



Original article

The Representation of Power and Ideology in Modern English Literature: A Critical Discourse Approach

Qutaiba Mohanad Mhaidi Alhatemi 

University of Baghdad, College of Agricultural Engineering Sciences

ABSTRACT

This study aims towards the analysis of George Orwell's (1984) text through Critical Discourse Analysis based on Fairclough's three-dimension framework highlighting the representation of power and ideology. The research has a qualitative case study approach, and selected parts of the text in the form of excerpts, slogans and narrative texts will be analyzed to see how power relations are built using linguistic structures and discursive strategies. Their results indicate that power is coded in terms of transitivity, modality and lexical choice that support surveillance and authority. Normalizing discursive strategies like repetition and framing and inhibiting alternative interpretations via ideological slogans. These codes are embedded in wider patterns of authoritative rule and ideologies. The study demonstrates how CDA can be valuable in examining how language, discourse and ideology are connected in a literary text highlighting the value of (1984) which reflects politics and constructs and legitimates it through discourse.

**Correspondence author:*

qutayba.m@cope.uobaghdad.edu.iq

Received: 04 May 2026

Accepted: 20 June 2026

Published: 25 August 2026

DOI:

<https://doi.org/10.31185/wjfh.Vol22.Iss3/Pt3.1941>



1812-0512 / © 2026 The Author(s). Published by Wasit Journal for Humanities Sciences, Wasit University. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).

Cite:

Alhatemi, Q. M. M. (2026). The Representation of Power and Ideology in Modern English Literature: A Critical Discourse Approach. Wasit Journal for Human Sciences, 22(3/Pt3).
<https://doi.org/10.31185/wjfh.Vol22.Iss3/Pt3.1941>

Keywords: Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), Norman Fairclough, Literary Discourse

تمثيل السلطة والأيدولوجيا في الأدب الإنجليزي الحديث: مقارنة تحليل الخطاب النقدي

م.م قتيبة مهند مهدي
جامعة بغداد- كلية علوم الهندسة الزراعية

المُستخلص

تهدف هذه الدراسة إلى تحليل رواية 1984 لجورج أورويل من خلال تحليل الخطاب النقدي بالاستناد إلى نموذج فيركلوف ثلاثي الأبعاد، مع التركيز على تمثيل السلطة والأيدولوجيا. وتعتمد الدراسة منهج دراسة الحالة النوعية، إذ تُحلَّل أجزاء مختارة من النص، تشمل مقتطفات وشعارات ومقاطع سردية، للكشف عن كيفية بناء علاقات السلطة باستخدام البنى اللغوية والاستراتيجيات الخطابية. وتشير النتائج إلى أن السلطة تُشَقَّر من خلال التعدية، والصيغة، والاختيار المعجمي، بما يعزز المراقبة والسلطة. كما تعمل الاستراتيجيات الخطابية، مثل التكرار والتأطير، إلى جانب الشعارات الأيدولوجية، على تقييد التفسيرات البديلة. وتُجسِّد هذه الأنماط البنى الأوسع للحكم السلطوي والأيدولوجيات. وتُظهر الدراسة كيف يبرز تحليل الخطاب النقدي العلاقة بين اللغة والخطاب والأيدولوجيا في النص الأدبي، من خلال إبراز قيمة رواية 1984 التي تعكس السياسة وتُسهِّم في بنائها وإضفاء الشرعية عليها عبر الخطاب

الكلمات المفتاحية: تحليل الخطاب النقدي، نورمان فيركلاف، الخطاب الأدبي

Introduction

Background of Study

Language does not simply serve as means of communication, but as a social system which constructs, negotiates and maintains meanings, identities and power relations. Functional linguistics (Halliday, 1978) sees language as social semiotic which mirrors and influences social structures. This is the outlook of the wider critical tradition which sees discourse as a space for the production and reproduction of social realities.

In this scheme, discourse has a deep connection with power as it helps to define what is sayable, who is allowed to speak and under which social conditions it is legitimate for someone to speak (Foucault, 1972). Thus, one acts not only under institutions, but also because of language, which governs knowledge as well as the social norms. Ideology, in the same way, is a key determinant in shaping discourse, as it provides ideologies that people use as the conceptual apparatus with which they interpret and construct reality. Language acts as an important medium in which dominant social orders are maintained, reinforced or resisted as (Eagleton, 2007) implies.

Within literary studies, these views suggest that literary works cannot simply be read as aesthetic objects but are also discursive formations which reflect and address power and ideology. Taking this perspective Jay (Fairclough, 1992) and (Fairclough, 1995a) revising Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) as an interdisciplinary approach which combines linguistic analytical models with social theory for the study of the production and reproduction of power and ideology in discourse. In this way, CDA has a contextualized analytical framework which can link text features to the

broader socio-political structures to gain a deeper understanding of the interplay between language and society.

Furthermore, the function of literary discourse in its representations of social reality and in shaping the ideological perception is important. Scholars like (Talbot, 2007) and (Fowler, 1991) state that discourse, whether literary or media-discourse, constructs actively representations of authority, identity and social relations through linguistic choice and/or narrative strategies. The contemporary literature in English thus represents a significant space for the analysis of both the processes of articulating, negotiating and contesting power and ideology in language.

Research Problem

Although the richness of the modern English literature is backed by the fact that the current literature reflects on the social reality, it still has a huge gap in the systematic analysis of the ways in which the power relations and ideological structures are implemented and reproduced through the medium of the language. Most studies of law and literature are inclined toward thematic or stylistic readings and overlook the nature of discursive processes that define the meaning. Specifically, there is still a lack of clarity in transferring the approach of the Critical Discourse Analysis, particularly the model by Norman Fairclough, to the contemporary English literary texts and to the methods of their critical interpretation. As such, the issue is the lack of integration between discourse-based methods of uncovering how literature is functioning as a site of constructing, reinforcing or challenging power and ideology.

Research Questions

1. What is the linguistic representation of power relations in the literary work of the modern period in the English language?
2. What ideological formations are engrained in literary discourse and how they are reflected or upset dominant social narratives?
3. In which ways can this three-dimensional model by Norman Fairclough be supported to connect textual features to discursive and social practices of contemporary English literature?

Research Objectives

1. This paper aims to examine the linguistic representations of power relations in the selected contemporary English literary texts through the Critical Discourse Analysis theoretical framework.
2. To discover and read the ideological formations that are embedded into literary discourse and how they refract or contradict the dominant social and political narratives.
3. To use the three levels of the textual features model of the text associated to discursive practices and other social practices in the context of modern English literature.

Significance of Study

This work contributes to the field of English literary study by blending Critical Discourse Analysis with interpreting texts, hence providing a multidimensional approach to text interpretation. It transfers the model of Norman Fairclough to the world of literary study.

The research is also a valuable contribution to understanding how language can be the instrument to build and challenge power and ideology in literary works. It will aid in increasing the level of analytical rigor to the study of modern English literature and contribute to a better understanding of socio-political aspects of the history of modern English literature.

Structure of the Paper

In this paper, there are several sections which are organized into a structure. A literature review, which discusses how power, ideology and critical discourse analysis have been implemented in literature, follows the introduction. The theoretical platform establishes outlines of CDA, with special attention to using the three-dimensional model as proposed by Norman Fairclough. The methodology section elaborates on the research design, methods of selection of data and analytical methods. The discussion and analysis parts reveal and discuss the findings, showing how power and ideology have been represented in chosen texts. Lastly, the conclusion will summarize the key findings and provide recommendations concerning future studies.

Literature Review

Power and Ideology in Literary Studies

The question of power and ideology has been a main topic in literary research, especially in the critical and post-structuralism traditions. Gradually, the literary uses of literature are being construed as loci of production, negotiation, and contestation of ideological meanings. In discourse-oriented approach, language has power, which may be demonstrated in power structures of dominance, control, and resistance. (van Dijk,1993) highlights the fact that elite discourse is important in the reproduction of social inequality as elite discourse shapes the cognitive capacities of the populace and determines access to knowledge.

Additionally, the process of ideology is carried out through discourse by shaping the process of reality representation and interpretation. (van Dijk,2008) regards ideologies not as an abstract system but as an enactment and reinforcement through daily communicative practices, such as literary narratives. This approach emphasizes the need to analyze the role of literary texts in contributing to the components of ideological structures that perpetuate or modify power relations. Consequently, interdisciplinarity as a literary analysis method increasingly applies interdisciplinary approaches to analysis by incorporating linguistic, sociological, and political methods of analysis when seeking to unveil the ideological layers of texts.

Discourse and Language in Literature

Discourse analysis presents an interesting approach to arriving at an understanding of how language has been used in literary works. Discourse-oriented approaches regard such aspects as a tool to create meaning and social relations. To a certain extent, discourse is constitutive and constituted at the same time where (Fairclough, 2000) contends discourse is constitutive and constituted simultaneously at the same time. The two-fold purpose here is especially pertinent in literary terms wherein language has been carefully structured to achieve a complex meaning and ideological stance.

The Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) is not solely a surface-level study of the text but is a process that can be expanded to cover the overall socio-cultural processes involved to influence the production and the interpretation of discourse. In the same way, (Wodak & Meyer, 2009) points out that discourse should be studied in a historical and social context since the meanings are not fixed but dynamically constructed in interaction.

This, in literary studies, would mean that the text should not be viewed solely as a stylistic feature but also as a discursive strategy wherein the narrative voice, the metaphor, and the framing were

identified as such. The mentioned factors are also influential in determining the representation of power and ideology. This means that discourse analysis allows a more refined analysis of literature as it interrelates linguistic features within the larger social and ideological frameworks.

Previous Studies on Critical Discourse Analysis in Literature

Applying Critical Discourse Analysis to the study of literature has been receiving increased attention, although it is not yet as well-developed as its usage in the media and in political discourse. (Rogers,2004) shows that CDA could be applied to examine the texts used in educational and literary fields to demonstrate that it has the potential to identify hidden power structures within the texts used in educational and literary settings. In a similar manner, CDA is extended by (Lazar,2005), to feminist studies, which is the way discourse can expose gendered power relations and ideological presumptions that prevail in texts.

The overview of CDA introduced by (Blommaert & Bulcaen,2000) is comprehensive, highlighting the interdisciplinary nature of CDA, as well as the focus of CDA on the interrelation of language, power and society. (Wodak & Meyer, 2009) also elaborate on methodological approaches within CDA and provide the means of analyzing discourse in various fields, including literature.

Irrespective of these contributions, the common methodology lacks methodological coherency in the integration of CDA into the process of the analysis of literature. Even though some research incorporates the ideas of CDA to derive meaning of literary texts, they do not necessarily completely formalize the analytical frameworks. Such gap implies that there should be more systematic implementations of CDA, more specifically the models like that one created by Norman Fairclough, which can be used to establish more systematic ways of connecting textual analysis with social theory.

Research Gap

Even though in literature, the relevance of discourse in the analysis of power and ideology has been established through various studies, several constraints in the analysis are present. To begin with, a large part of the CDA literature has thus far been applied to media, political and institutional discourse but with a relatively low application to modern literary texts in English. Second, past studies tend to either focus on linguistic characteristics or ideological topics on their own, without taking into full consideration the combination of characteristics and the distinctions between them within an overall analytical approach.

Besides, although the models developed by scholars like (van Dijk,2008) and (Fairclough,2000) have clear theoretical grounds, they have not been used in a systematic and coherent way in studying literary works. It makes a weakness between theory and practice, especially within the framework of the contemporary literature in English.

Thus, the research work aims to mitigate these shortcomings through the implementation of a systematic Critical Discourse Analysis paradigm to literary texts, incorporating linguistic, discursive and social components. In so doing, it is expected to offer a more in-depth insight of how power and ideology is reflected and constructed in contemporary English literature.

Theoretical Framework

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA)

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) is a methodological framework, which is interdisciplinary in nature and focuses on the connection between language, power and ideology in social context. Unlike CDA, CDA focuses on whether the system of language is made use of as a neutral communicative system, but it sees discourse as a kind of social practice both reflecting and creating social systems. Theories underlying CDA are closely related to (Fairclough,2003) and (Fairclough,2015) who regard discourse as a dialectical relationship between language and social structure. Discourse as seen from this point of view is a medium, and a way of producing, sustaining, and challenging power relationships.

In CDA discourse is the language used in context, that is both verbal and written language that occurs as a means of social communication. Language thus plays a key role in the process of creating identities, controlling knowledge and authorizing power. A wide definition of ideology is for it to be part of a discourse, for it to be a way individuals interpret reality and social relations. Repetition and normalization help "common sense" be taught by dominant ideologies and help to maintain existing power structures.

In addition, there are broader theoretical contributions that have also been considered in the CDA framework. Both (Wodak & Fairclough,1997) and (Gee,2014) highlight the need to view discourse within a historical and social context, and Gee emphasizes the fact that discourse is not only language, but also identity, cultural meanings and social practices. These perspectives are especially applicable to literary studies since literary works are not just aesthetic objects or foci but also discursive spaces where the representation and negotiation of ideology and power relations take place.

Research on Nineteen Eighty-Four by George Orwell is a case in point for use of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) method in his contemporary literary works due to his distinctly observable involvement with the elements of surveillance, ideology and authoritarianism. The novel was written in the wake of the Second World War, in a context in which there was worry about totalitarian political structures; it depicts a dystopia in which the use of language facilitates domination and social control. In the political slogans, the use of language and ideological repetition and the limited use of vocabulary, Orwell gives plenty of scope for analyzing how language is manipulated to create a sense of normalcy of power and a "reconstruction" of social reality. It is hence justifiable that the selection is done based on its good discursive density as well as its relevance with the study's aim of elucidating the relationship between language and power and ideology in literary discourse.

In the current research CDA is used as the main tool to analyze the ways power and ideology are linguistically created in selected literary texts, especially in Nineteen Eighty-Four by George Orwell. Attention is placed on the grammar, vocabulary, voice of the story and rhetorical-move that construct notions of surveillance, authority and ideological control.

Fairclough's Three-Dimensional Model

A three-dimensional approach is one of the most influential models in CDA that has been suggested by (Fairclough,2003). This is a model that systematically allows us to link textual analysis with

the macro discursive and social structures. This model has three interlinked dimensions: Text, Discursive practice, and "Social Practice.

The first dimension is the text, which looks at the linguistic qualities of texts such as vocabulary, grammar, transitivity, rhetorical devices, cohesion and modality. In the present research this level is employed to analyze the relationship of power and ideological positioning between which the linguistic choices made by Orwell in his writing are located. Lexical patterns, pronouns, sentence structure and notions of agency and surveillance are highlighted.

The second dimension relates to discursive practice, namely to the processes of text production, distribution and interpretation. To first level is the level at which discourse is organized, circulated and consumed in a specified institutional and/or cultural context. Discursive practice is examined in the recurring slogans, repetition, framing strategies and intertextual references that influence the way the reader understands the text and/or institutes the ideology as the dominant one in the literary text of this study.

The third dimension is social practice which places discourse in a larger social, political and cultural context. This level can be found to be key to connection of the micro-linguistic structures with the macro-social processes as described by (Chouliaraki & Fairclough, 1999). Within the current study, this dimension is applied to read into the theme of authoritarianism as well as surveillance and ideological control of social consciousness exhibited by the discourse of Orwell. These three dimensions can be studied as a connected whole to examine how linguistic systems, ideologies, and social politics are related in the study. Its usefulness lies in the fact that this model is very suitable for literary analysis as it is possible to analyze literary discourse not only as a manifestation of narrative expression but also as being a space where systems of power and ideology are developed, reproduced and challenged.

Power and Ideology in Discourse

The concepts of Power and ideology are central in CDA as they are concerned with the relation between discourse and society. Power is not just perceived as a top-down institutional form; rather it is diffused in the (linguistic and social) practice of everyday life. Discourse construct meanings, frames readings and can create knowledge, hence it acts as a power tool, which has an impact on how to perceive reality.

This is the case when some meanings and values are dominant and taken for granted as ideal or natural, which is called as ideological dominance or hegemony. In the words of (Fairclough, 2015) discourse can be used as a mechanism to convert certain types of views as legit whilst also marginalizing different views. Thus, discourses can be thought of as sites for the reproduction of ideology and fields of contestation.

Discourse also can be a form of resistance at the same time. (Wodak & Fairclough, 1997) stress that alternative discursive practices by a marginalized voice can be used to combat dominant ideologies. This dual function illustrates the dynamics of discourse; one might argue to stabilize as well as destabilizing existing relations of power.

In literary discourse such dynamics are particularly important since literary language may involve an ideology that is hidden within the narrative and stylistic structures. This will be explored in the present study through the application of CDA, which looks at how literary discourse establishes

systems of authority, ideologies and places readers in relations of power. The University aims to present evidence of how the literary genre is actively involved in the construction and the negotiation of social and ideological realities, and not a mere reflection of these.

Methodology

Research Design

The present work is research of this sort and is qualitative analytical research grounded on the thoughts of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). The qualitative method is suitable since the study aims to find out the meanings, to discover ideological formations as well as to analyze the presentation of power in the works of literature instead of determining variables quantitatively. The analysis framework is adopted based on the analytical model, which was developed by Norman Fairclough, where in the model he could analyze the discourse at the textual level, the discursive level and the social level.

Research Method

The method of this study is the Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) which is used as main method of analyzing the study. It is permitted to:

- An investigation of the linguistic aspect of literary work.
- Identifying embedded ideologies
- Discussion of discourse as power relations and how such relations are constructed by discourse.

CDA is a theory that is especially appropriate to analyze literature, since it can combine linguistic analysis with social theory, thus becoming able to connect the textual elements to the broader socio-political contexts.

Research Sample

The materials used for the present research constituted a purposive textual sample which was foremost obtained from *Nineteen Eighty-Four* (1949) by George Orwell. The novel was chosen as the main literary text to study because it brings the notions of structure, authoritarian discourse, ideological manipulation, surveillance, and power relations, which are central in CDA to the fore. Specific discourse and narrative sections, slogans, and excerpts are analyzed, in which interaction between language and ideology, as well as mechanisms of control, is clear. These excerpts were selected since they were discursively relevant with study objectives and applicable to use Fairclough's three-dimensional analytical framework.

Justification for Sample Selection

As has been mentioned they have chosen *Nineteen Eighty-Four* as the main literary work. A few analytical and theoretical reasons can be given for the choice of *Nineteen Eighty-Four* as the main literary work. The novel's structure is discursive: there are political slogans, used language and repeated ideological content, representations of surveillance etc., etc., all of which make the book very suitable for Critical Discourse Analysis. Secondly, it also reveals aspects of the larger socio-political issues around authoritarianism, censorship and control over the social consciousness, so that the study can be connected to broader aspects of language and ideology. Third, Orwell's story writing style offers ample samples of lexical manipulations, symbolic authority and discursive

control that is directly related to the working out of Fairclough's three-dimensional model at the textual, discursive and social levels.

Sampling Technique

The sampling procedures used in this research are using purposive sampling techniques. Certain portions of Nineteen Eighty-Four were deliberately chosen for having firsthand descriptions of relationships of power, ideology, surveillance and linguistic control. Selected passages include political slogans, narrative description and dialogic structures which give clear examples of the kinds of discursive strategies that are relevant for the goals of the study. Purposive sampling is suitable for qualitative discourse analysis which aims towards the identification of the units of text that have a linguistic and/or ideological significance and not toward statistical generalization.

Data Collection Method

Within this study the data collection is carried out in a systematic way, which includes a 'text selection' process as well as an 'extraction' process. This will be done by identifying the relevant literature, finding certain portions of the text (a given story, dialogue or part of it) and getting excerpts of literature for describing the fronting of relations of power and ideological forms. These data are based on published literatures, and this guarantees authenticity, credibility and academic reliability of these data. With this method, the researcher can concentrate on significant units of analysis that have a direct role to play in answering the research questions.

Data Analysis Method

The three-dimensional model proposed by Norman Fairclough is used to analyze the data to offer a comprehensive view of the discourse that can be analyzed at various levels. In the textual level (micro level), the analysis deals with linguistic traits including vocabulary, grammatical development, metaphors, figure of speech and narrative voice. At the discursive practice level (meso level), processes of text production and interpretation are analyzed, such as, intertextuality, authorial perspective and audience positioning. On the level of social practice (macro level), the analysis examines the overall socio-political environment, ideological models, and power relations, which on the one hand are shaped by the discourse, and on the other hand are affected by the discourse. In such a multi-layered approach, a comprehensive sense of the mechanics of language working in literary text is achieved, endowing this work with the capacity to create meaning and replicate/challenge social frameworks.

Analytical Procedure

This is an analytical process that is placed into a sequence level of action that will offer uniformity and exhaustiveness. To begin with, this is the choice of pertinent textual snatches, in its turn an extract of a chosen work of literature. The excerpts are then analyzed to discover what are the key linguistic features that could be helpful in making meaning. Then, interpretations of discursive strategies available in the text are made, with specific concerns about the ways these strategies reflect power relations and ideological assumptions. These results are subsequently related to the larger social and ideological settings, which permits a thorough exposition of the way discourse operates in the texts. Lastly, power and ideology as constructed, strengthened or challenged using language, can be seen through analysis.

Reliability and Validity

Several measures are taken to guarantee the rigor and credibility of the study. Theoretical validity is realized through underlying the analysis in well-established rules of Critical Discourse Analysis. The consistency of analysis is ensured by using the same framework to all the chosen texts. Besides, the element of transparency is achieved through the clarity in presenting the textual evidence, and the way the evidence gets presented in relation to the meaning it conveys.

As the present study adopts a qualitative Critical Discourse Analysis approach based on Fairclough's interpretive framework, formal inter-coder reliability measures were not employed. The analysis relies on theoretically guided textual interpretation rather than independent coding procedures. To enhance analytical rigor, consistency was maintained through the systematic application of the same analytical framework across all selected excerpts, and interpretations were grounded in explicit textual evidence and established CDA principles.

Ethical Considerations

Ethical considerations are very closely maintained during the study. All the literary texts used in the analysis are cited appropriately according to academic conventions. Information sources that the original meanings of the texts are maintained and not distorted or misrepresented. In addition, intellectual property rights are fully respected so that all the sources are given proper names.

Results

This section will present the results of applying the three-dimensional model suggested by Norman Fairclough, to some selected texts in literary works in the English language, of which the major focus will be on *Nineteen Eighty-Four* by George Orwell. The findings are grouped together in terms of three levels of analysis: textual (micro), discursive (meso), and social (macro). The presentation is still in descriptive form, supported by direct textual evidence and systematized tables.

Textual Analysis (Micro-Level Results)

At the textual level, it turns out that power relations are systematically coded with special linguistic ways, one of which is the choice of lexicon, the mode of speech, the structure of a sentence, the patterns of rhetoric.

Excerpt 1

"Big Brother is watching you."

Table 1. Micro-Level Linguistic Features

Linguistic Feature	Evidence	Description
Lexical choice	"Big Brother"	Abstract authority represented as a symbolic figure
Verb tense	"is watching"	Continuous aspect indicating ongoing surveillance
Pronoun usage	"you"	Direct address to the reader
Sentence structure	Simple declarative	Short and direct construction

Observed Pattern

The linguistic arrangement of the statement brings into being a continuous and normalized social condition of surveillance rather than describing something unusual and extraordinary. The persistence created by the present continuous verb phrase “is watching” is simultaneously accompanied with the permanence established by the second person direct pronoun “you,” who is the subject matter of watching and ideological control. Further, the symbolic phrase “Big Brother” serves as an abstraction of the center, and so the image of power can be seemingly all-pervasive but impersonal. The discourse is very short in syntax, thus reduces the possible ambiguity in understanding and confirms the psychological atmosphere of control and submission.

Discursive Practice (Meso-Level Results)

At discursive practice, the recurrence of the strategy in view of production, distribution and interpretation of discourse in the discourse in the text is present.

Table 2. Discursive Features and Distribution

Discursive Aspect	Observation	Description
Production	Institutional voice	Message attributed to centralized authority
Distribution	Repetition (slogan-like form)	Structured as a recurring public message
Consumption	Reader positioning	Reader addressed as subject of observation
Intertextuality	Political discourse	Resonance with surveillance-based governance narratives

Excerpt 2

“War is peace. Freedom is slavery. Ignorance is strength.”

Observed Pattern

The regular use of the paradoxical structure demonstrates a clear effort in ideological manipulation provoking the discursive repetition of contradictory meanings. The discourse undermines the traditional logic and re-creates reality by semantically opposing terms in simple declarative constructions, thus positioning it to the ideology of the authority construction. This syntactic simplicity gives an extra persuasive power to the slogans and enables the ideological contradiction to be internalized and accepted as an unquestionable truth in the social system represented in the text.

Social Practice (Macro-Level Results)

The macro level analysis shows that the features at the textual and discursive level can be related to the sociopolitical level which is the level of power and ideology.

Table 3. Representation of Social Structures

Dimension	Evidence in Text	Description
Institutional power	“Big Brother”	Centralized authority figure
Surveillance	“watching you”	Continuous observation
Ideological statements	“War is peace...”	Structured assertions
Social hierarchy	Implicit control structure	Authority vs subject relationship

Observed Pattern

The discourse is an organized system, one in which the authority is concentrated, observation to the case constant and statements of the case follow specific declarative forms.

Cross-Level Integration

Such consistency of the results at the three analysis levels showed some type of stability in relation to the congruence of the linguistic structures, discursive strategies and social representations.

Table 4. Integrated Analytical Results

Analytical Level	Key Observation	Corresponding Feature
Textual	Use of simple declarative sentences	Short, direct syntax
Discursive	Repetition and structured statements	Slogan-like construction
Social	Representation of centralized authority	Symbolic naming ("Big Brother")

Frequency Distribution of Key Features

For more detailed explanations, the number of significant discursive cues in the excerpts estimated which have been analyzed are listed below:

Summary of Results

The results show that in Nineteen Eighty-Four, language and discourse systemically create and legitimate ideologic power. In terms of text level, the modality, transitivity and position of the pronouns in the dialogue pieces help represent the surveillance and asymmetrical positions of power. Repetition, framing, and solarization are at the discursive level and serve as devices functioning to normalize ideological assumptions and restrict interpretive options. These discursive trends symbolize at the social level, their more general authoritarian trends of centralized control, cognitive control, and ideological dominance. The combination of three analytic levels substantiates the effectiveness of Fairclough's three-dimensional model in displaying the relationship of language, power and ideology in literary discourse.

Discussion (Q1-Level: Critical, Argumentative, Deep CDA)

This part then continues to critically pursue knowledge of the result in a theoretically ground way using the excerpts analyzed at a micro analytical level but interpreting it with larger arguments of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). The argument is based on the premises of (Fairclough, 2003) and (Fairclough, 1995b) the interactions between linguistic architecture, the discursive practices and the social formations to reproduce and authorize power and ideology. Instead of describing patterns, this section critically analyses what they imply and puts them in a relative position to other theoretical perspectives which are in competition.

Linguistic Representation of Power: A Micro-Reanalysis

The grammatical complexities that census agency and responsibility are coded not only in lexical choice but also in the more enduring grammatical complexities that are required to encode agency and responsibility. An example of asymmetrical transitivity arrangement can be found in the clause, Big Brother is watching you: the Actor, (Big Brother) is an abstract and non-human entity, whereas the Goal (you) is an individual entity that is actively addressed. The resulting structure is what can be termed as asymmetric visibility where power sees things without being seen.

In terms of CDA this can be related to (Fairclough,2003) who asserts that power works through the manipulation of the language of representation at the linguistic level. The analysis given, however, extends this formulation by showing that by repressing other agents' power is represented as well as grammatically stabilized. In opposition to an argument like that put forward by (Fowler,1991), which argues that ideological effects can be produced through lexical bias, the results contained within this argument suggest that syntactic minimalism per se can be used ideologically, eliminating interpretive ambiguity and establishing authority.

In addition, temporality is encoded in permanence using the present continuous tense (is watching), that makes surveillance a normal condition, and not an exceptional act. This supports (van Dijk,2008), who indicates that discourse influences cognitive process of naturalization of power; but current findings narrow this down by showing that grammatical aspect directly influences the cognitive process of naturalization of power.

Ideological Structures: Beyond Representation to Cognitive Control

Particularly ideological aspect of analyzed texts is seen in paradoxical constructions like this: War is peace. Freedom is slavery. Ignorance is strength. On a micro-level, their clauses have a relational process structure in which two semantically opposing entities are equated. The paradoxical structure can be understood as a discursive force, where opposite meanings are constantly being reiterated as 'normal' through the ideological discourses. These constructions are not just rhetorical contradiction but constructs which help to re-formulate interpretive logic through which the reader is forced to accept the contradictory meanings within a limited ideological context. The CDA is consistent with such observations. theories that take a view stressing the functions of discourse in controlling knowledge and developing systems of beliefs. While (Eagleton, 2007) devises ideology as a system that naturalized the prevailing meanings, the ideology here is rather a system that destabilizes semantic logic in reconstructing cognitive states. This slightly coincides with how (Foucault, 1972) puts it into arguing that discourse is the determining factor behind the frontiers of truth; but the results show that discourse can go the extra mile of bringing about truth through conflict, as opposed to harmony.

The discourse in this sense is a systematic "transformation" of the traditional semantic relationships, where dominant ideology constructs new meanings through repetition and contradiction. This is in line with CDA that focuses on how discourse helps to "normalize" the possible ways ideology can be assumed and the "reconfiguration" of social perception through language.

Discursive Strategies: Framing, Suppression, and Silence

The evaluation finds a combination of discursive strategies which are used in combination to unify power: repetition, framing and strategic silence. Examples of this include repetition, particularly in the discursive mode of slogan, of meaning being inaccessible to interrogation because of repetition.

Selectivity, like (Talbot, 2007), is always selective in nature but the results that are currently being achieved are a highlight that selectivity is not without systematic exclusion. The absence of alternative voices in the analyzed discourse is not some accident but the manifestation of some form of ideological silence, the sphere of possible interpretations. In the works of (Gee,2014),

identities and social positions are constructed through discourse. These second person addresses (you), make the reader feel he is a subject under surveillance, thus creating what can be described as internalized subjectivity. This reiterates the argument of Gee since it shows that an identity construction through discourse can neither be empowering nor can it be a mechanism of control. (Wodak & Meyer, 2009) note the significance of historical background in the analysis of discourse; but the current analysis shows that discursive strategies may work with a certain degree of independence and may create self-sustaining systems of ideologies even in the absence of actual references to context.

Interplay between Language, Power, and Society: A Dialectical Reframing

The synthesis of results at analytical levels shows that there is a dialectical correlation existing among language, power and society. The structures of linguistics do not correspond to social reality, but rather they are themselves engaged in making up the reality. This is in line with the conceptualization of discourse by (Fairclough, 2003) who views discourse as a constitutive and constituted phenomenon.

This framework is, however, furthered by present study which suggests that discourse is a kind of epistemic rule, whereby the control of language is in turn the control of knowledge. As it fits (Foucault, 1972) terms, power cannot be separated in terms of knowledge production; however, the results demonstrate that there is a mediating mechanism of micro-linguistic processes that controls the encoding and decoding of knowledge.

Moreover, although (van Dijk, 2008) emphasizes the importance of discourse in creating social cognition, the current analysis proves that it is not merely the cognitive process but rather such that is heavily embedded in the language itself. The combination of the simplicity of the texts, the repetitions of the discourses, and the authority of the society forms a system of values according to which the power is both obvious and indubitable.

The qualitative analysis revealed recurring patterns related to power representation, ideological statements, surveillance discourse, and structural repetition across the selected excerpts. These observations are intended to illustrate discursive tendencies within the analyzed material rather than provide quantitative measurements of frequency.

Theoretical Implications

The findings of the present study support major assumptions within Critical Discourse Analysis, particularly the argument that discourse functions as a mechanism through which power relations and ideological structures are reproduced. The analysis shows that the use of linguistic resources such as grammatical constructions, repetitions and symbolic expressions, themselves have significant effect on determining the ideological meaning in literary discourses. In addition, the application of Faircloth's three-dimensional model is shown to be useful for linking the text analysis process with other, overarching, social and political contexts. The study does not attempt to provide new theoretical framework; it just puts old theoretical constructs in practicing the CDA methodology in the literary field systematically, especially in Orwell's Nineteen Eighty-Four. This application emphasizes the relevance of CDA as an effective interdisciplinary means to analyze the interplay of language, ideology, and power in literary texts.

Conclusion

This paper was aimed at reviewing the representation of the issue of power and ideology in contemporary literature textbooks in the English language using the Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) framework in line with the works of Norman Fairclough. The results show that power can be regarded not only as a thematic feature but is also built into language at different levels of analysis. At the textual level, it comes to the Grammatical encoding of agency and obscuring responsibilities by way of grammatical forms of agency, modality and choice of vocabulary. Repetition, framing and direct address are some of the strategies at the discursive level that lead to normalization and reinforced power. At the social level these linguistic and discursive patterns may be traced to other systems of ideology, such as systems of centralized control, surveillance and cognitive dominance. What is more, the analysis suggests, ideology can, and does, operate at dynamic intersection of language, power and ideology.

Answers to Research Questions

The paper gives elaborate responses to the research questions. To start with, the linguistic representations, which exemplify the power relations in modern English literary writings, is expressed through given mechanisms such as syntactic structure that governs the agency, selection of lexicon that represents the power and patterns of grammar that normalize the control and surveillance. Second gears: the ideological constructions are enacted in the literary text in terms of discursive orders which comprise repetition, semantic contradiction and selective representation that are characteristic of specific fields of knowledge. As it turns out, the utilization of the three-dimensional model available by Norman Fairclough proves useful in following the relationships between language, power and social structure within literary works.

Recommendations

Relying on these findings, several recommendations could be possible. To unveil the concealed ideological strata entrenched within texts, it is imperative to bring Critical Discourse Analysis in a more systematic manner to the study of literature. The linguistic analysis on the micro-level analysis and especially grammatical structure such as transitivity and modality must also receive more stress since they are very important in encoding the power relation. Also, there is an opportunity for a dive into depth and rigor of analysis via adopting interdisciplinary approaches which combine linguistic, sociological and literary. Finally, the CDA approaches may be useful in reconsidering canonical literary works which could help to illuminate aspects of power and ideology that may have been overlooked before.

Implications for Future Research

Further studies could be performed in the future for several important journeys as defined in this study. Comparative analysis of diverse types of literary texts – ranging from novels, drama, poetry, etc. – might shed some light about power and ideology in different genres of narrative text. Such cross-cultural analyses which necessarily involve a generalization for CDA crossing over the boundaries of English literary cultures into local and/or non-English literatures might be useful to evaluate the universal or the local aspects of discursive power. Studying modern and digital adaptations of the slogan of ideologies' expression can also be of help in emphasizing the new possibilities of ideology formations in the media conditions. Apart from the quantitative

approaches, there are still some other uses in which CDA can be carried out with corpus linguistics to provide the studies with more empirical strength and external validity.

Limitations of the Study

This study does have some limitations which can be acknowledged. Second, it is done mostly with selected excerpts of a literary text-Nineteen eighty-four-and is not easily extended to other literary genres and traditions. Secondly, the study is qualitative and interpretive with the theoretical support of Critical Discourse Analysis, where there is possible subjective interpretation even at the level of systematic analysis. Thirdly, the study focuses primarily on textual and ideological aspects but does not include reader-response analysis or quantitative linguistic approaches. Comparative literary corpora, interdisciplinarity and corpus-assisted discourse analysis can be used in future research to broaden the empirical fields of CDA applications in literary studies.

Final Remark

Finally, as revealed by the present study, literary discourse is not simply the reflection of social reality, but it is a place of construction, reinforcement, and negotiation of power and ideology. By employing Fairclough's three-dimensional model, the analysis shows how the constructing effect of language, discursive practices, and socio-political texts interact with each other to create the ideological meaning in Orwell's Nineteen Eighty-Four. The results demonstrate the usefulness of Critical Discourse Analysis in revealing the mechanisms in which the literary language functions in terms of surveillance, in terms of the establishment of authority and in terms of the normalization of ideology. Generally, the research points to the need to combine linguistic analysis with social theory, for the purpose of gaining a better insight into the connection between literature, discourse and power.

References

- Blommaert, J., & Bulcaen, C. (2000). Critical discourse analysis. "Annual Review of Anthropology, 29", 447–466. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.anthro.29.1.447>
- Chouliaraki, L., & Fairclough, N. (1999). "Discourse in late modernity: Rethinking critical discourse analysis". Edinburgh University Press.
- Eagleton, T. (2007). "Ideology: An introduction". Verso.
- Fairclough, N. (1992). "Discourse and social change". Polity Press.
- Fairclough, N. (1995a). "Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language". Longman.
- Fairclough, N. (1995b). "Media discourse". Edward Arnold.
- Fairclough, N. (2000). Language and neo-liberalism. "Discourse & Society, 11"(2), 147–148. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926500011002001>
- Fairclough, N. (2003). "Analysing discourse: Textual analysis for social research". Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203697078>
- Fairclough, N. (2015). "Language and power" (3rd ed.). Routledge.
- Foucault, M. (1972). "The archaeology of knowledge". Routledge.
- Fowler, R. (1991). "Language in the news: Discourse and ideology in the press". Routledge.
- Gee, J. P. (2014). "An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method" (4th ed.). Routledge.

- Halliday, M. A. K. (1978). "Language as social semiotic: The social interpretation of language and meaning". Edward Arnold.
- Lazar, M. M.(2005). "Feminist critical discourse analysis: Gender, power and ideology in discourse". Palgrave Macmillan. <https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230599901>
- Rogers, R. (2004). "An introduction to critical discourse analysis in education". Lawrence Erlbaum. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781410609786>
- Talbot, M. (2007). "Media discourse: Representation and interaction". Edinburgh University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9780748630073>
- van Dijk, T. A. (1993). "Elite discourse and racism". Sage. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781483326184>
- van Dijk, T. A. (2008). "Discourse and power". Palgrave Macmillan. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-137-07299-3>
- Wodak, R., & Fairclough, N. (1997). Critical discourse analysis. In T. A. van Dijk (Ed.), "Discourse as social interaction" (pp. 258–284). Sage.
- Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (2009). "Methods of critical discourse analysis" (2nd ed.). Sage.