

Exploring Van Dijk: Critical Discourse Analysis's Aims

Nurul Fathia Salma

English Education Dept. Faculty of Teachers Training and Education
nurul_tiaa@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT: This paper is linked to the all science of the experts which discuss about Introduction to Critical Discourse Analysis where includes the definitions, the manner to do Critical Discourse analysis guided by the framework. Based on the theories of Michel Foucault, "*discourse analysis is focusing on power of relationships in society as expressed by means of language and practices*". Besides, there are five steps are based on the identification of rules in using "Foucauldian discourse analysis" according to Kendall and Wickham.

Key words : CDA, definition, aims, framework.

I. Introduction

On the article of Frohmann (1994) "*Discourse analysis is a way of approaching and thinking about a problem provide a tangible answer to problems based on scientific research, and enables us to understand the conditions behind a specific problem and make us realize that the essence of that problem, and its resolution*". Indeed, "DA provides a basic methodology to describes and analyze how the structure and content of the text encodes ideas and the relation among the ideas itself that are present in the text, systematically". (Hamuddin, 2012)

In this article, the author will discuss about interdisciplinary approach to the study of discourse that views language as a form of social application called Critical discourse analysis (CDA). According to Van Dijk (2004) "*Critical Discourse analysis is a type of discourse analysis research that primarily studies the way social power abuse, dominance, and inequality are enacted, reproduced, and resisted by text and talk in social and political contexts*". This study suggested Discourse Analysis, more particularly written Discourse Analysis since we are dealing with newspaper, in collaboration with CDA, to form a worthy framework and methodology could helps analyse the news from the critical point of view. The idea of forming Discourse Analysis and Critical Discourse Analysis in analyzing news among others discipline. Ruth Wodak in her terminology said (Kendall: 2007) "this paper might call as "integrated interdisciplinarity": integrating approaches for an object under investigation in innovative ways.

This paper may find a more or less critical perspective in such diverse areas as pragmatics, conversation analysis, narrative analysis, rhetoric, stylistics, sociolinguistics, ethnography, or media analysis however using CDA framework shall be the right choice to works under written DA methodology."

It emerged from 'critical linguistics' be expanded on 1970s at the University of East Anglia, and the terms are not often interchangeable. The major contribution of this study is called Ruth Wodak. Besides, Norman Fairclough who the Lancaster school of linguists was the most prominent figure of the first developing of CDA.

According to Van Dijk (1995), CDA is a special approach in discourse analysis, components, and consequences of Ulinuha et al., In this paper, I will describe the definitions of

Critical Discourse Analysis according to the experts especially Teun A. van Dijk. Besides, we need to study how to implement critical discourse analysis. So, we necessary to know the theoretical Frameworks in CDA.

II. Definitions and Characteristic of CDA

The phenomena of social are linguistics, in other words, the language activity that take place on social contexts and it is a part of the processes and practices.

The first time in studying CDA, we have to know what Discourse Analysis is. According to “**wikipedia**, *in semantics and discourse analysis, the meaning of discourse is a generalization of conceptual in conversation within each context of communication*”. Meanwhile, analysis is the process to solve a complex topic into smaller parts in order to acquire a better comprehension of it.

Thus, an interdisciplinary approach to the study of discourse that regarded languages as a form of social practice called Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). It has become the general etiquette for a particular approach to the study of talk and text, appearing from Critical Semiotic, Critical Linguistic, and commonly from a socio-politically aware and the manner of opposition in enquire language, discourse and also communication. In studying a language and discourse studies, surely there are many fields, approaches, subdisciplines, and others. as well as in the case of studying CDA, it is not easy to limit the specific principles, practices, goals, theories or methods of CDA. However, in studying CDA, it is usually characterized by the following features:

CDA is part of critical studies about humanities and social science for examples; in sociology, psychology, mass communication research, law literature and political science. It is usually discuss the effective about the study relevant social problems, such as those of sexism, colonialism, racism and other forms of social inequality. Much work in CDA is about the underlying ideologies that play a role in the against enequality. Besides, it focuses in the relation and also interrelated between Discourse and Society, such as (Politics, culture, economic, Social, etc). When learning the role of discourse especially on society, CDA particularly focuses on (groups) relation of power resisted by social group members through talk and text.

CDA commonly focuses on the strategies of manipulation, legitimation, the manufacture of consent and other discursive ways to influence the minds (indirect actions) of people in the interest oof the powerful. Besides, a school, a subdiscipline, or field of discourse analysis does not characterized by CDA, however it categorize an critical approach, position or the corner of studying talk and text explicitly. It (may) pay attention to all dimation of discourse, such as grammar (phonology, syntax, semantics), schematics organization, strategies of pragmatic, speech acts, interaction, etc. In the other hand, it also pay attention to other dimentions like semiotic (sound, music, picture, film, videos, gesture, etc) on communicative events.

Indeed, studies in CDA try to formulatoer sustan an overall perspective solidarity with dominated groups, e.g., by formulating strategic proposals for the enactment and development of counter-power and counter-ideologies in practices of challenge and resistance.

Based on the theories of Michel Foucault, discourse analysis is focusing on power of relationships in society as expressed by means of language and practices. Besides focusing on the

significance of a given discourse, the differentiator characteristic in this approach is the emphasis on the power of relationships. These are expressed through behavior and language, the relationship between language and power. So, This analysis try to comprehend how individuals envisage the world, and learn categorizations, politics, ideology, social and also personal and institutional relationships .

Studies used the Foucauldian discourse analysis can look at how the figures used language to propose their power dominance, and request obedience and honor from those subordinate to them. In a specific example, a study may look at the language used by teachers towards students, or military officers towards conscripts. This approach could also be used to study how language is used as a form of reciprocal to those in power.

III. Requirements for Conducting CDA

Critical discourse Analysis needs to fulfill a number of requirements in order to effectively actualize its aims: First, Critical Discourse Analysis has to be “better” than other research in order to be accepted. Second, It focuses essentially on political issues and social problems, rather than on current fashions and paradigms. In other requirements ie Empirically adequate the critical analysis of social problems is usually multidisciplinary. Fourth, rather than purely describe discourse structures, Critical Discourse Analysis make efforts to account them in terms of characteristics of social interaction and especially social structure. More particularlly, Critical Discourse Analysis concentrate on the ways discourse structures figure, ensure, legitimate, reproduce, reasonable, or challenge the links of dominance and power in society.

Fairclough and Wodak (1997) sum up the main concepts of Critical Discourse Analysis as follows: First, Critical Discourse Analysis discuss socials and politics problems. Second, power relations are erratic (discursive). Third discourse is a form of society and culture. Fourth, discourse carry out ideological works. Fifth, discourse is historical, Sixth, the link between society and text are mediated. Seventh, Critical Discourse analysis is interpretative and explanatory. The last, Critical Discourse Analysis is a form of social proceeding or action.

IV. The Manners to Do CDA

The current news either online or printed news can be utilize as a great source of learning analyzing language in use and it also present interesting material to regard. To bring current issues and hot news taken from media such as news in social media , magazine or news paper need more than just interpretive or catching specific information by way of reading, it needs a second approach to espouse Critical Discourse Analysis.

Hence we need to bring the students to more conscious and critical to the news posted in the media (papers or media social), hence we need Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) framework. Thereto, it can help the students in ELT (English Language Teaching) classroom grow more obverse in seeing the news and through the news. Thus, the students can learn to see news at least from 3 different level in Discourse Analysis class by using Critical Discourse Analysis based on Fairclough’s three dimensional frameworks, among others : text, discursive practice and social practice.

Students usually will want to know “how to do CDA”. Firstly, formulate the proposals for successful strategies of research. Second, we need to identify which structure and strategies of talk and text to attend in order to discover patterns of manipulation “in” texts theoretically and descriptively. Vice versa, focussing on major social, political problems and issues such as sexism and racism, we need to detail how such forms of inequality are expressed, enacted, legitimated, and reproduced by text and talk.

Kendall and Wickham outline five steps in using "Foucauldian discourse analysis". The first step is a simple admission that discourse is a set of statements that are organized in a systematic way. The subsequent four steps are based on the identification of rules on: How those statements are created; what can be said (written) and what cannot; how the spaces in which new statements can be raised are created; and making practices material and discursive at the same time.

In brief, CDA needs good theories of the role of discourse in the ratification and facsimile of resistance and social dominance. More than theories which only demand descriptive or explanatory sufficiency, however, CDA which is successful must be effective : in the conclusions, recommendations and the other interference must work. These are fairly difficult criteria. In that situation, CDA is not only a scientific practice, but also a scientific research programs. Orientation questions for frame application, includes : Is this a typical text of its type? , who produced this?; who will read it?; will everyone understand this text in the same way?; why was it produced?; in what other ways could it have been written?; what is missing from this text?; how does this text reflect the wider society?; What could we do about this text if we disagree with it?

V. Theoretical Frameworks

In the aims of Critical Discourse analysis mentioned atop, there are many types of Critical Discourse Analysis, and these may be analytically and theoretically quite diverse. Critical analysis of news reports in the press or of lessons and teaching at school are very different from Critical analysis of conversation. Therefore, the typical vocabulary of many scholars in Critical Discourse Analysis will show such ideas as "power", "dominance", "ideology", "hegemony", "gender", "class", "discrimination", "race", "interests", "institutions", "reproduction", "social order", and "social structure". In this part, The author will focus in a number of basic concepts themselves and devise a theoretical framework that critically relate with discourse, society and cognition.

1. Micro v.s Macro

Discourse, language use, communication and verbal interaction belong to the microlevel of the social array. Power, inequality and dominance between social groups are in particular terms that belong to a macrolevel of analysis. It means that Critical Discourse analysis should theoretically bridge the well-known “gap” between micro and macro approaches, which is of course a difference that is a sociological construct in its own right (Alexander et al. 1987; Knorr-Cetina and Cicourel 1981). There are certain ways to analyse these levels to arrive at a unified critical analysis as follows:

- Members–groups: Language users participate in discourse as a member of (several) social groups, organisations, or institutions; and vice versa, groups may act “by” their members.

- Actions–process: Social acts of individual actors are thus element of social processes and group actions, such as newsmaking, legislation or the propagation of racism.
- Context–social structure: Situations of discursive interaction are similarly part or principle of social structure; for example, a press conference may be a particular practice of organisations and media institutions. That is, “local” and more “global” contexts are tightly related, and both utilize constraints on discourse.

2. Power as Control

A central idea in most critical work on discourse is that of power, and more particularly the institutions or social power of groups. Summarising a complex social and philosophical analysis, we will define social power in the terms of control.

Finally, this means that those groups who control most dominant discourse also have more opportunity to control the ideas (minds) and actions of others. Simplifying these very complicated relationships, the author can divorce the issue of discursive power into three basic questions for Critical Discourse Analysis research: How can groups with more power control the public discourse? ; How does such discourse control the mind and action of groups which is less powerful? and ; What are the social effect of such control, such as social dissimilarity?

VI. Power and Access

Power which divided into two kinds are social power and power abuse. Where social power is (approximately) defined as a form of control of one group to another, while power abuse further implies that the control is in the interest of the dominant group, this means that dominant social group members may exercise such control over talk and text.

Access is defined in terms of their (powerful) social or institutional position or function and vice versa. and Discourse : Patterns of discourse control and access are indeed closely associated with social power. That is, discursively implemented dominance involves preferential access to text and context taken as a basis or resource of power, comparable to such social resources as wealth, income, a good job, position, status, knowledge and education.

Thus, whereas ordinary people only have active access to, and control over such discourse genres as everyday conversations with family members, friends or colleagues, and more passive access to institutional. For examples : *Politicians have control over, e.g. governmental and parliamentary discourse, and preferential access to the mass media ; Scholars control academic discourse, such as lessons, textbooks, courses and scholarly publications. ; Journalists have control over mass media discourse and preferential access to a host of other forms of official talk and text, such as press conferences, press releases, reports, and soon.*

VII. Conclusions

Based on the description above, the authors conclude : Critical Discourse Analysis is a particular approach in discourse analysis which focuses on the result or consequences of power abuse by dominant groups and institutions. CDA opposes the abuse of power that is usually done by high officials and institutions dominant by finding and criticizing mistakes. Critical Discourse Analysis aimed at yielding ‘emancipation and enlightenment’. Critical Discourse Analysis search not only to explain and describe , but also to eradicate a particular kind of fantasy. Even with differing construct of ideology, Critical Theory search to create awareness in agents of their own needs and concern. (Fairclough and Wodak: 2008) Besides, in conducting discourse analysis we need to identify which structure and strategies of talk and text to attend in order to discover patterns of manipulation “in” texts theoretically and descriptively. In addition, the CDA aims as a research program.

Further, CDA is a type of 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. It has a concern with representations of societal issues, hidden agendas, texts that impact on people’s lives it claims therefore to take an ethical stance in addressing power imbalances, inequities, social justice agenda to spur readers into resistant and corrective social action.

REFERENCES

- Boden, Deirdre and Don H. Zimmerman. (eds.) 1991. *Talk and Social Structure: Studies in Ethnomethodology and Conversation Analysis*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bull, Tove and Toril Swan. (eds.) 1992. *Language, sex and society. Special issue of International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 94.
- Chilton, Paul. (ed.) 1985. *Language and the Nuclear Arms Debate: Nukaspeak Today*. London : Printer.
- , 1988. *Orwellian Language and the Media*. London: Pluto Press
- Drew, Paul and John Haritage. (eds.) 1992. *Talk at Work: Interaction in Institutional Settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fairclough, Norman L. 1989. *Language and Power*. Londong: Longman.
- , 1992. *Discourse and Social Change*. Oxford: Polity Press.
- Fisher, Sue and Alexandra Dundass Todd. (eds.) 1986. *Discourse and Intitutional Authority: Medicine, Education and Law*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- .(eds.) 1988. *Gender and Discourse: The Power of Talk*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Company.
- Foucault, Michel. 1980. *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972- 1977*. New York: Pantheon.
- Fowler, Roger. 1991. *Language in the News: Discourse and Ideology in the Press*. London: Routledge.
- , Bob Hodg, Gunther Kress, and T. Trew. 1979. *Language and Control*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Geis, Michael L. 1987. *The Language of Politics*. New York : Springer.
- Hodge, Robert and Gunther Kress. 1988. *Social Semiotics*. London: Polity Press.
- Kedar, Leah. (ed.) 1987. *Power Through Discourse*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex
- Kramarae, Cheri, Muriel Schulz and William M. O’Barr. (eds.) 1984. *Language and Power*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Kress, Gunther and Bob Hodge. 1993. *Language as Ideology*. Second Edition. London: Routledge and Kegaan Paul.
- Hamuddin, B. (2012). *A comparative study of politeness strategies in economic journals* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Malaya).
- Hamuddin, B., & Noor, F. N. M. (2015, August). A Closer Look on Politeness Strategies in Malaysian Economic Journal. In *2nd INTERNATIONAL SEMINAR ON LINGUISTICS* (p. 52).
- Hamuddin, B. (2015). DISCOURSE ON MEDIA: Bringing Hot News into ELT’s Classroom Discussion. *Proceedings of ISELT FBS Universitas Negeri Padang*, 3, 87-95.
- Teun A. Van Dijk. Critical Discourse Analysis
<http://srihayupku.blogspot.co.id/2016/10/critical-discourse-analysis-from-teun.html>