

Critical Discourse Analysis of Political TV Talk Shows of Pakistani Media

Hafiz Ahmad Bilal

Department of English, University of Sargodha, Sargodha, Pakistan

Tel: 92-321-600-2709 E-mail: escholer@gmail.com

Hina Mujeeb Ahsan (corresponding author)

Department of English, University of Sargodha, Sargodha, Pakistan

Tel: 92-306-646-0000 E-mail: neena_619@yahoo.com

Sundus Gohar

Department of English, University of Sargodha, Sargodha, Pakistan

Tel: 92-334-755-4876 E-mail: sndsghr447@gmail.com

Sehreen Younis

Department of English, University of Sargodha, Sargodha, Pakistan

Tel: 92-336-598-9093 E-mail: sehreen05@yahoo.com

Saqib Javed Awan

Department of English, University of Sargodha, Sargodha, Pakistan

Tel: 92-347-422-7994 E-mail: saqibqazi2@gmail.com

Received: January 18, 2011 Accepted: February 8, 2012 Published: March 1, 2012

doi:10.5296/ijl.v4i1.1425 URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5296/ijl.v4i1.1425>

Abstract

This study aims at exploring the relationships between language and ideology and how such relationships are represented in the analysis of spoken texts, following van Dijk's Socio Cognitive Model (2002). In this study, it is tried to show that political talk shows broadcast by private TV channels are working apparatuses of ideology and store meanings which are not always obvious for readers. Through the analysis of two episodes of a very popular talk show of a private television channel of Pakistan, the researchers attempt to reveal how the ideologies are represented in these shows. It also suggests that these talk shows mystify the agency of processes by using various strategies. In other words, critical text analyses reveal how these choices enable speakers to manipulate the realizations of agency and power in the representation of action to produce particular meanings which are not always explicit for all readers.

Keywords: CDA, Socio cognitive model, ideology, TV channels, Power

1. Introduction

Language is a wide phenomenon and its usage is even wider. The term “*discourse*” refers to anything written or spoken under the normal usage of language. Surface meanings are always different from the real meanings and the aim of discourse is to bring forth how speech patterns are working in a particular frame work and how are they being utilized in the society.

“..using a language involves something that goes beyond the acquisition of structures and the ability to make appropriate choices in the realizations of the particular language functions.” (Yalden, 1987, p 39)

One of the remarkable things of language phenomenon is that it has the ability to judge the nature of utterances which are produced by others. In natural discourse utterances, particularly the spoken discourses, utterances are always unplanned. That is they are full of false starts, pauses, unfinished remarks, etc. Grammatically, they are not correct and are never considered so by the grammarians. Whenever one gets to listen to the conversations, particularly the “recorded” ones, as they are used for a critical analysis because the human mind is prone towards mistakes, these recordings would bring out many conclusions and amongst them would be the establishment of the fact that not a single piece of recording would actually be making any sense. In other words they are the incomplete sentences in grammar.

In connected discourse, the word “*utterances*” is usually taken into consideration what the people actually say take interms of ‘write’. This term does not restricts to any kind of sentences, in fact, it covers all kinds of it, even small sounds like “*uh-huh*”, “*hmm*”, etc. are having a complete sense as they convey a complete meaning.

“...there has been a widening of the field of research to include the external functioning of the verbal code as well, what people do with words. The emphasis in such an approach shifts *from* structure and grammar *to* function and communicative competence, *from* assembling structures *to* doing things with utterances, *from* sentence in isolation *to* the utterance in context. This, then, is the domain of discourse analysis..... The description of process whereby we create and relate, organize and realize meaning.” (Riley, 1985, pp. 1-2)

Discourse analysis is incomplete without formidable structures such as coherence and cohesion which complete the whole process of analyzing the discourse in written form or in speech. The former implies to the idea of derivation of the given context with the involvement of text with the participant. Context matters a lot as it gives the knowledge to the reader about that particular relation, culture, intensions, etc. in which something was being written or said. Cohesion may refer to the linking devices, which add up to the meaning of coherences among text or discourse.

2. Aims of Discourse Analysis

One of the major complications of language is that it has many underlying functional and structural meanings which are not apparent at times. Discourse analysis helps to unveil those

hidden meanings, be it any situation or in the form of text. One of its major goals is to demonstrate how certain linguistic elements tend to enhance the efficiency of language users in their communication.

Utterance can be of one or two words but it is, nevertheless, full of meanings. Discourse analysis enables us to decipher that very hidden code which is embedded even in messages like, “*NO DEPOSIT. NO RETURN*” (we do not accept back what already had been sold off).

Such and other messages are of significant meaning and they are observed with a critical eye.

3. Critical Discourse Analysis

As the name of this type is self-explanatory, it refers to the introduction of the concept where discourse analysis is viewed critically in order to trace out the power dominance which affects the discourse.

“Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) is a type of discourse analytical research that primarily studies the way social power abuse, dominance, and inequality are enacted, reproduced, and resisted by text and talk in the social and political context.” (van Dijk, 2001, p. 352)

Critical discourse analysis highlights the facts when viewed with a micro-eye. These facts are a key to unravel the dominating powers which either are in the forms of organizations, or are found on an individual level. Through CDA the manipulations or the statements which are used otherwise in the political scenario are magnified. These manipulations are helpful in figuring out the social power of a group over the society or another group.

According to van Dijk (1996), “one of the central tasks of CDA is to account for the relationships between discourse and social power”(p.84). For Van Dijk (2000), “if there is one notion often related to ideology it is that of power” (p.25). Social power refers to the hold of one group, be it an organization or an institution, over another. Whatever we say, our each and every utterance has a particular knowledge hidden inside it.

Dr. McGregor (2004) in his paper states that “*our words are never neutral*”. This makes the fact even clearer that in critical discourse analysis observations are conducted as to how different meanings in a society are conveyed through text or by the demonstration of power. “CDA sees itself as politically involved research” (Titscher et al, 2000, p.147).

CDA aims to help the analyst to decipher the hidden boundaries and the ideologies which are prevalent in the society and have maintained their own school of thought. It is supposed that attitudes affect the way we behave in a society. Media, as an instrument for (re)producing attitudes, “are not simply vehicles for delivering information. They guide the ideological stance of the reader” (Reath 1998, p.50). Different media influence our understanding and knowledge of the world we live in, when they employ a specific language. In effect, the language of media is not authentic since it is determined and administered by dominant world-views or ideologies or as Fowler (1991, p.11) said, “the world of the press is not the real world, but a world skewed and judged” Furthermore, within a society the parties or the organizations have their own personal interests. In addition to this the ones in power are brought forth and are unmasked in

terms of their agendas. Due to this, the ones oppressed are also given a chance to elaborate their say and views.

4. Application of CDA

As far as this research paper is concerned, it aims to critically analyze the hidden objectives of politicians and the involvement of anchors via analyzing certain talk shows telecast on private television channels. In this study, as Fowler (1991) maintained, "I am not gunning for the (media)" (p.8) but scrutinizing the structures of two selected political talk shows of TV channels for the aim of making clear relationship between structure and meaning.

SAMPLE #1.

<u>Show:</u>	* "Capital Talk"
<u>Telecast on:</u>	November 17, 2011. Geo T.V.
<u>Anchor:</u>	Hamid Mir
<u>Guests:</u>	Fauzia Wahab (PPP) Khurram Dastagir (PML-N) Haider Abbas Rizwi (MQM)

5. Opening and Background

The show is one of the most viewed shows in Pakistan and it aims to shed a light upon the "other side" of the political stage of the country. Use of "intended" pun, derogatory remarks and the coy with words is made use of in the said show, whereby CDA is applied and the power domination of certain parties shall be explored via unmasking the hidden agendas.

6. Topic(s) under Discussion

The show was telecast on November 17, 2011 on Geo T.V. at 20:00 hrs in the wake of a whole new hot-issue, the "Memo Scandal". The said issue at that time, and perhaps still is, one of the most "hotly debated" causing a major unrest on the political stage of Pakistan.

There are two halves of this show, but the selected part is on one half of the above said issue. The show opened with the subject line flashing as:

"seyasi aasman par bad'gumanion key badal kab ghaiyab hongey?" (Urdu)

English translation: *"When will the clouds of apprehensions disappear from the political skies of Pakistan?"*

There were three guests called from three major parties of Pakistan. Each representing his/her party was defending their side and was raising their views to overthrow the others'.

Two kinds of clouds were named by the anchor, Mansoor Ijaz and Zulfiqar Mirza. However, our focus shall be how the parties, in opposition to one another, will react to the statements or the questions raised by the anchor. Their expressions, their words, their complete dominance

over the subject-matter and the hidden agendas shall be unraveled in this section.

7. Analysis

Mansoor Ijaz since 1995 has been looming over the political skies of Pakistan. The anchor emphasized this fact again and again and in the initial three minutes, he has projected a mini clip of Imran Khan's procession conducted on October 30, 2011.

The anchor then starts off by telling the history of Mansoor Ijaz and how he in 1995 wrote a letter to the PM of that time, Ms. Benazir Bhutto, warning her of a rebellion initiated by and within her party. Later after the inquiries were made, Bhutto warned that Ijaz is not worthy of trust and must be kept at a distance.

The anchor then brings about articles from other print media of different nations having a different view of Ijaz. Through this he builds up the topic and prepares his guests to actively participate. After the lapse of a few minutes, he mentions a political unrest prevailing in the country once again as the subject under discussion, Mr. Ijaz, wrote a letter to Admiral Mike Mullen on behalf of President Asif Zardari, which was later to be handed over to President Obama. This letter was indeed transferred to the admiral but he did not pass it on, which as it was scheduled to be, to President Obama. The former did so as he thought that the letter was not "credible" and was unworthy of any attention.

The anchor fans off the fact that it has been proved that the letter *did* reach to Mullen and that it was sent by Ijaz himself. Now what needed to be clarified was that either the letter was sent by Zardari, or by the Ambassador of Pakistan in the US, Mr. Hussain Haqqani. H. Mir then starts the discussion by first getting an online telephonic connection with Haqqani and asks him about the matter at hand.

(Note that the guests are abstained from saying a word since they are not invited as yet to express their views.)

The accused Haqqani stresses on that phone call that he had not given the memorandum to Mr. Ijaz, nor did he write it. While stressing on this, he adds another point to clarify his position by saying that he is "the Ambassador of Pakistan in the US" and has some personal contact with Mullen.

Here Haqqani gave a particular emphasis in defining his position which gave an "*I am the ambassador of Pakistan, so treat me like one*" kind of ring. These kinds of phrases are helpful, through CDA, in detecting the hidden incentives, which in this case, are clearly felt and that is to warn others not to take this kind matter a joke.

Continuing further, he adds that Imran Khan, another "possible-threat", deliberately finger pointed him, while he (Haqqani) respects him.

This statement has its own critical value as Haqqani wants himself to be portrayed in a good light and in the good books of the government. Thus, establishing his dominance; hereby proving that he absolutely had no intention to sent or write a letter.

He, at an instant, said:

“....aadmi aur kuch na ho tou apney da’awey meni sucha ho.” (Urdu)

English translation: *“... the least a man can do is to be loyal to his words.”*

This statement of his can have been driven out of two possibilities, either he is referring to Mr. Ijaz, which most probably he is, or he might be talking in general regards. But as the odds are against him, it seems as if the former possibility is likely to be considered.

Now immediately after this, he adds that Ijaz claimed that *he*, himself, undertook a secret mission. Accusing Ijaz for clarifying this fact, Haqqani adds that now he himself had said that he undertook a secret mission; since he did that, then why should he write an essay on that? Furthermore, since he did so, why was it brought forth upon the media; now that this was also accomplished, why did he reject the very act of Mullen doing the very same to that letter? Adding further arguments he puts another quizzing question as to why did Mansoor Ijaz pose a threat to bring out before media all the calls or messages details personally made from Haqqani’s own cell? This, Haqqani termed as “blackmailing” and clearly made the impression that he is not among those who are blackmailed nor does he hold such intentions of becoming so. He further makes it clear that he loves Pakistan and its democracy and it is for these reasons that he is coming back.

Judging the said argument, it might be noted that Haqqani was a guest on the phone call, not a “visible” participator there. He was offered a say as he is directly involved in the grave matter which gives the general necessity of clarifying his position one way or another. In his conversations, while absolutely rejecting the accusations laid down upon him, he made certain remarks which are maybe out of hatred, or out of the embarrassment which he has to face, or it could be a face saving act to prove himself right in the eyes of the dominant party, that of PPP (Pakistan People’s Party). On the surface level it can be deduced that Haqqani did clear himself off the charges, but this may also be otherwise and could have been done so to keep up with his incentives.

Just when asked by the anchor of his too-soon an arrival to Pakistan, Haqqani turned the tables abruptly by making himself loud and clear by saying:

“...lekin yeh bat samajh lejiye key is purey shoor sharabey ka hadaf...” (Urdu)

English translation: *“.....do make it quite clear that the focus of this hue and cry...”*

As soon as he said the last word, he breaks off, and jumps to the next point. This breaking off clearly has its own meaning in discourse analysis and since the paper is to discuss the hidden agendas via CDA, this kind of abrupt switching matters a lot.

In the said case, either his own position could have been in jeopardy should he have completed the sentence or, he might have done this unintentionally. The question that arises from the above left off sentence is “who or what was the target?” Was the answer a secret he did not want to disclose or was it by chance that he, unknowingly, jumped off to another diverting topic?

Later on, he continues blaming Mr. Ijaz and further makes another attention seeking

statement:

“...phir aapkey chand media mein dost hein, aur wohi logg hein Pakistani media mein jo unka moaq’qaf baar baar beyan kar kar key usko zinda rakhtey hein.” (Urdu)

English translation: *“...then you have certain friends in your media, and these very same people in Pakistani media are presenting the stance again and again to keep this issue controversial.”*

Here what demands an extra explanation of CDA skills is the pun thrown by Haqqani upon “wohi log hein” (*the very same people*). Stress was given to it as if intentionally applied so. Media is also targeted. Furthermore, he is referring to some “people”. Who are these people? This he did not tell nor did the anchor ask him.

Several things link to this fact that if had he said that, supposedly, these are people with whom Ijaz interacts in the media and they are deliberately fanning off this issue to further enrage the burning coals. The anchor, on the other hand, has a very negligible say in this exchange of thoughts as Haqqani blasts these allegations off his shoulder and pushes the mind of the viewer to consider Ijaz in a not-so-good light. Thus, clarifying and maintaining his position. He may gain social favour, he may enhance his personal benefits by proving, verbally, that he is clean as a crystal.

Finally off the telephonic conversation, the anchor opens the house of discussion by turning first to the PML (N) representative by asking his views as to whether or not the investigation should be carried on about the letter or is he now satisfied by the explanation given by H.Haqqani? (K. Dastagir’s claim was that this letter exists and that those behind it should be investigated.)

Since PML (N) is in opposition these days, and holds a cold ice towards the decisions made by the government, their representative would clearly be doing exactly as he had been told to do. The representative has a few documents at hand which he reads out and this is called as a “selective reading” by the woman sitting next to him, belonging from PPP, Fauzia Wahab.

Clearly the sting can be felt in the pun thrown towards the opposition party’s member and has its own significance. It could be out of disregard for the others or out of professional jealousy. Whatever the case maybe, the viewer perceives it as a meaningful hit at the opposition party. PML (N)’s member asserts upon this fact that without an authority no one can send a memo to the US joint chief of army staff and that there was an involvement of an authority without any doubt.

Discourse arising out of it is pointing towards PPP, as their party is, according to N-league’s member’s statement, in jeopardy; as it needs to answer some hidden questions. This makes the latter’s discourse dominant as it offers an open challenge to the former to clear their position to settle the unrest of the ones in opposition. Dastagir demands the explanation of the letter, whosoever maybe involved and they need an explanation from the present government as to under whose authorization was that letter written. He strongly hits again at the present government by complaining:

“...Pakistan ki khaarja policy ki tazheel hui hai key kia yeh bhe mumkin hai key Pakistan mein koi bhe shakkhs normal kharja policy na karey aur sodey bazion key zariyey Pakistan ka naam chalaey?” (Urdu)

English translation: *“...Pakistan’s foreign policy has been degraded; as things have been so questioned about a possibility that should anyone from Pakistan not normally lead the foreign policy and manipulate according to his whims?”*

Whatever has been said, it indeed is putting this party into a dominant situation here as they are representing their thoughts on behalf of the whole party. Judging from the above complaint, it is viewed that neither PML (N) is the one who is in the government nor do they have the power to run it. The thing of a clear cut importance here is that the *public* would want to know the real cause behind this hue and cry; the letter, the authorities involved or uninvolved. The only way of voicing these arguments is to unravel the *hidden* truth. In order to obtain a public say, and to be in the good books of the nation, there are parties or groups who adopt certain ways to voice out their thoughts and realities. PML (N) might be doing just that!

The anchor turns to the PPP woman and asks her say on whatever has been blasted off by the opposing group. Here this fact can be of a worthy importance as to why did the anchor provide the chance to the one in opposition than the defender to exchange his thoughts on this hot issue? Why didn’t he pose an open question for all the parties there?

This may lead to one of the possible conclusions that the one in power has to face all kinds of criticism, be that positive or negative. Their single mistake, or flaw, gives an open invitation for a “finger-pointing” criticism to the ones who fought, or sought an opportunity to do so, for the very throne on which the dominant party resides. The anchor might have used the same logic, and in doing so might have enthralled the parties to engage in snapping at each other.

Moving on to Ms. Wahab, the anchorperson asks her opinion while fanning off:

“Fauzia Wahab sahiba aapkey colleague kehty hein key muamla abhe nahi nimta....” (Urdu)

English translation: *“Miss Wahab your colleague says that the matter is yet not solved.”*

In reply to this the woman says:

“...inki khwahish hai key yeh muamla na nimtey aur esi surat-e-haal paida heo jaey key logg har taraf fresh election ki baat karein aur hukumat discredit hojaey.” (Urdu)

English translation: *“...they wish that this matter remain unsolved and that such a situation be created that everywhere people should talk about fresh elections so that the government be discredited.”*

These kinds of nagging sentences are what further make CDA an interesting task. The nature of these remarks is explicit enough as they arise out of either political or professional jealousy. The ones in power will either jump to hot conclusions against other parties or will remain calm and would reflect their ideas. While applying CDA here, one should be well aware of

the conditions and the respective positions of the parties. We know how badly PML (N) wants the government's position and their matters in their hands and how badly PPP wants this *not* to happen. Wahab has mentioned the reason and that point towards the "fresh elections", which ultimately points toward the fact that it's a well fetching chance for the PML (N) to go forth and grab their luck; if it really is there.

Furthermore she calls these kinds of acts as "*saazishein*" (*conspiracies*) which she claims that though the media has gone invasive and through this, these issues have been resolved. She further says:

"...yeh jo saazishein ab banai gai hein... aur log jo koshish kar rahey hein yeh bhe, Insha'Allah nakaam ho jaein ge." (Urdu)

English translation: *"...these conspiracies which have been hatched...and these people who are trying their level best will see that they will fail to be materialized."*

The questions which again arise are: who are these *log* (*people*), and what kind of *saazishein* (*conspiracies*) is she referring to? This hidden information so far makes one thing apparent. The use of "*yeh jo logg*" (*these people*) is in fact pointing to a particular party, group, or organization. These people on the set are either PML (N) or MQM, other than PPP. Naturally, if one was to listen it with a clearer voice, there might have been the possibility that she could be referring to these two groups, or one of them, or the one which really is a growing pain in the neck.

Within this conversation, PML (N) member interrupts:

"Lekin aap khaarja policy ka record be tou dekhein." (Urdu)

English translation: *"But also take note of the foreign policy."*

Here the PPP woman bursts off:

"Kia khaarja policy?" (Urdu)

English translation: *"What foreign policy?"*

He further makes his say more strong by making the following statement:

"Inhon'ney July 2008 mein ISI ko wazarat-e-dakhla key maa'tehad karney ki koshish ki..." (Urdu)

English translation: *"they tried to make ISI answerable to the ministry of internal affairs."*

PPP again intervenes:

"Iska khaarja policy sey kia ta'aluq hai?" (Urdu)

English translation: *"What has this got to do with the foreign policy?"*

This, and many other comments are thrown at one another and these questions raised by the opposition party are always tending to put the leading party in a dubious position and by adopting such tactics, this party grabs a better chance to win the favor of on-lookers or the

public. Such are the ways adapted by parties to cross contradict others to have their say highlighted and approved in the name of public, and thus, in their discourses, power dominance is most obvious.

The analysis of this part of the research ends here, though it should be noted that the complete show was *not* taken into consideration as there was another talk show to be analyzed as well. The sole purpose is, however, achieved; the application of CDA and the unveiling of hidden motives and how the autonomous bodies tend to dominate the public and secure their position.

(Note that the show was on two issues, one being that of the Memo Scandal, and the other part opening a discussion on Zulfiqar Mirza. Only one part of this show was analyzed.)

SAMPLE # 02

<u>Show:</u>	* “Lekin” (But)
<u>Telecast on:</u>	December 03, 2011. Geo T.V.
<u>Anchor:</u>	Sana Bucha
<u>Telephonic Guest:</u>	Mansoor Ijaz

Contradictions in show is a normal thing but contradictions which give rise to controversies is something observed in the talk shows particularly those which are conducted on political grounds. The analysis conducted by the first will be put into a comparison with this one.

8. Opening and Background

The show is conducted by a female anchorperson, Sana Bucha. One of the recently on-aired shows, Lekin failed to gather as much strength as did the previously discussed show did. However, it has been selected on the basis of its credibility and the sensitive issue it highlighted on the above said date. The show, like the previous one, is telecast on Geo Television and went on-air on December 03, 2011 at 20:00 hrs.

9. Topic(s) Under Discussion

The anchorperson conducted her show on 12/03/2011 and by then days and months had flown off and Memo issue had gained its strength, so did Mansoor Ijaz. She would take him on a telephonic conversation and would probe matters from a different perspective. Inquires about the memo-gate scandal, about the Usama-Bin-Ladin’s assassination and the fact that Mansoor Ijaz opened another Pandora’s Box will be taken into consideration.

10. Analysis

The anchor opens up the show by giving a new perspective of the current awakening of Ijaz, who revealed another aspect of treachery committed on the part of government after the Memo scandal. The anchor puts it this time that if President Asif Ali Zardari and Hussain Haqqani knew about Usama-Bin-Ladin attack, then why did Mansoor Ijaz bring the fish out of water, when the fish was already dead and gone?

The anchor makes it known to the viewers that she in person would ask Ijaz. She welcomes him on a telephonic conversation in a typical business like tone and heads on with a posing question:

“...and now you’ve put on some serious allegations on the Zardari government, on President Asif Zardari himself and Hussain Haqqani that they knew before hand about the Usama-Bin-Ladin raid that America was going to conduct.”

(Note that the online guest, Mr. Ijaz, is an American national and does not understand Urdu at all. Therefore, the exchange of dialogues is limited to English only.)

After announcing this she asks him whether or not he has some evidence to support it. By blasting off this question, she neither asks him to defend him self nor asks for the nature of these statements, but wants the “evidence” from Ijaz. By the blunt demand of evidence she takes the reins in her hands, and thus, puts the defender in a difficult position to answer or provide any kind of factual detail.

The matter is, indeed, of a major political attention and the one who has been asked to put forward the evidence is brushing it away, by stating himself as an analyst and by professing the fact that he wrote an article as one in a foreign magazines (News Week) which appeared that day. He also confesses that he wrote an article on October 10th in the Financial Times. He then says that the Pakistani press picked up on the fact that there was a memorandum. To this he also adds that the minute that the Pakistani press picked upon that, Haqqani and his associates started an orchestration of denial and that denial came from the presidency and then from the foreign policy.

One of the main advantages of a telephonic conversation is that there is very unlikely a possibility to be interfered by a third person; since it’s only a one-on-one conversation. Mansoor Ijaz, one of the most sought after personalities dominating on the political stage of Pakistan, is now offered a chance to make him self clear of all charges. Being labeled as a “persona-non-grata”, Ijaz defends himself dropping off some major puns which make the analysis even more interesting.

About the denial of the fact there was a memorandum; Ijaz uses the word “orchestration” linking it to Haqqani and his associates which included the presidency and the foreign office. The fact that this word was used in the meanings of conveying a denial, most probably reflects that it was a collectively strong decision to deny the existance of that memorandum. Since the government is already in a peril these days, and these kinds of statements would further weaken their hold.

Two possible meanings can be deduced from Ijaz’s statement. First there remains the fact that the “Pakistani press picked up the fact that there was a memorandum...”- it’s a “fact” as said so. Secondly, there follows the immediate denial by the government and foreign office after the news was leaked out by the media.

These linked remarks paved way for the basis of minutely observed facts leading to certain conclusions. One such is that the information did most certainly reveal the utter lack of

possession of truth on the government's part. Things would have been different if the acceptability of the memorandum had been acknowledged by the government. There was a denial by the authorities from both inside and outside of the country.

Here at this establishment of the scenario, the government is in power as it runs the country. Ijaz can be brushed off and hushed away from all this matter yet he stands rooted on the ground until his say is taken into a worthy consideration. He clearly establishes certain motives to gain strength and by leaking out the confidential information, though they caused the public a major set back against the present government, he has made a place in the media, dominating and gaining strength day by day to go to any extent in bringing out that true face of what he believes the government to be.

He also claims that the Pakistani government is “covering this matter up” (that of the memo) and he wants to know why they are doing so and “what are they hiding?”. He keeps on going and says that he put forward his “analytical views” of what he believed to be the government of Pakistan is trying to hide. Projection of “facts” is what his part of agenda is. He wants to know “why was there a covering up?”. He says:

“...I am the only guy who holds the facts and I am the only guy who is willing to transparently put those facts on the ground.... There will never be a full truth on the table about why this all happen the way that it did.”

These statements may refer to the fact that the government is in jeopardy, and that there has been a dominating show put on by Ijaz and that this man through his “analytical articles” is trying to reveal the fact(s) which is/are completely and continuously being denied by the government.

The anchor puts the online person in a jeopardizing state, overthrowing a pun at “analytical overview”- the words actually used by Ijaz. She says:

“Are you saying that this is your ‘analytical overview’ that this is what they are trying to cover-up the fact that they knew that the Americans were going to go ahead and conduct a raid that’s going to get them to Usama-Bin-Ladin?”

Here the anchor is manhandling the statements and trying to dugout the facts which the online member either is not willing to disclose or he is forced to do so. The agenda of finding out the truth, the facts or these manipulating methods are the tools which are so often used by the anchors to put their guests in an uncertain way in order to find out the real truth behind it. CDA helps us in various ways to trace out the politically manipulated ways done on the part of the anchor and as to how do they manipulate statements of their guests and in doing so what the real agenda behind all these is. It is to put forward the real truth, which all anchors claim to do.

Moving further, the anchor continues to blast off certain questions which are repeatedly used to mean of “analytical overview” as this was what Ijaz named his analysis.

This repeated pun may seem ordinary but its overuse, along with a considerable emphasis, may give it a different colour as this act of the anchor may have certain hidden motives as by

pronouncing this term again and again may give a “dubious” ring to it, both to the one who originally used it and for the viewer too.

Later on, she makes it sound all black or white by putting it straight forwardly to Ijaz:

“Are you or accusing them or are you not accusing them?”

Certainly this can be a difficult state for Ijaz for he has to choose one, or to deny this. The latter, however, would perhaps be going against his will. He either has to lay down all the weapons or has to face the truth.

But here lies the smartness of Mr. Ijaz by dodging himself out of this grave situation and manipulating the statement completely while adding:

“Let me be very clear. It is my analytical view based on certain body of evidence that I’ve had access to.... But the reality is that I’ve got enough in my hands to be able to make the analytical argument that I’ve made....”

In these dialogues, it seems as if Mr. Ijaz is trying to avoid the boundary line the anchor sketched. Instead he pounces on Zardari and Haqqani that they could have stood up the day after this article showed up and they should have accepted it and should have taken the full ownership of that memorandum.

So instead of answering the real question Bucha asked, he moves on to blame the government and its heads. He further says:

“the Pakistani media is trying to twist and turn my words.”

This statement could have been thrown at the anchor as the said is manipulating the words and trying to dig out the hidden policy via her own methods.

The anchor then jumps off to another topic and these are the BBM (Blackberry Messenger) exchanges which involves the persuasion of Haqqani to Ijaz not to go public for the memorandum. Inwardly, she is trying to blame Ijaz for making it all a public event and perhaps due to this Ijaz says in an offensive way:

“...with all due respect, the memorandum did not go public from my hands.”

This stinging and, perhaps, an offensive remark here, clarifies his dubious position. He says that:

“I made sure that the BBM exchanges were made public... make sure that the public knew what this was all about.”

Public has a huge face, one that is maintained by some parties as their own, and those in opposition are determined to have their own way to deal with it. Again this fact should not be looked over that Ijaz, the one targeted here as if he had committed a blasphemous act by bringing all the hidden information on screen to the media, did this all to gain social power and this may also well clarify the fact that discourse analysis helps in uncovering a certain position of those who are doubted at by the government or autonomous organizations and are

made to look in the bad light through the media, although the case maybe otherwise.

11. Discussion

Every show has got the use of different tactics to unravel the hidden truth and to project them to the public. In both of these shows the ways adopted in order to project the manipulated truths differ from one another. In the first case the anchor starts off by engaging the representatives of different parties in a hot topic. On the other hand, the second show was anchor-based show because it had a great deal of anchor's own self involvement in order to dig out the truth from the online guest.

From both these analyses, there are several things deducible. Firstly, the nature of these shows varies and one may see it very clearly. In Sample 1, certain traits which were present and are observable herein, were absent in the Sample 2. The second show is perhaps limited to the anchor and the one-on-one communication; where only the anchor poses the questions for the one she is communicating on the telephone. On the other hand, the show 1 had a completely different pattern because there the anchor was actively involved with three other guests, and there the host was deliberately offering a punch to the sentiments by giving the opposite party, or the one in power, the most beneficial position.

Secondly, the use of telephonic conversation is there in both the shows. This kind of conversation has its own importance. Apart from the cross communications, it also tends to throw light on the fact that the one on telephone has nowhere to go, except, perhaps, dropping the line, and avoiding the questions thrown at him/her by the anchor.

Furthermore, the one who asks for a say is the anchor and not the person on the phone call or the guest; they are merely answerable to the questions or to have an exchange of opinions.

In Lekin, what appeared on the show was that she and Mr. Ijaz were on a one-on-one conversation. Here there were questions asked either straightaway or were manipulated. She stopped him, interfered in his opinions and brought them to be looked otherwise. There was no other guest at the show at that moment.

Considering Hamid Mir's show, he took Haqqani as a telephonic guest in the presence of three other guests. By doing this, he presented evidence, not only for the public but the guests as well so that it would be more of an "on-record" talk.

Last but not the least, there is the technique used in these talkshows of bringing about the prominent articles from across the globe, making certain controversial headlines and video clips are also played during the shows, briefing the guests about their statements made earlier. Sana Bucha did it, and so did Hamid Mir. There are certain objectives which are achievable. One of them is to convey the truth as it is. The other way round could be the fact to ensnare the one who is being targeted specifically and to dawn it upon them as to how their issue has been highlighted there.

12. Influential Source of the Research

Many a number of models have been constructed on CDA till this present day and reseachers

will continue to do so in the future as well. In this research, van Dijk's model for political and media discourse is used. For he aims at the fact that in our daily lives, we tend to forget how important words such as "our" and "them" are, as their usage can give birth to certain debatable points which, when observed with a critical eye, have a greater chance of coloring it all otherwise. He points out this fact:

"...events and actions maybe described with a syntactic variation that are a function of the underlying involvement of the actors (e.g. their agency, responsibility and perspectives)."

This, therefore, proves the very fact of the whole being of this paper as it determines the very hidden traits of individuals who are here analyzed and their possible outlook is magnified as to make a difference between what "is" and what "it actually was".

13. Conclusion

Let this fact be acknowledged: each show or anchor and their respective agendas do serve as an epitome of a single public-dominated society. To gain a social power and the favor of public, there are some tactics adopted. These tactics are utilized best on different levels and since this is political dominance being mentioned here CDA has played a major part in revolutionizing it, as it aims to have a critical overlook upon: how the utterances are made, and how the dominance of one party, group or organization, or even on an individual level, prevail throughout.

When viewed with a critical eye, these shows unravel the hidden agendas, incentives, motives, manipulations, and all such factors which are otherwise ignored and due to ignorance they are less viewed as critical talk shows.

*DISCLAIMER: The programs taken were specifically used for research purposes and that none other purpose should be extracted out of them, both on personal or political level. Note that the programs were not taken as a whole, but only a section of each program was analyzed.

References

- Fowler, R. (1991). *Language in the news: Discourse and ideology in the press*. New York: Routledge.
- McGregor, L.T. (2006). *Critical Discourse Analysis: A- Primer*. [Online] Available: <http://www.kon.org/archives/forum/15-1/mcgregorcda.html> (December 20, 2011)
- Reath, D. (1998). *The language of newspapers*. USA: Routledge.
- Riley, P. (1985). *Discourse and Learning: Papers in Applied Linguistics and Language Learning from the C.R.A.P.E.L.* London: Longman.
- Titscher, S., Meyer, M., Wodak, R. & Vetter, E. (2000) *Methods of Text and Discourse Analysis*. London: Sage
- Van Dijk, T.A. (2000). Ideology and discourse: A multidisciplinary introduction. [Online] Available:

<http://www.discourses.org/UnpublishedArticles/Ideology%20and%20discourse.pdf>

(December, 14, 2012)

van, Dijk, T.A. (1996). Discourse, power and access. In *Texts and Practices: Reading in Critical Discourse Analysis*. Coulthard, C., Rosa, C. and Coulthard, M. (Eds). London: Routledge. pp 84-104

van, Dijk, T.A. (2001). Critical Discourse Analysis. In *Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. Schiffrin, D., Tannen, D. and Hamilton (eds.). Malden: Blackwell. (pp352-371)

Yalden, J (1987). *Principles of Course Designing for Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Copyright Disclaimer

Copyright reserved by the author(s).

This article is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/>).