problems, changes, etc.) which are under investigation?" (Fairclough, 2009, p. 166). Hence, Fairclough (2001, p. 123) sees CDA as the "analysis of the dialectical relationships between semiosis (including language) and other elements of social practices," and emphasizes three broad ways semiosis figures in social practices. Firstly, semiosis figures as part of the social activity within a practice. To illustrate, individuals – or social actors – use language in a particular way because of their job. Therefore, interviews or political speeches can be considered examples of *genre* (the term Fairclough uses to refer to this aspect of semiosis) because individuals interviewing or giving a political speech frame discourse in a particular way. An audience comprehend and interpret interviews and political speeches according to the characteristics of the genre. According to Fairclough (2001, 2003), genres as significant ways of (inter)acting discoursally can provide the framework to maintain power and domination. Thus, this aspect of semiosis is particularly prominent for Critical Peace Education as its ultimate goal is to scrutinize the ways violence (which is not so visible most of the time) is maintained in the society. Secondly, semiosis figures in representations (produced by social actors within the practice); thus, *discourses* are ways of representing. Different discourses may represent a particular aspect of the world from different perspectives. In real life, individuals may experience this as conflicts. Fairclough (2003) exemplifies this concept as the political discourse of New Labor as opposed to the political discourse of "old" Labor (p. 26). Thirdly, semiosis figures in the performances of social actors who operate in positions within social practices. He refers to this discoursal aspect as *styles*. Styles involve individuals' social

and personal identities. Hence, individuals with differing characteristics may produce differing performances of a particular position through a particular way of discourse and behavior. For example, as an individual with a particular identity uses language in a particular way, he or she can portray a particular type of manager. Consequently, researchers can see *genres* (ways of interacting), *discourses* (ways of representing), and *styles* (ways of being) through texts. Fairclough (2003, p. 28) asserts,

> Genres, discourse and styles are respectively relatively stable and durable *ways* of acting, representing and identifying. They are identified as elements of orders of discourse at the level of social practices. When we analyze specific events, we are doing two interconnected things: (a) looking at them in terms of the three aspects of meaning. Action, Representation and Identification, and how there are realized in the various features of texts (their vocabulary, their grammar, and so forth): (b) making a connection between the concrete social event and more abstract social practices by asking, which genres, discourse, and styles are drawn upon here, and how are the different genres, discourses and styles articulated together in the text?

Dialectical-relational approach: tools, levels, and procedures

CDA has a significant potential in understanding structured inequalities and hidden violence. Rogers (2011) puts special emphasis on Fairclough (1992)'s approach in that it identifies how discourse not only functions to produce and reproduce society through its social structures, relationships, and value structures, but also has a hand in transforming society. Regarding the dialectic between individual agency and social structure, Fairclough (1992) affirms, "Discourse as a political practice establishes, sustains and changes power relations, and the collective entities between which power relations obtain. Discourse as an ideological practice constitutes, naturalizes, sustains and changes significations of the world from diverse positions in power relations" (p.67). Hence, in order to unpack what lies in the depths of a part of discourse, Fairclough (2001) suggests five stages to guide researchers employing his approach.

In this approach of CDA, there are three levels of social realty: social structures, practices, and events. While unpacking these three levels of social process, five initial stages to guide the researchers are suggested (Fairclough, 2001). Step one refers to focusing on a social wrong, in its semiotic aspect. Thus, this approach of CDA is problem-based. Having emancipatory objectives, this approach concentrates on social problems which result in 'losers' in particular forms of social life (e.g., the poor, the socially excluded, those subject to oppressive gender and race relations).

Step two relates to identifying obstacles to addressing the social wrong. In other words, it is crucial to concentrate on "the way in which social life is structured and organized that makes this a problem which is resistant to easy resolution?" (Fairclough, 2001, p. 125). According to Fairclough (2001), the obstacles are related to the social structuring of semiotic differences in orders of discourse. To illustrate, he asserts, the way in which managerial discourse has colonized public service domains such as education. These obstacles are also connected with dominant ways of interacting. Thus, in

order to reveal these obstacles, researchers should focus on both the structuring of orders of discourse and what goes on in particular interactions. Towards analyzing these obstacles, Fairclough suggests two aspects: interdiscursive analysis (how do particular types of interaction articulate together different genres, discourses, and styles?), and linguistic and other forms of semiotic analysis (e.g., analysis of visual images).

Step three refers to considering whether the social order 'needs' the social wrong. Linking "is" to "ought," this stage arises the question "in what sense might the social order 'need' this?" (Fairclough, 2009, p. 170). This way, it leads the researcher to consider the social wrong is inherent to the social order or whether it can be changed as this social wrong is the source of the problem.

Step four suggests identifying possible ways past the obstacles (Fairclough, 2013). Therefore, the focus of the analysis moves from negative to positive. Towards this goal, the dialectical relations between semiosis and other elements are analyzed. This way, the obstacles, whether they are in organized political or social groups or in the ordinary working, social and domestic lives of individuals, are challenged and possibilities to overcome these obstacles are considered.

The final stage involves reflecting on the analysis to ask, for example, the effectiveness of the critique and whether it leads to social emancipation.

Conclusions

This paper discusses critical peace education as it is informed by the dialogical method of emancipatory education and scrutinizes the promising potential of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) as an essential tool for on-going research in the field. Peace educators and peace scholars would do well to develop a critical peace education which will effectively address the social inequalities and issues of power because it would be a waste of time to try to build a culture of peace upon a culture of violence and oppression. Literature on the dramatic potential of CDA for critical peace education abounds (e.g., Meadows, 2009; Gavriely-Nuri, 2012; 2014; Hartley, 2010; Amer, 2012; van Zoonen, Vis, & Mihelj, 2010; Machin, & Van Leeuwen, 2009). Drawing on various theories, and employing several approaches to CDA, these studies, like several others, call for further research to provide a deeper analysis of socially constructed, and mostly not so overt, drivers of violence and oppression. They also successfully illustrate how CDA provides effective tools and designs to scrutinize violence in multiple levels.

Two possible limitations in employing CDA for critical peace education should be acknowledged. Firstly, the existence of numerous approaches to CDA might be confusing for researchers as they might find it challenging to decide which approach to employ for what kind of peace research. In fact, this is one of the advantages of CDA. Each approach presents its own benefits to uncover particular aspects of social wrong. As research is learned in the process itself, the more

experience and insights researchers gain about the process, the easier it will be to know which approach will work best for what purposes. Another possible limitation might be that CDA is an evolving paradigm with all its approaches in the process of development (e.g., Fairclough's dialectical-relational approach). This might be demanding for some researchers who are willing to apply it for critical peace education which is itself a relatively new field of scholarship. This is also another advantage in its depth because researchers can contribute to its evolution and maturation with their own insights and knowledge.

In short, towards fulfilling the goals of peace educators, Freirean dialogue and his six preconditions, namely love, humility, faith, hope, trust, and critical thinking, provides an exceptional foundation to address social wrongs in a constructive way while teaching individuals to engage in dialogue fruitfully. However, this is not an easy task. It is especially challenging to employ dialogue effectively (Macedo, 2005). Critical peace education enhanced with Freirean dialogue pedagogy must be employed together with CDA so that the process can be self-reflective while addressing power issues. Various approaches to CDA can enable researchers of the field to make visible what is seemingly hidden in all aspects of society.

References

Amer, M. (2012). The discourse of homeland: the construction of Palestinian national identity in Palestinian secularist and Islamist discourses. *Critical Discourse Studies*, 9(2).

Bajaj, M. (2008). Critical Peace Education. In M. Bajaj, (Ed.) Encyclopaedia of Peace Education. New York: Colombia Teacher's College.

Bajaj, M. (2010). The Politics, Praxis, and Possibilities of Critical Peace Education. Journal of Peace Education. 7(2).

Bartlett, L. (2008). Paulo Freire and peace education. *Encyclopedia of Peace Education*, Teachers College, Columbia University. Retrieved on May 13th 2014 from http://www.tc.columbia.edu/centers/epe/PDF%20articles/Bartlett_ch5_22feb08.pdf

Chouliaraki, L., & Fairclough, N. (1999) *Discourse in Late Modernity: Rethinking critical discourse analysis.* Edinburgh, UK: Edinburgh University Press.

Cissna, K. N. & Anderson, R. (1998).Theorizing about Dialogic Moments: The Buber-Rogers Position and Postmodern Themes. Communication Theory. Pp. 63-104.

Diaz-Soto, L. (2005). How can we teach peace when we are so outraged? A call for critical peace education. *Taboo: The Journal of Culture and Education, Fall-Winter*: 91-96.

Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analyzing Discourse: Textual Analysis for Social Research.* Routledge: London and New York.

Fairclough, N. & Wodak, R. 1997 Critical discourse analysis, in T. van Dijk (Ed.) Discourse as Social Interaction. London: Sage

Fairclough, N. (2001).The dialectics of discourse. *Textus XIV*, pages 231-242.

Fairclough, N. (2012). Critical discourse analysis. International Advances in Engineering and Technology (IAET) Vol.7 July 2012 International Scientific Researchers (ISR). Retrieved in May 13th 2014 from http://scholarism.net/FullText/2012071.pdf

Fairclough, N. 2009b A dialectical-relational approach to critical discourse analysis in social research. In M. Meyer & R. Wodak (Eds.) *Methods in Critical Discourse Analysis*. 2nd edition. London: Sage

Fairclough, N., Graham, P., Lemke, J. & Wodak, R. (2004). Introduction. *Critical Discourse Studies* 1(1): 1-7.

Foucault, M. (1972). *The archeology of knowledge and the discourse on language.* New York: Pantheon Books.

Foucault, M. (1975). *Discipline and Punish: the Birth of the Prison*, New York: Random House.

Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison*. New York: Pantheon.

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed.* London, Penguin.

Freire, P. (1972). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Freire, P. (1998c) Teachers as CulturalWorkers: Letters to those who dare teach. Boulder, CO,Westview Press.

Freire, P. (2005) *Education for Critical Consciousness.* New York: Continuum International Publishing Group.

Freire, P. (2013). Pedagogy of the oppressed. In D. J. Flinders and S. J. Thornton (Eds.). *The curriculum studies reader*. New York: Routledge.

Freire, P., Macedo, D. (1995). "A Dialogue: Culture, Language, and Race" in *Harvard Educational Review,* vol. 65, no. 3.

Gavriely-Nuri, D. (2012). Cultural approach to CDA. *Critical Discourse Studies*, 9(1), 77-85.

Gavriely-Nuri, D. D. (2014). 'Taking peace – Going to war': Peace in the service of the Israeli just war rhetoric. *Critical Discourse Studies*, 11(1), 1-18.

Gee, J (2011). *How to do discourse analysis: A tool kit*. New York. Routledge.

Gee, J. (1990). *Social linguistics and literacies: Ideology and discourses*. New York: Falmer.

Gumperz, J. 81982). *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge University Press. Cambridge, UK:

Harris, I. (2004). Peace education theory. *Journal of Peace Education, 1*(1): 5-20.

Harris, I. M. & Morrison, M. L. (2003) *Peace education*. McFarland Company, Inc., Publishers.

Hartley, J. (2010). Silly citizenship. *Critical Discourse Studies*, 7(4), 233-248.

Harvey, D. (1996). *Justice, Nature and the Geography of Difference*. Oxford: Blackwell

Holand, D., & Quinn, N. (Eds.). (1987). *Cultural models in language and thought*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Hymes, D. (1974). *Foundations of sociolinguistics*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Kress, G., van Leeuwen (2001). *Multimodal Discourse - The Modes and Media of Contemporary Communication*. London: Arnold.

Kress, G., van Leeuwen, T. (1997). *Reading images: The grammar of visual design*. London: Routledge.

Kress, G. (2010) *Multimodality: A Social Semiotic Approach to Contemporary Communication*. London: Routledge.

Kress, G. (2011) Multimodal discourse analysis, in J.P. Gee and M. Handford (eds.) *Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. New York and London: RoutledgeFalmer.

Kress, G.R., van Leeuwen, T. (1996). *Reading Images: the grammar of graphic design*. London: Routledge

Labov, W., & Waletzky, J. (1967). Narrative Analysis: Oral versions of person experiences. In J. Helm (Ed.) *Essays on the verbal and visual arts: Proceedings of the 1966 Annual Spring Meeting of the American Ethnological Society*. Seattle: University of Washington Press.

Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Latour, B. (1987). *Science in action*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Macedo, D. (2005). Introduction to the anniversary edition. P. Freire. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. Continuum International Publishing Group.

Machin, D., Van Leeuwen, T. (2009). Toys as discourse: children's war toys and the war on terror. *Critical Discourse Studies*, 6(1), 51-63.

Meadows, B. (2009). Capital negotiation and identity practices: investigating symbolic capital from the 'ground up'. *Critical Discourse Studies*, 6(1), 15-30.

Meyer, M. & Wodak R. (2009). *Methods in Critical Discourse Analysis*. 2nd edition. London:Sage

Miller, G. D. (1998). *Negotiating Toward Truth: The Extinction of Teachers and Students*. The Netherlands: Value Inguiry Book Series.

Mirra, C. (2008). *U.S. Foreign Policy and the Prospects for Peace Education.*Jefferson, NC: McFarland Press.

Montgomery, K. (2006). Racialized hegemony and nationalist mythologies: Representations of war and peace in high school history textbooks, 1945-2005. *Journal of Peace Education, 3*(1): 19-37.

Navarro-Castro, L., Nario-Galace, J. (2010). *Peace education: A pathway to a culture of peace*. The Center for Peace Education at Miriam College, Quezon City, Philippines.

Page, James S. (2008) *Peace Education: Exploring Ethical and Philosophical Foundations*. Charlotte: Information Age Publishing.

Pêcheux (M.). 1982. *Language, Semantics and Ideology.* London: Macmillan.Wodak (R.) & Meyer (M.) 2001. *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis.* London: Sage.

Reardon, B. (1988). *Comprehensive peace education*. New York and London: Teachers College Press.

Reardon, Betty (2001). *Education for a Culture of Peace in a Gender Perspective*. UNESCO.

Rogers, R. (2011). *An introduction to critical discourse analysis in education*. New York and London: Routledge.

Rule, P. 2004. Dialogic spaces; adult education projects and social engagement. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, 23(4): pp.319–334.

Scollon, R. (2001). *Mediated discourse: The nexus of practice*. London: Routledge.

Scollon, R., & Scollon, S. (1981). *Narrative, literacy and face in interethnic communication*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Scollon, R., & Scollon, S. W. (2002). Why do we need nexus analysis? Talk given at the PARC Forum, Thursday, December 12, 2002. Palo Alto, California.

Strauss, C., & Quinn, N. (1997). *A cognitive theory of cultural meanings*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

van Zoonen, L., Vis, F., & Mihelj, S. (2010). Performing citizenship on YouTube: activism, satire and online debate around the anti-Islam video Fitna. *Critical Discourse Studies*, 7(4).

Wodak, R., Meyer, M (2001). *Methods of critical discourse analysis*. London: Sage.

Wulf, C. (1974). *Handbook of peace education*. Frankfurt, Germany: International Peace Research Association.