



RESEARCH ARTICLE

HIV/AIDS RELATED STIGMA AND IT'S IDEOLOGICAL CONSTRUCTION OF "OTHERS": VIEW FROM CRITICAL DISCURSIVE ANALYSIS

Syed Abdul Hafiz Moinuddin and *Joydeb Patra

Department of Sociology, Vidyasagar University, West Bengal, India

Received 26th May, 2018; Accepted 20th June, 2018; Published 30th July, 2018

ABSTRACT

In this article we want to make an inference between HIV/AIDS related stigma and its Ideological construction of "others", exploring how a group of people those who are living with HIV/AIDS, confronted with perceived and existing thoughts about HIV and its socio-cultural understanding and legitimization through the hegemonic social order and ideology. We examine the social contextual and interactive rather iterative nature of stigma and uses as strong ideological tools that determines its cultural impact and Socio-Linguistic consequences and reaction on image of those who are being a stigmatized. We analyze Meta pragmatic discourse about HIV, Which suggest a language –Ideological component of stigma. We outline some areas of HIV related stigma research where different findings seems to be provoked some questions which remained unsolved or inspire to the further investigation. In this way, we provide a critical Discourse Analysis framework, outlining the way, in which the articles contribute to the resolution of the current intellectual debate in the existing literature and social research on HIV /AIDS related stigma. This article also provides a model of understanding about Ideological Construction of 'Others' that suggests furthering re-inquire and re-investigation of others types of marginality, oppression and abjection.

Key words: Stigma, Ideology, 'Other, Stigma Ideology, Critical Discourse Analysis.

Copyright © 2018, Syed Abdul Hafiz Moinuddin and Joydeb Patra. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Citation: Syed Abdul Hafiz Moinuddin and Joydeb Patra, 2018. "HIV/AIDS related Stigma and it's Ideological Construction of "Others": View from Critical Discursive Analysis" *International Journal of Current Research in Life Sciences*, 7, (07), 2500-2508.

INTRODUCTION

Stigma has been described as a dynamic process of devaluation that 'significantly discredits' an individual in the eyes of others. The qualities to which stigma adheres can be quite arbitrary for example, skin colour, manner of speaking, or sexual preference. Within particular cultures or settings, certain attributes are seized upon and defined by others as discreditable or unworthy. HIV-related stigma is multi-layered, tending to build upon and reinforce negative connotations through the association of HIV and AIDS with already-marginalized behaviours, such as sex work, drug use, and homosexual and transgender sexual practice. It also reinforces fears of outsiders and otherwise vulnerable groups, such as prisoners and migrants. Individuals living with HIV are often believed to deserve their HIV-positive status as a result of having done something 'wrong'. By attributing blame to particular individuals and groups that are "different", "others" can absolve themselves from acknowledging their own risk, confronting the problem and caring for those affected. Images of people living with HIV in the print and visual media may reinforce blame by using language (Powerful tool of Discourse) that suggests that HIV is a 'woman's disease', a 'junkie's disease', an 'African disease', or a 'gay plague'. Religious ideas of sin can also help to sustain and reinforce a

perception that HIV infection is a punishment for deviant behaviour. Stigma is expressed in language. Since the beginning of the epidemic, the powerful metaphors associating HIV with death, guilt and punishment, crime, horror and 'otherness' have compounded and legitimated stigmatization. In this regards, Lakoff (1975) clearly stated that HIV/AIDS related discriminatory language as responsible for causing them inferior and marginalized social position and objectifies them differently of "Others". This kind of language derives from, and contributes to, another aspect underpinning blame and distancing: people's fear of life-threatening illness. Some fear-based stigma is attributable to people's fear of the outcomes of HIV infection—in particular, the high fatality rates (especially where treatment is not widely accessible), fear related to transmission, or fear stemming from witnessing the visible debilitation of advanced AIDS. Stigma is deeply rooted, operating within the values of everyday life. Although images associated with AIDS vary, they are patterned so as to ensure that AIDS-related stigma plays into, and reinforces, social inequalities. These inequalities particularly include those linked to gender, race and ethnicity, sexuality and Stigma Ideology itself.

HIV/AIDS Related Stigma as a Powerful Ideology

From the reference of constructivist point of view Stigma Ideology clearly embedded in the broader social and political

*Corresponding author: Joydeb Patra

Department of Sociology, Vidyasagar University, West Bengal, India.

domain. As Terry Eagleton has described a set of characteristics or definitions of ideologies including the following: (a) the process of production of meanings, signs and values in social life (b) a body of ideas characteristic of a particular social group or class; (c) ideas which help to legitimate a dominant political power; (d) false ideas which help to legitimate a dominant political power. Constructed ideas are used to define “reality” and, as a way of seeing and known, they limit or constrain other ways of seeing and acting socially. In a similar vein, Mullins emphasizes four qualities in ideology: the way ideas have (1) power; (2) guiding evaluations; and (3) guiding actions. The fourth characteristic was that the ideology must be logically coherent. Given that thinking in individuals and societies has a necessary systemic quality from a cognitive point of view, this coherence is necessary and explains in part the violence that totalitarian groups exercise in the face of alternative visions of “reality”. Further, when an ideology plays an important role in guiding human-social interaction and in the structure of organizations, the coherence of these organizations requires their normative acceptance.

The pervasive influence of an ideology is also emphasized by Cranston who points out that in an ideology practical elements have similar importance to theoretical elements. As in many systems ideas can be used both as explanatory principles and descriptive ones. Therefore, one main function of an ideology is to act as a principle or set of principles by which to change society by providing a set of norms that are used as a guide for change through a normative thought process. In Duncker’s view ideology claims absolute truth. Cultural consensus is achieved through ideology. Sometimes this consensus may be held by a small and powerful group of individuals. We use the term ideology more broadly so that here it is concerned with HIV positive identity and cultural continuity and are made up of ideas, symbols and beliefs. Therefore:

1. An Ideology is a system of ideas that an individual or a social group holds over time to which they are committed;
2. Ideology is an organizing world view that obscures aspects of experience and when it operates as a closed belief system is impervious to evidence contradicting its position;
3. All ideology diminishes the importance of individuals. From this perspective, the ideologically motivated actor is one who uses stereotypes to analyse events and our understandings of an author (authority, originator) and an individual agent must take account of the inevitable interpretation that follows from such motivation.

To the extent that the Philosophical, Political or Religious ideology is doxical and even reflected in economic relations, it expresses in specific language a certain mental model of human relations, or a view of a commonly held structure to society. This doxical ideology, however, will tend to close the debate. Nevertheless, theoretical treatment of any ideology firstly has to be located at a synchronous level. Relations between synchronous and diachronic order are complicated because changes in the content and structure of a social system are interdependent. If we are to provide a mathematical model of a system, it must take account of both the synchronous case and the diachronic case. In the synchronous case, static or dynamic models may be constructed. In the diachronic case, we have to consider History and content as multiform

movements involving heterogeneous elements. Ideology infuses society at every level, expressing the Social System’s structure. Every individual in a society constructs their own understanding of their social world on the basis of their personal histories. The way this is done usually depends on the dominant ideology in the society, i.e., capitalist, communist, and so on. Sometimes the individual is faced with a choice, between a new ideology or remaining with the traditional. In today’s world, there are choices between populist solutions to social problems and the traditional established political solutions. Following Jacques Lacan’s theory, human choices are made by distortions of ideologies in the mirror of language. For example, populism may provide quick solutions that disrupt the system in the long term, while the traditional approaches have ignored the problems populists find important. Following any choices there are positive and negative consequences, and being too focused with an ideological bias may result in being blind to some of the alternatives. We view science as a form of ideology with its own methods and perspectives. Other well-known ideologies include ones based on economic theories such as communism, free trade, laissez-faire economics, mixed economy, mercantilism, and social Darwinism. Therefore, while we consider the scientific method as an ideology, this does not imply that it is incorrect to do so. Rather as an ideology science provides a way of organizing experience so that what we think we know can be tested against what we experience in experiments so moving beyond subjective interpretations. In everything concerning the study of the ideologies we can consider the problem in a double sense:

1. Homogeneity: each discourse informs a content previously given and that operates under its own syntaxes. This means that each ideological approach has its history and ways of solving problems, in short constitutes a paradigm. As such, problems at its boundaries are difficult to solve and may require a new paradigm. Ideologies impose a focus that produces a theoretical blindness (Kahneman, Dear *et al.*, 1997);
2. Heterogeneity: the relation of reality to language introduces a complete displacement of all the usual connections to reality, a fact that makes it impossible to consider the reality-language connections as simple duplicates.

This is a central feature of constructivism, that we each have different ways of making sense of the world. Inevitably, there will be differences that depend on the ways we make sense that depend on the experiences that we prioritise in coming to know. Therefore, no one has a monopoly on truth, there are different ways of accounting for experience. Typology of Ideologies Walsby’s theory (Flood *et al.*, 1997) is an historical proposal of a taxonomy of seven major ideologies. These are organised in historical sequence according to their order of appearance, reflecting the progressive development of needs in human social structures. In some ways, this taxonomy reflects a developmental process like that offered by John Dewey (ILO *et al.*, 2001) when he proposed three levels of moral judgment a pre-conventional a conventional and a post-conventional level. As a (hypothetical) developmental sequence, Walsby’s ideologies are perhaps like stages of moral development with Systems a society’s position on the sequence depending on the opportunities given to think about essential features of the given stage. The more opportunities given to think about ideologies the more likely one is to identify with more

advanced human needs, without necessarily rejecting completely preceding ideologies. At the beginning the societal-individual interface prioritizes the social and with time this interface alters towards prioritizing the individual. Walford divides Walsby's major ideological categories into three groups: a group that emphasizes stability of society as a central goal while allowing varying degrees of flexibility, a group that emphasizes the importance of human needs over the importance of society again with varying degrees of flexibility, and a final position that is concerned with ideology a meta-dynamic group.

(1) Ediotic group: The ideologies in this group are:

- a) The Protostatic Ideology: The function of this ideology is to provide a stable social group offering protection against other groups. Identifying with the group was important for survival so thinking was necessarily very conservative and dominated by social cohesion. The group's thinking is focused on the in-group and hostile or potentially hostile to the out-group;
- b) The Epistatic Ideology: This ideology is one in which improvements to the society become accepted by beginning to recognize individual rights. In some ways it is like Kohlberg's stage "*Good boy, good girl*" morality. It may be described as a transition from the extreme Right to conservatism;
- c) (c) The Parastatic Ideology: A feature of this view is that additional improvements are made for individuals in society through the influence of the sciences. Liberalism with its support for religious tolerance and free political institutions is associated with this ideology.

(2) Ediodynamic group: Following these ideologies emphasizing society the ediodynamic ideologies arose, concerned with restrictions to individual freedom. The emphasis has changed from conserving society and restricting individual freedom to promoting individual freedom. Improvements to living can be made by changing society. However, in each successive ideology there are less constraints on emerging dynamic forms of thinking. The ideologies in this group are:

- a) The protodynamic ideology: Here society is seen to be made up of classes and in this ideology the emphasis is on restructuring society along the lines that we know as social democracy. It is the first step away from conserving society based on individual freedoms;
- b) The epidynamic ideology: This ideology moves further away from social stability of the existing society by identifying class conflict as a medium of social change. Progress is achieved by resolving perceived conflict. Politically this is a form of communism;
- c) The Paradynamic ideology: In cognitive change there is a balance between what was known and emerging knowledge. As the constraints are removed the changes become anarchic. Therefore, the only limit on freedom is that of the individual, that is, the individual is prioritized in the society-individual interface.

(3) Metadynamic group: People in this group recognize that all ideologies depend on key assumptions.

Each assumption brings its own constraints between (1) groups of individuals and (2) between individuals and societies.

Studying the constraints allows insight into ways ideologies constrain freedoms. Maturana had described "good manners of living" that are like paradigms or ways of looking at the world. They suggest varieties of different ways that a person or group of people approach their experience of the world. Such "manners of living" suggest another taxonomy that is descriptive of types of world view or ideology orthogonal to the previous one:

- a) Affirmative Ideology: An ideology that is dominated by affirmative themes and over emphasises an optimistic world view;
- b) Negative or Divergent Ideology: An ideology overly dominated by negative criticism. There are many ways of being negative such as continually calling into question views expressed about the need for careful management of resources;
- c) Polar Ideology: Polar ideology is a negative oriented ideology that seems to derive its identity by being oppositional and antagonistic;
- d) Marginal Ideology: Those theories on the edge are marginal. Marginal ideologies border between affirmative and negative. For example: As for violent radical Islam, Feldman considers it a marginal ideology which in many ways it is. He goes on to envision what a Middle East beyond violent jihadism could be, quoting a saying of the Prophet Muhammad on the need for a greater jihad concerned with self-development;
- e) Split Ideology: Theories that indicate one thing while encouraging the opposite. People often think of ideologies as guiding political thinking with examples associated with political parties on the left or right of the political spectrum.

The Cambridge academic Raymond Williams contributed significantly to the Marxist critique of culture. His writings include the view embedded in cognitive development that ideas including ideological ones change when they meet challenging experiences. All ideas are continually in some sort of dynamic balance with both the past ideas from which they emerged and the contemporary discussions on their meaning and relevance in any society, particularly ones that encourage debate. Williams felt this worked best when it was voluntary and internalized both individually and socially. Williams using Gramsci's (Nelkin and Gilman, 1988) notion of hegemony identified three cultural forces:

- (1) The dominant ideology or ideology now in force;
- (2) The residual ideology. Ideology that was dominant;
- (3) The emergent ideology. Ideology that is evolving in resistance to dominance. All of these are co-present at any one moment of cultural history.

Pecheux has argued we make meaning with implicit ideological intent in our words, expressions, propositions. This hegemony has the corollary of the over-simplistic argument of philosophers and writers of the 20th century that adjustments to the language in the media may produce ideological homogeneity. Williams (Ngugi, Wa Thiong, 1986) describes residual ideology as referring to beliefs and practices that are derived from an earlier stage of society. Myth is still a vital component in the life of any community, still a motivating factor in our actions, and a matrix of any residual ideology of our civilization. Maybe the family belongs to a sort of residual ideology in which it was quite useful in the past for young adults to have babies because they could contribute to the family income at a very early age. We are talking of the pre-

industrial situation, and maybe we still have that residual ideology in modern society. In fact, this classification complements the previous ones; an ideology can be dominant or derived (in its social context), emergent and marginal. For Williams an emergent ideology refers to those values and practices which are developing in society outside of, and sometimes actively challenging, the dominant ideology. Williams saw residual ideology as the traditions and practices of the past that were remembered or influenced the present, and saw oppositional ideologies as being like the dis-identification described above. People can be wrong and numbers have nothing to do with it. Often it may be that being wrong hasn't made a difference that makes a difference. Large numbers of people sharing a vice does not turn the vice into a virtue, and errors remain errors even if many believe them. On the other hand, it may be the case that an ideology is identified with the community (or with a consensus), and this community it is not identified with a true socio-political institution based on the land (nation), but is identified with a transcendental principle, personified in the norms of a church, sect or another type of messianic organization. In this case, its effects on the secular political body, which prospers but with which it is not identified are inevitable and predictable destructive. It is established with a circular feedback process:

1. If the social order remains, then the ideological beliefs must somehow be valid, regardless of the pressure of the events;
2. If the ideological beliefs are agreed upon by all, then the social order is safe. Commitment of believers is the result of two opposite forces.
 - i) Social support (associations and no militant people), which maintains ideology;
 - ii) Problems posed by pressure of events which threaten ideology.

When ideology is shaken, further evidence of consensus is required. This can be provided by social rituals of various sorts, which may have any manifest content, but which act to convey additional messages. Each member of a believer group, in publicly identifying himself through ritual is rewarded by the public commitment of the others. Patriotic ceremonies, political meetings, manifestations by the streets of the cities, transfers and public religious ceremonies are classic examples of this. Such ceremonies typically involve a formal restatement of the ideal ideology in speeches, as well as rituals that give opportunities for individual reaffirmation of commitment. For Durkheim, ideological behavior could be rendered sociologically intelligible by assuming an identity between societies and the object of worship. The ideal of all totalitarian ideology is the total identity between the civil society and the ideological thought, that is to say, the establishment of unique thought without fissures.

Social Construction of category of "Otherness"

"Otherness" is the way of defining one's own "self" or one's own "identity" in relation to others. It is mainly a result of social, political, cultural and other kinds of constructions through different approaches. Education as one of the major agents can construct or deconstruct "otherness". Therefore, in this article we are tries to explain the concepts of "otherness", its relationship with stereotypes and prejudices. The concept of "otherness" The term "otherness" simply means a quality of

being not alike; being distinct or different from that which is otherwise experienced or known. Most of the time, otherness is interpreted by referring to two or more different groups' distinct features or by referring to special qualities of each group that makes them different or unique in relation to another. This experience of being other can be expressed in many ways. Usually age, ethnicity, sex, physical ability, race, sexual orientation, social-economic class, and other demographic factors are the most common factors for an individual or a society to be leveled or identified as being of a certain kind (Gallos, Ramsey 1997). According to Selcen Dogan's explanation, although the sources of otherness are numerous and they are extremely different in their types, it is mainly related with the "terms of identity and difference" (Dogan 2000). He further argued that: in the fields of feminism, cultural studies and sociology, "difference" increasingly replaces the concept of "otherness". This explanation leads us to the essential meaning making process of human beings based on their differences. For instance, to talk about male identity, it is first essential to know about "femaleness". Or to judge about the identity or, sometimes, about the qualities of certain ethnic groups they must be compared with other groups. It is mainly this knowledge of difference that helps us to create meanings. Without the knowledge of difference meaning could not exist. "...there are two general points to note here, first, from many different directions, and within many different disciplines, this question of difference and otherness has come to play an increasingly significant role. Secondly, difference is ambivalent. It can be both, positive or negative. It is necessary for the production of meaning, the formation of language and culture and for social identities - and at the same time, threatens, a site of danger, of negative feelings, of splitting, hostility and aggression towards the Other" (Hall 1997; Dogan 2000). Therefore, the central idea of otherness lies just on the divide, like normal and abnormal, insiders and outsiders, and it is generally the issue of "Us" and "Them". This division usually leads to Stereotyping, which is part of the maintenance of social and symbolic order. As illustrated by S. Dogan, stereotype "sets up a symbolic frontier between the normal and the deviant, the normal and the pathological, the acceptable and the unacceptable, what belongs and what does not or is Other, between insiders and outsiders, Us and Them" (Dogan 2000). Possible Agents and Aspects of constructing "otherness" As explained, in many ways, otherness is the result of constructions of identities through continuous interactions of human beings. In this case it is more related with constructions of individual and/or groups' identities. Hence, identity can be constructed or reconstructed through social interactions, cultural practices and value exchanges, political setups or decisions, and Ideological representation. In addition, there are many agents for the process of constructing otherness. The major agents include: social interactions, education/knowledge about HIV, Media representation, literature, art (music, drama, theater, and film), folklore, etc. In the process of constructing otherness HIV disease related information plays the dominant role in many ways. Because information has the ability to construct or deconstruct one's own identity at individual and/or group levels. Stereotypes and "otherness" The concept of stereotype is highly related with that of "othering" and "otherness". Like "otherness" stereotype is dominantly about "Us" and "Them". So examining stereotype helps us to understand how "otherness" can be constructed and it is very important to know the very notion of the term. Thus, Stereotype refers to a fixed mental impression of human beings. Or as described by

Gordon Allport, stereotype can also be defined as an exaggerated belief associated with a category. Its function is to justify or to rationalize our behavior in relation to that category. This definition implies a discrepancy between an objectively ascertainable reality and a subjective perception of that reality (Van den Berghe 1996; Dogan 2000). It simplifies and ignores social, cultural, and other types of diversities. All comments or group characteristics are presented as if they are universal to the whole group and to each individual member of that group, often as specific group or national characters that are inherent, natural, and therefore unchangeable. These characteristics are very often couched in terms of an implicit moralizing dichotomy, which draws boundaries between "Them" and "Us". But these boundaries are not merely passively descriptive; they incorporate a value judgment of the group that is embedded in the power differential between the various groups within that society. Stereotypes are thus highly emotionally charged (Breger, Hill 1998). "We are told about the world before we see it. We imagine most things before we experience them. And those preconceptions... govern deeply the whole process of perception. They mark out certain objects as familiar or strange, emphasizing the difference, so that the slightly familiar is seen as very familiar, and somewhat strange as sharply alien... they are aroused by small signs... aroused, they flood fresh vision with older images and project into the world what has resurrected in memory" (Dogan 2000). Consequences of Stereotype naturally does not only mean a negative attitude, a belief, or a prior knowledge of persons towards others. It can be either positively or negatively perceived images of groups or individuals towards "others". But most of the time the stereotyped description of so called marginalized groups is closer to prejudice, a mostly negative attitude. So, one of the dangers of stereotypes is that they are very close to prejudice. "Even that we do not know enough about a group. Hence, Giddens says that prejudice refers to opinions and attitudes held by members of one group towards another. A prejudiced person's preconceived views are often based on hearsay rather than on direct evidence, and are resistant to change even in the face of new information" (Giddens Dogan 2000) Hence, it is not difficult to recognize how stereotypes and/or prejudices are practiced. It is not about their representation of reality. But it is believed that if someone needs to clearly understand how ethnic, gender, racial or any other kinds of representation actually works, the set of representational practices or stereotyping should also be critically examined. According to Hall's explanation, Stereotyping reduces people to a few, simple and essential characteristics, which are represented as fixed by Nature (Hall 1997; Dogan 2000). Although stereotypes have different identities and characteristics based on their types, the dominant types of stereotypes result from cultural or ethnic differences, linguistic, and racial diversities. Likewise, the major causes for stereotypes here in Ethiopia stems from ethnic diversity. Next we will see how ethnic diversity would be a cause for stereotypes and the disadvantages of negative stereotypes.

Identity and Culture Social media is a special space of its own where many people are allowed into the lives of others. In view of this, Fairclough's (2003) notion of the Social Constructionist theory which legitimises and distributes identities to individuals and groups becomes very important. In order for us to get a better understanding of how these identities are associated to individuals, it is needful to know what culture does to these individuals and how they see the world around them. Hall describes culture as an

"unseen but powerful force that holds everyone captive: "Culture is not an exotic notion studied by a selected group ... It is a mould in which we all are cast, and it controls our lives in many unsuspected ways" (1959:52).

He further states that "culture hides much more than it reveals, and... it hides [itself] most effectively from its own participants" (Hall 1959:53). His argument suggests that the individuals that are caught in this web of culture do not realise their entanglement since attitudes and behaviours are usually being shaped by cultures. From another perspective, Varner and Beamer (2005:5) define culture as "the coherent, learned, shared view of a group of people about life's concerns that ranks what is important, furnishes attitudes about what things are appropriate, and dictates behavior". Therefore we as humans are capable of changing for better or worse. All this is to suggest the different subjective worldviews of individuals and groups. As such, it is indicative of the different constructions that we as individuals have towards others which is the rationale for this study. To clarify it further, it is needful for this writer to point out that culture uses language to construct and ascribe identity to individuals. In this regard, language constructs culture and is in turn constructed by culture. HIV positive Identity and culture in this study is constructed through discourse, further extended Ideology and this can explain why the notion of HIV identity is a very porous concept that can only be understood within a given context through an ethnographic study because it appears to mean different things to different people. It might be useful for the purpose of this study to look at personal HIV identity, cultural identity and social identity. These different forms of identities might have been created by the different contexts of interactions that can be referred to as culture. They appear to be very confusing to our understanding, as well as in practice by the participants in this research. Identity can be seen as socially constructed, something we "do" rather than something we "are" (Ochs 1993). We "do" different identities in different context and therefore we have multiple rather than a single identity. Identity therefore should be regarded as a cover word for a range of personae, including statuses, roles, positions, relations, institutional and other relevant community identity that one may attempt to claim or assign in the course of social life (Ochs 1993). Identity is also constituted in our discourses through our conscious and unconscious thoughts and emotions where our sense of the self are constantly reconstituted in discourse each time that we speak or think (Weedon 1987). Individuals are known to negotiate their identities with others in order to attain interactions. In light of this, we argue that it is not sufficient for an individual to look at the self as constituting a particular identity; others must also recognize the identity as well. Individuals are capable of taking up or resisting identities that may be assigned to them. Social Identity For the purpose of this study one needs a stronger focus on the understanding of the "self" first and foremost before an understanding of "other". This means that cultural identity appears to be an individual's sense of the self that must have been derived from formal or informal membership in groups that might have transmitted and inculcated knowledge, beliefs, values, attitudes, traditions, and ways of life (Jameson 2007). Thus a study of "other" is a study of "self" in relation to the "other". A broad conception of cultural identity should not privilege nationality but instead should try to balance components related to vocation, class, geography, philosophy, language, and the social aspects of biology. Cultural identity can change over time mainly through

negotiation and renegotiation. It can be intertwined with power and privilege that might have been affected by close relationships, and negotiated through communication. The proposed model of cultural identity can serve to highlight components that are directly related to intercultural communication competence, such as language, economic class and professional affiliation, and can also demonstrate how culture does not only connect people but also appears to define them as unique individuals (Jameson 2007). This model can enrich learning in inter-culturally diverse communities. Through the above lenses, Cultural identity should therefore be seen as one part of a larger concept of individual identity. The poststructuralists view identity as the recognition of the processes of restriction. In view of this, there is a call for theoretical framework that should understand social identities and the self as social, historical, multiple and evolving within the context of power relations. This view of identity seeks to make possible the recognition of experiential multiplicity. It further challenges the ability to know or understand anything directly or absolutely which in effect re-echoes the dynamic nature of identity.

In this regard, the truth should therefore be seen as subjectively mediated by discourse, power and desire (James-Gracia 2003). This is meant to suggest that the subject in search of liberation “turns out to be discursively constituted by the very political system that is supposed to facilitate its emancipation” (Butler 1993). The poststructuralists further claim that because of the subjectively mediated nature of knowledge and experience, normative judgments are always subjective and contingent, if not arbitrary. In view of this, there cannot be a reliable justification for any identity ascription to any individual. Resistance of identity from this stance or perspective can only either reverse the flow of power or dismantle it in a way that something new might take their place (Foucault 1979). Identity is never stable or internally homogenous (Foncha 2013). This is to suggest that we are not born with any given identity but rather we pick up baggage of identity as we grow. In the same way we pick up these identities, we also drop some of it to develop new ones. Thus identity is not static but dynamic. Foncha (2013) further argues that an identity that is accepted joyfully at one point may be resisted by the same individual the next moment. In view of this, some identities have a life span and when this is exceeded, it can create problems between an individual versus others. Therefore, there cannot be any such thing as authentic or exemplary identity which creates an epistemological difficulty for the concept of identity. That is to say that we cannot know with certainty what criteria to apply in analyzing and understanding the identity of an individual or a group. Based on this, there is the risk of naturalizing some traits or experience as normative and thereby marginalizing others. Thus it is engaging in the practice of ideological normalization and exclusion. When people change their class, status, age etc they also tend to view themselves based on their present identity and may take offense in a situation where they are reminded their previous identity. Society on these bases needs to be on the guard to update individual identity since it is a fuzzy concept. The bitter truth is that in a racist society where a brown skin (along with others colors) can cost lives, people will embrace any ideology that seems to offer hope for change. Even when that ideology proves to be counter-productive, the hope persists... [Nationalism] then has to be seen as a complicated two way edge sword. It can't be fully understood if we just dismiss it as 'identity politics'" (Moya 2003). Thus, identity can be said to

be responsible for intellectual, physical, moral, educational and all other forms of fighting in the society.

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA)

In order to understand how identity is constructed, it is necessary for this writer to look at Critical Discourse Analysis because it through it that identity is constructed and ascribed to individuals and groups. The analysis of discourse is necessarily the analysis of language in use. As such, it is not restricted to the description of linguistic forms independent of the purposes or functions which these forms might have been designed to serve in human affairs (Brown and Yule 1983) Discourse is therefore a culturally and socially organised way of speaking where the context of interaction becomes the key to meaning making. In view of the above, language is used to “mean something and to do something” and that this “meaning and doing” are linked to the context of its use (Talbot 2007). Therefore for one to interpret a text properly, “one needs to work out what a speaker or a writer is doing through discourse and how this ‘doing’ can be linked to wider inter-personal, institutional, socio-cultural arm of social practice material contexts”. “Texts” in this respect refers to “the observable product of interaction,” whereas discourse is “the process of interaction itself: a cultural activity” (Talbot 2007). This view of language as action and social behaviour as emphasized in CDA sees discourse – the use of language in speech and writing – as a form of social practice. It is this definition of discourse as a social practice that is most useful for the analysis of discursive construction, since it involves a two-way relationship between a “discursive event” (i.e. any use of discourse) and the situation, institution and social structure in which it may occur: discourse can be shaped by these but it also can shape them (Fairclough 1992). In other words, language represents and contributes to the (re)production of social reality. This definition of discourse establishes a link to identity ascription as engaged in “reality construction”. Foucault does not think of discourse as a piece of text, but rather as “practices that systematically form the objects of which they speak” (Foucault 1981). By discourse, Foucault means “a group of statements which can provide a language for talking about – a way of representing the knowledge about – a particular topic at a particular historical moment” (Hall 2000). Discourse as Foucault further argues governs the way that a topic is meaningfully talked about. It also influences how ideas are put into practice and it is also used to regulate the conduct of others. This means that discourse (or discourses in the social theoretical sense) limits and restricts other ways of talking and producing knowledge about the construction and ascription of identity. According to Fairclough (2003) languages are appropriated to legitimise, negotiate and challenge particular identities. Through discourses, humans from different cultural and linguistic backgrounds are able to negotiate their biases with each other in order to construe identities to self and other. In view of this, the “self” and “other” are at the fore and there is need for some form of compromise through negotiation and renegotiation to be able to reduce the tension that exists between the two. Based on the above, Corson argues that: The life chances of students are determined by their ability to interact critically with the discourses around them, while still avoiding the temptation to be seduced by the disempowering messages those discourses often contain. The discourse surrounding children teaches them who they are, what their place is in the world and what they need to do to become autonomous and valuable citizens.

Language, critically acquired, is potentially empowering for people as they constantly build on previous encounters with the words in their unique search for meaning and value (2001: 14). The above quotation is also echoed in Foncha (2013) when he notes that the concept of socialization is very vital in participants' understanding of discourses around and within them. Thus these participants need to be culturally sensitive and affective in order to negotiate and renegotiate their identities as it is an unending process. The more a participant understands the world view that a given space provides to him/her, the easier it is for that participant to negotiate his/her identity. Interaction therefore is known to be a vital ingredient through which identity is constructed and construed to individuals.

Role of Language

The role of language in ideological construction has been the focus of intense interest across the fields that straddle the humanities and the social sciences. Much of this interest has been driven by a critical agenda associated with 'critical theory' in general, including post-structural theory with Foucault as a centre piece and admixtures from Bourdieu. The sprawling field of discourse analysis has perhaps been the chief arena for exploration of language in relation to the three keywords in the title (discourse, ideology and identity), with links to thematic fields like postcolonial theory and gender studies. Our point of departure is the trajectory whereby cognitive linguistics has broadened to include social processes of meaning construction (cf. Harder 2010), raising the issues from the point of view of linguistic and mental entities and inquiring into their social anchoring. We have focused on the role of conceptualizations of the Stigma nation as a topic that can elucidate some aspects of the key issues that have been under-discussed in the dominant climate. A central motif will be the issue of grounding of especially discourse, but by implication also of ideology and identity viewed as discursive constructions. This is intended as a corrective to the post structural focus on detachment and reification, cf. Foucault's definition of discourses as "the practices that systematically form the objects of which they speak", in favour of a perspective that includes the background from which discursive practices emerge. In the context of cognitive linguistics, the issue is related to the question of the extent to which framing can in itself reshape political issues, cf. Lakoff (e.g., 2008). Data analysis was conducted according to Van Dijk's (1998, 1988) socio-cognitive framework for discourse analysis, which examines the structure, production and comprehension of texts. Rather than analyse the HIV/AIDS pandemic as a whole, the analysis focused on four key themes: power and ideology, causation, responsibility and responses. Power and ideology are key areas of investigation in van Dijk's (2001, 1988) critical discourse analysis. Causation, responsibility and responses are themes that emerged from the literature as important in the discourses surrounding the general HIV/AIDS pandemic in the media. Power is the ability to control or influence others, the environment or physical and political resources (van Dijk 2001; Rothgeb 1993). This includes the authority to define and construct disease meanings. Scannell (1998) defines ideology as a distorted system of values and beliefs used to promote the interests of a social group. In this context, power and ideology refer to the structure of power and the system of values and beliefs used to maintain that structure. Language both reflects and shapes social order (Jaworski and Coupland 1999). Therefore, the

choice of language is never neutral but can be used to subtly promote certain power structures and ideologies (Lupton 1998). In addition, the promotion of certain power structures and ideologies within a discourse often normalizes them and can limit the reader's ability to imagine alternatives. The theme of causation focuses attention upon whom or what the media portray as causing the pandemic. The next theme relates to how the newspaper texts portray responsibility for the HIV/AIDS pandemic in Sub-Saharan Africa. The ability of local coherence to expose cause and consequence made it a particularly useful tool in understanding how the texts attribute cause and responsibility.

The theme of responses refers to what the texts proffer as the recommended solutions to the HIV/AIDS pandemic in sub-Saharan Africa. Deconstructive tools that address structure, production and comprehension were used for each of the four themes in order to uncover elements that are fundamental to the textual portrayal of the themes within the discourse. Discourse analysis can reveal underlying power relations in society through examining discursive structures and the discourses surrounding an issue (van Dijk 2001). One way of uncovering these discourses is to examine the role of language in constructing perceptions of the social world and how language is used to promote and reproduce dominant values and ideologies held by particular social groups (Mills 2004; Lupton 2003; van Dijk 2001). In this instance, analysing the construction of the HIV/AIDS pandemic in the media can assist us to understand the associated international power relations that interact with and shape this pandemic. As Thussu (2008) notes, news is "a vehicle for engagement in the democratic process, feeding off and into domestic politics and international relations". In recognition of the power of ideology in the construction of health, public health researchers have used discourse analysis to analyse representations of health issues (Lupton 1992). The greater understanding such analysis brings has helped to challenge exploitation and stigmatisation, which are obstacles to effective health promotion and treatment (Scannell 1998; Lupton 1992). A strength of critical discourse analysis lies in its systematic deconstruction of texts according to textual and linguistic features such as active and passive constructions, ideological squares, local coherence and implied propositions (van Dijk 2001, 1998, 1988). This enables the researcher to uncover assumptions and ideologies otherwise overlooked by the casual reader. The rich textual structure of the print medium makes it an important starting point to analyse the discourses surrounding an issue.

Final Remarks

In this above overview indicates that HIV/AIDS related stigma across the socio-cultural context may centrally involve an ideology of exclusion or ideology of otherness, which maintained and monitoring through the interrelation of linguistic structure, language use through the lexical wording and lethal metaphor and meta pragmatic understating of HIV (Silverstein, 1979, Kroskrity, 2004). In other way, Linguistic construction or ideological formulation of "others" was marked and take an inference to HIV/AIDS related stigma build on uses of language or ideology, Meta pragmaticism notion about those living with HIV/AIDS, often involved in joking or constructed a metaphor to gear up social discomfort ability. Sociological theorization of Ideology, however, included the notions that indicate ideology is not monolithic

posture, rather constituted with multiple language expression. In addition, extending the ideological framework of others that confined beyond the HIV/AIDS related Scientific-medico understanding and it's sociological model to trace out cultural legitimacy within Socio-Geographic space. For instance, from the classical Anthropological point of view, the concept of "taboo", "Forbidden Activity", "Morally Disgusting", are always associated with marginality, not only that are positive o-relation with pollution, biologically not well, socially unacceptable but rather associated with potentially power acquiring notion,

In this regards, from the words of Douglas (1966), "To have been in the margins is to have been in contact with Danger (Biologically Harmful), to have been source of power". It is easy to understand that HIV/AIDS related stigma is just not a ideology of otherness rather linguistic process of exclusion, to some sort of conceptual understanding of others or social avoidance and its psychological manifestation. However, there are some linguistic school of thoughts and stigma scholar have claimed that Ideological construction of Otherness and abjection, which suggested common set of social and Linguistic process of social exclusion, liminality, marginality and stigma. As a central point of concern, we well come of those voice who have recently argued for a more interactive, contextual and critical discussion on existing Critical Discourse Analysis on the societal effects of stigmatization. With polemically, we posited our concern on socio-psychological condition and geo-spatiality under which the stigmatization effects to be expected, rather specific effects of stigmatization can occur. Stigma as a Ideology, can created a specific and unique phenomenon and mechanism thus cover the wider spectrum within socio-Political setting, linguistic construction of stigma, it's socio etiological meaning, simultaneously helped to rise some questions which critical in nature as well as motivated and inspire task performing setting. We hope as well that this review articles help to pronouncing new kinds of questions – questions that may be generated a new kind of Research Avenue and intellectual inquisitives.

REFERENCES

- Achmat, Z. 2001. Untitled opening address to the AIDS in Context International Conference on HIV/AIDS held at the University of the Witwatersrand, South Africa [Online], available at <http://www.tac.org.za/Documents/Speeches/zawits.rtf>, accessed 15 November.
- Airhihenbuwa, C. 1995. *Health and Culture Beyond the Western Paradigm* (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage).
- Airhihenbuwa, C. O. and Webster, J. D. 2004. Culture and African contexts of HIV/AIDS prevention, care, and support. *Journal of Social Aspects of HIV/AIDS*, 1, 4–13.
- Airhihenbuwa, C., Webster, D., Oladosun-Okoror, T. A., Shine, R. and Smith-Bankhead, N. 2003. HIV/AIDS and the African-American community: Disparities of policy and identity. *Phylon*, 50, 23–46.
- Airhihenbuwa, C.O. and Obregon, R. 2000. "A Critical Assessment of Theories/ Models Used in Health Communication for HIV/AIDS," in *Journal of Communication*, 10810730, Apr/Jun 2000 Supplement, Vol. 5.
- Anfara, A. Jr. and Mertz, N.T. 2006. *Theoretical Frameworks in Qualitative Research*. London: Sage Publications.
- Angelelli, C. V. 2004. *Medical Interpreting and Cross-Cultural Communication*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Beard, A. 2000. *The Language of Politics*. London: Routledge.
- Brown, Penelope and Stephen C. Levinson, (1987). *Politeness: Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Bull, P. "Slipperiness, Evasion, and Ambiguity Equivocation and Facework". In Cook, G. 2001. *The Discourse of Advertising* (2 nd Ed.. London and New York: Routledge.
- Cameron, E. 1993. *Legal rights, human rights and AIDS: The first decade. Report from South Africa 2*. *AIDS Analysis Africa*, 3, 3–4. Canales, M. 2000. Othering: Towards an understanding of difference. *Advances in Nursing Science*, 22(4), 16–31.
- Chinweizu, X. and Jemie, O. 1987. *Decolonizing the African Mind* (London: Sundoor.
- Cohen, S. 1980. *Folk Devils and Moral Panics. The creation of the Mods and Rockers* (Oxford: Martin Robertson & Co. Ltd..
- Colvin, M. 2000. Sexually transmitted infections in Southern Africa: A public Health Crisis. *South African Journal of Science*, 96(6), 335–339.
- Crewe, M. 1991. *AIDS in South Africa: The Myth and the Reality* (Harmondsworth: Penguin).
- Cutting, Joan (2003). *Pragmatics and Discourse*. Routledge: London and New York. Dijk, T.A. 1998. 'Critical Discourse Analysis' (second draft. (Internet Document. file://A:\Critical Analysis.h+ m.
- Dear, M., Robert, W., Lord Gaber, S. and Takahashi, L. 1997. Seeing people Differently: The Sociospatial Construction of Disability. *Society and Space*, 15, 455–480.
- Erwin, D. O., Spatz, T., Scotts, C., Hollenberg, J. A. and Doleny, L. A. 1996. Increasing mammography and breast self-examination in African American women using witness Project Model. *Journal of Cancer Education*, 11(14), 210–215.
- Fairclough, N. 1989. *Language and Power*. London and New York: Longman. 1992. *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Farmer, P. 1998. *Infections and Inequalities: The Modern Plagues* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Fassin, D. 2002. Embodied History. Uniqueness and exemplarity of South African AIDS. *African Journal of AIDS Research*, 1, 65–70.
- Flood, T., Hoosain, M. and Primo, N. 1997. *Beyond Inequalities. Women in South Africa* (Harare: Clarksbooks.
- ILO, OHCHR and IOM, 2001. *International Migration, Racism, Discrimination and Xenophobia. A discussion paper* (Geneva: ILO, OHCHR and IOM In consultation with Office of the UN High Commissioner for Refugees.
- Jochelson, K. 2001. *The Color of Disease: Syphilis and Racism in South Africa, 1880–1950* (Oxford: St Anthony's College.
- Johnston, A. G. 2001. *Twelve Key messages on HIV/AIDS, A briefing paper to US Ambassadors in Africa*. Report prepared by The Policy Project for The US Agency for International Development.
- Leclerc-Madlala, S. 2001. *Demonizing Women in the era of AIDS: on the Relationship between cultural constructions of both HIV/AIDS and Femininity*. *Society in Transition*, 32(1), 39.

- Leclerc-Madlala, S. 2002. On the virgin cleansing myth: gendered bodies, AIDS and ethnomedicine. *African Journal of AIDS Research*, 1(2), 87–95.
- Link, B. 2001. On stigma and its public health implications. Paper presented at the Stigma and Global Health: Developing a research Agenda Conference held in Bethesda, MD, USA, September.
- Nabaitu, J., Bachena, C. and Seeley, J. 1994. Marital instability in a rural Population in South West Uganda: Implications of the spread of HIV-1 infection in Africa. *AIDS*, 6(64), 243–251.
- Nelkin, D. and Gilman, S. 1988. Placing blame for devastating disease. *Social Research*, 55, 361–378.
- Ngugi, Wa Thiong’O. 1986. *Decolonizing the Mind: The politics of language in African literature* (London: James Currey/Heinemann).
- Parker, R. 2001. Alternative sexualities and genders in Brazil. Paper presented at the Stigma and Global Health: Developing a Research Agenda Conference, Bethesda, MD, September.
- Parker, R. and Aggleton, P. 2003. HIV and AIDS related stigma and discrimination: A conceptual Framework and implications for action. *Social Science and Medicine*, 57, 13–24.
- Paskett, E. D., Tatum, C. M., D’Agostino, R. Jr., Rushing, J., Velez, R., Michielutte, R. and Dignan, M. 1999. Community-based interventions to improve breast and cervical cancer screening: Results of the Forsyth County Cancer Screening (FoCaS. Project. *Cancer Epidemiology, Biomarkers & Prevention*, 8, 453–459.
- Qwana, E., Mkaya-Mwamburi, D., Lurie, M. and Mthembu, A. 2001. An Analysis of Reasons for wanting and not wanting to disclose HIV status. *South African AIDS Information Dissemination Service News*, 8(3), 5.
- Ratele, N. and Shefer, T. 2002. Stigma and social construction of sexually transmitted diseases. In D. Hook and G. Eagle (eds), *Psychology and social prejudice* (Cape Town: UCT Press.
- Sabatier, R. 1988. *Blaming others. Prejudice, race and worldwide AIDS* (London: Panos Institute.
- Said, E. 1978. *Orientalism* (New York: Vintage Books.
- Simbayi, L. 2002. Psychosocial and Cultural Determinants of HIV/AIDS in the SADC Region. *HIV/AIDS in Southern Africa: A review paper for the WK Kellogg Foundation* (Cape Town: HSRC Publishers.
- Streak, B. 2001, 26 Oct. They don’t love me like before. *Mail and Guardian* [Online], available at http://www.mg.co.za/articledirect.aspx?articleid5152081&area5%2farchives_print_edition%2f, accessed 15 November 2004.
