CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS ON DELIBERATIONS AMONG LECTURERS OF ARTS EDUCATION, PRINCE ABUBAKAR AUDU UNIVERSITY, ANYIGBA DURING THEIR EMERGENCY MEETING HELD IN THE HOD'S OFFICE ON 17TH FEBRUARY, 2022

OJONUGWA, Sunday Joseph
Department of Arts Education, Faculty of Education,
Prince Abubakar Audu University, Anyigba, Kogi State.
Email: joseph.so@ksu.edu.ng or Ugwa4christ70@yahoo.com;

Abstract

The study was aimed at examining the power relations and social struggle among lecturers of Arts Education, Prince Abubakar Audu University, Anyigba. The researcher adopted qualitative descriptive research design. This work was hinged on the theory of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). Participants' observation and document containing minutes of the Department Meeting held 17thFebruary 2022 were the major means of data-gathering for this research. What happened during the meeting was not controlled or conditioned but reflected the natural repertoire of how relations of power and social struggle are enacted and exercised in discourse, even among the intellectuals. The data collected were analysed with the instrumentality of descriptive and interpretative techniques. From the analysis, it was discovered that contemporary conversation is usually influenced by inherent property of a social system in which a particular discourse is situated and, the maximization of power of one class depends upon the maximization of its exploitation and domination of another. This study among other things, concludes that power is a social force that is struggled for in a conversation, those who hold power at a particular moment would want to constantly re-assert it, and those who do not hold it are always liable to make a bid for it.
Keywords: CDA, Conversation, Relations of Power, Social Struggle and Minutes of Staff Meeting.

Introduction

Like a medical doctor's office where a lifeless body, unable to speak, is dissected for the purpose of discovering the cause of death, Critical Discourse Analysis, henceforth (CDA) is the right place to perform an autopsy on the discourse (spoken or written)to find out the prevailing discursive strategies foregrounded in the discussion. O'Halloran (2004), states that CDA, as an important branch of Discourse Analysis, tries to focus on relations between ways of talking and ways of thinking, and highlights "the traces of cultural and ideological meaning in spoken and written texts". Also, Fairclough (2006) states that CDA broadens the scope of linguistic analysis, it includes the larger sociopolitical, administrative, and socio-cultural contexts within which discourse is embedded, as it is at this macro-level of analysis that we are able to unpack the ideological bases of discourse that have become naturalized overtime and are treated as common sense, acceptable and natural features of discourse.There are different

fields and topics which invite CDA to perform its valuable job. However, if there is one social field that is most fitting here, it is the field of academia. Demonstrations, personal philosophy, discipline, social justice, struggle for power among contemporaries, language embellishments, and academic brainstorming are all the fields of ideological battles and struggle for superiority. This is not surprising because, as Van Dijk contends, "it is eminently here that different and opposed groups, power, struggle and interests are all at stake, in order to compete, individuals need to be ideologically driven and organized" (1988).

One of the key factors that determines the success of Head of the Department in an academic setting in achieving his/her goals and to winning the consensus of members of staff while his/her tenure lasts is in his/her ability to persuade and impress members of staff. According to Teittinen, "the winning academic leader is the one whose language, words, terms, and symbolic expressions are dominant but transparent in nature, and this is where the need for critical listening and reading is felt more than any other time to realize what the reality is and how it is distorted through delicate and skillful use of language. Like the coroner, staff members must dissect the discourse, find the distortion, go through it, and discover the reality at last. Fairclough (1997) argues that all linguistic usage encodes ideological positions, and studies how language mediates and represents the world from different points of view. It is the connection between ideas, language, power, and the ordering of relationship within society that is important for those involved in CDA.Most academic deliberations are characterized and shaped by 'language use in context', and its unintelligibility is a product of an intentional discursive practice by those involved in the conversations who maintain specialized language patterns as a 'disciplinary discourse' of power and ideologies, constraining and normalizing behaviour through internalized discursive boundaries. It is obvious in modern society that power is increasingly achieved through ideology, and more particularly through the ideological workings of language, as ideology is the prime means of manufacturing consent which can generally raise issues of exploitative social relations. If this exploitative social relations among members of staff are not checked with the instrumentality of a critical discourse analysis, it will be difficult to increase consciousness of non-discourse analysts who are part of the discussion of how language, ideology and power work in a conversation, and particularly of how language contributes to the domination of Head of Department over members of staff of department. This contributes to the fact CDA is a version of discourse that does not posit language use free of ideological conditions. It is on the strength of the above that this work seeks to address the ideological dimensions of discourse during the emergency meeting of staff of Arts Education Department, Faculty of Education Prince Abubakar Audu University, Anyigba.

Theoretical Anchorage
Conventionally, CDA is a version of discourse that does not posit language use free of ideological conditions.According to Roghayah and Razieh (2018), critical discourse analysis has been approached and defined by different scholars from a variety of viewpoints. Hillary Janks in her article, assertsthat Critical Discourse Analysis is a research tool and critical theory of language which considers the use of language as a form of social practice (Janks, 2018). She also argues that:

> All social practices are tied to specific historical contexts and how existing social relations are reproduced or contested and different interests are served. It is the questions related to interests- How the text is positioned or positioning? Whose interests are served by this positioning? Whose interests are negated? What are the consequences of this positioning? that relate discourse to relations of power. Where analysis seeks to understand how discourse is implicated in relations of power, it is called *"Critical Discourse Analysis".*

Van Dijk decided to answer these multiple questions of what CDA is by asserting that Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) is a type of discourse analytical research that primarily deals with theabuse of social power and dominance of some people over others, and how this inequality is enacted, reproduced, and resisted by text and talk in the social and political context. With such dissenting research, critical discourse analyst takes explicit position, and thus wants to understand, expose, and ultimately resist social inequality. CDA takes aim to offer a different model or perspective of theorizing, analysis, and application throughout the whole field.

Van Dijk (1998) argues that critical research on discourse needs to meet the following requirements to effectively realize its aims. These requirements areit must be better than other researchto be accepted; it centralizes on social problems and political issues instead of current paradigms and fashions; proportional critical analysis of social problems is usually multidisciplinary; instead of merely describing structures, it attempts to explain them in terms of properties of social interaction and especially social structures. CDA concentrates on the ways in which discourse structures enact, confirm, legitimate, reproduce, or challenge relations of power and dominance in society.

According to van Dijk (1993), CDA is not intrinsically a specific direction of research; therefore, it does not have a unified analytical framework. He further points out that CDA is obviously not a homogenous model, not a school or a paradigm, but at most a shared perspective on doing linguistics, semiotic or discourse analysis. Van Dijk (1988) claims that discourse is not simply an isolated textual or colloquial structure. Rather it is an intricate communicative event that also epitomizes a social context, featuring participants (and their properties) as well as exploitation and power struggle. According to Roghayah and Razieh (2018), in the late 1970s, Critical Linguistics was developed by a group of linguists and literary theorists at the University of East Anglia, whose approach is based on Halliday's Systemic Functional Linguistics. CL practitioners such as Trew aimed at "isolating ideology in discourse" and showing "how ideology and ideological processes are manifested as systems of linguistic characteristics and processes (Trew, 1979). This aim is pursued by developing CL's analytical tools based on systemic functional linguistics (SFL). Following Halliday, these CL practitioners view language in use as simultaneously performing three functions: ideational, interpersonal, and textual functions. According to Kress (1990), among CDA practitioners, Van Dijk is one of the most often referenced and quoted in critical studies of media discourse, even in studies that do not necessarily fit within the CDA perspective. Despite the developments of CDA in different directions, Van Dijk's model with its focus on social context and the constituting featuring participants (and their properties) as well as production

and reception is top-notch. This is appropriate for this work in that it addresses social exploitations among the departmental lecturers.

Discourse as Social Practice

In CDA, discourse is defined as a type of social practice and the context of language is crucial (Fairclough, 1989, 1993, 2003; van Dijk 1993, 1997, 2001; Gee, 1990; van Leeuwen, 2006; Wodak, 1996, 2000, 2001; Scollon 2001; and Wodak, 2000). Discourse involves both written and spoken language as a form of social practice (Fairclough and Wodak, 1997, p. 35). Following Fairclough (1995), Reisigl and Wodak (2000) consider discourse as "a way of signifying a particular domain of social practice from a particular perspective". In seeing discourse as a social practice, Fairclough (1989) shows that a critical analyst is not only concerned with analyzing texts, but with analyzing the relationships between texts, processes, and their social conditions. In doing so, three dimensions of critical discourse analysis arise accordingly: description that concerns the formal properties of the text that concerns with what a text says, interpretation that concerns the relationship between text and interaction, and explanation that concerns the relationship between interaction and social context, (Fairclough, 1989). There is a dialectical relationship between discursive practices and the specific fields of action (including situations, institutional frames and social structures) in which they are embedded. Social settings affect and are affected by discourse. In other words, discourse shape social settings and it is shaped by them (Wodak, 2007). Social structures as well as social events are parts of social reality and the relationship between social structures and social events depends upon mediating categories, which Fairclough called 'social practices', the forms of social activities, which are articulated together to constitute social fields, institutions, and organizations (Fairclough, 2003).

In this sense, discourse is a particular type of social structure which creates social practices within the social network. Following Focault (1985b), Faiclough (1992, 2003), calls this social network "orders of discourse", the semiotic specific system of every field (i.e., political, educational, governmental, etc.). In social network, the relationship between discourse and society is interdependent: it is socially shaped and socially shaping. The task of CDA is to explore the tension between these two sides of practice, the socially shaped and socially shaping. It has the role to make those involved in the discourse who may not be aware of the intertwined relations of certain discourse understand its hidden meanings and relations. Social practice is a part of discourse that shapes matter of meaning that depend on matters of social relationship. Matters of meaning and matters of social relationships are interdependent as well, so we must understand both to understand either. CDA is characterized by a realist social ontology; it regards both abstract social structures and concrete social events as parts of social reality (Fairclough, 1993). Similarly, Michael Meyer (2001, p. 28) shows that many modern theories of CDA imply circularity between social action and social structure, since they concern two levels of interpretation. The first concerns general social theories, often called 'grand theories', which conceptualize relations between social structure and social action, providing top-down explanations (i.e., social structures interpret action). The second concerns bottom-up explanation (i.e., actions interpret structure), which links micro- and macro-sociological phenomena together. However, Van Djik (1993, p. 251) argues that CDA 'prefers to focus on the elites and their discursive strategies for the maintenance of inequality' through

studying top-down relations of dominance than to bottom-up relations of resistance, compliance, and acceptance. To him, this will often be effective and adequate, because it is easy to assume that directive speech acts such as commands or orders may be used to enact power, and hence also to exercise and to reproduce dominance. Similarly, it is easy to examine the style, rhetoric, or meaning of texts for strategies that aim at the concealment of social power relations, for instance by playing down, leaving implicit or understating responsible agency of powerful social actors in the events represented in the text. CDA, hence, studies the relation between society, discourse, and social cognition, which is the necessary theoretical and empirical interface that should be examined in detail. Social cognition is the missing link between discourse and dominance, a feature that distinguishes CDA from other non-critical approaches.

In CDA, discourse involves social conditions of production (e.g., text) as well as social conditions of interpretation. It is the linguistic form of social interaction that is either embedded in social context of situation or that it interprets the social system that constitutes the culture of institutions or society. It is a product of its environment, and it functions in that environment through the process of interaction and semantic choice. Text is the realization of such environment. CDA treats discourse as a type of social practice including visual images, music, gestures, and the like that represent and endorse it. Texts are produced by socially situated speakers and writers. For participants in discourse, their relations in producing texts are not always equal: there will be a range from complete solidarity to complete inequality. Meanings come about through interaction between readers and receivers and linguistic features come about because of social processes, which are never arbitrary. In most interactions, users of language bring with them different dispositions toward language, which are closely related to social status (Fairclough, 1989).

Power Relations and Social Struggle in an Academic Conversation
Power relations are not reducible to class relations. There are power relations between social groupings in conversations, as we have seen, and there are power relations between women and men, between ethnic groupings, between young and old, which are not specific to institutions. One of the problems in analyzing contemporary conversations is how to view the connection between power relations and these other types of relations. On the one hand, there is no simple transparent connection between them which would justify reducing these other relations to power relations, by seeing them as merely indirect expressions of power. On the other hand, power relations define the nature of the conversation, and have a fundamental and pervasive influence on all aspects of the conversation, including those other relations, so that it is not acceptable to regard gender, race and so forth as simply parallel to power.

According to Fairclough (2013) Power relations are always relations of struggle, using the term in a technical sense to refer to the process whereby social groupings with different interests engage with one another. He further explains social struggle as struggle that occurs between groupings of various sorts - women and men, black and white, young, and old, dominating and dominated groupings in a social conversation, and so on. But just as social relations are the most fundamental relations in conversations, so too is social struggle the most fundamental form of struggle. According to Wodak (1997), social struggle is a necessary and

inherent property of a social system in which the maximization of the profits and power of one class depends upon the maximization of its exploitation and domination of another. Social struggle may be intense and may appear in more or less overt forms, but all social developments, and any exercise of power, take place under conditions of social struggle. This applies also in conversations facilitated by language. Language according to Fairclough (2013), is both a site of and a stake in class struggle, and those who exercise power through language must constantly be involved in struggle with others to defend (or lose) their position in a conversation.

In addition, power in discourse or behind discourse is not a permanent and undisputed of any one person or social grouping. On the contrary, those who hold power at a particular moment must constantly re-asserting their power, and those who do not hold power are always liable to making a bid for it. This is true whether one is talking at the level of the situation, or in terms of a social interaction or conversation, or in terms of a whole society. According to Fairclough (2013), power at all levels is won, exercised, sustained, and lost during social struggle. According to Brown (1983), one dimension of power in discourse is arguably the capacity to determine to what extent that power will be overtly expressed. It is therefore quite possible for the expression of power relationships to be played down as a tactic within a strategy for the continued possession and exercise of power. That would seem to be a reasonable interpretation of the consciousness and deliberate adoption of strategies to win, exercise and sustain power on a conversation. This is a case of hiding power of manipulative reasons in discourse. Discourse is part and parcel of any complex situation of struggle, and we can deepen our understanding of discourse by keeping this matrix in mind, and our understanding of the struggle by attending to discourse.

Method
Participant observation and the document containing minutes of the Department Meeting held 17th February 2022 were the major means of data-gathering for this research. The researcher is a lecturer of the Department of Arts Education, Prince Abubakar Audu University, Anyigba, and is very familiar with the formality and informality of situations during departments meetings as he has attended several of such meetings.He is also aware that social struggle is a struggle that occurs between groupings of various sorts – HOD and members of staff, women, and men, black and white, young, and old, dominating and dominated groupings in a social conversation, and so on. The researcher has thus selected samples of data that best illustrate how power is won, exercised, sustained, and lost during social struggle. The data selected were analyzed with the instrumentality of Critical Discourse Analysis to justify how those who hold powernow constantly re-assert their power, and those who do hold power are always liable to make bid for it.

Presentation and Analysis of Data
The most appealing aspect of this meeting is that it is a meeting of the academics, a meeting of those who fairly possess equal thought of what may be possibly going to be discussed and the style of discussion. However, that doesn't mean that the deliverable of the meeting is very easy to detect. In fact, because the meeting is not what is usually called ''Departmental Board Meeting'' it is very possible to find contradictions.

HOD: *I welcome you all to this emergency meeting. This is an emergency meeting, and we must all abide by the rules. In this brief meeting, necessities will be considered and not the process. In view of this, some reactions and opinions may not be accommodated; so let us be guided.*

Participant A: *An observation Sir, I hope it is appropriate that someone is asked to give an opening prayer. That I have in mind, HOD replied.*

HOD: *This emergence meeting is hinged on the need to domicile all our courses in the department. Part of what informed this agitation is the letter from the Islamic and Arabic Department,Faculty of Arts and Humanities, informing my office of her decision not to allocate courses again to the lecturers in this department.I personally see the action of the Department of Islamic and Arabic Studies as a treat to our existence. I equally want to inform you that English and Literary Studies and Religious Studies Departments honoured our relationship allocated some courses to us. This, I have called you over that we may brainstorm and possibly come up with a decision that can stand the test of time.*

Participant B: *I think the positions of our servicing departments not to allocate courses to some lecturers in this department should not worry us that much, as they have indirectly helped to advance our course. By this, we have got a strong footing to support our earlier position on the domiciliation of all our courses in the Department. It behoves the committee on the domiciliation to fasten her steps to push our request as soon as possible to the appropriate quarters for an immediate consideration.*

HOD: *that I have plan to do immediately after this meeting. I will call on the secretary to do a letter to that effect. Let me take the Bull by the Horn, he added.*

Participant C: *I think we should advice the content lecturers in this Department to begin to think towards transferring their services to the Faculty of Arts and Humanities, as they have no prospects in this Department. They need to do it now, as they cannot be assessed as professors in this Department as their PhDs are not in Education.*

Participant D: *in his own response, thanked the HOD for the opportunity to speak. He stated that until the conditions under which a particular decision takes place have been ascertained and described, so that the observation may be repeated by other speakers, scant credence is likely to be given to the more extreme polymorphic views. I will advise that the detailed positions of our service departments be ascertained, so that we could have a way to defend further accusations regarding this domiciliation.*

HOD: *From my negotiations and discussions with the relevant authorities, I will advise the lecturers in the content areas to remain calm, while I wait for the outcome of my negotiations. He added by saying that the University management was aware of everyone's academic profiles before employing them into this department. He equally stated that the University Authority is aware of the peculiarity of the Department of Arts Education before conducting such a rigorous exercise.*

Participant E: *while trying to take a position in support of* **Participant C** *was not given the freedom desired as he started his point with conviviality. This act of trivialization was what made the* **HOD** *to cease the freedom given to him and advised him to always making use of his time whenever the system turns on for him.*

HOD: *I want to thank everyone present for his/her time over this matter and thanking you for making your voice heard over this matter. Having considered your various positions, I can assure you that I will work with the appropriate authorities to see to the accomplishment of our target. Also, I enjoy everyone to remain faithful to his/her official duties. He equally said he could see agitations and the interests on the minds of the staff of the Department, but those agitations and interests should form part of the next meeting's agenda. All efforts by some aggrieved staff to express themselves fruitless as they were not given the opportunity to do so*.

Discussion

Most times, conversation among lecturers of the university is 'deliberately opaque' to non-discourse analysts as shown in the above data. This they do is a product of an intentional discursive strategies by those involved in the conversation who choose to maintain specialized language patterns as a 'disciplinary discourse' of power and ideologies, constraining and normalizing behavior through internalized discursive boundaries. Research has it that power is increasingly achievedin our modern society through ideology, and more particularly through the ideological workings of language, as ideology is the prime means of manufacturing consent which can generally raise issues of exploitative social relations among the participants of the conversation.

HOD: *I welcome you all to this emergency meeting. This is an emergency meeting and we must all abide by the rules. In this brief meeting, necessities will be considered and not the process. In view of this, some reactions and opinions may not be accommodated; so let us be guided.*

Participant A: *An observation sir, I hope it's appropriate if someone is asked to give an opening Prayer. That I have in mind, HOD replied.*

HOD: *this emergence meeting is hinged on the need to domicile all our courses in the department. Part of what informed this agitation is the letter from the Islamic and Arabic Department informing my office of their decision not to allocation courses again to any of my lecturers. I personally see the action of the Department of Islamic and Arabic Studies as a treat to our department.*

The text above is an excerpt from a transcript of part of Arts Education Staff Meeting on the domiciliation of the departmental courses. The taking of turns is constrained within a question-plus-answer pattern, with other members of staff asking questions and the HOD answering the questions. During the meeting, turn taking was enforced as the HOD constrained every member of staff to observe the rules of engagement, as the conversation was forced to be explicit and direct. This is a case of formality, limiting the nature of relations between participants. This is one of the discursive strategies to show power behind discourse. The role played by the Head of Department in the discourse shows the level of enormity of power his office possesses over other members of staff, as he regularly interrupts to control the contributions of other staff in the conversations.

According to Fairclough(2013), power 'behind' discourse is not a permanent and undisputed attribute of anyone person or social grouping. On the contrary, those who hold power at a particular moment has to constantly reassert their power, and those who do not hold power are to always make a bid for power. This is true in the above extract as HOD constantly reasserts

his power over others with the way he controls the conversation and the corresponding information. There are various ways in which the HOD exercises more control over the discourse than one might expect. This he does by giving answers to their questions beyond what is directly relevant. The complex problems CDA deals with need a historical approach (Van Dijk, 2014). The conversation above provides the historical contexts *'this is an emergency meeting, and we must all abide by the rules'* shows that a similar event has happened in the past and the same approach applied. This is because language users manipulate,direct, or redirect the thoughts of others, create an entirely different but dominantly circulating worldview as a strategy to reassert power over others.

Participant B: *I think the positions of our servicing departments not to allocate courses to some lecturers in this Department should not worry us that much, as they have indirectly helped to advance our course. By this, we have got a strong footing to support our earlier position on the domiciliation of all our courses in the Department. It behoves the committee on the domiciliation to fasten her steps to push our request as soon as possible to the appropriate quarters for an immediate consideration,* **Participant B**, *added.*

HOD: *that I have plan to do immediately after this meeting. I will call on the secretary to do a letter to that effect. Let me take the Bull by the Horn, he added. Also, I want to warn that none of us here should initiate any system that will signal to our servicing centres that we are not on the same page. We should allow appropriate authorities to handle the matter, and I tell you, we will come out victoriously. HOD stressed.*

The power exercised by the HOD as exemplified above provides a finely articulated means for differences in power in social hierarchical structures. This confirms what Joseph (2021) stated, that power is not derived from language, but language can be used to challenge power. In this perspective, individuals are the vehicles of power at the point of application. From the above, it could be inferred that the HOD shows how his office can represent the interest of the staff.

From the analysis of power relations among Arts Education Staff, power in modern society is not a commodity, which some possess, and others do not. Rather, it is a structure of relationships, jointly constructed which shapes people's reactions during conversations. The data above demonstrate how power relations is interactively constituted: the influence of an utterance cannot be determined until its reception by the rest of the group is known. From the reception of the HOD's utterance by members of the staff, it is believed that the location of power in this conversation is in the HOD's utterance/office.

Participant C: *I think we should advise the lecturers in the content areas to begin to think towards transferring their services to the Faculty of Arts and Humanities as the case may be, as they have no prospects or future with this Department. They need to do it now that they are young on the job as they cannot be assessed as professors of education. Because, assessment of lecturers into the professorial cadres is always based on the area one acquires his/her Ph.D.*

Participant D: *in his own response, thanked the HOD for the opportunity to speak. He stated that until the conditions under which a particular decision takes place have been ascertained and described, so that the observation may not be repeated by other speakers, scant credence is likely to be given to the more extreme polymorphic views. I will advise that the detailed positions of our servicing departments be ascertained, so*

that we could have a lea way to further defend accusations regarding this domiciliation. He stated.

HOD: *on the content lecturers. From my negotiations and discussions with the relevant authorities, I will advise them to remain calm, why I wait for the outcome of my negotiations. He added by saying that the University Management was aware of everyone's academic profiles before conducting the interview that brought them in to the system. He equally stated that the University Authority is aware of the peculiarities of the Department of Arts Education before conducting such a rigorous exercise.*

Critical Discourse Analysis is a specific discourse analytical methodology that examines the role played by language in the construction of power relationships and the reproduction of domination. From the above extract, it shows that the relationship which exists between HOD, and other members of staff is an unequal one.This describes the power relation between HOD, Professors, and other members of staff as a manipulative one, as it is seen how the HOD negotiated or manipulated power over the less powerful (**Participants C and D**)in these deliberations. This shows that no discourse can ever be free of power and the exercise of power.

Based on extracts of this sort, we can say that power in discourse is to do with powerful participant (HOD) controlling and constraining the contributions, ideas, and thoughts of non-powerful participant (**Participants C and D**). We can equally see how the HOD frames issue of inequality, especially the issue of official rights as a matter of public conversation and controversy on which one is expected to hold opinions which fully, to a great extent demonstrated the show of power exercised by the HOD.

In the conversation, we could see how the HOD is comfortable with the use of first person singular 'I' in his response to the positions of other participants.

From my negotiations and discussions with the relevant authorities, I will advise them to remain calm, while I wait for the outcome of my negotiations. He added by saying that the University Management was aware of everyone's academic profiles before conducting the interview that brought them in to the system

The HOD's sharp responses and the use of 'I' indicate some of the ways in which social inequality and notions such as domination, exploitation, individual superiority, and individual differentiation can be understood as discourse markers. The HOD's position on the content lecturersrecalls the reality of power relations between the powerful and the powerless in a conversation in which the one holding power hardly loses it.

Participants E – ParticipantsE *while trying to take a position in support of **Participants C** was not given the freedom desired as he started his point with conviviality. This act of trivialization was what made the HOD to cease the freedom given to him and advised him to always make use of his time whenever the system turns on for him.*

The data above demonstrate how power relation is interactively constituted: the influence of an utterance cannot be determined until its reception by the rest of the group is known. From the reception of the **Participant E**'s utterance by HOD, it shows that the HOD was not on the same page with **Participant E**'s position, and the only way to keep him on the bench was for the HOD to interrupt him. This he did to show the superiority of his office over the participants in the discussion. It is believed that the location of power in this conversation

among staff of Arts Education is in the HOD's utterance/office.From the analysis of power relations among staff of Arts Education,power in modern society is not a commodity, which some possess, and others do not. Rather, it is a structure of relationships, jointly constructed which shapes people's reactions during conversations.

Conclusion

Much, if not all, of what is discussed in this work is contextual and within the scope of Critical Discourse Analysis of definable notion of the domain of face-to-face interaction. The work is believed to have partly broadened the scope of Critical Discourse Analysis. The power of CDA is appreciated in its capacity to look beyond the superficial meaning of discourse and to uncover hidden power relations behind the superficial meaning of texts, as all human conversations are sociologically shaped by relations of power and struggles overpower; and to explore how the opacity of these relationships between discourse and society is itself a factor for securing power and hegemony. CDA aims at making transparent the connections between discourse practices, social practices, and social structures, connection that might be opaque to the layperson.

In most cases, academic deliberation is 'deliberately opaque'to non-discourse analysts and can generally raise issues of exploitative social relations. If this exploitative social relations among lecturers in this conversation is not checked with the instrumentality of critical discourse analysis, it will be difficult to increase consciousness of non-discourse analysts of how language, ideology, and power work in a conversation, and particularly of how language contributes to the domination of some students by others.

References

Brown, G. (1983). *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge,

Fairclough, Norman (1985). *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Halliday, M.A.K. (1965). *Exploration in Functions of Language*. London: Edward Alnord Publisher Ltd.

Kress, G. & Hodge, B. (1994), *Language as Ideology*. London: Routledge.

O'Halloran, K. (2007). Casualness Vs Commitment: The Use in Critical Discourse Analysis of Lakoff and Johnson's Approach to Metaphor. In C. Hart& D. Lukes (eds) *Cognitive Linguistics in Critical Discourse Analysis: Application and Theory*. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Ojonugwa, J.S. (2021). Critical Discourse Analysis of Conversations on Security Challenges among Nigerian University Students on Facebook. A Ph.D. Dissertation Submitted to the Department of English Language and Literature, Faculty of Education, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka, Nigeria.

Roghayah, M. & Razieh, V. (2018). *Social Discourse and Text Analysis*. Cambridge: Polity.

Scollon, R. (2001).*Mediated Discourse: The Nexus of Practice*. London: Routledge.

Teittenen, M. (2000). Power and Persuasion in the Finish Presidential Rhetoric in the Early 1990's. Longman.

Trew (1979). *Critical Analysis of Fiction.*Cambridge: Cambridge Print.

Van-Leeuwen, T.J. (1996). The Representation of Social Actors in CR Caldas. In Coutthard and M. Couthand (Eds), *Texts and Practices Readings in Critical Discourse Analysis.* London: Routledge.

Van Dijk, T.A. (2011). Discuss and Manipulation. *Discuss and Society*, 17(2), 359-383.

Wodak, R. (2006). Mediation between Discourse and Society.*Assessing Cognitive Approaches in CDA Discourse Studies,* 8, 179-190.