

Favouritism in Sports Discourse

*Yrd. Doç. Dr. Nalan BÜYÜKKANTARCIOĞLU**

Özet

Bu çalışma, spor söyleminde yan-tutucu dil kullanımını eleştirel söylem çözümlemesi ve toplumsal ruhbilim ışığında incelemektedir. Yan-tutucu yaklaşımın söylemde yansıması bireyin ya da toplumsal bir grubun iki kategoriden birini diğerine göre kendine daha yakın değerlendirmesi, kendiyle özdeşleştirilmesi, diğerini de farklı, uzak ve olumsuz bulması sonucu temel ön yargılarını belli ideolojik yapı çerçevesinde dil aracılığı ile sunması olarak özetlenebilir. Bu yakın-değer biçme, özdeşleştirme ve kimlik tanımlayıcı yaklaşımın en belirgin örnekleri de taraftarların söyleminde, sporda gözlenmektedir. Bu nedenle, bu çalışmada 28 Mart 1999'da yapılan Türkiye -Moldova milli futbol karşılaşmasının ertesi günü Milliyet gazetesinde çıkan bir yazı örnek olarak incelenmiş, eleştirel söylem çözümlemesi ile toplumsal ruhbilim kavramları bağdaştırılarak sporda yan-tutucu söylemin ardındaki ideolojik yapı örneklerle sunulmuş, dil kullanımında sözcüklerin, anlamsal ve sözdizimsel yapıların seçiminin ideolojyi nasıl belirlediği irdelenmiştir.

Abstract

This paper provides an analysis of favouritism in sports discourse with reference to Critical Discourse Analysis and Social Psychology. Favouritism is observed in the ways an individual or a social group displays favouring treatment to one more than the other due to ideological common grounds. Reflection of this treatment in discourse is observable in the choice of lexical items, semantic and syntactic structures that support the ideology adopted for or against one of the groups in question. To illustrate how favouritism works in

* Hacettepe University, Faculty of Letters, Department of Linguistics.

discourse, a critical report published in Milliyet after an international football match between Turkey and Moldova on March 28, 1999 has been taken as an example. CDA procedures and social psychological concepts have been correlated to establish the ideological framework in the text with examples of intentional selection of lexical, semantic and syntactic structures .

1. Introduction : correlating social psychology with critical discourse analysis

Favouritism is defined as “the practice of unfairly helping or favouring one person or group much more than another” (Collins Cobuild Dictionary 1987). As the definition suggests, the act of favouritism is a biased act in which at least two (or more) parties are involved in a social context. As one of the parties, explicitly or implicitly, displays differential treatment to the other, it is possible to observe traces of ideological common grounds. Reflection of favouritism in discourse is the presentation of individually or socially adopted values. These value judgements of individuals or of societies are sometimes bound to be subjective, and it is hard to talk about universally complete value consensus based on objective criteria. For this reason, what is counted as biased or favouritism in one context may not be regarded in the same way in another.

A good deal of research carried out in social psychology relate the act of favouritism to ingroup-outgroup bias. Ingroup is defined as “ the social group to which an individual perceives herself or himself as belonging (“us”) ; on the other hand, outgroup is “any group other than the one to which individuals perceive themselves belonging (“them”)” (Baron & Byrne 1997: 609-610). Studies explain that the ingroup success, for example, is correlated with the group ability, while ingroup failure is with unlucky circumstances. On the other hand, outgroup success is due to luck or atypical hardwork, whereas outgroup failure is an illustration of ineptness (Hamilton & Troiler 1986, Forgas & Fiedler 1996). Turner (1987) mentions that this bias is closely related to the formation of basic conceptual phenomena in the sense that people tend to perceive ingroup objects to be more akin and similar, while they categorize outgroup objects as somewhat distant and unfamiliar.

Reflections of such perceptual phenomena are observed not only in the patterns of individual or group behaviour, but also in discourse. Looking at languages as having social functions is also the consideration of meaning - making processes from a social perspective. If the content of any piece of discourse is linked to social or social psychological phenomena, the analysis of discourse, then, requires a critical dimension to the society - bound reasons that give rise to the production of texts. This is the analysis of the systematic organization of ideologies as articulated in language. Kress (1985: 30) points out that “a linguistic feature or category therefore never appears simply by itself - it always appears as

the representative of a system of linguistic terms, which themselves realize discursive and ideological systems". For Gee (1990) and Hodge and Kress (1988), all discourses are ideological. This ideological content is reflected not only in the selection of lexical items, but also in the selection of syntactic and semantic structures throughout the text.

Discourse analysis is a heterogeneous discipline with wide-ranging interests. Studies of discourse that attempt to analyse texts in the domain of linguistic theory and description generally serve to an understanding of texts in terms of contextual, textual, co-textual, social, and pragmatic features. Within linguistic discourse analysis, techniques are used to go beyond the sentence structure with the assumption that the internal constituents such as subject, verb, object, etc. lead to the formation of macro structures above the sentence level. It is a reaction to traditional formal linguistic analysis. In this type of analysis, discourse analysts focus on the functions of linguistic items in the overall text in order to find out what helps the reader or listener make sense. Discourse analysts like Sinclair and Coulthard (1975), for example, are interested in what ways certain discourse structures function depending on particular situations. This is the analysis of natural discourse that serves to the realisation of linguistic communication.

When the texts are read with a potentially contentious activity "to show the imbrication of linguistic-discursive practices with the wider socio-political structures of power and domination" (Kress 1990:85), this activity can be taken within the framework of critical discourse analysis. Critical linguists argue that a systematic analysis of language can explain how people are influenced by current social issues and how this influence is observed in discourse, because, this influence gives rise to the production of purpose-specific political texts. In this view, individuals are treated as social agents in the network relations rather than as mere listeners, readers, speakers or writers. Mills (1997: 134, 148) mentions that critical discourse theories are more influenced by Foucault's work and Marxist linguistics than by linguistic discourse analysis.

Social psychological approach to discourse analysis has similarities to the CDA approach in that both fields relate to Foucault's definition of discourse, which explains that social institutions produce specific ways of talking about certain areas of social life. For Foucault, "...a discourse is something which produces something else (an utterance, a concept, an effect), rather than something which exists in and of itself and which can be analysed in isolation" (Mills 1997 : 17). Through discourse analysis, social psychological investigation focuses on the power relations in society such as racism, sexism, or feminism, all of which, in fact, can be grouped under the cover term *favouritism*. The social psychological analysis of discourse in a way is the analysis of societal structure.

Among domains critical discourse analysis (CDA) and social psychological discourse analysis provide insights, *favouritism* presents significant issues in which one can observe the social and ideological structures as employed through discursive practices. The answers to the “why” of these practices seem to be lying under the social psychological factors based on a social theory, while the answers to the “how”, under CDA procedures. Naturally, a thorough investigation of a social theory to shed light on the interrelation between meaning, power, and ideology would exceed the limits of this paper. Any interested reader can refer to the works of Bakhtin (1935, 1953), Foucault (1969), Voloshinov (1929) or Fairclough (1989). Instead, I want to relate to “the broad view” of CDA (Kress 1985 : 27) in order to take the notion of discourse as a ‘mode of talking’.

My particular purpose in this paper is to find out the traces of biased judgements as reflected in sports discourse, since sports is one of the areas in which biased categorizations and ingroup favouritism are generally observed. May it be the sports discourse or something else, when *favouritism* is observed, one cannot look at the issue without considering the ideological patterns involved in the given discourse. The term *ideology* itself covers the relations between the form of knowledge and its relations to various structures and practices in society. Therefore, an analysis of sports discourse necessitates the employment of CDA procedures, which essentially draw upon linguistics. However, both in CDA and social psychological discourse analysis, it is also possible to see the traces of post-structuralist theory in terms of power relations and production of knowledge (Mills 1997).

In this paper, to illustrate the functions of ideology in discourse, I will draw on a newspaper report that reflects ingroup-outgroup bias as articulated by the writer. I say “articulated by the writer”, because this ideology is shared by all the ingroup members as the football matches of the National Team in Turkey almost always promote the national feelings and encourage the concept of unity among people. Therefore, the atmosphere right before and after each national game is usually tense, and it prepares a wider setting of discourse suitable for the production of ingroup favouring judgements in language. Both in visual and written media, critical reports and discussions display good examples of ingroup bias.

2. An exemplification of the analysis of favouritism in sports discourse.

To illustrate how CDA demonstrates the ideological patterns of favouritism, and how social psychology can help understand the patterns of social behaviour, I have chosen a fairly long critical report published in the sports section of the daily paper Milliyet on March 28, 1999, the day after the Turkish National Team scored two goals and beat Moldova two-nil (2-0). The following is the original Turkish text, accompanied by its English translation. For the ease of reference, each sentence is numbered :

(1) Adamlar oyuna beklemediğimiz bir presle başladı. (2) Koşmayla yıldırımın ilk kurbanı 2. Dakikada Oktay oldu. (3) Oyundan çıktı ve yerine Hami girdi.

.....
(4) Adamlar adeta ölümüne topa giriyor. (5) Bu fizik çarpışma bölgesine Hakan'ın yanına bir türlü ikinci adamı atamadık. (6) O nedenle, Hakan işbirliği yapacak adam bulamadı.

.....
(7) Adamların sertliği önce Oktay'ı bitirdi. (8) Stroenco adeta Fatih'i sakatlıyordu. (9) Abdullah'a Tabanov vurdu, kart gördü. (10) İki dakika sonra Okan'a daha sert girdi. (11) Kırmızı kart görmesi lazımdı, hakem pas geçti. (12) Alpay, Epureanu ile hep boğuştu. (13) Hakemlik artık beceri ile beceriksizliğin ayrımını yapma sanatıdır. (14) Moldovya'nın sertliğine gösterilen izin oyunu çirkinleştirdi. (15) Ancak, bu maç bir gerçeği ortaya koydu. (16) Moldovya takımındaki fizik tempo bizim ötemizde. (17) Oyuncuların markajdan kurtulmak için topsuz koşmaları çok akıllı. (18) Top bölgesinde sayısal üstünlüğü de sağlıyorlar. (19) Cesaret kavramı sınırsız. (20) Ama önce profesyonelliğe geçememişler. (21) Adeta yürekli beceriksizler ordusu. (22) İlk yarıda bu yüzden üç sarı kart gördüler. (23) Nihayet, hakem Sishkin'i oyundan atarak gerçeği gördü. (24) Ayrıca, hakemin hoşgörüsü inanılmaz boyuttaydı. (25) Bir ara futbolcularımız tekme yememek için topu hemen uzaklaştırmaya başladılar. (26) Fatih ve Alpay hafiften sertliğe uydular. (27) Bu maçta rakibin şartlanmış kazanma hırsı onların fizik mücadele gücünü arttırırken, bizim teknik, beceri ve taktiğimizi tersten etkiledi. (28) Bu nedenle Hakan'ın belki de gördüğüm en güzel gollerinden biri o kadar zamanında geldi ki, bu, takıma istikrar ve güven getirdi. (29) Kuskünlerden Sergen ve Tugay çok iyi oynadı. (30) Onlar defansta o kadar çok adam kullanıyorlardı ki, bizim Hami, Tugay ve Sergen gibi hiç fizik mücadele yapmayan oyuncularımızın eksikleri sırtımadı bile. (31) Eğer iyi bir bitiricileri olsaydı öne geçmeleri işten bile değildi. (32) Çünkü maçın başında iki gol fırsatı onlara güldü. (33) Ama kolektif oyun bireysel beceriyi çok hırpalamış. (34) Çok şut attılar. (35) Maçın en çok koşan adamı hakemdi. (36) Galiba koştuğu için UEFA kendisine düdük çalma izni vermiş. (37) Yapılan sertliğe göre verilen sakatlıklar inanılmayacak kadar sınırlıdır. (38) Galiba bu bayramda bir kurban kesmek gerekir.

(Doğan Koloğlu, *Milliyet*, 28 Mart 1999)

Translation of the text :

(Numbering of sentences in the translated version is according to their equivalents in the original text)

(1) The chaps started the game with a press we had not expected.
(2) The first victim of their daunting efforts through fast runs was Oktay only in the second minute. (3) He got out of the game and Hami entered.

.....
(4) The chaps simply sweep the ball to their death. (5) We could hardly insert a second man into the physical combat zone beside Hakan. (6) For that reason, Hakan could not find a man to collaborate with.

.....
(7) The severity of the chaps first exhausted Oktay. (8) Stroenco almost aimed at crippling Fatih. (9) Tabanov hit Abdullah and saw the card. (10) Only after two minutes, he, this time even more violently, tackled Okan. (11) He should have seen the red card, yet the referee ignored. (12) All throughout the game, Alpay had to struggle with Epureanu. (13) After all, being a referee means the art of making fine distinctions between dexterity and clumsiness. (14) The permission for the severity of Moldova disfigured the game. (15) Nevertheless, this match disclosed a fact. (16) The physical tempo of Moldova is beyond ours. (17) It is very clever of the players to run without the ball in order to avoid the blocking. (18) They also get numerically superior at the zones where the ball is. (19) Their concept of courage is limitless. (20) Yet, they are too far from being professionals. (21) They are almost a mass of courageous awkward men. (22) That's why they had to see three yellow cards in the first half. (23) Finally, the referee saw the truth when he sent Sishkin off. (24) Above all, the referee's tolerance for Moldova was incredibly extensive. (25) Sometimes, our footballers, in order to avoid the kill shots, had to immediately hit the ball away. (26) Fatih and Alpay slightly adapted themselves to the severity of the game as well. (27) In this match, while the conditioned greed of the rival to win accelerated their power of physical combat, it negatively affected our techniques, skills and tactics. (28) For this reason, Hakan's one of the best goals I had ever seen came so timely that it brought the team stability and morale. (29) Of the demoralized ones, Sergen and Tugay displayed perfect performance. (30) They employed so many men at the defence that the deficiencies of our players like Hami, Tugay and Sergen did not even leap up although they hardly went for physical struggle. (31) If the rival had had a tactful player, they could have scored much before us. (32) Because, they had two lucky opportunities to score in the beginning of the game. (33)

But what seems is that the concept of collective game has thoroughly disturbed individual agility. (34) They had very few shots. (35) The man who ran the most in the match was the referee himself. (36) Apparently, it was merely because of his running skill that the UEFA permitted him to blow the whistle. (37) In comparison to the severity displayed, the number of the injuries caused is incredibly limited. (38) It seems that a sacrifice in this festival would do good.

(Doğan Koloğlu, *Milliyet*, March 28, 1999)

2.1 Social psychological and ideological patterns of favouritism as reflected in the text

In the text, one may possibly observe three categories at first sight : Us – Them – the Referee. However, what is particularly striking is that the sentences used for the referee give the reader the impression that he is not an ingroup favouring person; therefore, he is conceptually included in the outgroup. This underlies the typical fact that anyone or anything that does not belong to the ingroup supposedly displays outgroup characteristics. For this reason, it would be more appropriate to identify two main categories:

Us : Turkey and the Turkish people represented by the Turkish National Team

Them : a) the National Team of Moldova

b) the referee

The Us- versus – Them mentality is the basic phenomenon in ingroup-outgroup bias. The tendency to hold more favourable views about ingroup leads to the tendency to hold less favourable or negative opinions about outgroup. Basic reasons for the favouritism in the writer's discourse can be listed as follows :

- The Turkish National Team represents Turkey and the Turks.
- The writer is Turkish, thus a member of a big ingroup.
- Ingroup psychology leads him to produce discourse supporting the ingroup.

Social Identity Theory suggests that group membership is used as a source of belonging and pride. A group's quest for a positive identity leads the group members to upgrade the positive features of the ingroup and belittle those of the outgroup. Similarly, while negative features of the ingroup are either ignored or taken as unimportant, those of the outgroup are inflated. This tendency eventually leads groups to what is known as ultimate attribution error and prejudice rises out of this clash of social perception. Such attributions take it for granted that all members of outgroup are alike. In other words, the

social perception is that there is little or no variability among outgroup members than among ingroup members. We are usually more aware of the differences among the members of the group we belong to. This fact is referred to as outgroup homogeneity bias in social psychology (Feldman 1998, Baron & Byrne 1997).

The above mentioned concepts underlie the fundamental ideologies presented in the text. To show the ideologies injected in the text, I can make a list of the attributions for each group as in the following :

Us :

the Turkish National Team

- doing the best against all odds
- having individually skillful players
- having good tactics and skills, but prevented from displaying the real performance
- being continually tackled by severe attacks
- scoring despite the referee and the severe rival

Them :

the Moldovian National Team

- severe
- full of greed
- lacking necessary techniques
- employing nasty tactics
- false courage and no wisdom
- demoralizing
- mostly defensive
- lucky, but not skillful enough to make use of the opportunities.

the Referee

- tactless
- highly favouring the rival
- unable to make correct decisions
- having no other skill than running
- far from being a professional
- not objective
- does not deserve the UEFA card

2.2. Lexical , semantic and syntactic analyses of the text with reference to ideology and social psychology

According to the critical discourse analysts, every text provides the reader with a viewpoint or ideology, which the reader may or may not accept. This ideology in discourse is transmitted in two ways : (a) thematic structuring of the texts and its constituent sentences, (b) case structures of agency and causality. Thematic structuring entails an environment of discourse in which more or less implicit knowledge is taken for granted and cultural and social values affect decisions about the thematic roles of the selected linguistic items. (Kress 1989: 70). In this text, the thematic structure is based on the national football game about which most of the ingroup members, that is the Turkish readers in this context, are assumed to be sharing the same or similar judgements. In other words, us /them

distinction seems to have been taken for granted at first sight. Therefore, any related structure in the thematisation of the text implicitly or explicitly relates to the social psychological notions such as social identity theory, ultimate attribution error or outgroup homogeneity bias. What the writer does, in fact, is creating or recreating a 'reality' through the use of language, which is based on the ingroup judgements. No matter how objective or true some or many of these judgements may be, one can still identify the traces of ingroup bias or favouritism in the way these judgements are expressed. If a text of this sort were written by a writer from the other party, the 'created' reality would most probably be quite different. When the quality of the social mood, which is an important factor, is high, the relevance of the group membership is also high; consequently, people are more likely to adopt the realities created around the subject (Esses & Zanna 1995). This fact naturally helps the thematic validity of the texts improve. In order to make up a thematically effective structure, the writer has to employ language accordingly.

Ideological patterns in discourse are reflected through carefully selected words or phrases which find an accurate context in discourse. If we refer to the text, the repeated use of the first person plural pronoun *biz* (we) identifies the Turkish National Team with the whole nation; the big ingroup. The selection of this pronoun and its repeated use reinforce the *us-versus-them* mentality throughout the text. This mentality is enhanced also by the frequent use of the possessive pronoun *bizim* (our), which, at the same time, displays ingroup possession and support. On the other hand, the selection of the word *adamlar* (the chaps), which refers to the members of the outgroup as distant characters, creates an alienating effect on the reader. Besides the pronoun *onlar* (they) and the nouns *rakip* (the rival) and *adamlar* (the chaps), one can note that no other reference word such as 'the visitor' or 'the guest team' is used. This is noteworthy in that the visiting team is always referred to with words of somewhat distant and negative connotations.

The unfavourable reference to the visiting team is observed also in the phrase *yürekli beceriksizler ordusu* (a mass of courageous awkward men) in sentence # 21. The nouns such as *pres* (press), *yıldırma* (daunting), *cesaret* (courage), and the phrases or verbs such as (topa) *girmek* (to sweep the ball), *bitirmek* (to exhaust), *sakatlamak* (to cripple), *vurmak* (to hit), *sert girmek* (to tackle violently), *çirkinleştirmek* (to disfigure), and *tersten etkilemek* (to affect negatively) are all used in the context of the outgroup as the signs of severity and destroying masculinity. These are the active and transitive verbs that have grammatical and semantic relations with other words in the sentences. These words aim at particular objects or people and define the active, yet negatively defined roles or manners of the 'agents', that is the outgroup members. On the other hand, the ingroup players are mostly referred to as 'patients' or 'experiencers' (in terms of Fillmore's Case Grammar) on whom the acts are

realized (sentences # 2, 7, 8, 9, 10). Therefore, these players are implied as the 'victims' of the outgroup behaviour and the overt use of the word *kurban* (victim) is found in sentence # 2. The intention is not to define the ingroup players as poor, unskilled characters, but to attribute the negative characteristics to the outgroup members.

The words and sentences used for the referee, the man who is treated as an outgroup character, reflect the ideologies based on the ingroup bias and just like the other words or phrases used for the rival team, are of intentional selection : *pas geçti* (ignored), *gerçeği gördü* (saw the truth), *hakemin hoşgörüsü inanılmaz boyuttaydı* (the referee's tolerance was incredibly extensive), *hakemlik artık beceri ile beceriksizliğin ayrımını yapma sanatıdır* (after all, being a referee means the art of making fine distinctions between dexterity and clumsiness), *galiba koştuğu için UEFA kendisine düdük çalma izni vermiş* (apparently, it was merely because of his running skill that the UEFA permitted him to blow the whistle). In the last two sentences above, the referee is defined as an unprofessional man who is unaware even of the basic qualifications of a referee. The half humorous, half teasing sentence ...*galiba koştuğu için...* (sentence # 36) shows the writer's insidious humiliation of the referee. In sentence # 13, the writer uses the particle *-dır* to make his sentence a factive statement. This way, the idea in the sentence gains long term validity and permanency. On the other hand, in sentences # 33 and 36, the writer uses the *-miş* suffix for different semantic functions : while in sentence #33, *-miş* suffix explains a realization, in sentence #36, it adds a dubious meaning to the sentence, thus provokes doubts about the professional judgements of the referee. The phrase *gerçeği görmek* indicates a late realization of the fact on the part of the referee, who is said to have continuously displayed incorrect and biased judgements in the match in favour of the rival. The 'truth' is that the rival had hardly approvable acts. The frequent mention of the referee's favouritism for the rival and the rival's severity upgrades the success of the home team to the level of 'victory'. When the abundance of lexical items that refer to the negative manners of the outgroup is concerned, the writer's discourse is an example of "overlexicalization" (Halliday 1978), which means the availability of many words for the transmission of the ideology.

Ideological determinants in discourse are observed also in the use of certain syntactic structures. Sequencing, for example, allows either a specifying or non-specifying construction with a certain intended meaning in mind (Fowler 1985). Depending on the sequencing of elements in the sentence, the focus of attention is attributed either to the agent or to the patient/experiencer. This is observed in the selection of active and passive constructions, which matters in reflecting the ideology in question. In the text, what draws the attention is not the passive constructions, but the sentences in which the ingroup

members are presented as patients in the dative case. While the primary agentive roles in unfavourable acts are given to the outgroup players, the equally unfavourable manners of the ingroup players are generally backgrounded. For example, in sentence #26, Fatih and Alpay are presented as the players who had to adapt themselves to the severity of the game somewhat unwillingly. The intentionality in the selection of the phrase *hafiften sertliğe uymak* (slightly adapting oneself to the severity) has a purpose to minimize the severity these players might have displayed in the game. This way, even an equally unfavourable action is integrated into the ideological pattern of the writer. Similarly, in sentence # 30, the three ingroup players, whose weak performances are accepted, are not criticized at all, because the outgroup's having a lot of men at the defence is referred to as something even more important.

When the nature of transitivity, that is the kinds of processes and participants in discourse is examined, the causal roles of the outgroup members, including the referee, are the focus. The writer's selection of the transitivity features is systematic and intentional. The outgroup behaviour is explained through the use of active verbs with less sympathetic connotations. The writer's use of such active verbs for the outgroup implies the helpless situation of the ingroup members and maximizes their efforts and the result of the match. The use of the verb *boğuşmak* (to struggle) in sentence # 12 is another example of an intentional type of selection to emphasize the severity of the outgroup players. As the attribution of blame for the severity and for the unfair nature of the game is to the outgroup members, the patterns of lexical choices and sentence structures reveal the deliberate transmission of the ideology by the writer. This way, the writer not only makes the criticism of the match, but also helps the reader visualize the 'reality' he creates. However, this 'reality' is not totally an imposed type of reality, because the social psychological atmosphere is suitable and most of the ingroup members share the same judgements.

Many of the sentences and words are of simple type through which the ideology is most directly and clearly expressed. However, it is still possible to observe syntactic complexity in considerable number of sentences. Although many of the sentences are past tense sentences, the sentences # 4, 13, 16, and 37 are in the present. The intentional construction of present tense sentences is to emphasize a long term fact and to express that the ideas presented are not limited to the temporary context of the game.

Modal markers such as *-ebil*, *-meli*, *-malı*, etc. indicate the psychological conditions that the process is expressed by the verb. As the modality is not only a grammatical, but also a pragmatic category, the use of modal markers in the text help the reader appreciate the problems the ingroup members had to face in the match. For example, in sentences # 5 and

6, the modal markers are used not to refer to any type of implied clumsiness of the Turkish team, but simply to reinforce the ideology that the severity of the rival prevented us from showing the correct performance at the right time. Also in sentence # 11, *kırmızı kart görmesi lazımdı* (...he should have seen the red card) reflects the writer's desire for the correct judgement which is expressed through the use of modality to criticize what actually went on.

Another feature of lexicalization in the text is the use of field-specific terminology. The writer of the text is in control of the football genre. Even though many of the sentences do not present complexity for the lay reader, the football terms and phrases used indicate features of specialist discourse. For example, *pres* (press), *topa girmek* (to sweep the ball), *fizik çarpışma bölgesi* (physical combat zone), *adam atmak* (to send a man), *sakatlamak* (to cripple), *kart görmek* (to see the card), *sert girmek* (to tackle), *kırmızı görmek* (to see the red card), *fizik tempo* (physical tempo), *fizik mücadele* (physical struggle), *kollektif oyun* (collective game)... That the writer has a specialist genre is only natural, but this gives him the position of an authority whose judgements are placed in a professional context. In other words, the ideologies in the text may be taken as the objective comments of a professional critic, therefore the power of persuasion in the text gets even stronger. Another factor of persuasion or ideology can be found in the intentional insertion of sentences # 15, 16, 17, 18, and 19. The writer's use of such sentences is interesting in this context. These sentences might give the impression that the writer has an objective evaluation, but starting with sentence # 20, all the previous positive connotations are suddenly eliminated. However, the insertion of such positive judgements about the outgroup is not without merit : they upgrade the validity and the objectivity of the general ideology and the success of the home team.

At this stage, one may argue whether all the claims of the writer are biased. Definitely they may be not, but it is not the concern here. The nature of the text would be very different if the same match were told by an outgroup member in his own group. In other words, in the us/them distinction, the roles would differ and this time what is defined as "us" here would be "them" in that newly created 'reality'. This consideration once more indicates the fact that specific modes of talking are socially or politically determined and discourses of individuals cannot be described as neutral events. As the critical discourse analysts claim, no ideology is independent of socially or individually adopted values.

3. CONCLUSION

In this paper, I have attempted to provide an analysis of a newspaper sports report in terms of favouritism combining linguistic, social psychological and CDA perspectives. Although the word sports refers to a variety of activities, I have limited myself with the examination of a text on football. It is not simply because of football's popularity in Turkey, but because of the availability of a wide range of ideology-based reports in the media.

As noted earlier, the search for the ideologies employed in discourse is an attempt for CDA. When *favouritism* is observed as a social practice of us/them distinction, it seems necessary to add some social psychological perspective as well. It goes without saying though that each perspective draws upon the procedures of discourse analysis in the field of linguistics.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bakhtin, M. 1935/1986. Discourse in the Novel in M. Holquist (Ed.) **The Dialogic Imagination**, Austin, Tx : Un. Of Texas Press.
- Baron,R.A., Byrne, D. 1997. **Social Psychology**, Allyn and Bacon.
- Collins Cobuild Dictionary**. 1987. William Collins Sons & Co. Ltd.
- Esses, V. M., & Zanna, M. P. 1995. Mood and the Expression of Ethnic Stereotypes. **Journal of Personality and Social Psychology**, 69, 1052- 1068.
- Fairclough, N. 1989. **Language and Power**. NY : Longman.
- Feldman, R. S. 1998. **Social Psychology**, Prentice Hall.
- Forgas, J.P. & Fiedler, K. 1996. Us and Them : Mood Effects on Intergroup Discrimination in **Journal of Personality and Social Psychology**. 70. (28-40)
- Foucault, M. 1969. **The Archeology of Knowledge**. NY : Basic Books.
- Fowler, R. 1985. Power . in T. A. Van Dijk (Ed.) **Handbook of Discourse Analysis**. Academic Press, (61-82).
- Gee, J. P. 1990. **Social Linguistics and Literacies**. London : Falmer Press.
- Halliday, M. A. K. 1978. **Language as Social Semiotics** London : Oxford Un. Press.

- Hamilton, O.L. & Troiler, T.K. 1986. Stereotypes and Stereotyping : An Overview of the Cognitive Approach in J.F. Dovidio & S.L. Gaertner (Eds.) **Prejudice, Discrimination and Racism** (127-163) Orlando, FL: Academic Press.
- Hodge, R. & Kress, G. 1988. **Social Semiotics**. Ithaca, NY : Cornell Un. Press.
- Kress, G. 1985. Ideological Structures in Discourse in T.A. Van Dijk (Ed.) **Handbook of Discourse Analysis**, Vol. 4. Academic Press (22-42)
- Kress, G. 1990. Critical Discourse Analysis in W. Grabe (Ed.). **Annual Review of Applied Linguistics**. 11. (84-99) Cambridge Un. Press.
- Mills, S. 1997. **Discourse**. Routledge.
- Sinclair, J., & Coulthard, M. 1975. **Towards an analysis of Discourse : the English Used by Teachers and Pupils**. London : Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Turner, J.C. 1987. **Rediscovering the Social Group : A Self- Categorization Theory**. NY : Basil Blackwell.
- Voloshinov, V. N.. 1929. **Marxism and the Philosophy of Language**. Cambridge, MA : Harvard Un. Press.