



Critical Discourse Analysis of the Approval of Armenian Genocide by US Congress Panel in Four Languages

Mehdi Solhi, Omid Shokri Kalehsar, Türkana Hüseynova, Sara Dargahi
Bahcesehir University, Istanbul, Turkey
Yeditepe University, Istanbul, Turkey
Istanbul University, Istanbul, Turkey
Islamic Azad University, Ardabil, Iran
solhi.mehdi@gmail.com, shukriku@gmail.com
turkana.h@gmail.com, sara.dargahi@yahoo.com

Article Info

Received: 18th October 2012
Accepted: 29th October 2012
Published online: 1st November 2012

ABSTRACT

News is perhaps the type of written discourse with which people are confronted most frequently. Hence, first and foremost, the importance attached to the news as written discourse is undeniable. On the other hand, Critical Discourse Analysis strives to take democratic and ethical approaches to deal with the social issues, new reports, as commonly used source of getting information. Therefore, news might be considered as one of the most appropriate materials to be focused upon in such analysis because CDA is a form of discourse analysis that takes a critical position towards how language is used and analyzes news and other discourse types in order to find out the ideology and values underlying them. In this study, an attempt was made to critically analyze a hotly debated piece of news on the approved Armenian genocide by US Congress panel in 2010. This news was critically analyzed in four languages including English, Turkish, Azerbaijani Turkish, and Persian. In so doing CDA, a model proposed by Huckin (1997) was applied. Hence, the general strategy involved moving from 'text level' to 'word level'; at first, the news as a whole was taken into close account. Then, it was read sentence by sentence. Finally, words and phrases were in particular considered. Critically analyzing the news, some interesting similarities and differences among the four languages were found.

Keywords: Critical Discourse Analysis

1. Introduction

Conventionally, it is believed that newspapers have more readers than any other kind of written text. According to Van Dijk (1986b), for most people, news is perhaps the type of written discourse with which they are confronted most frequently. Hence, first and foremost, the importance attached to the news as written discourse is undeniable. On the other hand, Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), as Richards & Schmitt (2001) defines it, is "a form of discourse analysis that takes a critical stance towards how language is used and analyzes texts

and other discourse types in order to identify the ideology and values underlying them. It seeks to reveal interests and power relations in any institutional and socio-historical context through analyzing the ways that people use language".

Van Dijk's (1977, 1981) goes beyond the sentences and gives importance to text- and context-dependency of meanings. Van Dijk/ Kintsch (1983) considered the relevance of discourse to the study of language processing. Their development of a cognitive model of discourse understanding in individuals gradually developed into cognitive models for explaining the construction of meaning at a societal level. Van Dijk pays attention specifically to media discourse. He gives not only his own reflection on communication in the mass media (van Dijk 1986a), but also brings together the theories and applications of a variety of scholars who are interested in the production, uses and functions of media discourses (van Dijk 1985). In critically analyzing various kinds of discourses that hold prejudice, van Dijk's interest is in developing a theoretical model that will explain cognitive discourse processing mechanisms (Wodak/ van Dijk 2000). Most recently, van Dijk has focused on issues of racism and ideology (van Dijk 1998) and on an elaboration of a theory of context (van Dijk 2001).

Fairclough/ Wodak (1997) introduce 10 basic principles of a CDA program. They are as follows:

- (1) The approach is interdisciplinary. It is not possible to study the problems in our societies from a single perspective because they are too complex. This involves different dimensions of interdisciplinarity: the theories use different disciplines and try to integrate these theories. Teamwork consists of different researchers from different traditionally defined disciplines working together.
- (2) The approach is problem-oriented. So it does not focus on specific linguistic items. Social problems are investigated, such as "racism, identity, social change" and they could be studied from different perspectives.
- (3) The theories as well as the methodologies do not follow only one style. It means that theories and methods are integrated to make it possible to understand and explain the object under investigation.
- (4) The study always includes fieldwork and ethnography to explore the object under investigation as a precondition for any further analysis and theorizing. This approach makes it possible to deal with bottom- up and top-down approaches at the same time.
- (5) In this approach, constant movement back and forth between theory and empirical data is necessary. This principle is a prerequisite for principle 4.
- (6) Multiple genres and multiple public spaces are studied, and inter textual and inter discursive relationships are investigated. Recon textualization is the most important process in connecting these genres as well as topics and arguments. Genres are hybrid and innovative.
- (7) The historical context is always analyzed and integrated into the interpretation of discourses and texts.
- (8) The categories and tools for the analysis are defined according to all these steps and procedures and also with the specific problem under investigation. This involves some eclecticism, as well as pragmatism. Different approaches in CDA use different grammatical theories, although many apply Systemic Functional Linguistics in some way or other.

(9) Grand Theories might serve as a foundation; in the specific analysis, Middle-Range Theories serve the aims better. The problem-oriented approach includes the use and testing of middle-range theories. Grand Theories result in large gaps between structure/ context and linguistic realizations.

(10) Practice and application are considered. The results should be made available to experts in different fields and, as a second step, be applied, with the goal of changing certain discursive and social practices.

Kree (1989) points to the 'political economy' of representational media: that is, an attempt to understand how various societies attach importance to different types of representation, and how societies use these different types of representation.

Many of the basic assumptions of CDA, as Kree (1989) declares, could be described as follow:

- language is a social phenomenon;
- not only individuals, but also institutions and social groupings, have specific meanings and values that are expressed in language in systematic ways;
- texts are the relevant units of language in communication;
- readers/hearers are not passive recipients in their relationship to texts;
- there are similarities between the language of science and the language of institutions, and so on.

In most studies of CDA, analysts tend to do it with some reference to Hallidayan Systemic Functional Grammar. This indicates that an understanding of the basic claims of Halliday's grammar and his approach to linguistic analysis is really important for a proper understanding of CDA. In 1970, Michael Halliday pointed the relationship between the grammatical system and the social and personal needs that language should provide (Halliday, 1978). Halliday distinguished three metafunctions of language which are continuously interconnected: firstly, the ideational function, through which language gives importance to individuals' experience. The ideational structure has a dialectical relationship with social structure, both reflecting and influencing it. Secondly, the interpersonal function, which constitutes relationships between the participants. And thirdly, the textual function, which constitutes coherence and cohesion in texts.

Huckin (1997) introduces 6 ways in which CDA differs from other forms of textual analysis:

- Authentic text are produced and read (or heard) not in isolation but in some real world context.
- It tries to unite three different levels of analysis: the text itself; the discursive practices (that is the process of writing/speaking and reading/hearing) that create and interpret that text; and the larger social context that affect it.
- Societal issues such as cultural, political, social and so on. There is no restriction on the scope of analysis.
- CDA practitioners take an ethical stance dealing with power imbalances, social inequities, non-democratic practices, and other injustices in hopes of encouraging readers

to corrective action. This is why the term critical is used: CDA not only describes unfair social, political practices but is explicitly critical of them.

- CDA follows a social constructionist view of discourse in which people's notions of reality are constructed mainly through interaction with others. Reality is not seen as unchangeable but as open to change.
- In order to make their work as clear as possible to a non-specialist group of readers, CDA practitioners try to minimize the use of scholarly jargon and complicated syntax.

2. Critical Discourse Analysis

First, an analyst should play the role of a typical reader who is just trying to comprehend the text in an uncritical manner (text-level).

Second, he/she should try to start to look at it critically (word-level):

- Raising questions about it,
- Imagining how it could have been constructed differently,
- Mentally comparing it to other related text.

In fact, our general Strategy should involve moving from 'text level' to 'word level'.

2.1 The Text as a Whole

- At first, readers should try to find a certain genre (text type) which the text belongs to. This allows the analyst to see why certain kinds of statements appear in the text. For example, language used in an advertisement accompanying by visual aids is attention getting. If the genre ordinarily includes certain kinds of information, and one does not find such information in the text being analyzed, it gives the analyst reason to suspect that the writer has deliberately left it out.
- Framing refers to how the content of a text is presented, what sort of perspective (angle, slant) the writer is taking. For example, a news report might be framed as a narrative or story. Within that frame there might be two groups while one group of participants is being given favorable treatment over the other.
- Using visual aids is one of the powerful ways of framing. We should pay attention to photographs, sketches, diagrams, formatting devices.
- Foregrounding refers to the writer's emphasizing certain concepts (by giving them textual prominence) or de-emphasizing others which are backgrounding. Ultimate form of backgrounding is omission.
- Writers can also manipulate readers through presupposition. It is the use of language in a way that appears to take certain ideas for granted, as if there were no alternative.

2.2 Reading Sentence by Sentence

- Topicalization is a type of foregrounding at the sentence level. It is what the sentence is about. Often the topic of one sentence continues as the topic of next sentence emphasizing its importance in the text. Topics inserted in the sentences create perspective or slant that influence the reader's mind.

- Attention should be given to agent-patient relation in sentences. It deals with 'who is doing what to whom?'
- Another form of manipulation at the sentence level is the deletion or omission of agent, which escapes the notice of many uncritical readers. For example, 'massacre of 25 villagers reported.' In this example, there is no agent.
- Presupposition can also occur at the sentence level. For example, if a politician says we cannot continue imposing high taxes on the American people, he is presupposing that taxes Americans pay is "high".
- Insinuation (ideological complex) is comments which are slyly suggestive. Insinuations typically have double meanings, and if challenged, the writer can claim innocence, pretending to have only one of these two meanings in mind.

2.3 Words and Phrases

- Connotations are additional and special meanings that certain words and phrases carry.
- Labels carry unavoidable connotations. For example, abortion in the U.S. Someone who opposes abortion would likely be labeled "pro-life" by sympathizers and "anti-choice" by opponents.
- Sometimes connotations are conveyed through the use of metaphor.
- Register refers to a text level of formality or informality, its degree of technicality, its subject field. Writers can deceive readers by using a phony register. For example, including advertisement written either in a friendly conversational register or in an authoritative expert register.
- Modality refers to the tone of statements as regards their degree of certitude and authority. Such as using may, might, could, will, must, without a doubt, it seems to me, it's possible that, etc.

3. Methodology and Results

CDA is useful in indicating the discursive nature of much modern social and cultural change. The language of the mass media specifically is examined as a site of power, of struggle and also as a site where language is often apparently obvious. Media institutions often claim to be neutral, in that they provide space for public discourse. They claim to reflect news disinterestedly and give the perceptions and arguments of the newsmakers. In a nutshell, due to the fact the CDA tries to take democratic and ethical approaches to deal with the social issues, new reports, as commonly used source of getting information, might be considered as one of the most appropriate materials to be focused upon in such analysis. In this study, Huckin's (1997) model to CDA was applied to critically analyze the Approved Armenian Genocide by US Congress Panel in 2010 in four languages, e.g. English, Persian, Turkish, and Azerbaijani Turkish.

3.1. Analysis of the English News (retrieved from www.BBC.com)

3.1.1 The Text as a Whole

Genre. The structure used in this newspaper report is not top-down or bottom-up. However, the information is presented in a circling trend in which each part of the news can be considered as important. The use of "too important" phrase at the middle of the report can support the claim. As Huckin (1997) believes, whatever chosen by the reporter at the beginning of the report is mainly considered as the most important, and whatever appears last will be seen as least important. In this case, the reporter has tried to foreground the approval of the Armenian genocide committed by the Turks. The reporter does not clarify the reasons for doing so.

Framing. This news report has been framed as a narrative. In this case, it can be clearly seen that the report is giving textual prominence to the US congress panel and foregrounds the US congress panel vs. Turkey government. The writer has also chosen to depict the Congress Panel in favorable terms and Ottoman, generally Turkey government, in unfavorable ones. For example, at the final sentence of the news, the report, without any quoting and without indicating any evidence, tries to unpromisingly conclude that the Armenian genocide cannot be denied. Hence, the report's unfavorable tendency is undeniable. In the same time, he/she backgrounds the peace issues in the area.

Visual aids. When the whole of this news report is considered, it can be seen that formatting devices and language tense used in the headline of the report are attention-getting. In fact, in the newspaper, it is the headline that has the highest readership. The headline is the first thing a reader sees. The headline of this news report is in active voice. The large, bold typeface has been used for the headline which can get the reader's attention. A photo is accompanied this report; a group of protestors carrying signs in this hands demonstrating against Turkey government. Under the photo, there is a caption describing that the protestors were Armenian-Americans.

Omission. While asking a question like 'What could the writer have said here?', this report could have included the information about the reasons of the United States government to approve the claimed genocide, turkey's attempts to solve the diplomatic relations between the two countries during the last years, the demonstrators' slogans or signs in their hands, and so on. The writer could have interviewed the sign-holders and asked about their attitudes about the resolution.

Presupposition. The writer of the report indirectly describes the approval of the Armenian genocide in a way it seems there were no alternatives to this decision. The news report presupposes that the US Congress Panel was forcefully supposed to approve this resolution.

3.1.2 Reading Sentence by Sentence

Topicalization. At this level, the sentences are to be considered individually. The word 'genocide' has been written between the quotation marks and the writer tries to attract the

reader's attention to the act of genocide generally, not just the Armenian genocide, in particular. As it is obvious, at the first three sentences, the U.S. Congress Panel and the approved genocide have been topicalized. Then, the topic shifts to the Turkish government and it continues as the topic of the following sentences. After that, the writer changes the voice. In the last sentences, the reporter focuses on the Armenians, in general. The frame could be indicated as:

US Congress panel...
A US congressional panel...
...the House Foreign Affairs Committee
Turkey...
The White House...
President Barack Obama...
the Turkish government...
the Turkish ambassador...
A Turkish parliamentary delegation...
Turkey...
The Armenian government...
...the committee stage
...the George W Bush
Mr Obama...
Committee chairman Howard Berman...
The Turks...
Turkey and Armenia...
Armenia...
Hundreds of thousands of Armenians...
They (Armenians)...
Armenians...

Agency. Even though the Turkish government is heavily topicalized (7 times) in this report news, they do not have much power. In the first half of the report, US Congress panel is the one initiating actions: it accuses, describes, and approves. It is at the second half of the report that the Turkey government is empowered: it responds and opposes. If we look at the headline closely, it can be seen that "despite White House objections" could have been written at the beginning rather than at the end.

Deletion/omission. In this form of manipulation, the writer has used the passive verbs. For example, sentence "Turkey accepts that atrocities were committed..." is in passive form that does not say who did the genocide. In this case, the focus is on the victims rather than those guilty of the crime.

Presupposition. "Successive Turkish governments" phrase in this news report presupposes that all the former and present Turkey governments were and are against the approval of the Armenian genocide.

Insinuation. The reporter has tried to make a insinuation in the news. In the third sentence, he/she notes that "The White House had warned that the vote would harm reconciliation talks between Turkey and Armenia". On the other hand, the writer, in the fourteenth sentence, notes the committee chairman Howard Berman's statement; "I believe

that Turkey values its relationship with the United States at least as much as we value our relations with Turkey,". In the former sentence, the writer obviously comments that the congress approval of genocide will damage the relationship between Turkey and Armenia and this resolution will make it difficult for Turkey to join the European Nations. In the latter statement, the committee chairman is aware of the possible hostility that will come up between the U.S. and Turkey but he says that this approval would not terminate the relation between the two countries. The writer tries to compare the committee chairman's and The White House's attitudes toward this approval.

Register. Nearly all the text is written in the standard, semiformal register of news reporting. At the word/phrase level, the words used in this report are harsh and hostile words: genocide, killing, fiercely opposed, warned, would harm, condemning, war, crimes, hostility, and died.

3.2 Analysis of the Turkish News (retrieved from www.haberturk.com)

3.2.1 The Text as a Whole

Genre. This report has a top-down structure in which the approval of the Armenian genocide has been foregrounded. Therefore, more attention is being given to the act of approval. If the final sentence is closely considered, we can see that less attention is being paid to Barack Obama's comments and his warning against the following consequences of such approval because they have been mentioned at the very end. Therefore, Barack Obama's words have been backgrounded in this report.

Framing. This report is framed as narrative. In general, attention has been given to the ones who are against this resolution and its approval. Hence, the opposite groups' comments are presented before those of the allies. This framing tries to draw the readers' attention away from the supporters of the Armenian genocide approval and toward the objection and warnings of the opposite groups. The writer of the report has chosen to depict the opponents and opposite parties in favorable terms and the supporters of the approval in unfavorable ones. Similarly, those who are against the approval have priority over the supporters.

Visual aids. Visual aids can be considered as one of the powerful ways of framing a news report. Formatting devices and the typeface used in the headline of the report are attention-getting. The typeface is bold and larger than that of the report itself. The use of exclamation point at the end of the headline makes it more attention-drawing. In the same time, photo of U.S. Congress parliament is accompanied this report.

Omission. This report could have included information about the demonstrations of the Armenians. The writer has mainly included the reactions of the politicians in the U.S. rather he/she could have talked about the Turkish government and people's reactions to the approval of the genocide.

Presupposition. The way this news report is framed presupposes that the most obvious features of the approval are the warnings and the objections of the opposite politicians to the following consequences of the approval rather than the approval itself.

3.2.2 Reading Sentence by Sentence

Topicalization. If we consider the headline individually, the writer accuses the U.S., in general, rather than the U.S. Congress panel, in particular, because the writer notes 'approval to the Armenian resolution in the U.S.'. Considering closely, there is a pattern of sentence topics that supports the opposite politicians versus supporter ones frame. In this news report, the more emphasis is given to the U.S. politicians in general and less importance is paid to Turkish politicians.

The frame could be indicated as:

The House Foreign Affairs Committee of the U.S....
Committee...

The House Foreign Affairs Committee Chairman, Howard Berman...
Berman...

Obama...

Hillary Clinton...

Clinton...

Obama, the President of the U.S....

Abdullah Gül, the President of Turkey...

The House Foreign Affairs Committee Chairman, Howard Berman...
Berman...

Berman...

Berman...

Orhan Pamuk, the receiver of the Nobel in Literature...

Berman...

Howard Berman...

Dan Burton, a member of Assembly...

Burton...

Burton...

Michael McMahon, a member of Assembly...

McMahon...

McMahon...

Eni Faleomavaga, a member of Assembly...

Berman...

Some members of Assembly...

These members of Assembly...

Some members of Assembly...

Chris Smith, a member of Assembly...

Lethinen tarafindan, a member of Assembly...

Agency. As it is evident, Committee Chairman, Berman's comments have been mentioned nine times during the report. In the same time, the members of the Assembly's comments have been included twelve times in the news. However, opposite members of the Assembly do not have much power in the report. Berman's comments have priority over the other groups and he is the dominant person in the report.

Deletion/Omission. The writer could have included the 'genocide' concept or 'Armenian genocide' in the headline. He/she has applied 'a resolution' concept, instead. In addition, the writer could have used the U.S. Congress Panel to specify it. However, he has preferred to use the U.S. concept in general. He/she might try to attract the reader's attention to the United States and blame the U.S. for the approval.

Presupposition. In a paragraph titled 'IRAK VE AFGANİSTAN VURGUSU', Some Assembly members of the U.S. warn that such approval might jeopardize the position of the U.S. in Iraq and Afghanistan which are Turkey's neighboring countries. The members also introduce İncirli as one of the important place for American military actions in Iraq. These facts presuppose the critical role Turkey plays in the neighborhood.

In the last paragraph of the section named 'ORHAN PAMUK ÖRNEĞİ', Burton, one of the members of Assembly, warns 'especially in the case of Iran, we need friends like Turkey.' This sentence, similarly, underlines the significance role that Turkey has in the neighborhood, in particular, and the Middle East, in general.

Insinuation. The reporter at first includes the ones who are against the Armenian genocide approval and then introduces the ones who are supporters of the approval. The writer has tried to compare the two groups but he/she can claim that he/she just tries to give some facts.

Under the topic 'KOMİTEDE FARKLI GÖRÜŞLER', at the second paragraph, Howard Berman says 'more than 20 countries have approved the Armenian genocide'. Saying such a sentence, he presupposes that in the process of approval of the Armenian genocide, the U.S. is in the right and it is not the only country that has approved it. The writer can also claim that he/she merely gives some examples about the approval.

Register. Most of the report is written in the standard, formal register of news report.

3.3 Analysis of the Persian News (retrieved from <http://zamaaneh.com>)

3.3.1 The Text as a Whole

Genre. This news report has a top-down structure in which the information is presented from the most to the least important. In this case, killing the Armenians during the First World War was approved as genocide and the Armenian genocide is foregrounded. However, the White House objections to this resolution and the Turkey government reaction to this approving seem to be backgrounded. In fact, the US congress panel appears to have priority over the other groups in this news report; the language used in it seems to be subjective rather than objective.

Framing. In this report, the writer has chosen a narrative frame for the event. In the same time, the reporter has tried to frame the event as a simple confrontation between the two key groups; the US congress panel and the Turkey government; nevertheless, the priority is given to the US congress panel.

Omission. This report could have included information about the scope of the reaction of other countries in all over the world. The news report could have talked about the demonstrators and their photo could have accompanied the news.

Visual aids. No photos or other visual aids accompanied this report but a larger and bold typeface had been used to attract the reader's attention.

3.3.2 Reading Sentence by Sentence

Topicalization. If we look at the topic, similar to the English version, the reporter uses the quotation marks for the genocide concept. In this way, the more attention is given to the genocide rather than killing of Armenians. At the following sentence, it can be noticed that using the quotation marks, the 'genocide' concept has been emphasized again. Hence, the writer aims at drawing the readers' attention to the act of genocide and the importance attached to it, in general. As it can be seen in the following topic list, the report gives more attention to the countries, the famous features, politicians, and the governments. It seems that the reactions of the countries and the features have priority over the other issues in this report. If we consider the Turkey government and their outstanding characters, it can be seen that they have topicalized nine times during the news report. However, they don't have much power in it.

To put it in a nutshell, the frame could be illustrated as follows:

US Congress panel...
 Turkey...
 Approving resolution of genocide...
 The resolution...
 The approving...
 Obama...
 The resolution...
 Committee chairman Howard Berman...
 Turkey...
 Recep Tayyip Erdoğan, the President of Turkey...
 The Armenia Republic...
 Turkey...
 Ahmet Davutoğlu, Foreign Affairs Minister...
 Turkey media...
 Hilary Clinton...
 Robert Gibbs...
 Barak Obama...
 Foreign Commission of the U.S. Congress...
 Some politicians...
 Hilary Clinton...
 Turkey...
 The Turk politicians...
 Turkey...
 200 thousands to 1.5 millions of Armenians...

Presupposition. In the second paragraph, the writer uses the phrase 'بطور شکننده‌ای' which means 'fragile' to describe the Armenian genocide approving. He/she presupposes that the approved genocide is fragile and in doubt and it is not durable because it was approved by 23

votes 22. In the same paragraph, the reporter says that 'Even though the approval cannot be applied, it has led to Ankara's dissatisfaction. The reporter uses 'cannot be applied' to describe the approved genocide. In fact, he/she implies that there was no reason to approve such genocide because it may lead to the hostility between the Turkish and the U.S. governments.

Insinuation. In the report, the writer uses some clever insinuations. In the second paragraph, he/she reports committee chairman Howard Berman' comment. He says that "The Germany has accepted the responsibility of Holocaust. Now, it is the time for Turkey government to accept the Armenian genocide." In this comment, the writer of the report clearly compares the two countries and the situation in which they are involved but the reporter can argue that he was simply trying to make a statement of fact concerning accepting the genocide.

In the other case, the writer reports Barack Obama's comment during his election campaign. He had promised to use the "genocide" concept for the killed Armenians during the First World War. The report simultaneously reminds the readers of this promise given by Obama and cleverly tries to compare his assurance before and after the election. However, when asked, the reporter can claim that he/she is just giving a fact.

Register. Nearly all the text is written in the standard, semiformal register of news reporting.

3.4 Analysis of the Azerbaijani Turkish News (retrieved from www.yerli.ws)

3.4.1 The Text as a Whole

Genre. The structure used in this report is top-down and the information is presented in descending order. Accordingly, the approval of the Armenian genocide has fore grounded. At the last paragraph, the writer has included the events happened during the First World War in 1915 and Turkey's objections. Turkey firmly believes 'It is the historians not the politicians who are expected to have anything to claim about.' These comments expressed at the last paragraph have back grounded.

Framing. This news report has been framed as a narrative. In this case, the writer has given textual priority to the Turkey government and the politician who are against the resolution. The reporter has tried to depict the Turkey government and the opposite politicians in favorable terms and the Congress Panel in unfavorable ones. Notice that the opposite politicians' comments are presented before those of Howard Berman, the Congress Panel chairman. This framing aims at drawing the reader's attention to the groups who are against the approval.

Visual aids. There is the White House photo accompanied this news report. Using such a photo, the writer is trying to put emphasis on the U.S. government, in general, and blame it for the approval. The typeface is bold and the font of the headline is larger than that of the text.

Omission. The writer could have included the comments of the Turkey and the U.S. presidents and their reactions to the approval. In addition, he/she might have talked about the Armenian government's reaction. In the same time, the approval supporters' comments have not expressed at all. The writer could have also inserted a photo of the congress or the protestors on the street.

3.4.2 Reading Sentence by Sentence

Topicalization. If we consider the headline individually, it can be seen that the Armenian genocide has been written between the quotation marks to attract the reader's attention to the Armenian genocide, in particular. In addition, in the headline, the word 'qorndarma' (means misrepresented) has preceded before 'the Armenian genocide'. The trend the writer follows here is not democratic and his choice of concept is based on prejudice. Looking closely, at the beginning, the main focus is on the words said by the members of the Committee and the U.S. politicians. Then, at the fifth paragraph, the attention is shifted toward the Turkey Foreign Affairs Ministry reaction to the approval.

The frame could be shown as:

The House Foreign Affairs Committee...

The members of the Committee...

Mayk Penke, one of the members of the Committee...

Mayk Penke...

Maykl T. Makkaul, a republican...

Eni Faleomavaqa, a democrat...

Howard Berman, the Chaireman of the Committee...

Turkey Foreign Affairs Ministry...

Turkey Foreign Affairs Ministry...

Turkey...

Agency. The members of the Committee and the politicians who are against the given approval are highly topicalized (5 times). However, they don't have much power in the process of approval.

Omission. One of the members of the Committee, at the first paragraph, considers İncirlik as an important place for the U.S. and the critical role of Turkey in Afghanistan. The writer could have included the attitudes of supporters of the Armenian genocide approval toward Turkey, as well.

Register. The language used in this report is semiformal. More emphasis is given to the words of the politicians which are supposed to be formal.

4. Discussion

When the four pieces of news are considered, there lie some interesting similarities and differences among them. It worth pointing out that the language used in all of them is not democratic and tends to incline toward introducing a particular group or person in favorable terms and the others in unfavorable terms. The genre used in all is top-down except the English version in which the all parts of the news can be considered as fairly important. However, the more emphasis, in the English news, has been given to the Armenian genocide approval.

The framing, in all of them, is in narrative and textual priority was given to a particular group or groups. In all the cases, the headline was in bold and larger typeface. In all the news, a photo is accompanied the text except in the case of Persian news. In all the news, the approval of the Armenian genocide is fore grounded and more attention is given to it. The register applied in the news is formal or semi-formal framing of the news.

In Turkish and Azerbaijani Turkish, the emphasis has been given to the significant role of Turkey in the neighborhood. However, in English and Persian news, we cannot see such a comment. If we look at the headlines, it can obviously be seen that the 'genocide' concept has been used in English, Azerbaijani Turkish, and Persian pieces of news. However, in the Turkish news, the writer has preferred to use 'the Armenian resolution' and he/she has tried not to use the 'genocide' concept. At the end of English, Azerbaijani Turkish, and Persian news headlines, a period has been used to make them normal statements. In contrast, in Turkish news, the headline has an exclamation. It seems that the Turkish news writer has got more surprised than other writers.

When topicalization is taken into account, it can be seen that, in Turkish news, the most emphasis has been given to the individuals' comments. In comparison, in Azerbaijani Turkish, the least attention has been paid to the people's comments. The comments of the individuals in Turkish news have been topicalized and quoted twenty nine times while those of the people in Azerbaijani Turkish have been utilized nine times. In English, Turkish, and Persian pieces of news, some insinuations have been applied but in Azerbaijani Turkish no case is seen.

References

- Fairclough, N. and Wodak, R. (1997). *Critical Discourse Analysis*. In T. A. Van Dijk. (eds.). *Introduction to Discourse Analysis*. London, 258-284.
- Halliday, M.A.K. (1978). *Language as Social Semiotic*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Huckin, T. N. (1997). *Critical Discourse Analysis*. In Miller, T. (eds.). *Functional approaches to written texts: classroom applications* (pp. 78–131). Washington, D. C.: English Language Programs.
- Kress , G. (1989). *History and Language: towards a social account of language change*. *Journal of Pragmatics* 13 (445-466).
- Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. (2001). *Approaches and methods in language teaching*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Van Dijk, T.A. (1977). *Text and Context: Exploration in the Semantics and Pragmatics of Discourse*. London: Longman.
- Van Dijk, T.A. (1981). *Studies in the pragmatics of discourse*. The Hague/ Berlin: Mouton.
- Van Dijk , T.A. (1985). *Prejudice in Discourse*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Van Dijk, T.A. (1986a). *Discourse and Communication: New Approaches to the Analysis of Mass Media Discourse and Communication*. Berlin/ New York: de Gruyter.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1986b). *News schemata*. New York: Dans Cooper and Greenbaum.
- Van Dijk, T.A. (2001). *Critical Discourse Analysis*. In D. Tannen, D. Schiffrin, and H. Hamilton (Eds.). *Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Van Dijk, T.A. and Kintsch, W. (1983). *Strategies of discourse comprehension*. New York: Academic Press.
- Wodak, R. and Van Dijk, T. (2000): *Racism at the Top*. Klagenfurt: Drava.