Critical Discourse Analysis: Language Theoritical Framework

Arini Hidayah[1] and Widyashanti Kunthara Anindhita[2]

[1] Surakarta University. E-mail: ariniunsa@gmail.com
[2] Surakarta University. E-mail: wk.anindita@gmail.com

Abstract: *Critical discourse analysis is not only talking about assertions, but also about the structure and principles of discourse. Discourse principle and critical discourse analysis structures cannot be divorced from the connection or relationship between discourse and reality. The term "reality" refers to a collection of social creations established through discourse. The discourse analysis discussed in this paper will establish a foundation for understanding discourse as something other than a subject of language study, but as an intentional social practice. Discourse does not always occur in this manner, but has a definite goal intended to be communicated to the listener. It is not sufficient to evaluate the language parts alone while undertaking discourse analysis; one must additionally consider the context in which the speech is constructed. Not only does critical discourse analysis evaluate language in terms of linguistic studies or isolated parts of language, but it also analyzes language in relation to its environment. The context indicates that the language is being utilized for specific purposes and behaviors.*

Keywords*: Critical Discourse Analysis, Social Practice, and Power.*

Analisis Wacana Kritis: Kerangka Teoritis Bahasa

Arini Hidayah[1] dan Widyashanti Kunthara Anindhita[2]

[1] Universitas Surakarta. E-mail: ariniunsa@gmail.com
[2] Universitas Surakarta. E-mail: wk.anindita@gmail.com

Abstrak: Analisis wacana kritis tidak hanya berbicara tentang pernyataan, tetapi juga tentang struktur dan prinsip-prinsip wacana. Prinsip wacana dan struktur analisis wacana kritis tidak dapat dipisahkan dari koneksi atau hubungan antara wacana dan realitas. Istilah "realitas" mengacu pada kumpulan kreasi sosial yang dibentuk melalui wacana. Analisis wacana yang dibahas dalam makalah ini akan membangun landasan untuk memahami wacana sebagai sesuatu selain subjek studi bahasa, tetapi sebagai praktik sosial yang disengaja. Wacana tidak selalu terjadi dengan cara demikian, tetapi memiliki tujuan tertentu yang dimaksudkan untuk dikomunikasikan kepada pendengarnya. Tidaklah cukup untuk mengevaluasi bagian-bagian bahasa saja saat melakukan analisis wacana; kita juga harus mempertimbangkan konteks di mana pidato itu dibangun. Analisis wacana kritis tidak hanya mengevaluasi bahasa dalam hal studi linguistik atau bagian-bagian bahasa yang terisolasi, tetapi juga menganalisis bahasa dalam kaitannya dengan lingkungannya. Konteks menunjukkan bahwa bahasa digunakan untuk tujuan dan perilaku tertentu..

Kata-kata Kunci: Analisis Wacana Kritis, Praktik Sosial, dan Kekuatan.

Introduction

A discourse (Taylor 2010) will be seen as a text which is an object and data which is always open to reading and interpretation diverse. Text received and understood by the reader and the cultural environment where the text was produced and consumed. So, the text is intertextual and at the same time subjective or in other words, text is intersubjective. It means the text depends on how the interpretations submitted by others in codes and conventions of a community, and thus validated or rejected.

Discourse (Đorđević 2020) is understood as units and speech forms from interactions that become part of everyday linguistic behavior, but can appear equally in institutional environment. Discourse is text that is in a speech situation. Meanwhile, according to van Dijk, discourse is the text "in context". In discourse contains a broader context. In the context of linguistic behavioral theory, it is it is important to define "text", which the material is in text, separated from general speech situation which is only as the reader's receptive behavior, the basis is generally understood in a systematic sense, not historical meaning. In text, speech behavior have the quality of knowledge in serving transmission, as well as stored for use thereafter in written form which constitutive and for the use of the term daily. So, text is seen more as stand-alone linguistic phenomenon and separate from the speech situation.

Michel Foucault (Umanailo 2019) is one of the thinkers who developed the theory of discourse. In his studies show that humans arises because of the arrangement of words and objects changing. More explained that, a piece of time called modernity, resulting in a composition that give a special place to humans self-aware. Intended arrangement Foucault is a rift in the subject relationship (words) and objects (things) that because something is needed again. Something which makes the subject relationship rift and the recovered object is power, and that power is produced by discourse. How discourse is produced, who who produces and what is the effect of production discourse? who can answer questions above is the concept of Michel Foucault's discourse . In his concept, Foucault does not see discourse as a series of words or prepositions in the text, but produces another, i.e. an idea, concept or effect.

Another feature that is no less important in reading Foucault's discourse is the main characteristic discourse, namely its ability to be a set that functions to form and with power relations in a society. Critical discourse analysis is a theory to conduct an empirical study of the relationships between discourse and socio-cultural development, have insight and function to shape knowledge in a specific context, too generate interpretations by looking at the power effect of critical discourses without generalizing to other contexts (Suma Riella Rusdiarti 2008).

Discussion

Discourse is a series of sentences that related, so as to form a meaningful meaning match between the sentences. Jaworska (2021), explains that the meaning of discourse is as follows: a series of words or a series of speech acts that express a thing (subject) that presented regularly and systematically in a coherent whole, and is formed from segmental and non-segmental elements language. Based on his understanding, Jaworska identify characteristics and traits a discourse, as follows: 1) Discourse can be a series of sentences say orally and in writing or a series speech act; 2) Discourse expresses a thing (subject); 3) The presentation is regular, systematic, coherent, complete with all situations supporters; 4) Have a unified mission in the chain; 5) Formed by segmental elements and nonsegmental. In this case, discourse can be referred to as a complete linguistic record of communication events, and communication is a tool of social interaction, namely relationships between individuals or groups with individuals or other groups in the social process. Communicating can use the medium verbal (oral and written) and medium nonverbal (gestures and kinesics). Embodiment verbal medium is discourse which is a verbal communication products. Discourse assumes the presence of a greeter (speaker or writer) and addressee (listener or reader).

In the process of speaking, the greeter convey messages (thoughts, feelings, desires) which becomes meaning in language (lingual) to be conveyed to the addressee as mandate (Erdogan-Ozturk and Isik-Guler 2020). According to Reyes: (2015) discourse is a unit of language most complete and highest or largest above sentences or clauses with coherence and sustainable high cohesion, as well as capable of having a real beginning and ending. Meanwhile, Hirsch and Kayam (2021) opinion about discourse and communication and its function, that discourse with units Conversation requires an element of communication in the form of sources (speakers and writers) as well as recipients (listeners and readers). More Furthermore, it was also explained by him that all elements of communication related to function language, which includes: (1) expressive functions, generate types of discourse based on expository exposure, (2) fatigue function (conversation opener), generate dialogue opening, (3) aesthetic function, concerning the elements of message as an element of communication, and (4) function directive, relate to readers or listeners as recipients of discourse content straight from the source.

By referring to the function of the language above, then the classification of discourse can refer to the opinion of Leech in (Baryam 2010) which states that discourse can classified as follows: a) Expressive discourse, if the discourse sourced from the speaker's ideas or writer as a means of expressiveness, such as speech discourse; b) Fatic discourse, if the discourse comes from on the channel to expedite communication, such as introductory discourse in a party; c) Informational discourse, if the discourse sourced from messages or information, such as news discourse in the mass media; d) Aesthetic discourse, if the discourse sourced from messages with stress the beauty of the message, such as poetry discourse and song; e) Directive discourse, if the discourse directed at the action or reaction of speech partners or readers, such as discourse speech.

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) sees use of spoken and written language as social practice. Social practice in analysis critical discourse is seen as causing dialectical relationship between discursive events specific to the situation, institution, and structure social. This concept is emphasized by Fairclough and Wodak who saw the practice of biased discourse, display an ideological effect, which means discourse can produce

relationships unequal power between classes social, male and female, group majority and minority, where the difference is represented in practice social. Fairclough and Wodak argue that critical discourse analysis is how language causes social groups that there is a fight and put forward his ideology each. Fairclough (2013) express his opinion about the CDA that discourse analysis critical aims to help analyze and understand social problems in relationship between ideology and power. The purpose of critical discourse analysis is to develop assumptions that are the ideology contained behind the words in text or speech in various forms power.

Critical Discourse Analysis (Gu 2018) is used to reveal about the relationship of science knowledge and power. Aside from that, can be used for criticism. Analysis critical discourse in everyday context used to build power, knowledge new knowledge, regulation, and normalization, and hegemony (the influence of one nation on the other nations). CDA to used to describe something. translating, analyzing and criticizing social life reflected in the text or speech, i.e. a text produced with a certain ideology conveyed to the audience of readers. Gu (2018) concluded that CDA is shaped by social structures (class, status, ethnic identity, age, and type gender), culture, and discourse (language used). CDA trying to unite and determine the relationship between the actual text, discursive exercises (this process involves creating, writing, speaking, and listening) as well as the social context associated with discursive texts and exercises (Fairclough 2013).

In more detail, it is said that the text is an event in which something is told. Discursive exercises refer to rules, norms, feelings, specific socialization in relationship with the recipient of the message and message translator. It is useful for determine how individuals learn think, act and speak in various positions in social life. Context Social is a place where discourse occurs markets, classrooms, playgrounds, churches, mosques, and conference rooms). Discourse analysis critical always involves power and ideology, like the connected past context with the present (historical) context. CDA can be interpreted different depending on the background knowledge, and positions of power somebody.

The focus of CDA is on the ways in which discourse structures enact, confirm, and reproduce relations of power and dominance in society. More specifically, identified by Fairclough & Wodak in (Reyes 2015) as follows: Summarize the main tenets of CDA as follows: 1) CDA addresses social problems; 2) Power relations are discursive; 3) Discourse constitutes society and culture; 4) Discourse does ideological work; 5) Discourse is historical; 6) The link between text and society mediated; 7) Discourse analysis is interpretive and explanatory; 8) Discourse is forms of social action.

Fairclough and Wodak identified characteristics of critical discourse analysis and summarizing his main teaching, that critical discourse analysis: (1) pay attention to social problems; (2) revealing that power relations are discursive; (3) believe that discourse plays a role in the formation of society and culture; (4) believe that discourse plays a role in build ideology; (5) believe that discourse is historical or historical; (6) mediate the relationship between the text and social society; (7) is interpretive and explanative; (8) believe that discourse is a form of social action.

Teun A. Van Dijk stated that CDA is used to analyze critical discourses, including: politics, race, gender, social class, hegemony, and etc. Van Dijk (2006) define Critical Discourse Analysis as follows: CDA is a type discourse analytical research that primarily

studies the way social power abuse, dominance, and inequality are enacted, reproduced, and resisted by text and talk in the social and political context. With such incident research, Critical Discourse Analysis take explicit position, and thus want to understand, expose, and ultimately resist social inequality. The main aspects of CDA are: reveal how power, domination and inequality is practiced, reproduced or opposed by written text or discussion in a social and political context. Thus, CDA takes non-conformist or against the flow dominance in the grand framework to fight social injustice. The relationship or relationship between language, text, and social context in Critical Discourse Analysis. Language as a social semiotic is one of a number of systems meanings, such as traditions, livelihoods, and courtesy system that together shape human culture. In the process social, the construct of reality cannot be separated of the semantic system construct in place reality is worked out. At the level that very concrete, language contains no words, clauses or sentences, but contains text or discourse related to what what is actually done, interpreted, and people say in real situations. In interpersonal context, context where meaning is preserved, at all not without social values. Through action everyday meaning, society plays social structure, confirming status and role owned, as well as determine and define value and knowledge systems.

Halliday in (Taylor 2010) states that text is a semantic choice of context data social, which is a way of expressing meaning through spoken or written language. In this case there are four notes regarding the text, that the text is essentially (1) a unit semantics, (2) can project meaning at a higher level, (3) a process sociosemantic, and (4) determined by situation. Fowler, Hodge, Kress and Trew in (Gu 2018) apply grammatical functional theory Halliday in conducting Critical Discourse Analysis. Through the application of Halliday theory above, states that language has three main functions, namely communicating the process of occurrence of events in the world and all involved in it (ideational function), express the speaker's attitude towards propositions that have been prepared and the relationship between speakers and speech partners (interpersonal function), and present it coherently and adequate through the text (textual function). They applied an analysis of three function of the language, to dissect ideology in discourse. Analysis only carried out at the text level, namely analyzing vocabulary choice elements, nominalization and sentences used in text (Rogers, Singhal, and Quinlan 2014).

Critical Discourse Analysis in its development, has gave birth to a variety of theories with different approaches which is also diverse, used by para expert in his research. Using the exclusion approach and inclusion Baryadi (2001) to analyze how actors in the discourse are displayed and whether the actor is shown in full, only partially or even omitted. Exclusion is an exclusion or the omission of actors from a discourse. Process exclusion is realized through three strategies, namely passivation (removal of actors in the most common discourse carried out with using passive voice to describe an event), nominalization (process change verbs to nouns) and substitute clause.

Opposite of exclusion, inclusion relates to how actors are included or presented in discourse. The inclusion process is realized through six strategies, namely differentiation-indifferentiation (presenting actors or other events as a comparison), objectivation-abstraction, nomination-categorization, nomination-identification, determinations, and individualization assimilation. This type of approach allows for a more in-depth review and details about the position of the actor in the discourse. However, to see how the discourse is

formed as a whole, it is still not possible said to be detailed, remembering van Leeuwen only do analysis at the text level only (Dunmire 2012; Gu 2018).

In contrast to van Leeuwen and Mills, van Dijk's Critical Discourse Analysis approach (Dunmire 2012) known as the approach social cognition, including analysis of discourse maker cognition in the process discourse formation and also involves more in-depth linguistic analysis to dismantle power relations and dominance produced in discourse. Dijk classifying discourse elements into three, namely text, social cognition and context social. The level of the text is divided into three, namely: macro structure, relating to the external structure discourse constructor, related superstructure with discourse schematics, and microstructures includes linguistic elements that used in discourse. Van Dijk define the four linguistic elements that studied at the level of the microstructure, namely the elements syntactic, semantic, stylistic and rhetorical. Cognition social media exists to bridge the gap between text and context.

Social cognition is concerned with the process mental and cognition of discourse makers in discourse production process. There is analysis to social cognition through lists the question submitted to the maker discourse will further clarify how discourse is produced and in what context? which affects it. For analysis social context is done through study intertextuality, i.e. linking a discourse with related discourse that existed before and after. The relationship between the text, social cognition, and social context reflects the tendency of a discourse. Excess the discourse analysis process carried out by van Dijk is how to link between text and context through the maker's social cognition discourse. In line with van Dijk, Fairclough in Eriyanto (Eriyanto 2011) sees the text in various levels. A text not only show how an object depicted, but displays also what is the relationship between the objects defined.

Conclution

Critical Discourse Analysis looks at language as an action. Analyzed language by Critical Discourse Analysis does not describe aspects only language, but also connect it with context. Context in this case means language used for a specific purpose including the practice of power. That is, in a context it must be realized there will be interest, so the analysis formed must be realized has been influenced by the author from various factors, besides it must also be realized that behind the discourse there is a desired meaning and image as well as interests at stake. Discourse acts in determining the direction where the audience will be taken.

Eventually, indeed Critical Discourse Analysis is a effort or process (decomposition) to give explanation of a text (social reality) that someone wants or is studying or a dominant group that tends to have a specific goal to get something. The writers realize that this language theoritical framework is still far from perfect, that is why the writers would like to offer the suggestion to next writers or researchers who want to discuss about Critical Discourse Analysis.

References

Baryadi, Praptomo. (2001). "Konsep-Konsep Pokok Dalam Analisis Wacana." *Jurnal Widyaparwa No* 57:1–23.

Baryam, Fatih. (2010). "Ideology and Political Discourse: A Critical Discourse Analysis of Erdogan'S Political Speech." *Arecls* 7(January 2009):23–40.

Van Dijk, Teun A. (2006). "Ideology and Discourse Analysis." *Journal of Political Ideologies* 11(2):115–40. doi: 10.1080/13569310600687908.

Đorđević, Jasmina P. (2020). "The Sociocognitive Dimension of Hate Speech in Readers' Comments on Serbian News Websites." *Discourse, Context and Media* 33:100366. doi: 10.1016/j.dcm.2019.100366.

Dunmire, Patricia L. (2012). "Political Discourse Analysis: Exploring the Language of Politics and the Politics of Language." *Linguistics and Language Compass* 6(11):735–51. doi: 10.1002/lnc3.365.

Erdogan-Ozturk, Yasemin, and Hale Isik-Guler. (2020). "Discourses of Exclusion on Twitter in the Turkish Context: #ülkemdesuriyeliistemiyorum (#idontwantsyriansinmycountry)." *Discourse, Context and Media* 36:100400. doi: 10.1016/j.dcm.2020.100400.

Eriyanto. (2011). *Analisis Wacana: Pengantar Analisis Teks Media*. Yogyakarta: LKiS Printing Cemerlang.

Fairclough, Norman. (2013). "Critical Discourse Analysis." Pp. 9–20 in *The Routledge Handbook of Discourse Analysis*.

Gu, Chonglong. (2018). "Forging a Glorious Past via the 'Present Perfect': A Corpus-Based CDA Analysis of China's Past Accomplishments Discourse Mediat(Is)Ed at China's Interpreted Political Press Conferences." Pp. 137–49 in *Discourse, Context and Media*. Vol. 24. Elsevier B.V.

Hirsch, Tijana, and Orly Kayam. (2021). "Exploring the Complexities of Transnationalism: The Temporality, the Family, and the Host Language – An Empirical Study." *Ampersand* 8:100072. doi: 10.1016/j.amper.2020.100072.

Jaworska, Sylvia. (2021). "Competence and Collectivity: The Discourse of Angela Merkel's Media Communications during the First Wave of the Pandemic." *Discourse, Context and Media* 42:100506. doi: 10.1016/j.dcm.2021.100506.

Reyes, Antonio. (2015). "Building Intimacy through Linguistic Choices, Text Structure and Voices in Political Discourse." *Language and Communication* 43:58–71. doi: 10.1016/j.langcom.2015.05.002.

Rogers, Everett M., Arvind Singhal, and Margaret M. Quinlan. (2014). *Diffusion of Innovations*. Routledge.

Suma Riella Rusdiarti. (2008).“Struktur Dan Sifatnya Dalam Pemikiran Michel Foucault.”Taylor, Gordon. 2010. *Cohesion and Texture*. Vol. I. Umanailo, M. Chairul Basrun. 2019.“Pemikiran Michel Foucault.”