

**INVESTIGATING KINAESTHETIC IMAGE SCHEMAS
IN THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE SELF AND THE OTHER IN
BUSH'S DISCOURSE OF THE WAR ON TERROR:
A CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS**

SIVABALA NAIDU

**Thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
December 2010**

850499

rb
f HV6432.7
S624
2010

DEDICATION

To my beloved children:

Rajeevanethra, Jannanee, Shivadharshan and Ruthraroshann

In the deepest depths of you

Lies the most beautiful jewel

Shining forth eternally.

Seek it!

and

To the late P. Rajoo Naidu and K.S. Maniam

In the deepest depth of you

Lay the most beautiful jewel

Thank you for sharing it.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I wish to express my everlasting gratefulness to my supervisor Dr. Shakila Abdul Manan for her invaluable comments, guidance and encouragement throughout the duration of my study. She was an exemplary supervisor who was completely involved in my journey from the beginning till the end. Indeed, this journey would not have been a real fulfilment without her as my navigator. Her unwavering faith in my academic ability gave me the motivation and strength to overcome the obstacles that at times attempted to derail me. In short, this exciting journey would not have been this rewarding and fulfilling without her presence. For all these and more, I am truly indebted to her.

There were others who 'travelled' with me during parts of my journey who I would also like to thank: the external coder and fellow postgraduates Ghayth, Seok Hoon, Aydin and Lee Wah. They provided me with the necessary assistance without expectations. But more importantly, their friendship made my journey less frightening. I also wish to take this opportunity to extend my deepest appreciation to the Scholarship Division, Ministry of Education, Malaysia which awarded a scholarship to pursue my lifelong ambition of obtaining a doctoral degree. It is my earnest hope that I have fulfilled my obligations to them as a government-sponsored scholar.

Last but not least I wish to extend my sincerest appreciation to my soul-mate Krishnaveni whose love knows no boundaries. In the final analysis, it was her continuous devotion, support and patience that have made this journey worthwhile.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
DEDICATION	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
LIST OF TABLES AND FIGURES	x
ABSTRAK/ABSTRACT	xv
Chapter 1: BACKGROUND TO STUDY	
1.0 Introduction	1
1.1 US political discourse after 9/11	2
1.2 Corpus: radio addresses	5
1.3 Statement of problem	6
1.4 Research Objectives	11
1.5 Research Questions	12
1.6 Significance of the study	12
1.7 Limitations of the study	13
1.8 Definitions of key concepts	14
1.9 Plan of the study	17
Chapter 2: LITERATURE REVIEW	
2.0 Introduction	18
2.1 Metaphors – some interpretative theories	18
2.2 The conceptual theory of metaphors	22
• Challenges to the CMT	
• Image schemas	
• The internal structure of image schemas	
2.3 Metaphor-ideology link	50

2.4	Ideology	55
	• Thompson's ideological modes of operation	
2.5	Critical discourse analysis	63
	• Language and ideology	
	• A socio-cognitive model of CDA	
2.6	A theory of discourse	73
2.7	The self and the other	79
2.8	Conclusion	82
Chapter 3: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY		
3.0	Introduction	86
3.1	The Theoretical framework	87
	• The corpus	
	• Thomson's modes of operation of ideology	
	• The conceptual metaphor framework	
	• Van Dijk's socio-cognitive CDA framework	
	• A brief overview of the theoretical framework in application	
3.2	Data Collection and analytical procedure	103
	• Selection and labelling	
	• Identifying the vilification and legitimation modes	
	• Categorisation of linguistic units into KIS	
	• Intra rater consistency	
	• Enhancing reliability of the categorisation process	
	• Ideological implications	
3.3	Data Analysis	108
3.4	Ethical considerations	109
3.5	Conclusion	110
Chapter 4: ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION OF THE PRE-WAR CORPUS		
4.0	Introduction	111

4.1	Analysis and discussion of A1	112
	• Analysis of A1	
	• Discussion on the analysis of A1	
4.2	Analysis and discussion of A2	117
	• Analysis of A2	
	• Discussion on the analysis of A2	
4.3	Analysis and discussion of A3	123
	• Analysis of A3	
	• Discussion on the analysis of A3	
4.4	Analysis and discussion of A4	125
	• Analysis of A4	
	• Discussion on the analysis of A4	
4.5	Analysis and discussion of A5	128
	• Analysis of A5	
	• Discussion on the analysis of A5	
4.6	Analysis and discussion of A6	132
	• Analysis of A6	
	• Discussion on the analysis of A6	
4.7	Analysis and discussion of A7	137
	• Analysis of A7	
	• Discussion on the analysis of A7	
4.8	Analysis and discussion of A8	141
	• Analysis of A8	
	• Discussion on the analysis of A8	
4.9	Analysis and discussion of A9	146
	• Analysis of A9	
	• Discussion on the analysis of A9	
4.10	Analysis and discussion of A10	150
	• Analysis of A10	
	• Discussion on the analysis of A10	
4.11	Analysis and discussion of A11	155
	• Analysis of A11	
	• Discussion on the analysis of A11	

4.12	Analysis and discussion of A12	158
	• Analysis of A12	
	Discussion on the analysis of A12	

4.13	Mental models in the pre-war corpus	
	• Mental models in the legitimization category of the pre-war corpus	164
	• Mental models in the vilification category of the pre-war corpus	

4.14	Conclusion	176
------	------------	-----

Chapter 5: ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION OF THE POST WAR CORPUS

5.0	Introduction	178
-----	--------------	-----

5.1	Analysis and discussion of B1	178
	• Analysis of B1	
	• Discussion on the analysis of B1	

5.2	Analysis and discussion of B2	183
	• Analysis of B2	
	• Discussion on the analysis of B2	

5.3	Analysis and discussion of B3	188
	• Analysis of B3	
	• Discussion on the analysis of B3	

5.4	Analysis and discussion of B4	193
	• Analysis of B4	
	• Discussion on the analysis of B4	

5.5	Analysis and discussion of B5	198
	• Analysis of B5	
	• Discussion on the analysis of B5	

5.6	Analysis and discussion of B6	204
	• Analysis of B6	
	• Discussion on the analysis of B6	

5.7	Analysis and discussion of B7	210
	• Analysis of B7	
	• Discussion on the analysis of B7	

5.8	Analysis and discussion of B8	217
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analysis of B8 • Discussion on the analysis of B8 	
5.9	Analysis and discussion of B9	224
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analysis of B9 • Discussion on the analysis of B9 	
5.10	Analysis and discussion of B10	230
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analysis of B10 • Discussion on the analysis of B10 	
5.11	Analysis and discussion of B11	236
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analysis of B11 • Discussion on the analysis of B11 	
5.12	Analysis and discussion of B12	241
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analysis of B12 • Discussion on the analysis of B12 	
5.13	Mental models in the post-war corpus	248
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mental models in the legitimization category of the post-war corpus • Mental models in the vilification category of the post-war corpus 	
5.14	Conclusion	260

Chapter 6: CONCLUSION

6.0	Introduction	261
6.1	The study – revisited	261
6.2	Discussion and Summary of Research Question 1	265
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legitimation in the pre-war corpus • Vilification in the pre-war corpus • Legitimation in the post-war corpus • Vilification in the post-war corpus • A summary of the findings for research question 1 	
6.3	Discussion and Summary of Research Question 2	272
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ideological similarities and differences in the legitimization category • Ideological similarities and differences in the vilification category 	

6.4	Discussion and Summary of Research Question 3	279
6.6	Some constraining forces	287
6.7	Contributions of this study to the body of knowledge	292
6.8	Recommendations for future research	294
6.9	Concluding remarks	295
	REFERENCES	297
	APPENDICES	311

LIST OF TABLES AND FIGURES

Table	Title	Page
2.1	Thompson's modes of ideology and strategies	61
3.1	Examples of categorisation into KIS (vilification)	100
3.2	List of abbreviations used in this study	102
3.3	The analytical procedure	103
3.4	The pre-war corpus	104
3.5	The post-war corpus	105
4.1a	Vilification in A1	112
4.1b	Legitimation in A1	115
4.1c	Kinaesthetic Image Schemas in A1	117
4.2a	Vilification in A2	117
4.2b	Legitimation in A2	120
4.2c	Kinaesthetic Image Schemas in A2	122
4.3a	Vilification in A3	123
4.3b	Legitimation in A3	123
4.3c	Kinaesthetic Image Schemas in A3	125
4.4a	Vilification in A4	125
4.4b	Legitimation in A4	126
4.4c	Kinaesthetic Image Schemas in A4	128
4.5a	Vilification in A5	129
4.5b	Legitimation in A5	130
4.5c	Kinaesthetic Image Schemas in A5	132

4.6a	Vilification in A6	132
4.6b	Legitimation in A6	134
4.6c	Kinaesthetic Image Schemas in A6	137
4.7a	Vilification in A7	138
4.7b	Legitimation in A7	139
4.7c	Kinaesthetic Image Schemas in A7	141
4.8a	Vilification in A8	142
4.8b	Legitimation in A8	142
4.8c	Kinaesthetic Image Schemas in A8	146
4.9a	Vilification in A9	146
4.9b	Legitimation in A9	147
4.9c	Kinaesthetic Image Schemas in A9	149
4.10a	Vilification in A10	150
4.10b	Legitimation in A10	151
4.10c	Kinaesthetic Image Schemas in A10	155
4.11a	Vilification in A11	155
4.11b	Legitimation in A11	156
4.11c	Kinaesthetic Image Schemas in A11	158
4.12a	Vilification in A12	158
4.12b	Legitimation in A12	159
4.12c	Kinaesthetic Image Schemas in A12	164
4.13a	Mental models in the legitimation category/pre-war corpus	165
4.13b	Mental models in the vilification category/pre-war corpus	171

5.1a	Vilification in B1	178
5.1b	Legitimation in B1	179
5.1c	Kinaesthetic Image Schemas in B1	183
5.2a	Vilification in B2	183
5.2b	Legitimation in B2	184
5.2c	Kinaesthetic Image Schemas in B2	188
5.3a	Vilification in B3	188
5.3b	Legitimation in B3	189
5.3c	Kinaesthetic Image Schemas in B3	193
5.4a	Vilification in B4	193
5.4b	Legitimation in B4	194
5.4c	Kinaesthetic Image Schemas in B4	198
5.5a	Vilification in B5	199
5.5b	Legitimation in B5	200
5.5c	Kinaesthetic Image Schemas in B5	204
5.6a	Vilification in B6	204
5.6b	Legitimation in B6	205
5.6c	Kinaesthetic Image Schemas in B6	210
5.7a	Vilification in B7	210
5.7b	Legitimation in B7	212
5.7c	Kinaesthetic Image Schemas in B7	217
5.8a	Vilification in B8	217
5.8b	Legitimation in B8	219

5.8c	Kinaesthetic Image Schemas in B8	224
5.9a	Vilification in B9	224
5.9b	Legitimation in B9	225
5.9c	Kinaesthetic Image Schemas in B9	230
5.10a	Vilification in B10	230
5.10b	Legitimation in B10	232
5.10c	Kinaesthetic Image Schemas in B10	235
5.11a	Vilification in B11	236
5.11b	Legitimation in B11	236
5.11c	Kinaesthetic Image Schemas in B11	241
5.12a	Vilification in B12	241
5.12b	Legitimation in B12	242
5.12c	Kinaesthetic Image Schemas in B12	248
5.13a	Mental models in the legitimation category/post-war corpus	248
5.13b	Mental models in the vilification category/post-war corpus	255
6.1	Frequency of KIS in the pre-war corpus (legitimation)	266
6.2	Frequency of KIS in the pre-war corpus (vilification)	267
6.3	Frequency of KIS in the post-war corpus (legitimation)	268
6.4	Frequency of KIS in the post-war corpus (vilification)	269
6.5	The most dominant KIS in Bush's radio addresses in declining order	272

Figure	Title	Page
2.1	Image schemata for climb	36
2.2	Basic image schemata for OUT	37
2.3	Basic image schemata for FORCE	39
2.4	Discourse-cognition-society triangle	71
2.5	The relationship between the principle variables of this study	72
3.1	The theoretical framework of this study	98
6.1	KIS in the pre-war corpus (legitimation)	266
6.2	KIS in the pre-war corpus (vilification)	267
6.3	KIS in the post-war corpus (legitimation)	268
6.4	KIS in the post-war corpus (vilification)	269

**MENELITI SKEMA IMEJ KINESTESIS YANG MEMBINA KENDIRI DAN ORANG
LUAR DALAM WACANA PERANG ATAS NAMA KEGANASAN BUSH: SATU
ANALISIS WACANA KRITIS**

ABSTRAK

Kajian ini meneliti imej kinestesis (kinaesthetic image schemas) yang terkandung dalam 24 ucapan radio bekas Presiden Amerika Syarikat, George W. Bush berkaitan dengan Perang Atas Nama Keganasan (War on Terror), khasnya wacana yang berhubung dengan Iraq.

Ucapan-ucapan ini dibahagikan kepada dua set: ucapan yang diberikan sebelum tercetusnya peperangan di Iraq sehingga terjatuhnya Baghdad ke tangan Amerika Syarikat (dilabel sebagai korpus pra-peperangan) dan ucapan-ucapan yang diberikan selepas 'tamat' peperangan sehingga tahun 2007 (dilabel sebagai korpus pasca-peperangan). Setiap korpus mengandungi 12 set ucapan.

Teori yang digunakan dalam kajian ini ialah teori metafora kognitif (conceptual metaphor theory) yang dipelopori oleh Lakoff dan Johnson (1980). Secara terperinci, penyelidik menggunakan unit-unit linguistik untuk mengenal pasti lapan jenis imej kinestesis iaitu ATAS BAWAH (UP DOWN), DEPAN BELAKANG (FRONT BACK), SAIZ (SIZE), BEKAS (CONTAINER), TENGAH TEPI (CENTRE PERIPHERY), PENGHUBUNG (LINK), SEBAHAGIAN-PENUH (PART WHOLE) dan LALUAN (PATH).

Seterusnya model analisa wacana kritis socio-kognitif (*socio-cognitive critical discourse analysis*) digunakan untuk mendedahkan ideologi yang tersirat berdasarkan analisis imej kinestesis. Seterusnya, imej-imej yang paling dominan digunakan untuk mengenal pasti metafora konseptual yang tersirat dalam keseluruhan ucapan-ucapan yang diteliti di kajian ini.

Hasil kajian membuktikan bahawa imej kinestesis yang merupakan fenomena kognitif boleh dikaji dari sudut linguistik dengan menggunakan rangka analisis wacana kritis untuk menyiasat ideologi sesuatu kumpulan. Ia juga boleh digunakan untuk menentukan metafora tersirat yang terkandung dalam wacana politik.

Justeru itu, kajian ini mensyorkan supaya lebih banyak kajian yang mengabung kaedah socio-kognitif dan analisis wacana kritis dijalankan untuk memahami hubungan di antara fenomena kognitif (seperti metafora) dan bahasa. Penyelidik berpendapat bahawa kajian seumpama ini dapat menambah kesedaran kita tentang kewujudan ideologi negatif yang tersirat di wacana yang berkaitan dengan Orang Luar. Ini seterusnya memberikan peluang kepada para penyelidik untuk mencetuskan wacana bertentangan yang lebih positif.

**INVESTIGATING KINAESTHETIC IMAGE SCHEMAS IN THE CONSTRUCTION
OF THE SELF AND THE OTHER IN BUSH'S DISCOURSE OF THE WAR ON
TERROR: A CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS**

ABSTRACT

This study investigates kinaesthetic image schemas (KIS) involved in the discursive construction of the self and other in 24 radio addresses pertaining to the War on Terror articulated by the former US President, George W. Bush. The speeches were investigated according to two broad divisions: the pre-war and post war corpuses, each consisting of 12 speeches.

The main theory that informs this study is the cognitive theory of metaphor developed by Lakoff and Johnson (1980). Specifically, this study attempted to identify the types of KIS based on linguistic triggers or cues and tabulate their frequencies of occurrence in relation to the positive-us and negative-other construction embedded in the speeches. For this purpose, eight KIS were specifically selected as the basis of categorisation of the linguistic cues: UP DOWN, FRONT BACK, SIZE, CONTAINER, CENTRE PERIPHERY, LINK, PART WHOLE and PATH schemas.

Subsequently, a socio-cognitive Critical Discourse Analysis framework was applied to interpret and explain the bipolar positive-us and negative-other representation in the two sets of corpuses in relation to the eight image schemas. The study also attempted to establish the institutional mental models (or underlying attitudes)

inherent in the radio addresses. Finally, the most dominant image schematic structures and the mental models were used to establish a list of conceptual metaphors that are thought to permeate the entire 24 radio addresses related to the War on Terror.

On the whole, this study illustrates that KIS in discourse can be investigated from a critical discourse analytical perspective to gain insights into the ideological viewpoints that organise the attitudes shared by members of a group from where the discourse originates. In addition, this study has also shown that the most dominant conceptual metaphors present in discourse, which also reveal the underlying attitudes and beliefs, can be established on the basis of the kinaesthetic image schematic patterns.

This study, thus, recommends that more research integrating socio-cognitive and critical approaches to the study of discourse pertaining to the other is conducted to better understand how cognitive frameworks (such as metaphors) present in the mind are manifested linguistically. This will bring about a greater awareness on how negative out-group ideology is perpetuated in discourse, subsequently presenting opportunities for scholars to initiate counter-cognitive models to challenge negative stereotypes about the other.

CHAPTER 1

BACKGROUND TO STUDY

1.0 Introduction

On the morning of September 11, 2001 (henceforth, 9/11) the United States of America (henceforth, US) was rocked by a series of coordinated strikes by terrorists, alleged to be affiliated to the terrorist group al-Qaeda. In the incidents, four US domestic aeroplanes were hijacked and were crashed into several targets. Two planes crashed into the north and south towers of the World Trade Centre in New York, while the third plane targeted the Pentagon, the US Department of Defense headquarters in Washington, DC. The fourth plane crashed into a field in Somerset County, south of Pittsburgh after resistance from its passengers (Silberstein, 2002; Karim, 2002).

Subsequently, in the immediate aftermath of 9/11 and beyond, the world saw a shift in US foreign policy, initiated by George W. Bush, the US President at that point in time. For instance, in September 2002 his administration announced its National Security Strategy, "which declared the right to resort to force to eliminate any perceived challenge to US global hegemony" (Chomsky, 2003, p. 3).

More importantly, as far as this study is concerned, 9/11 also led to a spectrum of political discourse that promoted particular beliefs and prejudices which produced striking contrasts (see example in Section 1.1 below) in the positive representation of the self (us) and negative representation of the other (them).

1.1 US political discourse after 9/11

One of the key characteristics of the discourse related to 9/11 was the constant and continuous exhortations of Bush and his administration that certain states or groups such as Iraq and Al-Qaeda posed serious threats to their internal security.

Scholars such as Hamilton-Hart (2005) argue that such exhortations, subsequently, resulted in an articulation of a US foreign policy that was marked by a wide ranging array of new security concerns that had far-reaching consequences in domestic and foreign policies throughout the world including South East Asia.

This view is also shared by Mustapha (2007, p. 12) who asserts that:

The US foreign policy discourse takes on constitutive properties that have real-world consequences for the populations that are the "subject" of these discourses. The populations of some Southeast Asian countries have become the subject of (and subject to) this discourse vis-à-vis the identification of the region as a potential 'second front' in the war on terror by several top officials, including Colin Powell as Secretary of State and Tom Ridge as Secretary of Homeland Security.

Mustapha's argument is amplified in many studies, one of which is a research conducted by Volčić and Erjavec (2007) who found that socio-political actors in Serbia had appropriated such discourse for their own purposes, leading young Serbians to construct an analogy that positioned Muslims in the Balkans as a threat to them, similar to how Bush had positioned Iraq and al Qaeda as threats to the United States. The scholars argue that such a comparison stemmed from US discourses that made covert links between terrorism and militants who are Muslims. As a result of the conflation, young Serbians generally perceived their country as a victim of terrorism and as an anti-terrorist nation. Their study is not only reflective of the effect of the positive in-group and negative out-group

representation, as mentioned above, but also draws our attention to the conflation of terrorism with Islam in post 9/11 discourse, which has generally brought about a negative portrayal that Islam and Muslims are intolerant of diversity and inclined to war-mongering. According to Karim (2002), such prejudices against Muslims and negative stereotyping of Muslim behaviour and beliefs have developed rapidly in the last three decades which has effectively alienated Muslims and made them the primary other, globally.

In this researcher's view, the prejudicial representation of Muslims and Islam also gets consumed by Malaysians via news coverage and articles sourced from US speeches on the *War on Terror* (henceforth WOT), a label used to describe US efforts to combat terrorism particularly in Afghanistan and Iraq. Even, the local media could be party to such portrayals via news reports from foreign based wire agencies such as Reuters and AP as reflected in Gomez and Smith's claim (2003, p. xxvi): "the Western media comments on Islam, and their loose equation of Islam, fundamentalism and terrorism, was immediately, and often provocatively, syndicated world-wide, including in Islamic communities throughout the world."

This researcher believes that such prejudices are catalysed by the discourse related to the WOT which subsequently positions the world in a bipolar ideological division of us versus them in stark contrasting lines. For example, Bush, in his address to a joint session of Congress and the American people on September 20, 2001 had this to say (example 1) about the attackers and the impending war against the Taliban regime in Afghanistan (example 2).

1) They are the heirs of all the murderous ideologies of the 20th century. By sacrificing human life to serve their radical visions – by abandoning every value except the will to power – they follow in the path of fascism, and Nazism, and totalitarianism.

2) This is not, however, just America's fight. And what is at stake is not just America's freedom. This is the world's fight. This is civilization's fight. This is the fight of all who believe in progress and pluralism, tolerance and freedom.

The articulation of such discourse basically began in the immediate aftermath of 9/11 and continued right up to the retirement of Bush, a period of roughly seven years. They have been the focus of discussions, debates and criticisms, in a diverse range of fields. However, Hodges and Nilep (2007, p. 1) claim that studies pertaining to the discourse of WOT are limited as most specific treatments of 9/11 are basically from the fields of political and cultural studies that focus on the events, history or consequences.

This current study is concerned with WOT discourse and thus places the critical lens on language to detect how the dichotomous positive representation of the self and negative representation of the other are conceptualised linguistically in a series of radio addresses (see below) delivered by Bush and how such conceptualisations, in turn, reflect particular patterns or themes that carry certain ideological underpinnings. In other words, this study attempts to investigate the language in the discourse of WOT on the premise that it is via language, social reality is mediated as language is a social medium, conditioned socially via which human beings interact and communicate (Fairclough, 2001).

1.2 Corpus: radio addresses

The objects of investigation of this research are transcripts of 24 radio addresses given by Bush between 2001 and 2006 which were downloaded from <http://www.whitehouse.gov/infocus/iraq/archive.html> a link available at the official United States government website where speeches related to the WOT were archived. The radio transcripts are part of a wider range of transcripts of Bush's speeches made in various settings such as press conferences, policy statements and state of the union addresses that were also available at the site.

The 24 radio addresses were analysed according to two categories. The *pre-war corpus* comprises the first 12 radio addresses which include speeches delivered before and during the period of the American invasion of Iraq till the declaration that the US-led war in Iraq was officially over. The second set of 12 radio addresses, labelled *post-war corpus* consists of speeches made during the immediate aftermath of the invasion (i.e. right after American and coalition troops had taken control of Baghdad) and beyond (please see Section 3.1, Chapter 3 for more details on the two sets of radio addresses).

The radio addresses were selected for this study because they are 'pieces of political communication' originating from an influential political actor i.e. the then president of the US, George W. Bush. Thus, the researcher regards them as important political instruments that seek to influence the 'consumers' of the speeches. This view is in line with Andrews' claim (1983, p. 9) that political communication primarily aims to influence emotions, opinions and/or actions of the general public via various argumentation and reasoning strategies. Hence, he stakes a claim that politicians' speeches provide concrete evidence of "how actors

living through history perceive what is going on and how they try to shape the perception of others.” In the context of this research, what is communicated in the speeches by Bush is an effort to make sense out of 9/11 and to project causes of action consistent with that sense (via language). This is congruent to the view of critical discourse analysts, who consider language to be laden with ideological beliefs.

In addition, the radio addresses which are initially targeted to its immediate audience i.e. the listeners, are eventually stored in the archives and easily assessed by the members of the public, worldwide. They are also often reported by journalists in other forms of the media such as online portals, newspapers or magazines. For example, a radio address by the US First Lady, Laura Bush linking the military campaign in Afghanistan to restoring the rights of Afghan women was syndicated by a news agency (AP) and subsequently reported in the USA Today on 18th November 2001 (Stabile and Kumar, 2005). Sauer (1996) argues that politicians, being aware that their speeches have a wide circle of audience, always ensure that the important messages are easily picked up by the audience and journalists. The implication here is that there is a wider communication circle for the speeches than its immediate listeners.

1.3 Statement of problem

Silberstein (2002, p. 2) argues that “the power of the presidency rests in its ability to persuade” and Bush’s radio addresses are part of a wider circulation of WOT discourse aimed at persuading listeners (or readers of the transcripts) through arguments and reasoning that influence their emotions, opinions and actions. Although there are various rhetorical and political postures available to

persuade the masses, scholars such as van Dijk (1997b) argue that real persuasive power lies within the realm of political language.

In relation to the above argument, Silberstein (2002, p.1) who investigated the language of Bush's public rhetoric after 9/11 claims that it was "the strategic deployment of language" that helped in the formation of a national identity and rendered Bush's national and foreign policies common sense. Similarly, Butt, Lukin & Matthiessen (2004) who studied post 9/11 discourses claim that the lexis and grammar were the critical tools used in the construction of a post 9/11 identity.

Salient to the notion that power lies in the persuasive use of language is the argument that ideas or concepts will be accepted more widely if they are presented naturally and logically (Fairclough, 1995). This will provide it with power that "lies beneath the threshold of consciousness" (Butt, Lukin & Matthiessen, 2004, p. 270) that acts upon the audience of a particular discursive context to accept the dominant view expressed as common-sense knowledge.

This idea of one group exercising dominion over others is described as hegemony among scholars studying political discourse. Hegemony, in Mumby and Stohl's view (1991) involves the formation of a consensus among subordinate group members to share the same opinions and ideas as members of the dominant group or groups. In a similar vein, Fairclough (1995, p. 76) describes hegemony as an act of "constructing alliances and integrating...through concessions or through ideological means" to win the consent of the majority by the dominant class or elites.

The researcher acknowledges that consensus-building is not unitary – struggle between different social groups in hegemonic relationships are bound to

be present. Yet, it cannot be denied that the people who have political or economic power have the capacity to 'control' and 'constrain' people who do not have such power. Such a capacity is labelled as ideological power or "the power to project one's practices as universal and common sense" (Fairclough, 2001, p.33).

In the context of these arguments, the ideological struggle in hegemonic relationships basically occurs at the level of discourse as posited by van Dijk (1995, p. 7) who asserts: "it is discourse [that] plays a prominent role as the preferential site for the explicit, verbal formulation and the persuasive communication of ideological propositions. In other words, ideological power is embodied in discourse – it does not exist "independently in some free-floating realm of 'ideas'...but [is] a way of thinking, speaking, experiencing" (Belsey, 1998, p. 5). If discourse is the preferential site of ideology, the process of organisation, selection and representation of language can thus be ideologically motivated (Thornborrow, 1991).

In tandem with the above arguments, this research regards the language in Bush's WOT discourse as a (re)construction of reality through a process of conscious and subconscious structuring of language to represent events and experiences to promote a particular worldview – a particular way of seeing the world. In other words, the speeches are not accepted as a straightforward reflection or manifestation of a pre-existing objective reality but rather as a medium that "hand[s] down to us ready-made categories" that "unconsciously carry with them an ontology or ideology of which we may not be aware" (Goatly, 2007, p. 25).

In a related argument, Fairclough (2001, p. 2) postulates that it is language, "the commonest form of social behaviour," that is utilised as the "primary medium

of social control and power” in societies. A similar view is also proffered by Thornborrow (1991, p. 33) who claims that the language we use to “represent and interpret experiences of events in the world are to a large extent the product of ideology.”

This researcher is influenced by all the above arguments: he, basically, accepts the view that it is language that mediates social reality. Thus, he considers the language of the discourse on the WOT which is at the centre of this study as part of an ideological process that carries important social significance, giving this study a social relevance.

Specifically, the researcher aims to unravel the mental images, particularly kinaesthetic image schemas (henceforth, KIS), embodied in the language of the speeches he has selected and explain how these mental images perpetuate and accentuate the bipolar US-THEM representation. It is essentially a study on the cognitive properties of language from a critical discourse analytical perspective, marking a sharp contrast between studies that attempt to make direct links between discourse structures and power structures. In other words, making links between direct speech acts (such as commands) and social power relations, for example, may be adequate but the reproduction of dominance via discourse is more complicated than that (van Dijk, 1993b, p. 250).

Very often, scholars scrutinising discourse attempt to make such direct kind of links. Chang and Mehan (2008), for example, focus on the reasoning practices in several selected WOT discourse, relying on a descriptive approach that lacks the critical element. Their study is basically an attempt to establish how political reasoning was systematically represented to build a case for a war against Iraq.

Hence, it analysed, among others, the descriptions of Saddam Hussein's character and the political implications of the portrayal and how this, subsequently, built an argumentation system for the case against Iraq. This study attempts to avoid from being overtly discursive to the extent that it is open to criticism, by scholars such as Widdowson (1996) who claims that there appears to be confusion between the text-discourse, analysis-interpretation boundaries in critical discourse studies.

Apart from the above problem, the researcher's survey of related studies indicates that although WOT discourse has been studied extensively from a linguistic perspective, kinaesthetic image schemas have not been the focus of investigation. Some of the researchers who have studied the discourse of the WOT and their units of analysis are as follows: rhetoric (Johnson, 2002), multi-modality (Chouliaraki, 2004), intertextuality (Lazar & Lazar, 2004), grammar (Butt, Lukin & Matthiessen, 2004), globalisation (Fairclough, 2006), re-contextualisation (Erjavec & Volčič, 2007), metaphor and metonymy (Meadows, 2007) and, new metaphors (Hobbs, 2008).

Two salient observations emerge from the survey: 1) studies that focus on KIS as a domain of conceptual metaphors are conspicuously absent and, 2) studies that integrate the cognitive and critical perspectives are scarce.

Indeed, scholars such as Koller (2005) and, Eubanks (2000) claim that CDA studies that integrate theoretical concepts from cognitive approaches to the study of language are limited. According to Wodak (2006, p. 180) integrating socio-cognitive concepts in studies that aim to analyse, understand and explain social problems from a discourse perspective is necessary as mental processes which "link text production and text comprehension to both explicit utterances, text and

acknowledged. To support her claim, she quotes a study conducted in Austria with Lutz in 1987 that provided empirical evidence that the comprehension of news were influenced by factors such as background knowledge, opinions and preconceived stereotypes which form cognitive frames in the brain.

This study heeds the call of Wodak and like-minded scholars to integrate cognitive approaches with critical discourse analysis. By doing so, the researcher hopes to add to our understanding of how KIS is a fundamental means by which language and knowledge is structured (Langacker, 1987) and in that sense, deepen our understanding on of how ideologies operate in discourse.

Having specified the orientation of this research, the researcher will now present the research objectives, research questions and definitions of key concepts that are pertinent to this study.

1.4 Research Objectives

This research aims to achieve the following research objectives for each set of corpus i.e. the pre-war and post war corpuses:

1. To identify the types of kinaesthetic image schemas and the frequency of their occurrence in sentences that manifest positive representations of the *self* and negative representations of the *other*.
2. To interpret and explain the ideological role/roles of KIS in naturalising and reinforcing the bipolar us versus them representation.
3. To interpret the common conceptual metaphors embedded in the two sets of corpus based on the analysis of the kinaesthetic image schemas.

1.5 Research Questions

1. What are the types of kinaesthetic image schemas and the frequency of their occurrence in sentences that manifest positive representations of the *self* and negative representations of the *other* ?
2. How do the kinaesthetic image schemas naturalise and reinforce the bipolar positive *self* and negative *other* representations?
3. What are the common conceptual metaphors permeated by the kinaesthetic image schemas present in the radio addresses?

1.6 Significance of the study

In broad terms, one of the purposes of this study is to raise awareness of the inherent biases in the discourse of the WOT. In his attempt to do so, the researcher identifies the way language is constructed in terms of a cognitive mechanism (KIS) and subsequently attempts to explain their role in the construction of a bipolar positive-us and negative them identities. He, subsequently attempts to explicate the dominant metaphors triggered via the KIS.

Since this study attempts to make sense of KIS and how they are triggered linguistically in political discourse, it is hoped that the findings can provide an understanding of the cognitive aspects of ideology and how this shapes our thoughts and thinking. In Lakoff's view (1987), KIS are not mere arbitrary symbols but are adequate representations of the human pre-conceptual experience motivated by structures inhering in everyday bodily experience. Hence a study on this cognitive phenomenon can reveal insights into how our language is structured in terms of these schemas.

The researcher also believes that this research will broaden our understanding on the role played by KIS in the formation of metaphors in political discourse which in turn influences our understanding of Islam and Muslims. This, in this researcher's view, is important to the world at large, so that we can be critically aware of the role of political discourse and language in the formation of prejudice and stereotypes. It is essential that we become more critical of public discourse and not accept whatever that is proffered to us blindly.

It is also hoped that this study will indirectly be beneficial to students of linguistics and literature as it will provide a framework to identify and analyse KIS in discourse. This will, then, facilitate discussion and help students to express their views they have of these texts with concrete evidence (see, Simpson, 1993). In line with this argument, it is also hoped that this study would inspire others to be "actively critical rather than meekly receptive" (Fowler, 1991, p. 234) in the consumption of public discourse which will emancipate and provide them with an option to either accept or resist a discourse's ideological dimensions.

Finally, Fairclough's claim that the "primary terrain of domination" is via language that is utilised in "the struggle to impose the new neo-liberal order" (2001, pp.203-205) also provides the rationale for this study as it focuses on discourse on the WOT that has widespread implications globally.

1.7 Limitations of the study

The data used in this investigation are transcripts of 24 radio addresses delivered by the US President George W. Bush pertaining to the War on Terror – downloaded from his official administration website. Therefore, it is limited in that

sense – what is discovered from this study can perhaps only be generalised to those set of radio addresses.

Secondly, the analysis in this research is on the written word rather than the spoken one, features such as tone, intonation and stress patterns that would have a bearing in the actual radio addresses are not considered here.

Thirdly, this research will not address the issue of dialogism as it is beyond the scope of this study – hence, it adopts a simplified perspective on authorship and audience where Bush/members of his administration are considered as the primary authors and the radio listeners and the internet surfers who have read or will read the transcripts available at the United States administration's official website as the primary audience.

Finally, it is concerned with only one aspect of conceptual metaphors that is KIS. However, this is unavoidable for a research situated in the critical paradigm as the study is expected to be tedious and time consuming. Hence, other linguistic features such as pronouns, modality or transitivity patterns which can be ideologically significant are not included for analysis. In addition, other related concepts originating from the cognitive linguistics paradigm such as Fillmore's Construction Grammar (1996), Fauconnier's mental spaces (1997) and Talmy's force dynamics (2000) are also not considered in this research.

1.8 Definitions of key concepts

The definitions of the key concepts used in this study are presented on the next page to contextualise it and establish its parameters in accordance with the research objectives.

- *Ideology*: The perspective of ideology adopted in this research is best summed up by Kress and Hodge (1979, p. 6) who define the concept as “a systematic body of ideas organised from a particular point of view” and by Belsey (1980, p. 5) who asserts that ideology is a concept that is “*inscribed* in discourse... [and is] a way of thinking, speaking, experiencing.” Thus, ideology in this study is believed to be manifested via language through the way in which particular discourses construct meanings and influences our understanding of the world.
- *Discourse*: In this study, discourse is viewed from the perspective of the French philosopher Michel Foucault. Hence, Kress’s (1989, pp. 7-8) definition that “discourses are systematically-organised sets of statements which give expression to the meanings and values of an institution” and has the capacity and capability to “define, describe and delimit what it is possible to say and not possible to say” is the perspective adopted by this researcher. Thus, language in this study is conceptualised as discourse – a form of “social practice” on the basis that it is a part of society, a “social process” and at the same time a socially conditioned process, “conditioned by other parts of society” (Fairclough, 2001, pp. 18-19).
- *Kinaesthetic image schemas*: In this study, KIS are considered as mental images that are available in our minds that are used to help us understand and make sense of the world in more meaningful ways. According to Gibbs and Colston (1995, p. 349) they are “dynamic analog representations of spatial relations and movements in space” which are manifested via lexical

and grammatical items (Johnson, 1987, Lakoff, 1987). They consists of “a phonological and semantic component and, specific categorizing relationships for integrating these components with other structures and schemas for organising and extending these structures into different (and usually increasingly abstract) domains” (Oakley, 2007, p. 218-219). In this research, linguistic units, mainly words or phrases, in Bush’s radio addresses are scrutinised to identify the image schemas based on their semantic component.

- *Sentences*: In this study, reference to sentence/s means text-sentences rather than grammatically-based system-sentences (Brown & Yule, 1983). System-sentences do not correspond to the sentences that occur in the normal everyday use of language, so the researcher finds it irrelevant. In this study, the researcher employs the term *sentence* in the text-sentence sense as it is not overly-concerned with the explicit grammatical description of language. However, in the process of locating and identifying the kinaesthetic image schemas, specific parts of a sentence, particularly noun, verb, adjective, adverb and prepositional phrases are scrutinised and described.
- *Us*: The *us*, in the context of the radio addresses are the immediate past president of the United States, George W. Bush, his administration, his staff, Americans who support the war in general and, their allies. It may also include Iraqis, Muslims and other Middle Eastern countries which fully or partially support the United States.

- *The other*. The term will be used to refer to the former President of Iraq, Saddam Hussein, his supporters, his troops, terrorist organisations or networks such as al-Qaeda, its leaders and any other groups or states either real or imagined that are perceived as a threat to the United States and its allies. The other, in this sense, will occupy the object position of *them* in the phrase: *us versus them*.

1.9 Plan of the study

Chapter 1 has provided a general introduction to the objectives of the study, along with all the necessary pre-requisites that contextualises the entire research. The second chapter will provide an account of all the important theories and disciplines that form the backbone of this study. Chapter 3 will describe the research design adopted to carry out the analysis while Chapter 4 and 5 will provide the analysis of the data and discussion of the findings. Chapter 6 will provide the conclusions, consider their implications and offer suggestions for further research.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.0 Introduction

This study aims to explicate the kinaesthetic image schemas manifested in 24 radio addresses of the immediate past president of the United States, George W. Bush pertaining to the WOT. Subsequently, it aims to rationalise as to how these mental images embodied in the discourse perpetuate and accentuate the bipolar positive us versus negative them representation. Finally, the research intends to establish the dominant conceptual metaphors (or root metaphors) catalysed by the image schemas. In essence, this study is concerned about the cognitive properties of language which is investigated from a critical discourse analytical perspective.

Based on the above scenario, this chapter aims to situate the current research in its broader perspective. In the process, it hopes to coherently connect this study with both related research in the area and the theories that underpin it, namely Lakoff and Johnson's conceptual metaphor theory (1980) and its offshoot i.e. image schema theory (1987), van Dijk's sociocognitive approach to critical discourse analysis (1995, 1996, 2000, 2007, etc.), Foucault's (1972) theory of discourse, Thompson's modes of ideology framework (1990) and Edward Said's (1978) concept of an alternative mode of knowing known as Orientalism.

2.1 Metaphors – some interpretative theories

The study of metaphors has brought about various theories which emerged in response to the way metaphorical utterances were thought to be produced and interpreted. Scholars generally agree that that there are two traditional views of

metaphors which are the comparison and interaction theories of I.A Richards (1936) and Max Black (1954) which prompted the 'rebirth' of metaphors (see, Searle, 1979, Goatly, 1997, Jaszczolt, 2002).

The **comparison theory** posits the notion that metaphorical utterances involve similarity, resemblance, or a comparison between objects (Jaszczolt, 2002). This perspective on metaphors has its origins in the ideas of Aristotle where metaphors are regarded as decorative devices added to plain, ordinary everyday language to provide certain effects. Basically, a metaphor is said to function when a literal expression is substituted with a non-literal one. Accordingly, metaphors are believed to be distinct from literal language; there exists a literal/figurative language distinction. Hence, it requires special forms of interpretation to construct the intended meaning of the metaphorical expression. The theory's main weakness lies in its over-generalisations of metaphorical utterances that does not account for different and varied interpretations which are dependent on contexts and co-texts (Goatly, 1997). Other than being partly utilised in the literal language theory, the comparison theory is not popular in contemporary research.

The **interaction theory**, on the other hand, is based on the notion that metaphors function due to the interaction between the content of the metaphorical expression and the content of the literal context. In line with this argument, this theory recognises three different aspects in a metaphor which are its Topic, Vehicle and Grounds (Goatly, 1997). The metaphorical statement, thus, is believed to project certain features of the Vehicle, called Grounds, on to the Topic.

In the following invented example, "writing a thesis is a tiring journey", the noun phrase *writing a thesis* is the Topic and *a tiring journey* is the Vehicle. So, the

Grounds here are some features of a journey such as movement from one point to another, speed, obstacles and, etc. which are mapped on to the process of writing a thesis. Some features of a journey such as the type of road, the exact journey or the geographical location and, etc are suppressed. Though, the interaction theory is considered more viable than the comparison theory, its primary orientation is towards noun-based metaphors and thus cannot account for sentences such as: "Saddam Hussein is addicted to weapons of mass destruction" or "We have taken the fight to the enemy."

Owing to the weaknesses of the comparison and interaction theory of metaphors, Searle (1979) proposes a **pragmatic theory** in the interpretation of metaphors. He argues that the comparison theory is false because similarity between objects may not be always the case in a metaphorical utterance. In addition, as explained above, only some features of the Vehicle (or source domain) are mapped onto the Vehicle (or target domain) while others are suppressed. In the following invented example, TEACHERS ARE CANDLES, only certain attributes of teachers make sense in the comparison but other possible interpretations such as teachers are made of wax are naturally omitted.

Thus, Searle argues that metaphorical meaning is not sentence meaning per se as sentence meaning is basically literal meaning; instead he asserts that metaphorical meaning is always speaker's utterance meaning because it only gets across based on hearer's assumptions on the possible intentions of the speaker. In other words, the pragmatic view on metaphors suggests that the interpretation of a speaker's meaning involves going beyond the literal meaning of words and sentences.

In a contrasting development, Cohen (1979) argues that metaphors should be regarded as a feature of sentence meaning rather than utterance or speaker meaning. This is because a metaphor functions on the basis that certain important semantic features related to word meaning are cancelled in the process of interpretation. For example, in the following metaphor, MY WIFE IS AN ANGEL, the noun *angel* obtains its metaphorical status only because an important semantic feature of the noun i.e. *a messenger of God* is cancelled. In Cohen's view, the topic or target domain (my wife) is responsible for the cancellation on the comment or source domain (angel).

A more recent argument in favour of a semantic theory of metaphors is by Stern (2000) who believes that the interpretation of metaphor types are based on the content its token expresses in their respective context. In other words, it is the context that determines the content or meaning of the metaphorical expression. So, he argues that the speaker has an abstract kind of knowledge other than the knowledge of the particular content of each metaphorical token in its respective context. It is the abstract kind of knowledge associated with a metaphor that gives the metaphor its character. Thus, the character of the metaphor is said to determine different content for different contexts. This, according to Stern, is knowledge of linguistic meaning or semantics.

Although there has been a long-term dispute whether metaphors are entirely semantic or both semantic and pragmatic, Jaszczolt (2002, p. 353) argues that metaphorical meaning is gained through both semantic and pragmatic processing as "grasping the metaphor requires grasping the beliefs and intentions of the speaker and hence can be said to belong to speaker meaning" and not as

traditionally believed i.e. processed by the hearer because he/she detected an anomaly in the literal meaning.

Both the semantic and pragmatic theories of metaphors have their relevance to this study. In the process of interpreting the various linguistic expressions into their image schemas, it is the semantic content of the expressions that is utilised by the researcher to assign the expressions to the relevant image schemas. In that sense, the researcher also has to utilise his pragmatic knowledge in analysing the meanings to go beyond the literal meaning of language. However, the theory that forms the backbone of this study is the conceptual theory of metaphors which is a result of viewing metaphors from a cognitive viewpoint.

2.2 The conceptual theory of metaphors

The conceptual theory of metaphors or conceptual metaphor theory (CMT) owes its development mainly to Lakoff and Johnson's *Metaphors We Live By* (1980) where they assert that metaphors are pervasive in our language, thought and actions on the grounds that "our ordinary conceptual system, in terms of which we think and act, is fundamentally metaphorical in nature." Hence, they argue that our everyday realities are defined by this conceptual system: "the way we think, what we experience, and what we do everyday is very much a matter of metaphor" (p. 3).

Their argument suggests that all our experiences of the world are stored cognitively as metaphorical conceptions or conceptual metaphors. These metaphors are believed to have systematic structures which are *always* revealed in linguistic utterances; it is language that becomes the expressive medium for conceptual metaphors, without which they cannot be even formed or thought

about: “only through its expression in some representational system can we grasp the subject of metaphor, and the most elaborated representational system available to us is linguistic” (Kittay, 1987, p. 15).

In other words, the study of metaphors from this cognitive viewpoint is centred on language as it is linguistic evidence that provides the foundation for this line of thought. Kittay and other scholars subscribing to this view such as Jaszczolt, (2002, p. 345) regard language as “a way of externalizing general mechanisms of the brain” which provides invaluable insight into the cognitive processes that define reality in terms of our perceptions, thoughts and actions.

The most important principle underlying CMT is its notion of mapping which “refers to systematic metaphorical correspondences between closely related ideas” (Grady, 2007). Thus, the tendency in a cognitive based approach in the analysis of metaphors is to identify such mappings in terms of their source and target domains and to explain the rationale for such mappings. In its most basic form, this is precisely what this study attempts to do.

The ‘mapping principle’ can be observed in the following English sentences (Nos. 1 – 5). The respective conceptual mapping (in parentheses) is presented in capitals, with the target domain in the subject position and source domain as predicative, according to the conventions of the CMT.

1. The road to a successful life is full of obstacles (LIFE IS A JOURNEY).
2. I invested plenty of time just to write a section in my dissertation (TIME IS MONEY).
3. I am still trying to grasp the main orientations and their theories pertaining to metaphors (MIND IS BODY).

4. If my supervisor likes what I have written, I will be feeling up but if she thinks this is bad, I am going to feel down (UP IS GOOD, DOWN IS BAD).
5. It is linguistic evidence that provides the foundation for this line of thought (THOUGHT IS LINEAR).

The examples above also show that common everyday utterances are metaphorical in nature and can reveal one's conceptualisation and perception of the world. Studies by Lakoff (1980) have also revealed that there is ample evidence to show that such metaphorical mappings are systematic and thus one metaphor may give rise to a whole range of related expressions as exemplified in the following expressions related to LIFE IS A JOURNEY metaphor:

6. I am at a crossroad in my life.
7. My partner and I have decided to go separate ways as our relationship is going nowhere.
8. I am stuck at a dead-end so I have to turn back and start my life all over again and try to avoid the humps and bumps so that the ride does not get sidetracked.

Following the traditions of cognitive linguists such as Santa Ana (1999, p. 191), a metaphor in this study is regarded as "a conceptual mapping from one semantic source domain to a different semantic target domain" that facilitates understanding of one domain of experience in terms of another. The mappings are generally systematic in its projections of elements and include not just the objects and their chief characteristics but the relations, events, and scenarios that characterise the domain (Grady, 2007). Thus, in the examples below (central idea from Lakoff and Johnson, 1980) the target domain of argument is conceptualised