

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter explanation about some theories of related to the problems of the research such discourse analysis, critical discourse analysis, critical discourse analysis by Teun A. Van Dijk, analyzed the data uses Van Dijk and Searle's theory, speech, previous studies and theoretical framework.

2.1 Discourse Analysis

Discourse analysis is primarily text based. Van Dijk (1998:42) stated that discourse is very complex, featuring many levels of structures, each with their own categories and elements, which may be combined in innumerable ways. According to Van Dijk and Walter Kintsch (1983:1) the study of discourse became relevant in particular as soon as it was recognized, also around 1970, that language studies should not be restricted to the grammatical analysis of abstract or ideal language systems, but, rather, that actual language use in the social context should be the empirical object of linguistic theories. Then Van Dijk in his book entitled *News as Discourse* (1998:17) said that Discourse analysis is a new, interdisciplinary field of study that has emerged from several other disciplines of the humanities and the social sciences, such as linguistics, literary studies, anthropology, semiotics, sociology, psychology, and speech communication. It is striking that the development of modern discourse analysis took place more or less at the same time in these *respective* disciplines, at the end of the 1960s and the beginning of the 1970s. Whereas at first these developments were more or less autonomous, the last decade has seen increasing mutual influences and integration, which has led to a more or less independent new discipline of text or discourse studies.

When we carry this investigation further and ask how it is that we, as language-users, make sense of what we read in text, understand what speakers mean despite what they say, recognize connected as opposed to jumbled or incoherent discourse, and successfully take part in that complex activity called conversation, we are undertaking

what is known as discourse analysis (Yule 1985:104). Fairclough said what is envisaged is a discourse analysis focused upon variability, change, and struggle: variability between practices and heterogeneity within them as a synchronic reflex of processes of historical change' which are shaped by struggle between social forces (1992:36).

2.2 Critical Discourse Analysis

Beginning in the late 1980s, Critical discourse Analysis (CDA) has now become a well-established field in the social sciences (Wodak, 2001). She also mentioned that the roots of CDA lie in rhetoric, text linguistic, anthropology, philosophy, socio-psychology, cognitive science, literary studies and sociolinguistics, as well as in applied linguistics and pragmatics. Critical discourse analysis' (henceforth CDA) subsumes a variety of approaches towards the social analysis of discourse (Fairclough & Wodak 1997, Pêcheux M 1982, Wodak & Meyer 2001) which differ in theory, methodology, and the type of research issues to which they tend to give prominence.

Jaffer Sheyholislami (2015:1) in Critical Discourse Analysis said according to Van Dijk (1998a) Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) is a field that is concerned with studying and analyzing written and spoken texts to reveal the discursive source of power, dominance, inequality and bias. It examines how these discursive sources are maintained and reproduced within specific social, political and historical contexts. In a similar vein, Fairclough (1993) defines CDA as

discourse analysis which aims to systematically explore often opaque relationships of causality and determination between (a) discursive practices, events and texts, and (b) wider social and cultural structures, relations and processes; to investigate how such practices, events and texts arise out of and are ideologically shaped by relations of power and struggles over power, and to explore how the opacity of these relationships between discourse and society is itself a factor securing power and hegemony. (p. 135).

To put it simply, CDA aims at making transparent the connections between discourse practices, social practices, and social structures, connections the might be opaque to the layperson

As cited in *Critical Discourse Analysis* by Teun A. Van Dijk (1998:353), Critical research on discourse needs to satisfy a number of requirements in order to effectively realize its aims:

1. As is often the case for more marginal research traditions, CDA research has to be “better” than other research in order to be accepted.
2. It focuses primarily on *socio problems* and political issues, rather than on current paradigms and fashions.
3. Empirically adequate critical analysis of social problems is usually *multidisciplinary*.
4. Rather than merely *describe* discourse structures, its try to *explain* them in terms of properties of social interaction and especially social structure.
5. More specifically, CDA focuses on the ways discourse structures enact, confirm, legitimate, reproduces, or challenge relations of *power* and *dominance* in society.

In the application of CDA in a research, it should be noted also the tenets in there which Fairclough and Wodak (1997: 271-280) 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 is mediated
7. Discourse analysis is interpretative and explanatory
8. Discourse is a form of social action.

2.3 Critical Discourse Analysis by Teun A. Van Dijk

One of many approaches in CDA is Teun A. Van Dijk theory. As cited in *Critical Discourse Analysis* by Jaffer Sheyholislami (2015:4), Van Dijk (1995) essentially perceives discourse analysis as ideology analysis, because according to him, “ideologies are typically, thought not exclusively, expressed and reproduced in discourse and communication, including non-verbal semiotic messages, such as pictures, photographs and movies” (p.17).

2.4 Analyzed the Data Uses Van Dijk and Searle's theory

2.4.1 Intended Meaning

Intended meaning is a purpose or plan of something that can be showed to know certain mean in it. There are two ways that used analyze:

2.4.1.1 Microstructure

At the microstructure level, analysis is focused on the semantic relations between propositions, syntactic, lexical and other rhetorical elements that provide coherence in the text, and other rhetorical elements such quotations, direct or indirect reporting that give factuality to the news reports (Jaffer Sheyholislami 2015:3).

2.4.1.1.1 Semantics

Van Dijk (1998, p. 25) argue that semantics, next, deals with meanings of words, sentences, and discourse. It formulates the rules that assign interpretations to units and that combine interpretations of units into interpretations of larger units. Although this kind of meaning-semantics has prevailed in much of linguistic theory, it is only half of the story. In philosophy and logic, semantics also deals with interpretations, but in that case it is not only meaning which is assigned to expressions, but rather truth, or in general referents (or extensions, or denotations). This research uses semantics covering detailed, meaning, presupposition, proposition, and modality

2.4.1.1.2 Syntax

In general, syntax describes which syntactic categories (such as noun or noun phrase) may occur in sentences and in which possible combinations. Thus, syntactic rules specify which sentence forms, consisting of syntactic categories, are well-formed. We also use this notion of syntax in a wider, non grammatical sense, for instance when we want to describe the overall forms of discourse. We may even use it to account for forms in the expressions of other semiotic systems, such as film, music, dance, or nonverbal gestures in talk. (Van Dijk 1988, p.25). This research uses syntax denial and pronoun.

2.4.1.1.3 Rhetoric Analysis

Another dimension of discourse, rhetoric, deals with both formulation and context. Earlier, we saw that both classical and modern rhetoric deals with the persuasive dimension of language use and, more specifically, with the account of those properties of discourse that can make communication more persuasive. These rhetorical structures of discourse, featuring for instance the well-known figures of speech, are also based on grammatical structures but are not themselves linguistic or grammatical. Like syntax, semantics or pragmatics, such a rhetoric also has a more empirical dimension, which studies the social psychological aspects of persuasion based on the use of specific rhetorical structures. In this research, rhetorical type uses a hyperbole.

2.4.1.2 Searle's Theory

In Searle's Theory there are five types as below:

2.4.1.2.1 Representative

Representatives in Yule (1996:53) tells about the truthfully of the utterance. Representatives, which commit the speaker to the truth of the expressed proposition (paradigm cases: asserting, concluding, etc.) (Levinson, 1983:240). In other words, it represents external reality by making their utterance/ words fit with the world as they believe it to be. Representatives are a statement which commits the speaker to something being the case. This type performs actions such as: stating, describing, affirming, boasting, concluding, claiming, and etc. For example: "*no one can make a better cake than me*", this utterance is a representatives that boasting about himself and disparage others.

2.4.1.2.2 Directive

Directives, which are attempts by the speaker to get the addressee to do something (paradigm cases: requesting, questioning) (Levinson, 1983:240). In other words, the utterance in this category attempts to make the addressee perform an action. Directives perform commanding, ordering, requesting, warning, suggesting, inviting, and etc. For example, because the garage was mess, Ed said on Fey "*clean it up!*" it's mean that Ed commanding Fey to clean the messy (Peccei, 1999: 52).

2.4.1.2.3 Commissive

In commissives, speakers commit themselves to a future act which will make the words fit their words (Peccei, 1999:51). Commissives, which commit the speaker to some future course of action (paradigm cases: promising, threatening, offering) (Levinson, 1983:240). Commissives perform promising, vowing, planning, threatening, offering, and etc. For example, in dialogue:

Frank: I will go to your home to finish our assignments.

George: My dad is sick

Frank: I promise not to speak loudly

Frank wants to commit something to George. George will allow Frank to go to his home because Frank believes that George will not disturb his father.

2.4.1.2.4 Expressive

Searle make a one category for speech act that focus on primarily on representing the speaker's feeling, it was expressive, which express a psychological state (Levinson, 1983:240). The expressions such as thanking, apologizing, welcoming, condoling, congratulating, and etc, produce in this category. "*I thank to you, you had already helped me yesterday*" is the example of thanking in expressive types. It reflects that the speaker requires some thanking to hearer.

2.4.1.2.5 Declaration

Declarations, which effect immediate changes in the institutional state of affairs and which tend to rely on elaborate extra linguistic institutions (Levinson, 1983:240). The paradigm cases are: declaring, excommunicating, declaration war, firing, christening, and etc. For example utterance: "*Governor of Jakarta Joko Widodo resigns because he becomes the Indonesian President.* This utterance by the vice governor to declare the resigning the governor and will changed by his vice.

2.4.2 Ideology

According to Van Dijk (2000 p,17) said the categories that define the ideological schema should probably be derived from the basic properties of the social group. That is, if ideologies underlie the social beliefs of a group, then the identity and identification of group members must follow a more or less fixed pattern of basic categories, together with flexible rules of application. Thus, we briefly assumed above that the following categories reflect rather fundamental categories of group life and identity, categories that may be good candidates for the schema that organizes the ideologies of the same group. There are categories that used to find the ideology:

Categories of the ideology schema

- Membership criteria: Who does (not) belong?
- Typical activities: What do we do?
- Overall aims: What do we want? Why do we do it?
- Norms and values: What is good or bad for us?
- Position: What are the relationships with others?
- Resources: Who has access to our group resources?

2.4.2.1 Fascism Ideology

Fascism is a complex ideology. There are many definitions of fascism; some people describe it as a type or set of political actions, a political philosophy or a mass movement. Most definitions agree that fascism is authoritarian and promotes nationalism at all costs, but its basic characteristics are a matter of debate. Fascism is commonly associated with German Nazi and Italian regimes that came to power after World War I, though several other countries have experienced fascist regimes or elements of them. Adolf Hitler in Germany, Benito Mussolini in Italy, Francisco Franco in Spain and Juan Perón in Argentina were well-known fascist leaders of the 20th century. [Dictator Deaths: How 13 Notorious Leaders Died] Robert Paxton, a professor emeritus of social science at Columbia University in New York who is widely considered the father of fascism studies, defined fascism as "a form of political practice distinctive to the 20th century that arouses popular enthusiasm by sophisticated propaganda techniques for an anti-liberal, anti-socialist, violently exclusionary, expansionist nationalist agenda." Other definitions, Paxton said, rely too heavily on documents that Mussolini, Hitler and others produced

before they came to power. Once in power, fascists did not always keep their early promises. As the American Historical Association put it, speaking of fascism in Italy, "The proclaimed aims and principles of the fascist movement are perhaps of little consequence now. It promised almost everything, from extreme radicalism in 1919 to extreme conservatism in 1922."

2.4.3 Power Relation

According to Van Dijk in his book entitled *Discourse & Society* (1996) he said that is, while focusing on *social* power, we ignore purely personal power, unless enacted as an individual realization of group power, that is, by individuals as group members. Social power is based on privileged *access* to socially valued resources, such as wealth, income, position, status, force, group membership, education or knowledge. This research uses a two type of social power, there are position and status.

The he added Power involves *control*, namely by (members of) one group over (those of) other groups. Such control may pertain to *action* and *cognition*: that is, a powerful group may limit the freedom of action of others, but also influence their minds. To find how the power relation in Donald Trump's Speech, the researcher uses interpretation from intended meaning and also ideology. After that, the researcher makes a statement that shows power relation of Donald Trump.

2.5 Speech

According to Sandra Cornbleet and Ronald Carter (2011, p.18) said that that Speech is made up of combination features such, sounds, intonation, rhythm, pitch, pace. All speech performs a function: in speech we can make a promise or a threat, deliver a warning or rebuke, congratulate or apologise (p. 23). Speech is a talk activity in front of public or oration to explain statement or to give an overview about a thing or event that important and proper to talk. Thus speech is used by a leader to lead and oration in public or subordinate. The aims of speech are to influence others people to willingly follow our volition, and give information for others people.

2.6 Previous Studies

This study reviews other people's studies as guidance:

2.6.1 Firstly, Farhatun Nuuril Awwaliyah entitled *A Critical Discourse Analysis of Tony Abbot's and Bill Shorten's statements related in spying Allegation towards Indonesia* from Universitas Muhammadiyah Surabaya. On this research, she used CDA theory by Norman Fairclough's approach and supported by Van Dijk's approach of CDA to demonstrate and examine political discourse strategies and ideological component which are closely associated with overall political goals. In analysis of this research, she emphasizes to describe about political discourse of Tony Abbot and Bill Shorten in their statements in Australia Parliamentary sessions, and reveal about the way of Tony Abbot and Bill Shorten use political discourse, find out the aims of their political discourse, and also describe the effects of their statements for Indonesia. The findings are reflected in political language and rhetorical strategy used, power relations performed to discourses and the reflection in social relations.

2.6.2 The next previous studies are Mohamad Shofil Mubarrok thesis from Universitas Muhammadiyah Surabaya, entitled *A CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS OF THE FIRST SPEECH OF ANIES BASWEDAN AS A JAKARTA GOVERNOR*

On his research, The Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) is conducted which aims to describe language features, discourse strategy and social implication of Anies Baswedan's speech that is used as the first speech as Jakarta Governor. The methods of this thesis use Norman Fairclough's Theory and qualitative analysis. The results of this thesis show that is using linguistic feature to convey his perspective by choose appropriate word and sentence. Meanwhile, the use of discourse strategies by Anies Baswedan is good systematically. The last the last, Social implication is not released of risk.

This research, entitled "Critical Discourse Analysis of Donald Trump's Speech: Jerusalem as a capital of Israel" has differences characteristic with both previous studies. The researcher is trying to elaborate the ground theory of CDA by Van Dijk and supported by Searle's Theory. The findings of this research were reflected on dominance covering intended meaning, ideology and power relation used by Donald Trump speech.

Figure 1.1 Framework of CDA Donald Trump’s Speech

