A CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS OF THE LANGUAGE OF WEBINARS: POLITICS BUILDING TASK

MARIA SALIM MOHAMAD and ALYA M.H.AHMED AL-RUBAI'I,
Dept. Of English, College Of Languages, University Of Duhok, Kurdistan Region-Iraq
Dept. of Translation, College of Languages, University of Duhok, Kurdistan Region-Iraq

ABSTRACT. This study aims at analyzing how through language use, power relations are built in webinars. Recently, webinars have become very popular as effective instructional tools in education. They are one type of multi-synchronous system used for online education. This study follows a qualitative methodology. Five webinars from Edweb.net meant for personalized professional learning are analyzed critically, and the texts are described and explained using James Paul Gee's (2014a) approach and method of critical discourse analysis. According to the scope of this study, only the politics building task, among seven building tasks and the social language tool, the figured world tool, and the situated meaning tool are used as tools of inquiry for data analysis. This study clarifies how speakers give or take social goods from persons, institutions or things based on some ideological principles in certain social groups. It explains that speakers do not only say things through language but also do things and be things. It has been found out that teachers have the power of maintaining discipline and are authoritative in classroom management while students are given less power regarding discipline. Additionally, technology in the 21st century is seen as an innovative powerful source in education as in other fields too.**

1. INTRODUCTION

With the proliferation of online education, interest in understanding online communication is on the rise. Technology is constantly in progress to provide its users a path for learning that can be easily followed in their education experience. The Web is used for various reasons, such as communication of online performances, lectures, workshops, and so forth (Yadav, 2011).

One way of online education is through webinars, which have gained significant fame throughout recent years. Webinars are the newest progresses through which visual and oral communication takes place. The webinar is a term that means online conferences; this system is used by some universities to assist blended learning, which comprises face-to-face courses with online courses to strengthen communication and connect students from the same course (Khechine et al., 2014). A webinar, according to Karabulut and Corries (2008), is a means of an educational communication environment that is spread worldwide; across time and place (as

cited in Khechine et al., 2014). Basically, a webinar is a word formed by the process of blending; joining the word "web" and "seminar" which are considered as the best means to get in touch with faraway users for educational reasons (Khechine et al., 2014). This means that the participants are from different geographical areas and different cultures. Therefore, it is worth investigating how language is used in webinars for successful communication.

Online education through online conferences and meetings as in webinars is increasing rapidly and is moving towards a different environment from the traditional one. In webinars, the educator or the presenter of the webinar addresses people all around the world; people from various cultural environments. It is an intercultural forum. The nature of the language used in these webinars which has created specific context, has not yet been investigated; therefore, it is important to have a close examination at this online setting produced for educational purposes.

1.1 Research Aims

This study aims at:

mariamazuri@hotmail.com

1. Investigating the language used in webinars in terms of power relations, i.e. the distribution of social goods.

2. Examining how individuals build the politics building task through language use in webinars.

3. Setting guidelines for non-native educators for presenting webinars-online seminars, regarding the use of power or the distribution of social goods in online academic discourse.

1.2 Research questions

This study puts forward the following questions:

1. How do educators, through language, convey perspectives on the distribution of social goods?

2. What kind of power relations show in the spoken language of webinars?

3. How does language reflect the online context of webinars used by speakers or educators?

2. CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) as a particular branch of Discourse analysis (DA) with a typical dominant feature which is being critical in nature has become salient in recent years. It has been initiated in the early 1990s based on earlier works, such as the work of Fowler, Hodge and Kress (1979) on language, power, ideology, and domination; and the work of Halliday on the systemic-functional linguistics (Blommaert, 2005). The terms of CDA and Critical linguistics (CL) have been used interchangeably since the former is more preferable but still denotes the theory identified by the latter (Wodak, 2001). According to Fowler (1991), "critical linguistics simply means an enquiry into the relations between signs, meanings, and the social and historical conditions which govern the semiotic structure of discourse, using a particular kind of linguistic analysis" (Wodak, 2001, p. 90). The definition of CDA and CL can be stated as basically concerned in the analysis of the explicit and implicit essential relationships of dominance, discrimination, power, and control as demonstrated in the use of language (Wodak, 2001). CDA aims at integrating the social context in the study of language. This new approach is deeply interested in the real issue and forms of "inequality" instituted in society (Blommaert, 2005, p. 6).

Some approaches to DA are named "descriptive" which aim at describing and comprehending the ways language works; whilst for other approaches to DA, language description is not the only target, but also putting forward profound explanations, and these approaches are called "critical" as in CDA (Gee, 2011, p. 9). In this sense, a critical approach to DA is obviously CDA which offers theoretical as well as practical application to the analysis of discourse. Gee (2011) points out that all DA should be critical since the analysts must be political and language by itself is political as it gives or takes social goods to people (p. 9). Gee was contacted by the researchers for further explanation of his view about DA and CDA, and his reply was as follows:

Since all language use has implications for "politics" in the sense of how social goods like status, respect, acceptability, and so on, are distributed, the all discourse analysis should be critical and we should not distinguish between critical and non-critical--just between good and bad discourse analysis perhaps (James.Gee@asu.edu).

This implies that it is not of necessity to specify DA for the critical aspect since all DA is critical because language is itself political, henceforth critical. In another study, Roger (2004) claims that researchers interested in language-society connections apply CDA to describe, interpret, and explain such connections. The explanation answers the questions why and how discourse works and not just offers descriptions or understanding, this makes CDA different and critical.

Chronologically speaking, CD analysts or main figures are Fairclough (1989), Van Dijk(1998), and Wodak(2001). Fairclough's work on CDA in 1995 "The critical study of language" maintains that language and social realities are connected to each other and lead to the generation of "social change" (Fairclough 1995; 2010). He explained:

By 'critical' discourse analysis I mean discourse analysis which aims to systematically explore often opaque relationships of causality and determination between (a) discursive practices, events and texts, and (b) wider social and cultural structures, relations and processes; to investigate how such practices, events and texts arise out of and are ideologically shaped by relations of power and struggles over power; and to explore how the opacity of these relationships between discourse and society is itself a factor securing power and hegemony (p. 93).

This means that CDA, according to Fairclough (1995), aims at the exploration of implicit relations between discourse practices, social practices, and social structures; the aim is to explore how discursive practices appear and the way they are ideologically designed by power relations and the struggle over gaining power. The opaque relations that CDA will analyze are non-transparent to the layman. In this sense, Fairclough seems to be interested in relating CDA to social practices while van Dijk (2001) on the other hand, views CDA differently, and he defines it as:

A type of discourse analytical research that primarily studies the way social power abuse, dominance and inequality are enacted, reproduced, as resisted by text and talk in the social and political context. With such dissident research, critical discourse analysis takes explicit position, and thus wants to understand, expose, and ultimately resist social inequality (p. 352).

CDA, according to van Dijk (2001), is a critical research that is interested in analyzing and explaining how social power exploitation, power control and inequality are practiced or constructed through text or discourse in social or practical contexts. He states that "CDA should primarily deal with the discourse dimensions of power abuse and the injustice and inequality that result from it" (p. 252). For van Dijk, CDA is a discipline that is concerned with studying and analyzing the language of written and spoken texts to expose the discursive sources of power, dominance, inequality, and discrimination, hence, the misuse and discrimination of power in society (van Dijk, 1998). Similarly, Wodak (2011, p. 52) center "power" as a main condition in CDA in relation to social life. He indicates that:

[CDA] studies real, and often extended, instances of social interaction which take (partially) linguistic form. The critical approach is distinctive in its view of (a) the relationship between language and society, and (b) the relationship between analysis and the practices analyzed (Wodak, 1997, p. 173).

Wodak (2004) defines CDA as: "fundamentally interested in analyzing opaque as well as transparent structural relationships of dominance, discrimination, power and control as manifested in language" (p. 187). This means that according to the writer the aim of CDA is to analyze social inequalities in discourse as it is

communicated, established, "legitimized" and so on. The concept of CDA will be used in this paper as the study that describes, explains, and interprets the way language is used and how it operates in saying, doing, and being things through language.

Obviously, the existence of various definitions to CDA gives the implication that there are some main properties of CDA but there are still many kinds of CDA with diverse theoretical and analytical features. The following are some main properties of CDA that are stated by Fairclough and Wodak (1999 as cited in van Dijk, 2015).

1) CDA addresses social problems.
2) Power relations are discursive.
3) Discourse constitutes society and culture.
4) Discourse involves ideologies.
5) Discourse is historical.
6) Text and society are mediated by "orders of discourse."
7) Discourse is interpretive and explanatory.
8) Discourse is a form of social action.

These principles are considered general to CDA, and the concept of power, inequalities, and racism, within the educational framework, will be analyzed in this study using Gee's method of analysis of CDA, the politics building task.

2.1 GEE'S METHOD OF CDA

As discourse analysis is the study of "language in-use," it is reasonable to define what language is. The word "language" is used by Gee (2018) akin to what linguistics call "natural languages," native language or first language that human beings acquire. Language is used by language users according to Gee (2014a, p. 3) not only to say things like informing someone of something or being informed about something; it is also used as he puts it, "to do things and be things." He adds that "doing things" with language means permitting us as language users to participate in practices, such as promising, or proposing for marriage, and so forth. The author continues that language allows us "being things" by taking manifold "socially significant identities" that is identities that are socially known and obviously important, such as speaking as a physician or a carpenter. Being things and taking an identity in a specific place and time, according to Gee (2011, p. 2), means that we must "talk the talk" besides "walk the walk." This shows that we talk a different talk

when for instance "being a gang member" than being a privileged student. However, to comprehend language correctly, it is necessary to know who is saying what and what he/she is attempting to do. Hence, when language is used, people are habitually saying things, i.e. informing someone of something, when doing things through language means performing actions, and being things through using language means performing a social significant identity.

Gee (2014a, p. 33) argues that his approach focuses on how saying and doing things through language are interpreted in terms of identity (being things). His approach foregrounds identity that is the different roles individuals play in society, such as a student, a mother, a physician, and so on. The writer refers to language users as designers of language, who form their language concerning who they are communicating with (listeners or readers). Gee (2014a) holds that we, as language designers (speakers and writers), perform "two key jobs": recipient design and position design. "Recipient design" is using language in any context, and it is shaped in respect to who the recipients are or to whom the language is being addressed (Gee, 2014a). An example is a doctor who may talk differently to his daughter than to his patient. While using language, people do not only perform who they are, but also how their recipients must perform (Gee, 2014a). The speaker or writer invites the recipient to presume a certain identity that the speaker is asking for indirectly, this is what is meant by "position design" (Gee, 2014a, p. 34).

So far, diverse approaches to CDA have been tackled; each with different scope of domain, but most of them originated from CL. Various linguistic approaches to DA use dissimilar grammatical theories and have different perspectives about meaning (Gee, 2011; 2014a). Meaning in Gee's approach is viewed as the way saying, doing, and being are integrated, and grammar is viewed as a tool that is used to achieve this integration. Gee (2018) believes that discourse can reach some places where grammar cannot go.

Gee's (2014a) approach does not follow the Hallidayan model of grammar and textual analysis; it is influenced by the American non-Hallidayan grammar (De Wet, 2014). He states that his own theoretical frameworks are grounded in sociolinguistics and literary criticism. He believes that discourse goes deeper than grammar but it is initiated in grammar as the selection of words that allow people say things differently.

Grammar of any social language, according to Gee (2014a), is constructed of two types: first, "the traditional set of units," such as nouns, verbs, and adjectives; the second type is "the rules" to which these units are used to make patterns, which he calls "correlations" among sentences. In another work, the toolkit book, a practical book about Gee's (2014b) approach of CDA, he introduces some basic information about grammar since it plays a basic role in DA, and he calls them "grammar interlude." However, the writer did not explain every single detail of grammar but the main ones, yet the analyst can work similarly and find more interludes.

Gee (2011, pp. 10-11) says that the approach he is using does neither belong to himself, nor does any theory belong to anyone. He illustrates that his approach is a combination in which he "begged, borrowed, and patched together." The domain in his approach is the language in use which is analyzed and followed by the theory of "the nature of language in-use" which is saying, doing, and being things with language and the meaning is taken from enacted practices.

The perception that all DA being critical or not in Gee's (2011; 2014) perspective is quite interesting. He believes that all DA needs to be critical because language itself is political which gives or takes "social goods" from people. Gee (2011, p. 5) defines social goods as "anything some people in a society want and value." For instance, the practice of being a good student has its rules across time and place; there are rules of behaving so and therefore, if you wish your children to be accepted as good students, they will gain a social good if they follow the rules of being so. Language takes its' meaning, according to the writer, from the practice in which it is practiced; such practices contain social goods and their distribution. This would mean that any description of language will deal with politics and is therefore critical. This would mean that owing "a social good" means having power and control as in politics, those with social goods are more powerful than others who do not have them.

By actions that we as language users accomplish using language, we either build or

destroy something in the world (Gee, 2004). Whether speaking or writing, the author adds that we continuously build one of the seven things or area of "reality" in the world. These seven things that are built with language in-use are referred to as "the seven building tasks" of language. For instance, a minister in church may say in a marriage ceremony "I now pronounce you man and wife." Here by using direct speech act, the minister made the marriage happen by using language (Gee & Handford, 2013). This is a verbal action carried out with language, while there are also non-verbal actions which can be performed without language such as threatening someone with gestures (Gee, 2011, p. 17). The task of the CD analyst is therefore asking about these seven building tasks for any piece of language and Gee (2011; 2014a; 2014b) has put for each building task a clear question to be asked by the analyst. The following questions about the building tasks can hence be used as tools for DA.

a) POLITICS BUILDING TASKS

The term "politics" is used by Gee (2014b) in a distinct way, which does not mean "government or political parties," but it is used to mean, "any situation in which the distribution of social goods is at stake" (p. 126). The meaning of "social goods," according to Gee (2018), is whatever a community or a discourse takes as valuable, good or necessary possessing it. Language is used to build or ruin a social good, and the writer gives the following example, treating the other respectfully is a social good, and doing it disrespectfully, is not a social good. Therefore, talking and acting with or without respect in such a situation, social goods are distributed accordingly.

While using language, according to Gee (2014a, p. 12), "social goods are always at stake." He adds that people gain social goods, or lose them, and they might give or deny them while speaking or writing.

Gee (2014b) claims that he used the term politics for the distribution of social goods, and these social goods make people feel accepted, being normal, significant, appreciated, etc., all these things render people power, position, and wealth. The question of the discourse analyst is:

What perspective on social goods is this piece of language communicating (i.e., what is being communicated as to what is taken to be "normal," "right," "good," "correct," "proper,"

"appropriate," "valuable," "the ways things are," "the way things ought to be," "high status or low status," "like me or not like me," and so forth)? (Gee, 2011, p. 19).

b) THE SOCIAL LANGUAGE TOOL

Social languages are diverse varieties of a language that a language user uses for different reasons (Gee, 2014a). The style of language the speaker is using has two indications: first what identity he/she is assuming others to be taken as and what identity he/she wants the listeners to take (Gee, 2018).

Two varieties of social languages can be distinguished: the vernacular social language (VSL) and the specialist social language (SSL) (Gee, 2018). The VSL is a chief type of social languages that is mainly used when language users speak as "everyday persons," not as specialists or professionals (p. 151). This would mean that the VSL does not construe technical terms and contains Germanic vocabulary that is used in less formal contexts (Gee, 2014b).

Another variety of social languages is the SSL, the non-vernacular style of social language (Gee, 2018). SSL is used when speaking as specialists, not as everyday person and this category is divided into two sub-categories: academic social language and non-academic specialist languages. The former is used in academic settings, while the latter is used by experts in settings outside academics. In such settings, more formal contexts, mostly Latinate vocabulary is used (Gee, 2014b).

According to Gee (2014a, p. 131), a discourse analyst can ask about the following for any texts: **A)** "What social language(s) are involved? What sorts of grammatical patterns indicate this? Are different social languages mixed? How so?" **B)** "What socially situated identities and activities do these social languages enact?"

c) FIGURED WORLDS TOOL

Figured worlds are theories, stories, or pictures of a "simplified world" that are in people's mind demonstrating what is ordinary or not ordinary about people, activities and communications (Gee, 2014a, p. 386). What people regard as ordinary differs from individuals and settings. Figured worlds, according to the writer, are sometimes also called "folk theories" or "cultural models." This would mean that we might have personal and common figured worlds. We judge things, give or take social goods from people depending on our figured

worlds and knowledge. The figured worlds of each culture, individual, or social group determine what is proper or improper.

d) SITUATED MEANING TOOL

A distinction here is made between two types of meaning, the general meaning of a word called "utterance type meaning" and the specific meaning of a word, called "utterance token meaning" (Gee, 2014b, p.159). The specific meaning is situated meaning which gets its meaning because certain language forms take different meanings in different settings. This means that situated meaning is the meaning that a word or phrase gains from the context of use.

The following is said about situated meaning tool of inquiry by Gee (2014b, p. 159) "for any communication, ask of words and phrases what situated meanings they have. That is, what specific meanings do listeners have to attribute to these words and phrases given the context and how the context is construed?"

To conclude, this study will use Gee's approach to CDA because of the following reasons: firstly, the main purpose behind following Gee's approach is that Gee's model of analysis differs from other approaches in that it mainly focuses on how the speaker designs, builds, and uses language. However, other approaches study language from the recipient perspective by analyzing external relations as power or textual features as grammar. The researchers consulted professor Gee about this consideration and he positively assured and agreed upon it. Analyzing language from where it originates, asking about how speakers build things, enhances the process of CDA.

The second reason for following Gee's approach is that the typology of text to which this approach can be applied is unspecified which means that it can almost be applied to any kind of text. Fairclough's and van Dijk's approaches are mainly focused on texts in which power relations exist as in political speech or news. In Wodak's "discourse historical approach," on the other hand, the concentration is on historical context as the name suggests. The data of this study is neither political nor historical; it is rather the analysis of the spoken language used in an educational online setting. Therefore, Gee's building tasks will be most suitable and plausible to be followed in the current data. Finally, Gee's approach is very practical since Gee (2011; 2014) provides plenty of examples

and has a toolkit book that exemplifies every single tool for analysis on manifold types of samples.

2.2 AN OVERVIEW OF WEBINARS

Before the invention of webinars, traditionally, meetings or conferences took place in a conference room or hall. If one could not attend the meeting or could not make a note, it was simply missed out. Webinars changed the traditional view of seminars; according to Sharan and Carucci (2014), the word webinar is a "portmanteau" word that is originated by the formation of two separate words: web and seminar. They state that this new word is formulated to describe an activity that refers to online meetings. However, Yadav (2011) indicates that webinars usage is not restricted to the presentation of seminars only, but also to other practices as the communication of presentations, lectures, and workshops that take place through the web. Hence, webinars can be any meeting, such as online presentations, workshops, seminars, or lectures transferred via Internet.

Furthermore, in the domain of webinars, Sharan and Carucci, (2014) state that meetings refer to the use of Internet for the formulation of online space that is available through nearby screens or anywhere with Internet access. They define webinars as "a communication between two or more individuals over the Internet that uses audio, video, and interactive technology" (p. 12). This means a meeting between two or more people through the Internet by using visual as well as auditable tools for interaction. However, Yadav (2011) adds that webinars provide the presenter and participants with the opportunity of practicing another level of interaction which occurs online. Madrid and Gomez (2017) claim that because webinars are beneficial in knowledge distribution, communication and interaction simplification, and teacher-student or employer-employee development, they perform "educational, informative or instructional" functions.

Webinars, according to Sharan and Carucci (2014), work in the following three ways: similar to seminars, webinars gather a group of people together for the discussion of a topic, but the gathered people are not physically in the same room, but are distributed in various geographical places. The writers add that a moderator is used in webinars for the

explanation of agenda, setting up the PowerPoint presentations, and other appropriate contents are shared for the participants. Finally, audio and visual aids are used and shared in any webinar through the Internet connection. To be able to participate in any webinar, they maintain that the following technologies are needed: computer, speakers, and Internet. However, there might be other requirements for attending a webinar, like having access to a certain website and for the presenter, a webcam and a microphone is also necessary.

To the best of our knowledge, no previous studies are found about the language of webinars. The following are characteristics of webinars in general, and they are the reason behind webinars getting popular. According to Sharan and Carucci (2014) webinars are getting popular for some aims which can be personal, social, or economical; webinars are:

1) Affordable: webinars are not costly, by that the writers mean that they might save money for the expenses of transportation.

2) Location is irrelevant: participants who are eager to attend the meeting can do it anywhere by getting access to the Internet, logging in and finally attending, there are no geographical boundaries for attending a webinar.

3) Time zone-proof: time variation is not an issue, whether morning in an area and afternoon in another, they can all attend the webinar peacefully.

4) Flexibility: webinars offer people flexibility by simply downloading a webinar online and making a note for others who need to attend and that is all. It saves people time to spend on making schedules and finding a location for the meeting to take place.

5) Interactive: webinars are also interactive; interaction can happen as in reality.

6) Can be watched on-demand: in case one misses a webinar, he/she can watch it later on and more than once.

7) Are cost-effective: one can attend a webinar with much less cost than attending a seminar.

Similarly, Wand and Hsu (2008) state five advantages of using the webinar tool, which are: affordable, permit synchronous communication, simplify immediate communication, also facilitate multi-level collaboration, and give their users the opportunity to record and save the content of webinar for personal reasons. Because

of these advantages, webinars have recently gained much popularity as in the domain of education. Webinars offer multi-synchronous computer-mediated communication and this can also be considered one of their advantages and another reason behind their popularity.

Wang & Hsu (2008) identify three types of webinar sessions: (1) a presenter versus manifold participants from one single site; (2) a presenter versus manifold participants from different sites, and (3) several participants from one single site versus many participants from one or more sites. In this research, the webinar-session is from type one and three, and some webinars have one presenter whereas some have two or more but all belong to the same single site. The participants are from different origins but they all have the same target which is getting training for professional learning.

To sum up, in the 21st century, due to globalization and technology, things have changed quickly and continuously. Webinars have almost replaced seminars or online meetings, blended learning has replaced the traditional way of learning and so on. The new tools or entities should contain the original function of the instituted one in addition to other functions. In webinars case, they confirm the same job that seminars do in addition to other functions as being flexible, such as watching a webinar online at an indefinite place and time. Webinars multi-functional, multimodality, and multi-synchronous offer their users the opportunity to benefit from them in their education and in their career. Webinars are not specified to one place, as participants might be participating worldwide depending on the course of webinar, and this function increases the webinar users gradually. The spoken language among other semiotic resources (visual, audio, gestures) in webinars is considered the most salient to be analyzed by the researchers since it is the core of communication and interaction. The webinars used in this research are for teachers' professional learning.

3. METHODOLOGY

This study is a qualitative research. The data for this research is collected from edWeb.net. Five webinars are selected for analysis based on the researcher's career goal. Having selected the topics of webinars, the webinars are transcribed

broadly (with fewer details) using Gee's (2014a) method of transcription, then described, and explained. The webinars are taken from a well-known website, which is edWeb.net. This website is basically a professional, social, and educational network that is composed of communities of teachers, librarians, and administrators who eagerly offer online help for teachers all around the world. The following table contains the name of the webinars and the presenters:

Table (1): webinars number, topics, time and gender.

Webinar	Topic	Time	Presenter
1	Assessment	56:54 minutes	Female
2	Blended learning	51:23 minutes	Female
3	Classroom management	54:16 minutes	Male
4	Lesson planning	44:14 minutes	Female
5	Personalized learning	01::04:43 minutes	Male
Total	Five webinars	04:50:83 minutes	Mixed

These webinars are presented by professionals and experts, males and females, to fulfill the needs of educators. The webinars can be watched live or on-demand. In the case of carrying out this study, for data collection, the webinars were watched on-demand.

3.1. Data analysis procedure

This paper will represent the analysis of the five webinars following Gee's (2014a; 2014b) method of CDA, the politics building task. The analysis will include the educator's or speaker's construction of the politics building task using the following tools of inquiry: the social language tool, the figured worlds and the situated meaning. Initially, the question stated by Gee (2014a; 2014b) for the politics building task will be asked and the text will be analyzed mainly by analyzing the linguistic devices within the text. From each webinar, two samples are taken for analysis to give a clearer explanation.

The following steps were conducted in the analysis of this study:

1. Transcribing the webinars according to Gee's method of transcription.
2. Asking about Gee's main question of the politics building task.
3. Analyzing grammatical and linguistic features that have useful communicative functions in presenting webinars.
4. The social language tool, situated meaning tool, and figured worlds tool will be used as helping devices for the analysis.
5. Linking the analysis of the text to society to show what the speaker is doing and being via language rather than saying only.

When the analysis is completed, the analysis of the text will be related to the outer world, the society. Power relations, racism, and equalities will be pointed out and discussed. Afterwards, some general guidelines will be stated for native or non-native educators interested of creating webinars.

A CDA will take place on the transcripts taken from online webinars by using Gee's method of analysis. The five webinars are from a professional website that offers online help in education. The webinars are meant for educators who seek help in their teaching career. The webinars are analyzed by using the tools of inquiry to ask about the politics building task.

4. ANALYSIS

Webinar number (1)

In this webinar, the presenter is communicating through language the proper way of writing rubrics and therefore considers the rubrics that qualify students work as very good. Hereby, she gives social goods to those teachers who write the effective rubrics, including all specified criteria. She says in writing rubrics that have "performance level descriptions," it is "so much easier to uhh defend yourself" when rating students' work. Defending oneself is valued in schools especially while assessing students work. In consequence, a social good is given to such rubrics.

"," A comma represents a pause

"." marks a short pause

"(pause)" marks a clear pause

CAPITALIZED WORDS means it has been said with "emphatic stress."

"?" is a final rising intonation contour
":" means the sound was lengthened
"(inaud")" means a portion of the speech was inaudible on the tape

Transcript (2), (from page 18, 2nd and 3rd paragraph)
The thing about rubrics is those descriptions, which students can match to work, which students try to figure out what they UNDERSTAND and which student can then try to AIM FOR and use to IMPROVE their own work. Tha:t's the genius of rubrics… (Brookhart, 2015).
Verbs as "figure out," "understand," "aim for," and "improve" are used to describe the rubrics that match with students' work. These verbs have positive connotations and are crucial for students' development and that is what teachers should aim for. The speaker lengthens the vowel in "that's" to draw the attention of the listeners, then she uses the adjective "genius" to describe the rubrics that she had defined. Hereby, the speaker through language, by using certain verbs and adjectives with positive connotations gives social goods to rubrics that match and describe the work of students, she considers them as proper and correct.
Social goods, on the other hand, are denied to rubrics which only count grades; they are communicated to the recipient through language use. In the following transcript, rubrics that count errors are considered unsuccessful.
Transcript (10) (page 5, 1st paragraph)
Notice that the top ones simply count errors (pause). People LIKE that, easy to defend when somebody says "why did I get a three"? You can say "there you got two errors you count them" but it's NOT a good way to rate student work quality, BETTER is to describe the substance of in the case of story writing (Brookhart, 2015).
The speaker, by constructing her language to describe the two types of rubrics, uses adverbs through which she can evaluate them. By using the adverb "simply" with rubrics that count errors, and "better" with those which "describe the substance," the speaker gives power to the latter since "better" has a positive connotation here which also indicates her agreement and opinion. The downtowner "simply" which precedes the verb "count" is used to disvalue the rubrics that count errors. This would mean that the speaker considers the rubrics that describe

the substance of students' work as effective and powerful. Therefore, social goods are distributed among the various types of rubrics depending on their effect on students and the learning outcome.

Webinar number (2)
The teacher, through language, gives social goods to technology and disruptive innovation that has changed many things for better such as computers, cars, and airplanes and is the basic reason behind blended learning.
Transcript (24) (page 5, 1st paragraph)
So the disruption, the disruptive innovation is not just the computers got better and cheaper, is that a COMPANY, a provider entered the market who could offer something more affordable and accessible to more people (Fisher, 2017).
She values what the Company has provided people with as the result of technology. She describes it and gives it the following adjectives "cheaper," "better," "more affordable," and "accessible." By using these comparative adjectives, the speaker regards the outcome of "disruptive innovation" better compared to the computers before. This indicates her admiration and agreement towards Apple's achievement as a result of disruptive innovation. The foremost concentration of her presentation is on the power of technology and how it changed things for better among which is education, the following transcript clarifies this point:
Transcript (25) (page 17, 2nd paragraph)
And the POWER of a student getting that level of visibility into seeing themselves progressing, feeling sort of micro successes along the way KEPT their students far more motivated than a students in a traditional classroom (Fisher, 2017).
While comparing traditional classroom to classrooms in the 21st century, in which technology is one of the basics in learning, the speaker gives examples that show how students were "far more motivated" when working online. The verb "progress" is used while explaining how students vision themselves, this verb is an important verb regarding the school environment and students' development, it has a positive meaning. Additionally, the speaker describes the students that use technology in class as "far more motivated" compared to students in a "traditional classroom." The students now and before, with the presence of

technology in classrooms, are described by using "progress" and "motivate," these two verbs are two main concepts in successful education. Henceforth the speaker, through language, evaluates the presence of technology in schools as powerful and successful.

Webinar number (3)

In the following transcript, the speaker compares between the old system of education in schools to the new system available now.

Transcript (39) (page 18, 2ⁿᵈ paragraph)

And so you know in the olden days when you were in school, a student would ask why? And you would say "because I say" so and that'd be it. There'd be no need to explain anything because we were TAUGHT to COMPLY with what the teacher said. No questions asked and if you asked a question the teacher looked at it as, "that student's disrespecting me ASKING ME WHY" (Holden, 2017).

In this transcript, the speaker is denying a social good from the school system in old days. He quotes a speech by a teacher in the old days in school; the teacher's answer to the question asked by the student is totally illogical. The speaker expresses himself by saying "we were taught to COMPLY" by using this verb which has a negative connotation, the state of listening or obeying teachers is described as inappropriate. Therefore, by viewing the old system as being obeyed or "comply," it is accorded lower social status and lower power.

By expressing his point of view towards the old system in schools, he uses the verb "comply" which indicates that all the authority was given to teachers. Teachers were powerful and students were powerless and had to fulfill what the teacher asked them to do. Accordingly, social goods are taken from the old system of education in schools. Later on, the speaker again refers back to the system back then and now, which indicates that he finds it important to compare and contrast between the two.

Transcript (40) (page 12, 2ⁿᵈ paragraph)

Putting kids down, using sarcasm, physical contact, trying to embarrass students those are not effective ways to discipline kids specially these days. Now.. I started teaching in 1991 and so there was an element of all of this, that some teachers would employ and THOUGHT were effective ways to discipline students. It's a WHOLE different world NOW (Holden, 2017).

Describing the bad disciplines as "embarrassing students" which means humiliating them is used as a bad deed and denies a social good from those disciplines. Those disciplines are considered in the speaker's point of view as "not effective ways of disciplining kids" and they are after effective ways, therefore, the opposite of it is unacceptable. Then, he added "specially these days" which refers to the system of this century, in which bad discipline is totally unacceptable. While he talks about his experience, in the late of previous century, teachers "thought" their ways of disciplines were effective but in fact they were not, this verb, in this context, has a negative connotation which is being uncertain about something. It is just something they kept in their minds but in reality it did not happen. He emphasizes the difference in the two systems, "it's as a WHOLE different world NOW," by stressing "now" the speaker, draws attention to it. Nevertheless, the speaker denies social goods to the previous system in education and gives a social good to the system now through language. Figured worlds in people's head determine what is proper and what is improper. The speaker takes a social good from the teacher's action of constantly putting students in the hallway for discipline, as improper and thus denies a social good as in transcript (35). According to our understanding, it is abnormal to see students from a particular class regularly having discipline, it might be logical sometimes but it becomes illogical if repeated too often.

Webinar number (4)

During this webinar, according to the language in-use, the speaker is supporting bilingualism and multilingualism "So it's really important that we as educators stress the benefits of being bilingual while communicating with families." In this sentence, by communicating the benefits of "being bilingual," the speaker takes it as something good and therefore gives it a social good.

In the following transcript, the speaker considers the action of giving attention to students' home language in schools as an achievement to reach multilingualism, which helps in the process of language learning. Therefore, she gives multilingualism a social good in schools and especially in language learning classes.

Transcript (53) (page 12, 1ˢᵗ paragraph)

It can helpful for students to see their language represented in an academic setting, it's just a

social language, it's not just a home language, um and again it's just another way to celebrate that multilingual culture that we are after (Lillard, 2018).

The speaker describes the process of having students' language "represented in academic setting" as "helpful," and this means she regards it as something good, something useful. "It is not just a home language" is what she is communicating; it is a "social language," which means that all languages are equal and should be given enough attention. Additionally, she says that it is to "celebrate that multilingual culture that we are after," describing this action as "celebrate" makes it of great achievement that they want to accomplish. This verb has a positive connotation meaning performing an enjoyable activity. Henceforth, the speaker considers multilingualism in schools as a big achievement that they are after, so it is what will empower their system and work best for language acquisition.

Transcript (54) (page 17, 4th paragraph)
Um students definitely do need some guidance and a little training to effectively use picture dictionary, but it's a great resource as you want students to become more independent writers (Lillard, 2018).

Some things are seen as social goods only in a certain social group or institution. The institution regarding this webinar is the school and administration. Therefore, within these circumstances, the speaker views that students "definitely do need some guidance" to emphasize the necessity of guidance. She uses "definitely" and "do need" to show extra emphasis on students' need of guidance while she is less certain about "training" since she uses the adverb "little" before it. Using the adverb "little" in this clause, she makes training less important and mitigates its social good.

Webinar number (5)
Language is used to illustrate and build certain perspectives on the nature of the distribution of social goods which is anything valued by an individual or a social group. For the purpose of this study, what educators value or disvalue within school framework and within their online presentation are analyzed.

The speaker in this webinar is talking about a topic relevant in schools which is personalized learning. Within his presentation, he gives a

social good to personalized learning which classifies students according to their abilities and not according to their age. One major point in personalized learning is having a mission, in the following transcript; he gives an example about mission:

Transcript (68) (page 7, 1st paragraph)
Uh capable, curious and confidents learners, those were the three characteristics we REALLY wanted and the whole purpose is students need to understand and respond to the challenges of an ever-changing world. This mission is kind of ah you know it's evergreen in the sense that uh whatever I think you know whatever… Whatever century it is you know we don't say 21 century is like this a perennial purpose from thousand years ago to thousand years from now, um this seems like the kindda mission we want for our school and district (Hudson, 2017).

Within each social group or institution, certain things are valued and honored, so the academic institution in this case, within the school setting, is teaching the students to be "capable, curious and confident learners"; this mission is valued and seen as successful. This mission is described as "evergreen" meaning that something always wanted by schools and something essential for the process of learning in all times. He considers this mission as something beneficial for schools, therefore, gives it a social good. The speaker takes social good from the old system in schools that is not based on personalized learning. The following example shows how he views the system back then as unsuccessful.

Transcript (69) (page 17, 1st paragraph)
If you think back to the one room school house, then there's not many students there. There's nine kids and one teacher, even so differentiation can be challenging. So what typically happens is okay today's lesson is fraction operations "we're gonna be adding and subtracting fractions" for example and do you really have data that every student is ready for that ah you know this whole course, this whole unit, for some students it's gonna be JUST right for some students, it's gonna be TOO HARD, and for some students it's gonna be too easy on, haven't learned anything new all year. That sometimes happens in math classes some kids are growling and some kids are growling maybe ah cause they're bored (Hudson, 2017).

What the speaker is saying is that if a class, like classes before, does not take student's individual

learning into consideration, "it's gonna be just right for some students" or "too hard" or maybe "easy" for others. In this way, the speaker describes that students might get "bored" and that is undesirable. However, the speaker takes social good from such classes and systems and gives a social good to personalized learning.

5. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

To explain the results of analysis, the following themes are drawn from the analysis and description of the language of webinars. In the analysis, what the speakers were trying to say and be were analyzed, while in this section, what the speakers are trying to do is explained. The speakers distributed the social goods differently for various reasons, but since the context is the same, the social goods given are nearly similar in all the five webinars. The following themes are the areas which were mainly highlighted by educators in webinars.

a)   Theme one: The critical role of technology

Across the five webinars, the educators constantly referred to the power of technology and its impact in different fields. In webinar number two, the speaker compared and contrasted between computers, Toyota's pre-s car, and the southwest airlines before and after the innovative technology. The presenter indicated that there was a significant difference before and after the use of technology, he used the following adjectives to describe the difference "cheaper," "better," "more affordable," and "accessible." She gave significance to the role of technology in all fields and considered technology powerful and beneficial for people and in life, see transcript (24 & 25). However, the inference behind this comparison in this presentation while talking about blended learning is that the speaker thinks of technology as most powerful and effective in all fields and even in education. The technology has almost changed everything compared to previous centuries. This means that the education system is likely to change as well, just as computers changed for better (they became smaller and smarter), the teaching and learning system is undergoing a change but not a complete one.   This is an awareness and preparation for teachers to be ready for the change. The presenter wants the teachers to be prepared and benefit from technology properly,

that is what she wants to make the listeners to do.

b)   Theme two: Power struggle

In all webinars, through language, different power relations appear within the webinar context. The speakers act as educators having the authority of leading the presentation, they present the webinars by using the personal singular pronouns "I" to refer to themselves and "you" to refer to the listeners. Moreover, they also act as teachers when talking about the classroom environment, they use the personal plural pronoun "we" to include themselves to the listeners. The different identities that they take in different situations show the inequalities in society. This means that they consider the listeners unequal to them whilst they are presenting and leading the webinar, while they regard themselves equal to listeners when talking about the classroom environment, since they are all teachers. However, giving oneself a higher status in one place and not in another, shows how people are treated differently and unequally.

c)   Theme three: The system of education

Going over the transcript or the text of webinar number three, it can be discussed that the speaker is not only saying things with language but is also doing things with language. Relating this text to society, power relations can be realized. The connections that the educator is referring to are: teacher-student, parents-students, parents-administration, and administration-teacher. These relations show the power struggles between them.

Another sort of power relation appears in webinars number 3, the speaker criticizes the old system of education by expressing himself using the verb "comply" to refer to the action that students had to obey teachers. Similarly, in webinar 5, the speaker takes social goods from classrooms before by critizing their educational system, he expresses himself by saying that giving all students similar activities might be either "too hard," "too easy," or "bored" for students. These words have negative connotation, henceforth, a negative perspective is conveyed. However, all the educators conveyed a positive perspective about the new system of education now, they praised and support it by describing it as "very good," or a synonym of it. This point shows how society has changed over time, the changing of rules, the

power of time therefore appear to have huge impact on society, education, and even on personal figured worlds.

5.1 GUIDELINES FOR NON-NATIVE EDUCATORS

The following guidelines are devised on the basis of the findings of the present study. They are meant for non-native educators for presenting webinars in order to enable them to distribute social goods properly through language use.

1. As for **social goods,** it is recommended that educators

a. distribute the social goods according to their speciality, the topic of webinar (the related field, e.g. educational field), and the context of situation;

b. remember that within the 21st century educational system, social goods are distributed differently than in the old educational system;

c. give the social goods to the new system of education in the 21st century rather than the old system of education which should be regarded as inappropriate, therefore, social goods should be taken form it;

d. show that technology is a powerful aspect in the 21st century, and how it has made changes in other fields and in education too; and

e. give social goods to teachers who maintain a good discipline and are effective in classroom management. Such teachers should be considered successful and effective.

2. As far as **Social identities** are concerned, it is recommended that educators

a. assume two different social identities for successful presentation: educators or teachers; take the identity of educators who have the authority compared to the recipients when leading the webinar, but act as teachers when treating the listeners as equals.

3. With respect to **Linguistic devices,** it is recommended that educators

a. make use of various grammatical and linguistic devices in order to give or take social goods from people, institutions, or other things;

b. use adverbs containing emphasizers, amplifiers, down toners, and minimizers to give or take social goods;

c. compare and contrast between two different aspects in order to highlight their difference and value or disvalue one of them;

d. vary the voice (pitch) when they want their audience to refocus on a certain point. Stress

certain things when they want to make them significant; and

e. use "you" to address their audience, so that they feel that they are addressed directly, or use "we" if they want to show sympathy or show connection between themselves and their audience.

4. Finally, regarding **society**, it is recommended that educators

a. give plenty of examples on each topic under discussion for the clarification of the topic, relate the examples to the society, such as examples on schools, multilingual students, technology, and institutions; and

b. connect the topic to reality and to the outer world (society) to make the topic more realistic and connected to participants' lives and career.

6. CONCLUSIONS

The current study came up with the following conclusions while analysing the language of educators in webinars:

1. The educators in webinars use language to convey perspectives on the nature of social goods by using words that have positive or negative connotations. The educators labelled any action, individual, or other concepts as "appropriate," or a synonym to convey a positive perspective, while they used the word "inappropriate," or a synonym to convey a negative perspective on the nature of the distribution of social goods.

2. While relating language to society, different power relations appear within the discourse of webinars; the authority of teachers, the power of technology and inequalities in the educational environment.

3. The discourse of webinars is reflexive or representative. This means that it reflects the online educational context. The educators constructed a language suitable for that context, they use the language of teachers or the school based language in order to be approachable and comprehensive. They used such a language because the recipients participate from different geographical places and the educational online context required so.

4. Within the educational field, academic settings, social goods are distributed to various concepts depending on various educational systems; the teachers in the old system of

education valued certain things which are disvalued in the new education system of the 21st century.

5. Language users or educators use language in webinars not only for saying things, but also being things and doing things. Describing the grammar and semantics of the language, the saying and being of the speaker are analysed, while analysing what is behind the language, what the speaker is making listeners to do is analysed.

6. The language is used for saying when providing the participants with new information. While the language used for being things is acting as educators and teachers who are giving a presentation. Finally, language is used for doing things is to make the participants make a change, change the learning for better in the case of these webinars.

7. Knowing how language works, how through language social goods are distributed, makes the process of online learning and teaching run smoother.

REFERENCES

Blommaert, J., & Bulcaen, C. (2000). Critical discourse analysis. *Annual review of Anthropology*, *29*(1), 447-466. Retrieved on Jan 20, 2019 from https://1211a172-a-62cb3a1a-s-sites.googlegroups.com/site/pgletrasufms/Home/downloads/CriticalDiscourseAnalysis.pdf?attachauth=ANoY7crL0LlvRIokEhjrXXYGUXbV0kb7u127mYurWlmatBFuBitt2LRG6YKjU0UYZ_gehyv8r_d7YWfZ-2FU8EinXXipGTgjhLZHlQBYr-Dtu0ZBBCN3sIDcwlb85bPpaDovvVEJ3h8lt1eloC2U70rpgzEOwxs5z-yyyapKeba-NfORD5KdtK3azJ7FZFn-cyUFjpaWEH0ArngywC2VgMuHJVgzjTBDrET94v5NUgBWc6ZYzWQzQRghf13l1v4jAzH5O2D9-HeG&attredirects=0

Brookhart, S. (2015, Apr 29). Creating and using effective rubrics [webinar]. In assessment for learning. Retrieved fromhttps://media.edweb.net/edWebinar/?view=20150429edwebnet20

De Wet, M. (2014). *Women in higher education: an analysis of narratives on gender in the workplace* (Doctoral dissertation, Stellenbosch: Stellenbosch University). Retrieved on Jul 27, 2019 from: https://scholar.googleusercontent.com/scholar?q=cache:fpjUd7qA9KsJ:scholar.google.com/+

De+Wet,+M.+(2014).+Women+in+higher+education:+an+analysis+of+narratives+on+gender+in+the+workplace+(Doctoral+dissertation,+Stellenbosch:+Stellenbosch+University).&hl=en&as_sdt=0,5

Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and Power.* New York: Longman. Retrieved on Dec 16, 2019 from http://93.174.95.29/_ads/CDEAA94B594F1AC0BAD15568A6EBC6BE

Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language*. New York: Longman. Retrieved on Oct 2nd, 2018 from http://93.174.95.29/_ads/E120D76506EC6EF73492937484ADCEBE

Fairclough, N. (2001). *Language and power (2nd ed.).* New York: Pearson Education. Retrieved on Nov 16, 2018 from http://93.174.95.29/_ads/DED2A8414AD8B849D0C48F2F7946F9C8

Fairclough, N. (2010). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language (2nd ed.).* New York: Routledge. Retrieved on Oct 7, 2018 from http://93.174.95.29/_ads/ECCF85C33835F582A8EE632A6855C3E6

Fisher, J. F. (2017, Feb 21). Five tips for getting blended learning right [webinar]. In Differentiating instruction with educational technology. Retrieved from https://media.edweb.net/edWebinar/?view=20170221edwebnet6

Fortuño, B. B., & Gómez, I. F. (2005). Spoken academic discourse: An approach to research on lectures. *Revista española de lingüística aplicada*, (1), 161-178. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Inmaculada_Fortanet-Gomez/publication/28128935_Spoken_academic_discourse_An_approach_to_research_on_lectures/links/540447ea0cf2c48563b069ea.pdf

Gee, J. P. (2004). Discourse analy*sis*: What makes it critical?. In *An introduction to critical discourse analysis in education* (pp. 49-80). London: Routledge. Retrieved on Feb 15, 2019 from https://www.taylorfrancis.com/books/e/9781410609786/chapters/10.4324/9781410609786-9.

Gee, J. P. (2011). *An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method (3rd ed.).* New York: Routledge. Retrieved from Jan 30, 2018

from https://www.joycerain.com/uploads/2/3/2/0/23207256/52_james_paul_gee-an_introduction_to_discourse_analysis__theory_and_method-routledge___2010_.pdf

Gee, J. P., & Handford, M. (Eds.). (2013). *The Routledge handbook of discourse analysis*. London: Routledge. Retrieved from https://books.google.iq/books?hl=en&lr=&id=Q2T6-LHp8T8C&oi=fnd&pg=PR3&dq=Gee,+J.+P.,+%26+Handford,+M.+(Eds.).+(2013).+The+Routledge+handbook+of+discourse+analysis.+Routledge.&ots=Bv_s42tfRa&sig=ndfpDkUULkM1w8HYRHRK159ib_k&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q=Gee%2C%20J.%20P.%2C%20%26%20Handford%2C%20M.%20(Eds.).%20(2013).%20The%20Routledge%20handbook%20of%20discourse%20analysis.%20Routledge.&f=false

Gee, J. P. (2014a). *An introduction to discourse analysis: theory and method* (4th ed.). New York: Routledge. Retrieved from Jan 24, 2019 form james.gee@asu.edu

Gee, J. P. (2014b). *How to do discourse analysis*: A toolkit (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge. Retrieved from Jan 24, 2019 form james.gee@asu.edu

Gee P. J. (2018). *Discourse analysis: From grammar to society.* New York: Routledge. Retrieved on Jan 24, 2019 form james.gee@asu.edu

Gee, J. P. (2019, January 4). Critical Discourse Analysis [E-mail to the researcher]. Duhok.

Holden, Sh. (2017, Oct 24). Classroom management tips for new teachers [webinar]. In Teacher help. Retrieved from https://www.edweb.net/?ewWebinarsBrowse@@.bebc200

Hudson, T. (2017, Jan 24). Leading, implementing, and sustaining innovations in personalized learning [webinar]. In leadership and innovation. Retrieved from https://media.edweb.net/edWebinar/?view=20170124edweb40

Khechine, H., Lakhal, S., Pascot, D., & Bytha, A. (2014). UTAUT model for blended learning: The role of gender and age in the intention to use webinars. *Interdisciplinary Journal of E-Learning and Learning Objects*, *10*(1), 33-52. Retrieved from: http://www.ijello.org/Volume10/IJELLOv10p033-052Khechine0876.pdf

Lillard, Ch. (2018, Sep 17). Strategies for lesson planning and instruction for English language learners [webinar]. In helping ELL/ESL students succeed. Retrieved from https://media.edweb.net/edWebinar/?view=20180917edweb68

O'Halloran, K. L. (2011). Multimodal discourse analysis. *Companion to discourse*, 120-137. Retrieved from: http://multimodal-analysis-lab.org/_docs/pubs14-OHalloran%28in%20press%202011%29-Multimodal_Discourse_Analysis.pdf

Rogers, R. (2004). An introduction to critical discourse analysis in education. In *An introduction to critical discourse analysis in education* (pp. 31-48). Routledge. Retrieved on April 22, 2019 from https://www.taylorfrancis.com/books/e/9781410609786/chapters/10.4324/9781410609786-8.

Sharan Sh., & Carucci J. (2014). *Webinars for dummies.* Canada: New Jersey. Retrieved from: https://get-ebooks.club/-/reader-roman/#/z=31490/s1=nwcbooks.com/q=Webinars%20For%20Dummies/

Van Dijk, T. A. V. (1988). News analysis. *Case Studies of International and National News in the Press.* New Jersey: Lawrence. Retrieved on Jan 22, 2019 from http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.470.4348&rep=rep1&type=pdf

Van Dijk, T. A. (2001). Multidisciplinary CDA: A plea for diversity. *Methods of critical discourse analysis*, *1*, 95-120. Retrieved from https://s3.amazonaws.com/academia.edu.documents/30265525/methods_of_critical_discourse_analysis__ruth_wodak_and_michael_meyer_2001.pdf?response-content-disposition=inline%3B%20filename%3DA_dialectical-relational_approach_to_cri.pdf&X-Amz-Algorithm=AWS4-HMAC-SHA256&X-Amz-

Credential=AKIAIWOWYYGZ2Y53UL3A%2F20190910%2Fus-east-1%2Fs3%2Faws4_request&X-Amz-Date=20190910T205217Z&X-Amz-Expires=3600&X-Amz-SignedHeaders=host&X-Amz-Signature=785268c00e3f0b6b54b2f9f553c664335ebd9d1098b0e0023779dda9bbfbf72c#page=104

Van Dijk, T. A. (2005). Discourse analysis as ideology analysis. In *Language & peace* (pp. 41-58). Routledge. Retrieved on May 20, 2019 from https://scholar.google.com/scholar?hl=en&as_sdt=0%2C5&q=+Language+%26+peace+van+dijk&btnG=

Wang, S. K., & Hsu, H. Y. (2008). Use of the webinar tool (Elluminate) to support training: The effects of webinar-learning implementation from student-trainers' perspective. *Journal of interactive online learning*, *7*(3), 175-194. Retrieved on Jan 12, 2019 from https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/66b9/67863348deb093a70bc3abc83d96f6cd479e.pdf

Wodak, R. (2001). The discourse-historical approach. *Methods of critical discourse analysis*. (63-95). Retrieved on Sep 30, 2018 from: https://s3.amazonaws.com/academia.edu.documents/30215804/methods_of_critical_discourse_analysis__ruth_wodak_and_michael_meyer_2001.pdf?response-content-disposition=inline%3B%20filename%3DA_dialectical-relational_approach_to_cri.pdf&X-Amz-Algorithm=AWS4-HMAC-SHA256&X-Amz-Credential=AKIAIWOWYYGZ2Y53UL3A%2F20190823%2Fus-east-1%2Fs3%2Faws4_request&X-Amz-Date=20190823T160741Z&X-Amz-Expires=3600&X-Amz-SignedHeaders=host&X-Amz-

Signature=98dbd5004be5d9959299cfa90c38f1b6211d878d913f7995a635611f064d7bce#page=72

Wodak, R. (2002). Aspects of critical discourse analysis. *Zeitschrift für Angewandte Linguistik*, *36*(10), 5-31. Retrieved on Dec 15, 2018 from: https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/939e/d07528ca2c534455baa6fc1c6784138bf743.pdf

Wodak, R. (2004). Critical discourse analysis. C. Seale, G. Gobo, J. F. Gubrium, D. Silverman, (2007) *Qualitative research practice* (pp.185-201). London: Sage. London: Sage. Retrieved on Feb 12, 2019 from: http://93.174.95.29/_ads/66D196B73700CE034CD1F74AFAFA16D5

Wodak, R. (2011). Critical linguistics and critical discourse analysis. *Discursive Pragmatics. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company*, 50-69. Retrieved from: http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.459.7306&rep=rep1&type=pdf#page=67

Wodak, R. (2015). Critical Discourse Analysis, Discourse-Historical Approach. *The International Encyclopedia of Language and Social Interaction*, 1-14. Retrieved from: https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Ruth_Wodak/publication/280621881_Critical_Discourse_Analysis_Discourse-Historical_Approach/links/55bf4c7008ae092e966537d4.pdf

Yadav, P. K. (2011). Blogging as a means of professional development for ELT professionals. *Journal of NELTA*, *16*(1-2), 123-132. Retrieved from: https://www.nepjol.info/index.php/NELTA/article/view/6136.