

## **Exploring Ideologies of Function Words in George Orwell's *Animal Farm***

**Ayman Farid Khafaga<sup>1,2</sup>**

<sup>1</sup>*Department of English Language, College of Science & Humanities, Prince Sattam bin Abdulaziz University, Al-Aflaj 11912, Saudi Arabia*

<sup>2</sup>*Department of English, Faculty of Arts and Humanities, Suez Canal University, Ismailia, Egypt*

### **ABSTRACT**

The main objective of this paper is to explore the extent to which function words, such as pronouns and modals go beyond their semantic functionality towards particular ideological meanings. To this end, the paper attempts to present a computer-aided critical discourse analysis to decipher the ideological weight of both pronouns and modality as carriers of persuasion and/ or manipulation in the discourse of George Orwell's *Animal Farm*. Analytically, the focus is on two types of pronouns: the first person singular *I* and the first person plural *we*. Also two types of modals are discussed in this article: the truth modal *will* and the obligation modals *must* and *should*. In doing so, this paper draws upon two analytical frameworks: critical discourse analysis (CDA) and the computer-aided text analysis manifested in a frequency distribution analysis via concordance. Two main findings are reported in this study: first, pronouns and modality in the discourse of the selected novel go beyond their grammatical functions towards further pragmatic functions constituting persuasion and/or manipulation; second, the frequency analysis shows that despite the high frequency of the pronouns and modals investigated in the discourse of the selected novel, only few occurrences are indicative in generating both a persuasive and/or manipulative discourse. This, in turn, accentuates the relevance of employing a computer-aided critical

discourse analysis to decipher specific interpretative meanings of the linguistic units in corpus and text linguistics in general and literary texts in particular.

*Keywords:* *Animal Farm*, frequency analysis, manipulation, modality, persuasion, pronouns

### ARTICLE INFO

*Article history:*

Received: 28 April 2021

Accepted: 5 August 2021

Published: 21 September 2021

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47836/pjssh.29.3.30>

*E-mail address:*

[dr\\_ayman76@yahoo.com](mailto:dr_ayman76@yahoo.com)

## INTRODUCTION

Any literary genre, specifically the narrative, as is the case for the one at hand (i.e., *Animal Farm*), contains a huge number of pronouns, such as *I*, *we*, *you*, as well as an enormous number of modals, such as *will*, *shall*, *should* and *must*. These, for Quirk et al. (1985), are categorized within language as function words; that is, they are linguistically employed to communicate a grammatical function. As such, a pronoun grammatically serves as, for example, a subject of a verb (e.g., *we* enjoy reading English), an object of a verb (e.g., Thomas gave *her* the money), a subject complement of a verb (e.g., it was *you* who wrote the report), an object of a preposition (e.g., I bought a new dress for *her*), and as apposition of a noun (e.g., the books, *those* which are on the table, have been sold). In the same vein, modals, according to Palmer (1986, 1990), are function words in language that are used to express various grammatical functions, such as obligation (e.g., *must*), prohibition (e.g., *mustn't*), permission, ability and possibility, either in the present time (e.g., *can*) or the past time (e.g., *could*), probability (e.g., *may*), and certitude (e.g., *will*). However, pronouns and modals can go beyond their surface grammatical functions towards specific pragmatic and ideological purposes. For example, within particular discourse situations and in the hands of particular speakers, pronouns can communicate the discourse functions of competency (e.g., the pronoun *I*), solidarity (e.g., the inclusive pronoun *we*), power and domination (e.g., the pronoun *you*), distance

(e.g., the exclusive pronoun *we*). Likewise, modals can be discursively employed to express commitment of a future act (as is the case for the modal *will*).

This article, therefore, attempts to explore the extent to which pronouns and modals are employed in Orwell's *Animal Farm* to communicate specific ideologies rather than what they convey by their ordinary grammatical use. To this end, the paper draws on critical discourse analysis (CDA) to show how these devices are used by language users to practice power and domination, either persuasively or manipulatively. The reason why CDA is particularly chosen for the analysis of the selected data is due to the fact that this model of analysis is concerned with exposing hidden relations of power and domination in discourse as well as the ideological use of language (see e.g., Fairclough, 1989, 1995; Fowler, 1981; van Dijk, 1995, 1997a, 1997b; Wodak & Meyer, 2001; Wood, 2004). This is analytically accompanied by a frequency analysis to the selected pronouns (*I*, *we*) and modals (*will*, *should*, *must*) that serves to extract the concordance lines of the indicated pronouns and modals in the novel under investigation. The frequency analysis is analytically enabled by the program of concordance, which helps delineate credible and concise results to each entry of the function words at hand.

### Statement of the Problem

One of the characteristics of literary genres, particularly the narrative, is their rich nature of lexis. Function words, such as

pronouns and modality, are among the lexis abundantly employed in narrative texts. These words usually communicate their assigned semantic and grammatical functions; however, they, sometimes, go beyond their semantic functionality towards further pragmatic and ideological purposes in discourse. The identification of such ideological and pragmatic weight necessitates a close linguistic investigation through which one can differentiate between the function words used to convey their semantically-based functions and those utilized as carriers of specific ideologies. Such linguistic investigation of the ideological significance of function words in narrative genres, represented here by Orwell's *Animal Farm*, is anticipated to facilitate the understanding of not only the thematic message of the novel, but also the intended ideologies beyond the surface semantic proposition. This study, therefore, attempts to use a critical discourse analysis aided by a frequency analysis to explore the extent to which function words are not only grammar indicators, but also ideology carriers.

### Significance of the Study

The significance of the current study is twofold. First, it tries to offer a linguistic analysis of Orwell's *Animal Farm*, by investigating the way pronouns and modality are used to communicate ideologies in the discourse of the novel. This, in turn, serves not only to facilitate intelligible perception of the literary thematization of the novel under investigation, but also

to provide a linguistic awareness of the way language is used and/or abused in the production of power and dominance in discourse. Second, the study highlights the analytical integration between critical discourse analysis as a model of analysis targeting the exposition of relations of power, dominance and ideology in discourse and the application of concordance as a computational tool that helps arrive at the indicative occurrences of the function words under investigation. This is conducted by highlighting the contextual environment in which each searched word occurs, which is realized by one of the options available by concordance (Key Word in Context KWIC), and then the analytical role of CDA in revealing the way the contextualization of function words in specific conversational situation can be interpreted to underpin the hidden ideologies in discourse.

Four research questions are addressed in this article: first, what are the different ideologies the selected pronouns/modals communicate in *Animal Farm*? Second, are these pronouns/modals employed to influence a persuasive discourse or a manipulative one? Third, to what extent is a frequency analysis relevant to highlight the indicative occurrences that thematically reflect the intended discourse functions of the selected entries? Fourth, to what extent can CDA and the frequency analysis be incorporated analytically to expose hidden relations of power in discourse? The answer of these research questions mirrors the main objective this paper tries to achieve: to explore the extent to which

specific pronouns and modals exceed their grammatical functions to communicate further ideological functions in the discourse of *Animal Farm*.

The remainder of this study is divided into five sections. Section 2 presents the literature review of the study by reviewing the previous studies relevant to the topic under investigation. Section 3 offers the methodology of the paper, in which a brief account of the collection and description of data, the rationale of the study, and the analytical procedures adopted in the paper is provided. Section 4 is confined to the analysis of the selected data, wherein some conversational turns are extracted from the novel to undergo the analytical process. Section 5 is dedicated to discussing the findings of the study, whereas Section 6 concludes the study and offers some recommendations for future research.

## **THEORETICAL PRELIMINARIES AND LITERATURE**

### **Critical Discourse Analysis**

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) is discussed and approached by many linguists as a multidisciplinary approach of analyzing and exposing the hidden ideologies and the different power relations in language (e.g., Fairclough, 1989, 1995; Fairclough & Wodak, 1997; van Dijk, 1993, 1996, 2000, 2001a, 2001b; Weiss & Wodak 2003; Wodak & Meyer, 2001; Partington, 2003; Widdowson, 2007, among others). It constitutes textual analysis that draws on the different features of texts. For Widdowson

(2007), CDA is a socio-political approach of analyzing texts and talks in order to reveal the hidden ideologies pertaining to these texts. CDA, van Dijk (2001a) argues, is an analytical approach of language research that tends to highlight the manner through which power relations are manifested in text and talk within different political and social contexts. Along with its interest in the analysis of language critically, CDA is also concerned with the relationship between discourse and power, language and ideology, and language and social relations in society (Edelman, 2001).

CDA is concerned with social problems and political issues because it deals with discourse as a social practice (Fairclough & Wodak, 1997). For van Dijk (2001a), within CDA's analytical and ideological framework, discourse structures are enacted, confirmed, legitimized and reproduced to uncover the different power relations practiced and represented by various linguistic devices in texts and talk. Van Dijk (2001a) maintains that there are different types pertaining to CDA, and each type has its analytical characteristics. For example, he differentiates between the CDA of a conversational genre and that of a news report. Each type constitutes its principles, and is dealt with from different perspectives. However, all of them are linguistically analyzed in light of CDA's theoretical and analytical framework to demonstrate the way particular discourse structures are employed to produce and reproduce relations of power, dominance and hegemony.

Van Dijk (1993) maintains that CDA focuses on “the structures of text and talk” (p. 259). This approach serves to clarify the way different relations of power are linguistically represented in discourse. This, in turn, functions to reveal the hidden ideologies beyond the surface semantic expressions of discourse. Significantly, the ability to expose hidden meanings in discourse contributes to the understanding of the intended message and the global meanings of discourse (Wood, 2004). To clarify the significance of CDA in exposing the hidden discursive structures of power, van Dijk (1993) argues that discourse analysts need to trace three analytical strands. First, they should highlight the way speakers encode ideological assumptions in discourse; second, they should know the purposes these ideological meanings are employed to achieve in discourse; and, third, they should shed light on the structures of discourse involved in this ideological process.

According to Fairclough (1989, 1995), pronouns and modality belong to function words that have been assigned specific grammatical functions, such as agency and obligation. In order to approach these function words by means of a critical discourse analysis, Fairclough (1989) proposes sets of questions that should be thoroughly examined while analyzing a text. They are as follows:

- i. What experiential values do grammatical features have? In this question, the focus of CDA is on the analysis of agency,

nominalization, passivization and negation;

- ii. what relational values do grammatical features have? The focus here is on the modes through which discourse is delivered (i.e., declarative, interrogative, imperatives), the relational features of modality, that is, their linguistic activity in communicating interpersonal relationships in discourse, and the use of pronouns in the different contexts of discourse; and
- iii. what expressive values do grammatical features have? The focus in this question is on the expressive features of modality (i.e., obligation, truth, and possibility).

Significantly, Fairclough's sets of questions are employed within the general interpretative and analytical framework of CDA. That is, they are linguistically investigated through the three main stages of analysis in CDA: description, in which the analytical focus is on formal properties of the text; interpretation, wherein the focus is on the relationship between text and interaction, by perceiving the text as the product of a process of production, and as a resource in the process of interpretation; and explanation, which focuses on the relationship between interpretation and social context, with an emphasis on the social determination of the processes of production and interpretation, and social effects (Fairclough, 1989). In other words, for Fairclough (1989), conducting a CDA for any text requires text analysis (description), process analysis (interpretation), and social

analysis (explanation). A CDA of any text, therefore, requires the study of the interrelatedness of texts, interaction and contexts.

### **Computer-Aided Text Analysis**

In tracing the different computational software packages, it becomes obvious that the program of concordance is the most appropriate tool for the analysis of the corpus in this paper. This is because concordance can collect, access, and check the relevance of a large amount of data that can be indicatively used in corpus linguistic analysis. For Wiechmann and Fuhs (2006), concordance can load a corpus from different files, offers some changes on the files of any corpora, and provides various types of analysis, varying from simple text searches to the search of specific expressions, words, or phrases. According to Peachey (2005), concordance serves to access a large amount of data for specific analytical purposes. This has previously been accentuated by Flowerdew (1993), who argues that concordance is employed to access data to discover how a given word as well as its contextual environment occurs in a corpus. The application of this software, thus, facilitates the browsing of a corpus in order to obtain results concerning the number of occurrences of particular words or phrases, as well as offers useful insights into the use of language in particular contexts.

According to Yavuz (2014), concordance has extensively been utilized in the analysis of literary texts with the aim to count the

frequency and function of a particular word/phrase in a given text. Its main concern is to offer a better understanding of the searched word/phrase within its contextual use in text. Obviously, revealing the frequency of any word is indicative in clarifying various research purposes beyond any corpora. The application of concordance can contribute to thematic analysis, collocations, contextualization, and even technicalities of texts (Flowerdew, 1993).

The frequency analysis is one option among other uses and applications of concordance. This program also provides other analytical options that are relevant to the study of particular topics in literary texts such as the theme of ideological manipulation and/or persuasion approached in the current study. Among these options is the Key Word in Context (KWIC) verifiable input, through which words are shown in combination with their neighboring lexical items. This, in turn, valorizes the reason why concordance is relevant to the linguistic and ideological investigation of texts (Hockey, 1980; Kennedy, 1998).

According to Khafaga and Shaalan (2020), the use of concordance in general and the frequency distribution analysis in particular in the investigation of literary texts has many advantages. One of these advantages is the ability to achieve authenticity, credibility and transparency in corpus linguistic analysis. This is clearly evident when concordance targets literary texts; because such type of texts abounds in words that would be difficult to be verifiably studied manually. Another advantage of

applying concordance to the analysis of large data texts, for Krieger (2003), is that it helps analysts to find out not only the various patterns of language use, but also the contextual environment in which these linguistic patterns are employed in texts.

### Related Literature

Pronouns and modality have been approached within the scope of critical discourse studies (e.g., Khafaga, 2019; Khafaga & Aldawsari, 2021; Pinto, 2004; Widdowson, 2007; Wood & Kroger, 2000; Fairclough, 1989; van Dijk, 2001b, among others). Fairclough (1989), in his attempt to theorize for a framework of CDA at the description, explanation and interpretation levels, has specified one separate level for the grammatical devices in discourse. This includes linguistic criteria that should be followed in the analysis of discourse. Pronouns and modality are among these aspects. Fairclough (1989) maintains that a discourse analyst should investigate the experiential, relational and expressive values that grammatical aspects carry in discourse. So, he clarifies that notions, such as agency, passivization and nominalization should be dexterously analyzed in terms of their linguistic weight to communicate the various values listed above (i.e., experiential, expressive and relational). Pronouns, in Fairclough's model, are linguistic indicators of expressing agency in discourse that are employed to communicate particular ideologies. The choice among the different pronouns as well as their position in a sentence may represent textually a particular

action, event, or maintain a specific type of relationship among discourse participants. He also clarifies that the choice among these grammatical types serves to highlight agency, which, in turn, may be "ideological or they may be conscious hedging or deception" (Fairclough, 1989, p. 122).

Widdowson (2007) also argues that pronouns exhibit an ideological weight in expressing agency in discourse. This, for him, is related to the linguistic characteristics of pronouns in the communication of relations of power in discourse; the use of the first person singular *I*, the first person plural *we*, or the second person pronoun *you* is sometimes used for ideological reasons, particularly when they are utilized within the framework of politics. Widdowson's viewpoint has previously been accentuated by Wood and Kroger's (2000) contention that the use of pronouns is ideological in nature; that is, the use of the first person singular pronoun *I*, for example, is to reflect the speaker's responsibility, his/her competency, as well as authority over his/her recipients. Further, the same ideological viewpoint of using pronouns in discourse has been emphasized by Fairclough (1989), who differentiates between the inclusive *we*, which includes both speaker and hearers; and the exclusive *we*, which excludes all members outside the speaker's group. Widdowson's (2007) and Fairclough's (1989) arguments go in conformity with Pinto's (2004) claim that the use of the exclusive *we* indicates that the speaker has power over his/her recipients, whereas the employment of the inclusive

*we* communicates the feeling that the rights, goals, attitudes and beliefs of the individual are inferior to those related to the group. Crucially, this in-group and out-group discourse is also discussed by van Dijk (2001b), who highlights the indicative role pronouns play to demarcate polarization in 'We' and 'Them' discourse.

Modality, for Fairclough (1989), is another way of communicating ideology in discourse. He differentiates between relational modality and expressive modality, where the former refers to the authority practiced by one discourse participant over another, and the latter constitutes such authority which is concerned with the truth or probability of a representation of reality. Modality, according to Fairclough (1989), is linguistically manifested in modal auxiliary verbs, adverbs or tense. He maintains that there is, sometimes, some sort of grammatical overlap between expressive modality and relational modality. So, some modals appear to carry more than one grammatical function. For example, *must* can indicate both obligation and certainty; *should* can communicate probability and obligation; and *may* can be associated with the meaning of permission and possibilities.

Wood and Kroger (2000) also argue that modality is employed to maintain discursive agency. They clarify that the use of the obligation modal *must* in, for example, *Thomas must leave now*, indicates that Thomas has no freedom to choose or to decide. This agency that is discursively practiced in discourse often carries ideology, that is, it reflects the indented meaning of

its users, which is always shaped by the cognitive background of the language user. Indicatively, the combination of both modals and pronouns, Pinto (2004) argues, indicates a high level of obligation internalization. Halliday (1985) further differentiates between modalization and modulation; the former indicates probability and usuality, whereas the latter constitutes obligation and inclination. Halliday's account of modality focuses on both functionality and pragmaticization of the concept. In light of this paper, pronouns and modality are discussed in terms of not only their functional perspective, but also their pragmatic one. This means that an analytical and linguistic link is established to relate linguistic structures to social structures (the functional dimension); and to allow more effective role for the reader in the process of discourse interpretation (the pragmatic dimension).

Within the scope of fiction, Pariña and de Leon (2014) investigated the linguistic role of modality in communicating the writer's point of view in *Ian Rosales's Things You Don't Know*. This study attempts to decode the stylistic and linguistic features of modality in the selected prose work to allow readers better understand the different dimensions of point of view of the narrator, that is, at the character-to-character level of communication. Among the findings of this study is that the narrator's point of view can be maintained by the writer's linguistic and stylistic use of modality, particularly the epistemic modality. Pariña and de Leon's (2014) study concludes that approaching



modality linguistically facilitates the process of understanding texts, either textually and/or contextually. In another study, Khafaga and Aldawsari (2021) discussed the indicative part played by pronouns in communicating ideologies and practicing power. By using a drama text as its main corpus, the main objective of Khafaga and Aldawsari's (2021) study is to explore the extent to which agency can be produced, reproduced and practiced by pronouns. Their study reveals that specific meanings can be seized at the discourse level, which, in turn, serves to expose hidden relations of power in and behind discourse.

## METHOD

### Data

The data in this article constitutes George Orwell's *Animal Farm* (1944). The selected novel consists of 10 chapters. For Bolton (1984), the novel tells the story of the totalitarian Russia and calls for a socialist system that is based on democracy. The political background of the story as well as its symbolism shapes the whole atmosphere of the novel. The rationale for selecting this novel in particular is that it abounds in linguistic usages of pronouns and modality that go beyond their perceived grammatical use towards further pragmatic and ideological purposes. These ideological purposes revolve around one main function: to produce and maintain a persuasive and/or manipulative discourse. Crucially, marking such an ideological weight of both pronouns and modality is analytically enabled by the

use of a frequency-based analysis, through which the total frequency and the indicative occurrences of the searched items are reported.

### Procedures

Four procedural stages are adopted in the analysis of the selected novel. The first stage is textually-based, in which the novel was precisely read to highlight the different textual expressions that carry any of the pronouns (*I, we*) and the modals (*must, should, will*). This stage further provides a general idea of the way the linguistic items under investigation are employed at the character-to-character level of discourse. With the second stage comes the role of the computational linguistics work manifested in the program of concordance. In this stage, the selected pronouns and modals are searched through concordance to arrive at the total frequency of each searched item. The third stage is contextually-based, in which all occurrences of each searched item arrived at by means of concordance are investigated in terms of their contextual environment in the novel. This contextual reading has resulted in marking the indicative occurrences out of the total frequency of each searched item. The fourth stage is an interpretative one, wherein the indicative occurrences are linguistically analyzed by means of CDA to arrive at the different pragmatic and ideological purposes beyond the use of the selected pronouns and modals. Importantly, all italicized words in the extracts are emphasized by the author for analytical purposes.

It is worth mentioning that Simple Concordance Program (free concordance software for Windows) is the software utilized in this study. It allows three main analytical options: concordance, word list and statistics that are used to extract the concordance lines, arrive at the total frequency of each searched item, and identify the contextual environment in which each searched item occurs in texts. For analytical purposes pertinent to the objective of the current study, concordancing is the only option adopted from the employed software. By means of the concordancing option, a searched item is inserted in the search engine of the program to get all occurrences of such an item, which is also called key word in context (KWIC); users can also highlight the searched items to distinguish them from previous and consequent words. By clicking on frequency, the total frequency for each searched item is displayed within its contextual environment in text. The employed software was confined to search only the selected pronouns and modality under investigation. Because the employed software allows the search criteria to be determined and modified, the search was limited to identify only five words both in the left and the right sides of the searched items. Due to the numerous number of concordance lines extracted for each searched item, only the total frequency of the searched items and the indicative occurrences were recorded and demonstrated in the tables. This frequency analysis was followed by a thematic analysis that was based on the contexts of each

searched item; this was conducted by activating the analytical nature of CDA with the work of concordance. In this stage of analysis lies the analytical integration between CDA and the work of computer: concordance software.

## ANALYSIS

### Pronouns

This section analyzes two types of pronouns as carriers of persuasive and/or manipulative ideologies in the selected novel: the first person singular pronoun *I* and the first person plural pronoun *we*.

**The First Person Pronoun *I*.** The first person singular pronoun *I* is used in the discourse of equality to indicate agency. Consider Old Major's following words:

Comrades, you have heard already about the strange dream that *I* had last night. But *I* will come to the dream later...*I* do not think, comrades, that *I* shall be with you for many months longer, and before *I* die, *I feel* it my duty to pass on to you such wisdom as *I have acquired. I have had a long life, I have had much time for thought* as *I* lay alone in my stall, and *I* think *I* may say that *I understand* the nature of life on this earth as well as any animal now living. (Orwell, 1944, pp. 7-8)

Old Major gathers the animals to tell them about a dream he had the night before. Old Major foregrounds himself as the authoritative *I* who has the right to speak on the animals' behalf due to his long experience as the oldest animal in the farm

who understands the nature of life more than any animal. Major's overuse of the pronoun *I* reflects his power and authority over the other animals. It indicates that he has a strong popularity among animals, the thing which makes everyone on the farm "quite ready to lose an hour's sleep in order to hear what he had to say" (Orwell, 1944, p. 5). Old Major uses the pronoun *I* to emphasize his competency via showing his experience on the farm's affairs. He attempts to assert his

trustworthiness and benevolence in order to prepare the animals' minds to accept what he is going to communicate. Major's utterance *I feel it my duty to pass on to you such wisdom* implicates that he is the only authoritative source of wisdom. The combination between *my duty* and *wisdom* serves to convey Major's competency and to motivate the rest of animals towards a specific action. Consider the following table.

Table 1  
A concordance of the first person singular I

I.....TF (82)			
Indicative Occurrences (10)			
Context	Word	Context	Line
longer, and before I die,	I	feel it my duty to	83
you such wisdom as	I	have acquired. I have	84
have had a long life	I	have had much time for	85
think I may say that	I	understand the nature of life	86
It is about this that	I	wish to speak to you.	87
Comrades, he said,	I	trust that every animal here	99
actually dislike milk and apples.	I	dislike them myself. Our	107
Comrades, here and now	I	pronounce the death sentence upon	133
then paused and added impressively	I	warn every animal on this farm	213
'Snowball! He has been here!	I	can smell him distinctly!' and	246

Note. TF means Total Frequency

Table 1 demonstrates a high frequency of the first person singular pronoun *I* (82 occurrences). However, only 10 occurrences are indicative in communicating specific ideologies in the discourse of the novel. These can be monitored by the contextual environment wherein the pronoun occurs.

**The First Person Pronoun *We*.** The first person plural pronoun *we* is employed in *Animal Farm* both inclusively and exclusively. In the discourse of equality, the pronoun *we* is used inclusively to include both speaker and hearer in order to achieve pure persuasion, whereas it is used

exclusively in the discourse of inequality to achieve manipulative persuasion. Consider the following extracts:

*Our* lives are miserable, laborious, and short. *We are born, we are given just so much food as will* keep the breath in *our* bodies, and those of *us* who are capable of it are forced to work to the last atom of *our* strength; and the very instant that *our* usefulness has come to an end, *we* are slaughtered with hideous cruelty. (Orwell, 1944, p. 8)

And above all, no animal must ever tyrannize over his own kind. Weak or strong, clever or simple, *we are* all brothers. (Orwell, 1944, p. 12)

Old Major uses the first person plural pronoun *we* inclusively to express solidarity and intimacy between him and the other animals. He conveys that they share the same fate. In the first extract, Major explains

to the animals how they suffer under Major’s rule. Major’s use of the pronoun *we* accompanied with the passive construction in *we are born, we are given* and *we are slaughtered* is to emphasize that the animals are both the agent and the patient in an attempt to persuade them of their ability to lead the farm themselves. Major tries to assure them that their silence is the main reason beyond Mr. Jones’s exploitation to them. This atmosphere of closeness and solidarity, which Major tries to create, serves to pave the way for what he is going to convey. In the second extract, the same solidarity and inclusion are expressed by Major in his utterance *we are all brothers*. He uses the pronoun *we* to emphasize the animals’ equality and to unify their efforts to end the oppressive regime of Mr. Jones. The following table presents a concordance of the inclusive *we*.

Table 2  
A concordance of inclusive *We*

WE.....TF (59)			
Indicative Occurrences (12)			
Context	Word	Context	Line
are miserable, laborious, and short.	we	are born, we are given	62
and short. We are born,	we	are given just so much	62
has come to an end	we	are slaughtered with hideous cruelty	65
our imagining. Why then do	we	continue in this miserable condition	74
is the only real enemy	we	have. Remove Man from the	77
And even the miserable lives	we	lead are not allowed to	94
a year. To that horror	we	all must come cows, pigs	99

Table 2 (Continued)

WE.....TF (59)			
Indicative Occurrences (12)			
Context	Word	Context	Line
be our own. Almost overnight	we	could become rich and free	106
and free. What then must	we	do? Why, work night and	107
that in fighting against Man,	we	must not come to resemble	133
or strong, clever or simple,	we	are all brothers. No animal	137
us free. For that day	we	all must labour, Though we	173

Table 2 shows that the first person plural pronoun *we* is used inclusively 12 times out of 59. These occurrences are indicative in conveying a persuasive ideology of their speakers.

Once the rebellion had been accomplished, the pronoun *we* is ceased to be used inclusively; that is, including all animals. The pigs begin to use the same pronoun exclusively, by establishing a discourse of distinction that shows the pigs' superiority over other animals. Notice the following extract:

Comrades! He cried. You do not imagine, I hope, that *we pigs* are doing this in a spirit of selfishness and privilege? Many of *us* actually dislike milk and apples.... *Our* sole object in taking these things is to preserve *our* health....*We pigs* are brain-workers. Day and night *we are* watching over your welfare. (Orwell, 1944, p. 32)

Squealer uses the first person plural pronoun *we* exclusively to emphasize the distinction between the pigs and the other animals, and to assert the pigs' higher status and their skill in running the farm. He communicates the pigs' need for such milk and apples to be able to organize the farm. Proclaiming public interest is a way of justifying their violation of the principles of animalism. This public interest is engulfed with an indirect threat as the alternative of the animals' objection, which is represented in Jones's return. Here, there is a big difference in the terms of address; that is in the discourse of equality, the pronoun *we* is uttered and is followed immediately by a verb as in *we are slaughtered*, *we are born*, and *we are given* but now the same pronoun is followed by the word *pigs*, which indicates that there are two different groups of animals on the farm: the pigs and the others. The following table present concordances of the exclusive *we*.

Table 3  
*A concordance of exclusive We*

WE.....TF (59)			
Indicative Occurrences (5)			
Context	Word	Context	Line
not imagine, I hope, that	we	pigs are doing this in	528
the well-being of a pig.	we	pigs are brainworkers. The whole	532
is for YOUR sake that	we	drink that milk and eat	534
know what would happen if	we	pigs failed in our duty	535
then, comrades? He said, ?that	we	pigs now sleep in the	1041

Table 3 indicates that the pronoun *we* is used exclusively 5 times out of 59 to achieve manipulative persuasion.

**Modality**

This section presents two types of modality: obligation modality, which is represented by the modals *must* and *should*; and truth modality, which is manifested in the modal *will*.

**Obligation Modality.** The obligation modals *must* and *should* are used to produce both pure and manipulative persuasion in the discourse of equality and the discourse of inequality. Notice the following extract:

And remember, comrades, your resolution *must* never falter. No argument *must* lead you astray. Never listen when they tell you that Man and

the animal have a common interest, that the prosperity of the one is the prosperity of the others. It is all lies. (Orwell, 1944, p. 11)

The obligation modal *must* in *your resolution must never falter* and *no argument must lead you astray* is employed by Old Major to emphasize the animals’ enmity towards Mr. Jones, and to arouse their revolutionary spirits to revolt against him. The modal *must* carries a sense of necessity and obligation and signifies to force the animals to get rid of Man. Major assures the animals not to listen to any argument that leads them to forget man’s enmity or share his interests. Obligation modality then is used to achieve pure persuasion. The following table presents a concordance of the modal *must*.

Table 4

*A concordance of persuasive Must*

<b>MUST.....TF (26)</b>			
<b>Indicative Occurrences (7)</b>			
<b>Context</b>	<b>Word</b>	<b>Context</b>	<b>Line</b>
And remember, comrades, your resolution	must	never falter. No argument must	114
must never falter. No argument	must	lead you astray. Never listen	114
in fighting against Man, we	must	not come to resemble him	133
adopt his vices. No animal	must	ever live in a house	134
And, above all, no animal	must	ever tyrannise over his own	136
are all brothers. No animal	must	ever kill any other animal	137
For that day we all	must	labour, Though we die before	173

Table 4 displays that 7 occurrences out of 26 of the modal *must* are indicative in the production of pure persuasion.

Another example of using the obligation modals to achieve pure persuasion can be found in the following words:

‘Ribbons’, he said, *should be* considered as clothes, which are the mark of a human being. All animals *should go* naked. (Orwell, 1944, p. 20)

Snowball tries to persuade the animals that ribbons which some of them used to wear

are forbidden now since they are considered clothes which are considered to be a *mark of a human being*. In doing so, Snowball uses the obligation modal ‘should’ in *ribbons should be considered as clothes* and *all animals should go naked* to reflect the necessity of removing such ribbons. The obligation modal *should* is preceded by the positive quantifier *all* to generalize the process of prohibition in order to include all animals without any exception. The following table presents a concordance of the modal *should*.

Table 5

*A concordance of Should*

<b>SHOULD.....TF (33)</b>			
<b>Indicative Occurrences (2)</b>			
<b>Context</b>	<b>Word</b>	<b>Context</b>	<b>Line</b>
market days? Ribbons? he said?	should	be considered as clothes, which	297
a human being. All animals	should	go naked.? When Boxer heard	298

Table 5 demonstrates that 2 occurrences out of 33 of the modal *should* are indicative in the production of pure persuasion.

Obligation modality is also used to produce manipulative persuasion. Notice the following:

Remember, comrades, there *must* be no alteration in our plans: They shall be carried out to the day. Forward, comrades! Long live the windmill! Long live Animal Farm. (Orwell, 1944, p. 63)

Napoleon is talking to the other animals after the destruction of the windmill. He uses the obligation modal *must* in *there must be no alteration in our plans* to make them certain of their ability to build another windmill. He narrows the gap between him as the leader of the farm and the other animals by using the word *comrades* in an attempt to show that both of them share the same fate. Napoleon’s use of the obligation modal *must* serves to manipulate the animals to work day and night in order to rebuild the windmill. The following table presents a concordance of the modal *must*.

Table 6  
A concordance of manipulative Must

MUST.....TF (26)			
Indicative Occurrences (2)			
Context	Word	Context	Line
The needs of the windmill	must	override everything else, he said	966
so easily. Remember, comrades, there	must	be no alteration in our	1100

Table 6 shows that 2 occurrences out of 26 of the modal *must* are indicative in the production of manipulative persuasion.

**Truth Modality.** The truth modal *will* is used to produce pure and manipulative persuasion. Consider the following extract:

You young porkers who are sitting in front of me, every one of you *will* scream your lives out at the block within a year ....you, Boxer, the very day that those great muscles of yours

lose their power, Jones *will* sell you to the knacker, who *will* cut your throat and boil you down for the foxhounds. (Orwell, 1944, p. 10)

The use of the truth modal *will* in *you will scream your lives out at the block within a year* and *Jones will sell you to the Knacker, who will cut your throat and boil you down* signifies to reflect a high level of certitude and serves to persuade the animals of the expected suffering under Jones’ regime if they remain silent. Old Major tries to



communicate that if the animals do not carry out what he is going to deliver, they will not escape the atrocities of Mr. Jones. He tries to motivate them to rebel against Mr. Jones in order to end their suffering and toil. The phrases *scream your lives* and *cut your throat*, which follow the modal *will*, together with the verb *boil* in *boil you down* function

to arouse their fear since these phrases carry torture-related verbs: *scream*, *cut*, and *boil*. These verbs carry the connotative meanings of death and suffering, which, in turn, forces them to do their best in order to remove Mr. Jones. The following table presents a concordance of the modal *will*.

Table 7  
A concordance of persuasive Will

WILL.....TF (36)			
Indicative Occurrences (7)			
Context	Word	Context	Line
at a year old? you	will	never see one of them	91
me, every one of you	will	scream your lives out at	98
yours lose their power, Jones	will	sell you to the knacker	101
you to the knacker, who	will	cut your throat and boil	101
not know when that Rebellion	will	come, it might be in	109
that sooner or later justice	will	be done. Fix your eyes	110
do not need sugar. You	will	have all the oats and	230

Table 7 shows that 7 occurrences out of 36 of the modal *will* are indicative in the production of pure persuasion.

The truth modal *will* is also employed to produce manipulative persuasion. Notice the following extract by Napoleon, “This very morning we begin rebuilding the windmill, and we *will* build all through the winter, rain or shine. We *will* teach this miserable traitor that he cannot undo our work so easily” (Orwell, 1944, p. 63). Here, Napoleon is talking to the animals after the destruction of the windmill. He tries to motivate the animals to rebuild it, pointing out that Snowball is the only one

who is responsible for this destruction. To manipulate them into working again, Napoleon uses the truth modal *will* in *we will build all through winter* and *we will teach this miserable traitor that he cannot undo our work, so easily*. Napoleon’s use of the truth modal *will* has two functions: to emphasize Snowball’s treachery and to stimulate the animals’ potential capabilities to rebuild the windmill. The modal *will* here indicates credibility and certitude of doing the job. The connection between the first person plural pronoun *we* and the truth modal *will* serves to prove closeness and intimacy between Napoleon and the

other animals. Through using the modal *will*, Napoleon attempts to manipulate the animals into accepting both Snowball's treachery and his decision to rebuild the windmill. Notice the following table.

Table 8  
A concordance of manipulative Will

WILL.....TF (36)			
Indicative Occurrences (4)			
Context	Word	Context	Line
rebuilding the windmill, and we	will	build all through the winter	1099
winter, rain or shine. We	will	teach this miserable traitor that	1099
two years! ? What matter? We	will	build another windmill. We will	1622
will build another windmill. We	will	build six windmills if we	1622

Table 8 shows that 4 occurrences out of 36 of the modal *will* are indicative in the production of manipulative persuasion.

are employed in Orwell's *Animal Farm* to achieve persuasion (*I*, inclusive *we*, *must*, *should*, and *will*) or manipulation (exclusive *we*, *must*, and *will*). Table 9 below adds more clarification.

**DISCUSSION**

Findings reveal that pronouns and modals

Table 9  
Linguistic manifestations and ideological functions of pronouns and modals and their frequencies in *Animal Farm*

Word Type	Linguistic Manifestation	Ideological Function	Total Frequency	Indicative Occurrences	
Pronouns	I	Persuasion	82	10	
	We (inclusive)	Persuasion	59	12	
	We (exclusive)	Manipulation	64	10	
Modality	Obligation	Must	Persuasion	26	7
			Manipulation	26	2
	Should	Persuasion	33	2	
	Truth	Will	Persuasion	36	7
			Manipulation	36	4

Table 9 clarifies that pronouns and modality are utilized in the discourse of *Animal Farm* as carriers of both persuasion and manipulation. The table shows that the first person singular pronoun *I* occurs 82 times, but only 10 occurrences are indicative in the realization of persuasion. The first person plural pronoun *we* has a frequency of 59 when it is used inclusively, and occurs 64 times when it is employed exclusively; only 12 and 10 occurrences are indicative in carrying either manipulative or persuasive ideologies, respectively. In the same vein, the obligation modals *must* and *should* have the total frequency of 26 and 33, respectively; yet the indicative occurrences for each modal are 9 and 2, respectively. Likewise, the truth modal *will* has the total frequency of 36; 7 of which are employed to convey a persuasive ideology, whereas 4 occurrences are utilized to channel a manipulative ideology.

The findings obtained from the analysis and summarized in Table 9 above demonstrate the different ideologies communicated by the pronouns and modality under investigation. The identification of the type of ideology as persuasive and/or manipulative is entirely based on the interpretation linguistically conducted to the contextual environment in which each function word occurs in the discourse of the novel. As alluded earlier, the key word in context option offered by concordance has the task of identifying these different contexts, which are discursively interpreted by linking the formal linguistic features of the novel with both the interpersonal interaction

between discourse participants and the sociopolitical contexts of discourse. This, in light of Fairclough's (1989) three stages of critical discourse analysis, represents the reciprocal tripartite relationship between texts, interaction and contexts.

The analysis demonstrates that pronouns and modality are conduits of specific ideologies. In many conversational situations in the discourse of the novel, pronouns and modality go beyond their mere grammatical functions and prove useful in communicating particular ideological meanings. These meanings usually target the benefits of those in power. This ideological weight of such linguistic devices goes in conformity with Fowler's (1996) argument that each single word in language is ideological. That is, all lexis are ideological in nature in the sense that they reflect the cognitive background of their users. Such a cognitive background is called "store of knowledge" (van Dijk, 2004, p. 46), and is always shaped and reshaped by the individual's ideology concerning the different aspects of life. As such, the use of specific vocabulary, including pronouns and modality, is motivated by the general schemata of the language users; they usually use language in a way that goes in conformity with their store of knowledge and avoid using language in a way that challenges their cognitive beliefs and attitudes. This ideological weight of lexis is also accentuated by Fairclough (1989) who postulates that the way vocabulary is used, consumed and structured is ideologically based.

Thus, writers/speakers can encode their ideology in vocabulary through wording, meaning relations, metaphor, or euphemism. Consequently, pronouns and modality in the discourse of the selected novel go beyond their grammatical functions towards further discursive functions constituting persuasion and/or manipulation.

Furthermore, ideology is always there in language, and agency is one of the linguistic conduits of such ideology. This reconciles with Fowler's (1991) argument that language is ideology-laden means of communication. Each communicative act has a purpose that serves the benefit of discourse participants. This sheds light on an important idea; that is, the word, being the smallest syntactic unit, can carry further meanings and communicate different ideologies rather than what is conveyed by its surface propositional meaning. It is analytically evidenced that it is not only content words that can carry ideological significance in discourse. However, function words are also contributive in this regard. The analysis shows that pronouns and modality go beyond their semantic functions of conveying their prescribed grammatical function, such as the deictic function, truthfulness, and certitude, towards further pragmatic functions that add to the general understanding of the ideologies encoded in discourse.

It is analytically evidenced that the application of a frequency-based analysis to the critical study of discourse is relevant and contributes to the ideological interpretation of discourse. This manifests

itself in the obtained results shown in the analysis, which clarify that despite the high frequencies of the pronouns and modals under investigation, only few occurrences are indicative in the realization of both persuasion and manipulation in the selected novel. As demonstrated in the analysis, the use of concordance proves useful in the linguistic investigation of texts, particularly those that contains a gigantic number of words such as the literary ones. The analytical part conducted by the frequency analysis in the current study shows that not only high frequency words are indicative in communicating ideologies, but also low frequency words are of great ideological weight in channeling ideologies of their users. Obviously, the frequency analysis makes it possible to process and examine large data for a variety of purposes and to investigate questions which could not feasibly be answered if the analysis was carried manually. This has previously been accentuated by Kennedy's (1998) contention that the application of computer-aided frequency analysis to large data texts allows analysts to monitor more credible and authentic results than those realized by a mere manual analysis.

## CONCLUSION

This paper applied a computer-aided critical discourse analysis to test the hypothesis that function words (pronouns and modals) can go beyond their semantic functions towards further pragmatic purposes. The analysis has linguistically evidenced that pronouns and modals are ideology carriers

that convey particular pragmatic functions. These intended pragmatic functions revolve around specific ideologies such as persuasion, manipulation, competency, and dominance (research question No. 1). The analysis clarified that some of the pronouns and modals under investigation are ideologically employed in the discourse of the selected novel to convey persuasion (the first person singular pronoun *I* and the obligation modal *Should*), whereas the other function words discussed in this study are used to communicate both persuasion and manipulation (the first person plural pronoun *We*, the obligation modal *Must*, and the truth modal *Will*; research question No. 2).

The analysis also showed that a computer-based frequency analysis proves useful in discourse studies in general and in linguistic analyses in particular. This computational approach helps arrive at credible and accurate results during the process of data analysis, which, in turn, helps to uncover the hidden ideologies beyond the use of each single word in the text under investigation. The frequency analysis conducted in this study also accentuates the ideological weight pronouns and modals convey in texts, either individually, by the number of occurrences they have, or in combination with other neighboring words, by the contextual environment wherein they occur. The analysis further demonstrated that in order to understand language, one has to deconstruct its elements, i.e. words, phrases, and sentences in order to uncover the ideological purpose beyond

each single word used in a particular context (Khafaga, 2017a, 2017b). Obviously, such a process of decoding meanings is analytically strengthened by the application of the computer work in corpus linguistics (research questions No. 3 and 4).

Finally, this paper recommends further applications of computer software programs to discourse studies. This could yield more credible and accurate results to the linguistic study of texts than those approached by means of the traditional linguistic analysis, particularly in large data texts. Pedagogically, the paper recommends the use and application of computer-assisted tools in the EFL and TESOL contexts. This is anticipated to contribute to the teaching methods employed in the EFL courses delivery, which, in turn, serves to produce better learning outcomes in the process of teaching and learning literary texts.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The researcher would like to thank Prince Sattam bin Abdulaziz University in Saudi Arabia alongside its Scientific Research Deanship for all technical support it has provided to complete this study.

## REFERENCES

- Bolton, W. F. (1984). *The language of 1984. Orwell's English and ours*. Basil Blackwell Publisher Limited.
- Edelman, M. (2001). *The politics of misinformation*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511612640>
- Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and power* (2nd ed.). Longman.

- Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. Longman.
- Fairclough, N., & Wodak, R. (1997). Critical discourse analysis. In T. van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse as social interaction: Discourse studies: A multidisciplinary introduction* (Vol. 2, pp. 258-284). Sage.
- Flowerdew, J. (1993). Concordancing as a tool in course design. *System*, 21(2), 231-244. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0346-251X\(93\)90044-H](https://doi.org/10.1016/0346-251X(93)90044-H)
- Fowler, R. (1981). *Literature as social discourse*. Batsford Academic and Educational Ltd.
- Fowler, R. (1991). *Language in the news: Discourse and ideology in the press*. Routledge.
- Fowler, R. (1996). On critical linguistics. In C. R. Caldas-Coulthard & M. Coulthard (Eds.), *Texts and practices: Readings in critical discourse analysis* (pp. 15-31). Routledge.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1985). *An introduction to functional grammar*. Edward.
- Hockey, S. (1980). *A guide to computer applications in the humanities*. The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Kennedy, G. (1998). *An introduction to corpus linguistics*. Longman.
- Khafaga, A. (2017a). Linguistic manipulation of political myth in Margaret Atwood's *The Handmaid's Tale*. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 7(3), 189-200. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v7n3p189>
- Khafaga, A. (2017b). Discourse interpretation: A deconstructive reader-oriented approach to critical discourse analysis. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature*, 6(2), 138-146. <https://doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.6n.2p.138>
- Khafaga, A. (2019). Linguistic representation of power in Edward Bond's *Lear*: A lexico-pragmatic approach to critical discourse analysis. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 9(6), 404-420. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v9n6p404>
- Khafaga, A., & Aldawsari, M. (2021). Ideological agency in Edward Bond's *Lear*. *Applied Linguistics Research Journal*, 5(2), 11-23. <https://doi.org/10.14744/alrj.2021.63496>
- Khafaga, A., & Shaalan, I. (2020). Using concordance to decode the ideological weight of lexis in learning narrative literature: A computational approach. *International Journal of Advanced Computer Science and Applications*, 11(4), 246-252. <https://doi.org/10.14569/IJACSA.2020.0110433>
- Krieger, D. (2003). Corpus linguistics: What it is and how it can be applied to teaching. *The Internet TESL Journal*, IX(3), 123-141.
- Orwell, G. (1944). *Animal farm*. Penguin Books Ltd.
- Palmer, F. R. (1986). *Mood and modality*. Cambridge University Press.
- Palmer, F. R. (1990). *Modality and the English modals*. Longman.
- Pariña, J., & de Leon, K. (2014). A stylistic analysis of the use of modality to identify the point of view in a short story. *3L The Southeast Asian Journal of English Language Studies*, 20(2), 91-10. <https://doi.org/10.17576/3L-2014-2002-08>
- Partington, A. (2003). *The linguistics of political argument: The spin-doctor and the wolf-park at the White House*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203218259>
- Peachey, N. (2005). *Concordancers in ELT*. Teaching English. <http://www.teachingenglish.org.uk/think/articles/concordancers-elt>
- Pinto, D. (2004). Indoctrinating the youth of post-war Spain: A discourse analysis of a Fascist Civics textbook. *Discourse & Society*, 15(5), 649-667. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926504045036>

- Quirk, R., Greenbaum S., Leech, G., & Svartvik, G. (1985). *A comprehensive grammar of the English Language*. Longman.
- van Dijk, T. A. (1993). Principles of critical discourse analysis. *Discourse & Society*, 4(2), 249-283. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926593004002006>
- van Dijk, T. A. (1995). Ideological discourse analysis. In E. Ventola & A. Solin (Eds.), *Interdisciplinary approaches to discourse analysis* (pp. 135-161). New Courant.
- van Dijk, T. A. (1996). Discourse, power and access. In C. Caldas-Coulthard, & M. Coulthard (Eds.), *Texts and practices: Readings in critical discourse analysis* (pp. 84-104). Routledge.
- van Dijk, T. A. (1997a). Political discourse and racism: Describing others in western parliaments. In S. H. Riggins (Ed.), *The language and politics of exclusion: Others in discourse* (pp. 31-64). Sage.
- van Dijk, T. A. (Ed.). (1997b). Discourse as interaction in society. In *Discourse as social Interaction: Discourse studies: A multidisciplinary introduction* (Vol. 2, pp. 1-37). Sage.
- van Dijk, T. A. (2000). On the analysis of parliamentary debates on immigration. In M. Reisigl & R. Wodak (Eds.), *The semiotics of racism: Approaches to critical discourse analysis* (pp. 85-103). Passagen Verlag.
- van Dijk, T. A. (2001a). Critical discourse analysis. In D. Schiffrin, D. Tannan, & H. Hamilton (Eds.), *The handbook of discourse analysis* (pp. 352-392). Blackwell.
- van Dijk, T. A. (2001b). Discourse, ideology and context. *Folia Linguistica*, 35(1-2), 11-40. <https://doi.org/10.1515/flin.2001.35.1-2.11>
- van Dijk, T. A. (2004). *Communicating ideologies*. Academic Press.
- Weiss, G., & Wodak, R. (Eds.). (2003). *Critical discourse analysis: Theory and interdisciplinarity*. Palgrave Macmillan Ltd. <https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230514560>
- Widdowson, H. G. (2007). *Discourse analysis*. Oxford University Press.
- Wiechmann D., & Fuhs, S. (2006). Concordancing software. *Corpus Linguistics And Linguistic Theory*, 2(2), 107-127. <https://doi.org/10.1515/CLLT.2006.006>
- Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (Eds.). (2001). *Methods of critical discourse analysis*. Sage. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9780857028020>
- Wood, L., & Kroger, R. (2000). *Doing discourse analysis: Methods for studying action in talk and text*. Sage Publications, Inc.
- Wood, T. (2004). Ideology: The power of prior discourse. In P. Martin, N. A. JoAnne, & T. A. van Dijk (Eds.), *Communicating ideologies: Multidisciplinary perspectives on language, discourse, and social practice* (pp. 39-58). Peter Lang.
- Yavuz, F. (2014). The use of concordancing programs in ELT. *Procedia- Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 116, 2312-2315. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.01.565>

