

CHAPTER 2

THEORITICAL FRAMEWORK

In order to analyse the data in this research, there are theories that will be used as the basis will be explained in this chapter.

2.1 Discourse Analysis

Based on Thornbury (2005:6), discourse is the way that language -both spoken or written- is used for communicative effect in a real-world situation. Discourse analysis is the study of such language, and the analysis of the function and uses of texts -or text analysis- is an essential thing of discourse. One of the methods to find the difference between discourse and text is to take discourse as the process and the text as the product.

According to Harris (as cited in Paltridge, 2012:2), discourse analysis is a pattern how to analysing connected speech and writing. There are two main interests: 1) the examination of language beyond the level of the sentence, 2) the relationship between linguistic and non-linguistic behaviour. He states that discourse has characteristic linguistic features associated, not only give particular meanings. Paltridge also explains patterns of the language throughout texts and considers the connection between language and the social and cultural contexts wherein it is used.

*“The runway is full at the moment has a particular meaning in a particular situation (in this case the landing of a plane) and may mean something different in another situation. If I say *The runway is full at the moment* to a friend who is waiting with me to pick someone up from the airport, this is now an explanation of why the plane is late landing (however I may know this and not an instruction to not land the plane” (Paltridge, 2012:2).*

Additionally, he considers the approaches using language to provide other perspectives of the world and particular understandings. It examines how the use of language is affected through relationships between participants in addition to the impact the use of language has upon social identities and relations. Besides, it considers how perspectives of the world, and identities, are developed thru the use of discourse.

Schiffrin et al., (2015:1) define that discourse has three principal classes as:

1) something beyond the sentence, 2) language use, and 3) a broader variety of social form that consists of non-linguistic and non-particular model of language. There are many definitions of discourse from several linguistics books that now start with a survey of definition. Considering disciplinary diversity, it is no wonder that the term “discourse” and “discourse analysis” have various meaning to the scholars in different fields. From above theories, it can be understood that discourse analysis is a way that has a relationship between speech and writing, also the language used by people to communicate in social life.

2.2. Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA)

Van Dijk (1993:249) defines that critical discourse as a study of the relation among discourse, power, dominance, social inequality, and the position of the discourse analyst in social relationships. It is a complex, multidisciplinary, and as yet underdeveloped area of study, that might know as socio-political discourse analysis since this is only the most relevant dimensions of this field can be discussed here. The specific process from critical discourse analysts may involve structures, strategies, or other properties of text, talk, verbal interaction or communicative events play a role in these modes of reproduction.

In particular, van Dijk (1993:250) claims that the purpose of critical discourse analysts is to comprehend structures, strategies, or other properties of text, talk, verbal interaction, or reproduction. Analysts’ understanding of actual power and dominance relations in society is important as an analysis of strategies of resistance and challenge despite the fact that such an analysis needs to be included in a broader theory of power, counter-power, and discourse. Critical discourse analysts’ approach focuses on the elites and their discursive strategies for the maintenance of inequality.

Van Dijk (1995) mentions there are 12 criteria works in CDA as follows: 1) it is problem – or issue-oriented, rather than paradigm-oriented. It needs appropriate theoretical and methodological approach to convincingly study relevant social problems, such as sexism, racism, colonialism, and other forms of social inequality, 2) CDA is an explicitly critical approach, position, or stance of studying text and talk, 3) CDA work is typically inter or multidisciplinary, and specifically focuses

on the relations between discourse and society (including social cognition, politics, and culture), 4) CDA is part of a broad spectrum of critical studies in the humanities and the social sciences, for instance in sociology, psychology, mass communication research, law literature, and political science, 5) CDA studies pay attention to all level and dimensions of discourse, those of grammar (phonology, syntax, semantics), style, rhetoric, schematic, organizations, speech acts, pragmatic strategies, and other interaction, 6) CDA is unlimited to verbal approaches to discourse, but also pay attention to other semiotic dimensions (pictures, film, sound, music, gestures, etc.) of communicative events,

The next 6 criteria works are: 7) CDA focuses on relations of power, dominance and inequality and the ways these are reproduced or resisted by social group members through text and talk, 8) CDA deals with the discursively enacted or legitimated structures and strategies of dominance and resistance in social relationships of class, gender, ethnicity, race, sexual orientation, language, religion, age, nationality, or world-region, 9) CDA is about the underlying ideologies that play a role in the reproduction of or resistance against dominance or inequality, 10) the aim of CDA studies is specifically focuses on the strategies of manipulation, legitimation, the manufacture of consent and other discursive ways to influence the minds and implicitly the actions of people in the interest of the powerful, 11) CDA studies is try to expose the discursive means of mental control and social influence implies a critical and oppositional for the powerful and the elites who abuse of their power, 12) otherwise, studies in CDA is try to express an overall perspective of solidarity with dominated groups by formulating strategic proposals for the enactment and development of counter-power and counter-ideologies in practices of challenge and resistance.

Fairclough (2013:21) explains that discourse involves social conditions that can be specified as social conditions of production and social conditions of interpretation. This social condition connects with three different levels of social organization: the social situation's level or the immediate social environment in which discourse occurs, social institutions' level which constitutes a wider matrix for the discourse, and the society's level as a whole. Fairclough divides critical discourse analysis into three dimensions or stages, including 1) the description is a

stage is concerned with formal properties of text, 2) interpretation is concerned with the connection between text and interaction – with seeing the text as the product from a production process, and as a source withinside the system of interpretation, 3) explanation is concerned with the relationship between interaction and social context.

Critical discourse analysis can be understood as a study that has a relation to discourse, power, dominance, and social inequality. This study pays attention to all levels and dimensions of discourse, also to other semiotic dimensions. This is also supported by Fairclough's theory that divides the critical discourse into three dimensions. This dimension will be used for the analysing data in the next chapter for doing critical discourse analysis.

2.2.1. Language

Hymes (as cited by Blommaert, 2005:70) states that the problem occurs the role of language might have differed from community to community. The cognitive significance of a language relies not only on structure but also on patterns of use. The consequences of the relativity of the structure of language based on the relativity of the function of language. Moreover, societies differ in the role they assign to language itself in socialization, acquisition of cultural knowledge, and performance. As sociolinguistic approach, it claims attention to the organization of linguistic aspects in social interaction.

Description of speaking can indicate basic cultural values and orientations. It focuses on the worlds of social relationships, what is disclosed are not orientations towards persons, roles, statuses, rights, and duties, deference, and demeanour. Language functions and the ways in which they are performed by people are important to assess and evaluate. Saussure (as cited by Fairclough, 2013: 38)

“Language and speaking are thus interdependent; the former is both the instrument and the product of the latter” (Fairclough, 2013: 38).

Ramsey and Reading (2017: 299) claim that language is one of the most dominant and strong aspects in our daily lives, yet exceptionally few people pay attention to it in interpersonal and public communication. The power of language is to develop, to describe, and to preserve our social realities consider to the world

around us that cannot be exaggerate. Chomsky (as cited in Ramsey and Reading, 2017:299) explains that:

“Language is a process of free creation; it’s a laws and principles are fixed, but the manner in which the principles of generation are used is free and infinitely varied. Even the interpretation and use of words involves a process of free creation.” (Ramsey and Reading, 2017:299).

Siddique (as cited in Kanwal and Garcia, 2018: 322) shares that language is a complex set with many social, political, cultural, and symbolic implications. In line with Foucault (as cited in Kanwal and Garcia, 2018: 322) that through language, we not only express our views about the world but also exert power and build through language. According to above theories, language has powerful aspect in our lives. People use language to communicate with others, both verbal and non-verbal, and they have their own style that will reflect the purpose personality, or characteristics in communicating. We can see the status of a person from their language style.

For instance, the language style used by directors has a certain style to indicate their position at work, but their language style will be different when their position themselves as parents or close friend. In critical discourse analysis, language plays an important role in the use of power, dominance, and societies, wherein superior societies are formed from those who have the power into a community, causing a difference in social values.

2.2.2. Power Relations

According to Blommaert (2005:68), power can affect the field of language in society, and more, in particular, inequality would be a central concern. Commonly, every difference in language can be turned into a difference in social value; difference and inequality are two sides of a coin, a point often overlooked or minimized in analysis. Gumperz (as cited in Blommaert, 2005:69),

“Language differences play an important. Positive role in signalling information as well as in creating and maintaining the subtle boundaries of power, status, role, and occupational specialization that make up the fabric of our social life. Assumptions about value differences associated with these boundaries in fact form the very basis for the indirect communicative strategies employed in key gatekeeping encounters.” (Blommaert, 2005:69)

Societies operate unequally within unity often conceived as “one society” or “community”, and they operate a fortiori across such unity. Therefore, when people

move through physical and social space (both are usually intertwined), they move through orders of indexicality affecting their ability to distribute communicative resources, and what functions well in one such unity might immediately cease to function or lose parts of its functions in another such unity.

Van Dijk (2008:1) defines that critical discourse studies are a study particularly interested in theory formation and critical analysis of the discursive reproduction of power abuse and social inequality. The main function of critical discourse studies is to a comprehensive study of the concept of power, yet many fundamental notions of the social sciences, as well as the notion of power, is complex as blurred. As van Dijk explains:

“Social power is a property of the relationship between groups, classes or other social formations, or between persons as social members. Although we may speak of personal forms of power, this individual power is less relevant for our systematic account of the role power in discourse as social interaction.” (Van Dijk: 2008:29).

More powerful groups and their members control or have access to an increasingly wide and varied range of discourse roles, genres, occasions, and styles. In contrast to the powerless people have literally nothing to say, nobody to talk to, and usually only recipients.

Van Dijk (2008:1) claims that it is important to notice however this methodological pluralism is preference and tendencies, hence critical discourse studies give a specific focus on power abuse and in general on the social conditions and the effect of text and talk. The research methods are concerned with the social empowerment of dominant groups, particularly in the domain of discourse and communication.

Fairclough (2013:39) states that power in discourse is related to powerful participants controlling and constraining the contributions of non-powerful participants. Three types of such constraints on: 1) contents, on what is said or done, 2) relations, the social relations people enter into in discourse, 3) subjects or the subject positions people can occupy. It is useful to differ widely among the three constraints that are overlapped and co-occur in practice since relations and subjects are very closely connected. There are two crucial aspects of the power/language relationship, power in discourse, and power behind discourse. Power in discourse is concerned with discourse as a place where relations of power are enforced and

stipulated.

From the point of view of Omrow (2018:15), frame analysis is the critical perspective that gives the intention of the researcher to analyse the study since the frames as mechanisms of hegemonic control employed by the powerful. The most important frame analysis same as CDA when finding out how discursive practices are situated in matrices of hegemonic power. From above explained theories, it can be understood that power is closely related to a group or class. More powerful its group, the member will be playing an important role in social societies. If the social societies not concerned with the power of those groups, it will produce power abuse and social inequality since the notions of the power is complicated.

2.2.3. Ideology

Van Dijk (1998:127) states that ideologies are similar background as socially shared knowledge and social attitudes. Ideologies are not individual and not represented like specific, episodic memories, or as a personal opinion. A group that controls how and why social attitudes could be organized as coherently structured sets of groups opinions describe how they build it from group-based ideologies and social beliefs. As in particular might disagree about opinions and different groups could have different or conflicting goals or interest, it is not surprising that the ideologies underlie such opinions are associated with groups. Group members with these beliefs (with their own truth criteria) might name it as knowledge, however others might see them as “mere” ideas or opinions.

Fairclough (2012:80) mentions that ideas, beliefs, and discourses manifest concern are related to ideologies, as well as enactments of such discourse in practices that contribute to establishing, sustaining, and reproducing social orders and relations of power. Critical social science in ideology to find out causal explanations of the normalization, naturalization, and institutionalization besides pervasiveness and endurance within populations.

Based on Fairclough (2013:25), ideology become a primary idea and category in this early work on critical discourse analysis, and even though its salience in his later work has varied as a new issues and categories had been added in, it is been and remains the main issue throughout. Ideologies are an important factor of

processes beyond which relations of power are established, maintained, enacted, and transformed. Besides, during the past twenty-five years, ideology has become much less of an issue in social research, and the researcher to work on this necessary category grows smaller.

This is clearly associated with the simultaneous decline in the salience of social class as a theme and a category, for ideology as a theoretical category has developed within theories of capitalist societies as class societies, dominated by a ruling class and characterised by the struggle between classes. Fairclough (as cited in Bulan and Kasman, 2018:52) defines ideology as a tool that constructs value which contributes to the relation between domination and power. Domination relations are born from people who have the same ideology, meaning that ideology makes a big contribution to the hegemony of power and power relations. Ideology can contribute to maintaining power and transforming power relations.

From the above theories explained, it can be understood that ideology is a group belief that contributes to establishing, sustaining, and reproducing social orders. It is key to examine further the power main issues.

2.3. Public Speaking

According to Fraleigh and Tuman (2017: 46), public speaking is an essential skill for anyone looking to inform, influence, or persuade others, usually, it is a required subject in college and universities for everyday situations. People in most professions who do public speaking is valued person. A public speaking study helps you to rise in your career also skilfully in other subjects in the main of your major and make valuable contributions in other fields in your life, such as taking a role in the society.

Fraleigh and Tuman (2017: 48) state that the most of the talking in public speaking is the speaker, while the audience usually listens. It does not mean the audience does not respond to what they are hearing. The audience might respond with more than silence, they can smile, frown, or be confused. These signals can recognize by talented speakers and if needed, they modify their message. For instance, they may give applause to the speaker or shout out words of encouragement and give appreciation if they are satisfied with the speaker's

message.

Fraleigh and Tuman (2017: 51) claim that public speaking skills can learn by studying and practicing to deliver effective presentations and give people the power to share your ideas for change the world around them. They will be more confident speaking up at a meeting, hanging out with new co-workers, or make a presentation at the last minute when they become more comfortable with public speaking.

From the point of view of Millner and Price (2017:28), since the communication is a way to bring the ideas about right and wrong or good and bad formed, so the key to public speaking is the development of ethics. When leaders make deceive statements, it needed ethical communication because ethics are not just important for presidents and other public figures. Ethical concerns occur in a various of public speaking topic, such as honesty, integrity, and morality issues in our everyday lives. Public speakers make ethical choices when preparing and delivering a speech because undoubtedly be faced with a moral dilemma on what information to provide or how to accurately represent this information. Speakers are able to encounter ethical dilemmas with a strong moral compass by knowing the speaking setting, the audience, and understanding of the topic.

Based on Grasp (2017:57), effective public speaking not only about learning what to say, it needs to build a self-confidence. A lot of people make an effort to overcoming the nerves and convincing their self that they well stand up and speak there. The most effective to reducing the impact from anxiety is increased self-awareness and willingness to work on it. Each person needs to identify the anxiety factors for solve those nerves. Public speaking is an essential skill that need to studying and practicing every day to deliver effective presentations and build a self-confidence for a good speak. A good public speaking is inseparable to ethical communication.

2.4. Previous Related Studies

Related to the limitation of problem focuses on discovering the language, power, ideology, and framing are used by Joko Widodo in his speech about the Covid-19 Indonesia's policies on March 24, 2020. There are other related studies

which also focus on language, power, ideology, and framing.

The first research is found in a journal titled “It is not easy being green: A critical discourse and frame analysis of environmental advocacy on American television” by Omrow (2018). This research focuses on critical analysis of the discourses and frames surrounding the construction of environmental advocacy on American mainstream television. The aim of the journal is to serve as an instalment in an ongoing project at York University. The researcher found that the aforementioned television programs marshal a host of linguistic, rhetorical, and metaphorical strategies that construct, sustain, and discursive representations of environmental advocates. The discursive representations and framing of environmentalists perpetuate cognitive injustice insofar as their ability to bring meaning to their lives through various forms of advocacy is stigmatized, ignored and even distorted through mainstream media. The researcher is using Norman Fairclough’s (1995) critical discourse analysis and Erving Goffman’s (1974) frame analysis on qualitative approach.

The second research is found in a journal titled “Analisis Wacana Kritis pada Pidato Ahok di Kepulauan Seribu” by Bulan and Kasman (2018). This research focuses on analysing ideology, power relations, and the implicatures that emerged from Basuki Tjahja Purnama or known as Ahok speech in Kepulauan Seribu. The analysis of the research based on the video of Ahok’s speech in Kepulauan Seribu from the YouTube page. The researchers found that Islamic and feminist ideology appear in Ahok’s speech. In the opening of his speech, Ahok used the Muslims greeting moreover Ahok did not use the greeting of his own religion. There is power relation in Ahok’s speech also implicatures as a model of meaning implied in Ahok’s speech.

The third research is found in a journal titled “Representation of Gender Through Framing: A Critical Discourse Analysis of Hillary Clinton’s Selected Speech” by Kanwal and Isabel (2019). This research focuses on analysing the projection of Hilary Clinton’s gender identity through her discourse and the role of frames for the gender identity in her speech. The analysis of the research is based on Hilary Clinton’s political speeches. The classification of the research is based on Fairclough’s three-dimensional model for analysing data. The researchers found

that Hilary Clinton's primary campaign speeches for the American presidency are a great significant point of view from critical discourse analysis. Through her speeches, she built different frames and through these frames, she had not only projected her ideology but also presented her gender identity. The most commonly used frames in her speeches are the fight and family frames. The data shows that through her discourse, Hilary Clinton has used effective tactics to convince her audiences and all the Americans to the fact that although she is a woman, she had the strength and vigour required to become the future president of America.

From the explanation of previous related studies above, the similarities between journals above and I are the discussion related to critical discourse analysis with a different approach. The differences are data sources, the objective of the research, and the formulation of the problem. This term paper will focus on the analysis of ideology, power relations, and framing used by Joko Widodo as President of the Republic of Indonesia in handling the spread of the COVID-19 virus.

