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**Abstract**

The aims of this study aretrying to give us a deep understanding of what Critical Discourse Analysis is. This study starts with a discussion of the origin of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), then exploring interdisciplinary based on the renowned theories in CDA which proposed by Fairclough, van Dijk and Wodak. In the last part of the article discussed the principles of CDA form Fairclough point of view. The present article uses a descriptive qualitative approach from reputable references which is relevant to the topics.
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**INTRODUCTION**

Discourse; Discourse Analysis (henceforth: DA); and Critical Discourse Analysis (henceforth: CDA) are the focus topic to discuss in this article. These terms have many perspectives of meaning that need to be underlined and understand in a dynamic perspectives. The terms above switch a massive discussion and explained briefly in many previous studies, van Dijk (1997) and Cameron (2001); quite different in seeing discourse as a term. This is quite similar what Hamuddin (2012) mentioned in his paper “The term discourse is a complex and mammoth-like interpretation … since its introduction to modern science and the various broad interpretations of discourse.

However the study above seems quite similar with the definitions of discourse proposed by Michél Faucault (1972) “discourse refers to complex constellations of beliefs and actions that comprise social practice”. Foucault explains that Discourse analysis’ term has come up to be used with a large range of meanings which cover up a wide range of activities analysis or. Discourse Analysis (DA) is used to demonstrate activities at the intersection in sociolinguistics, psycholinguistics, philosophical linguistics and computational linguistics disciplines. Some linguists may give attention to on determining the formal properties of a language, the discourse analyst is committed to an investigation of what that language is used for.

Van Dijk (1995) says, “discourse analysis as ideology analysis, ideologies are typical, through not exclusively, expressed and reproduced in discourse and communication, including non-verbal semiotic messages, such as pictures, photograph, and movies” (p. 17). “DA is a way of approaching and thinking about a problem. Although, does not provide a tangible answer to problems based on scientific research, but it enable to understand the conditions behind a specific problem and make us realize that the essence of that problem, and its resolution. Nevertheless, DA provides a basic methodology to describe 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).

The most progressive area in DA in the past decades is CDA. A mammoth alike numbers of papers and conference manuscripts had been published showing CDA is one active area in DA. Fairclough (1995a) explains CDA as one discourse analysis branch which purposes to systematically travel around often opaque relationships of causality and determination between (a) discursive practices, events, and texts, and (b) wider social and cultural structures, relations and process; to study how such practices, events and texts arise out of and are ideologically shaped by relations of power and struggles over power, and to travel around how the opacity of these relationships between discourse and society is itself a issue securing power and hegemony. So, in my opinion CDA is critical all of context that related.

**METHODOLOGY**

In doing the review, looking for the related study uses the electronic database search that is Academia.edu, Google Scholar, and eBooks. Academia.edu is a social networking that provides to share a document, monitor the effect or even follow a particular field. The document can be thesis, journal, or other information are provides by adequate resources. Furthermore, Google Scholar is a service that provides the variety of subjects for student in the variety of format text. So, the keywords like critical discourse analysis study were chosen to complete the research.

Based on the criterion, 20 related studies were downloaded from Academia.edu, and 15 studies were downloaded from Google scholar. But only 10 of them were selected because their analysis was concrete to CDA approach that related to Fairclough, Van dijk, and Wodak approach.

**FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION**

**CDA: ANOVERVIEW**

1. ***The origin***

Critical Discourse Analysis (henceforth: CDA) is kind of discourse analytical research which the point is to learn social power abuse, domination, and inequality that formed, production, and faced by texts and talks in social and political contexts. The Philosophical and linguistic according which CDA is grounded are certain branches of social theory and earlier discourse analysis, text linguistics and interactional sociolinguistics. Habermas (1981) is one of the CDA writers. His explanation contributes in the theory of communicative actions is the notion of validity claims and universally presupposed in all discourse. Validity states can be challenged and defended in a communication situation that is free from coercion, is only stands on rational argument, and permits access to all who are affected by the discourse.

Creeds of CDA has been finding in critical theory by Frankfurt School before Civil War II (Rasmussen, 1996). CDA just focuses on language and discourse is called by ‘critical linguistics’ that appear (particularly in England and Australia) in the late 1970’s (Fowler Hodge, Kress & Trew, 1978). The University of East Anglia mused a new trend of analysis, as linguists and literary theorists were interested in linguistics choice in literature. Later on, they would focus on other texts of relevance in the public sphere, especially the mass media. This did not mean only a terminological change (i.e. from *linguistic criticism to critical linguistics).* The fresh label, which is sometimes taken as synonymous with CDA, indirect a new attitude in academe: The scholar’s commitment to social injustice.

Hallidayian linguistics was proposed by The East Anglia School for the analysis of news texts (Hodge and Kress 1993). Social semiotic, the three *meta functions*, and transitivity and modality in language became sets in this new discipline. Chomsky’s (1957) was also appropriate since one of its main concerns is describing the implications of syntactic transformations: Passivisation and nominalization have been the center of many a CDA work. CDA include pragmatics, conversation analysis, narrative analysis, rhetoric, sociolinguistics, ethnography, and media analysis.

1. ***Theory by Fairclough***

Norman Fairclough was born in 194 is an emeritus Professor of Linguistics at Lancaster University. He is one of the founders of Critical Discourse Analysis as applied to sociolinguistics. CDA includes texts, talk, video, and practices. Fairclough’s perception study is oriented discourse analysis (TODA), to distinguish it from philosophical enquires not involving the use of linguistics methodology, is specially anxious with the mutual effect of formally linguistic textual properties, sociolinguistic speech genres, and formally sociological practices. Fairclough has a theory that has been central to CDA over more than the past ten years. *Critical Language Study* (1989, p. 5) is his earlier work approach to language and discourse. It tells us about the objective of this approach as “a contribution to a general rising of consciousness of exploitative social relations, through focusing upon language” (1989, p. 4). The aim is further develops his approach so that it is now one of the most comprehensive frameworks of CDA (Chouliaraki and Fairclough, 1999). Here is brief of Fairclough’s work in CDA.

For Chouliaraki and Fairclough (1999) say, “CDA bring social science and linguistics … together within a single theoretical and analytical framework, setting up a dialogue between them” (p. 6). The linguistics theory refers to Systematic Functional Linguistics (SFL), which has been the foundation for Fairclough’s analytical framework as it has been for other practitioners in CDA (Hodge & Kress, 1979). His approach also draws upon number of critical social theorists, for example, Foucault (i.e. a concept of *orders of discourse*), Gramsci (concept of *hegemony*), Habermas (i.e. *the concept of colonization of discourses*), etc.

1. ***Theory by Teun van Dijk: CDA***

There are many discourse analysis models developed by some experts, but the van Dijk model is the most widely used. This is because van Dijk formulates discourse elements, so, it can be used practically. The model was named "social cognition" (Eriyanto, 2001).

Social cognition has two meanings. On the one hand he shows how the process of text is produced by journalists / media, on the other hand he describes the values ​​of society is spread and absorbed by the cognition of journalists and eventually used to make the news text (Eriyanto 2001).

Discourse by van Dijk is described as having three dimensions / buildings: text, social cognition, and social context. The linkage between text, social cognition and the social context reflects the tendency of a discourse. The advantages of the discourse analysis process undertaken by Van Dijk is how he relates the text and contest through the social cognition of discourse makers (Van Dijk 1988).

Van Dijk divides the text structure into three levels. First, the macro structure. This is a global / general meaning of a text that can be observed by looking at a topic or theme put forward in a story. Second, the superstructure. It is a discourse structure that relates to the framework or schema of a text, how parts of the text are composed into the story as a whole. Third, microstructure is the meaning of discourse that can be observed from a small part of a text word, sentence, paraphrase and others.

1. ***Theory by Ruth Wodak: CDA***

Wodak states that CDA is not just a method or methodology but also a production theory and text receptions. CDA emphasizes detail, systematization and transparency. The reader can trace the details of deep textual analysis as much applied to social research.

The CDA initiated by Ruth Wodak is called the sociolinguistic discourse based on the Bernsteinian sociolinguistic tradition, the Frankfrut school especially Jurgen Habermas. According to him, sociolinguistic discourse is sociolinguistic which is not only explicitly dedicated to studying text in context, but also various other factors having equal importance. The sociolinguistic discourse is an approach that has the capability to identify and describe the mechanisms that contribute to the discourse inherent in specific contexts such as the structure and function of media or institutions such as hospitals and others who can not avoid the impact of communication.

1. ***Interdisciplinary of CDA***

Norman Fairclough divided the framework of Critical Discourse Analysis to three-part of frameworks, known as “three dimensional framework” which sees the discourse into three level of analysis:

1. *Text*

One of three-part model by Fairclough is *text.* It involves linguistic analysis in terms of vocabulary, grammar, semantics, the sound system, and cohesion-organization above the sentence level (Fairclough, 1995b, p. 57). Linguistic analysis is applied to text’s lexical-grammatical and semantic properties, two aspects that have a mutual impact on each other (pp. 57-58). Any sentence in a text is analyzable in terms of the articulation of these functions, which he has relabeled representations (perhaps carrying particular ideologies), relations (for example formal or informal, close or distant (Fairclough, 1995b, p. 58)), and identities (for instance, in term of what is highlighted – whether status and role aspects of identity, or individual and personality aspect of identity).

1. *Discourse Practice*

This dimension has two facet: institutional process (e.g. editorial procedures), and discourse processes (changes the text go through in production and consumption (Fairclough, 1995, p. 5-59). For Fairclough, “discourse practice straddles the division between society and culture on the one hand, and discourse, language and text on the other” (p. 60). On beside, *discourse processes* can be described through discussing a core concept in his approach: *intertextuality.*

Linguistic analysis at the discourse level that Fairclough calls “intertextual analysis” (1995b, p. 61) which focuses on the borderline between text and discourse practice in the analytical framework. The Intertextual analysis is looking at the text from the perspective of discourse practice, searching the traces of the discourse practice in the text. (p. 16). Fairclough (1992, p. 85) identifies two types of intertextuality, manifest intertextuality, and constitutive intertextuality. Fairclough (1995, p. 189) states that intertextual properties of a text are realized “in its linguistic features” since it is assumed that text “may be linguistically heterogeneous”.

In spite of everything, Fairclough (1995b) asserts that “Linguistic analysis is descriptive in nature, whereas interpretative analysis is more interpretative. Linguistics features of texts provide evidence which can be used in the intertextual analysis, and intertextual analysis is a particular sort of interpretation of that evidence…” (p. 61).

1. *Sociocultural Practice*

Fairclough divided to three aspects of the sociocultural context of a communicative event: economic: economic (i.e. economy of the media), political (i.e. power and ideology of the media), and cultural (i.e. issues of values). According to him, one does not have to bring out an analysis at all levels but any level that might “be relevant to understanding the particular event” (p. 62). However, Fairclough considers that reception studies (for instance, need the answer of the audiences about their actual interpretations of text) could assist discourse analysis in identifying meanings and effect of texts. Even so, he believes that text analysis should be the central element in media analysis provided. It is accompanied by analysis of text production and consumption (Fairclough, 1995, p. 16).

1. ***Principles of CDA***

By means of concluding this section, principles of CDA, sketched by CDA practitioners (Fairclough, 1995a; Van Dijk, 1998a; Wodak, 1996) can be concluded as follows:

1. Language is a social practice through which the world is represented.
2. Discourse/language use as a form of social practice in itself.
3. Texts obtain their meanings by the dialectical relationship between texts and the social subjects: writers and the readers, who always operate with various degrees of choice and access to texts and means of interpretation.
4. Linguistic features and structures are not arbitrary.
5. Power relations are produced, exercised, and reproduced through discourse.
6. All speakers and writers control from specific discursive practices originating in special interests and aims which involve inclusions and exclusions.
7. Discourse is texts acquire their meanings by being situated in specific social, cultural and ideological contexts, and time and space.
8. CDA does not solely interpret texts but also explains them.
9. ***The Benefits We Learn Critical Discourse Analysis***

When we learn about CDA, of course we get benefits from it, among them are we can know and understand the meaning of critical discourse analysis, the difference between critical discourse analysis and discourse analysis, the foundation of critical discourse analysis, concepts, assumptions, approaches in critical discourse analysis, and principles in critical discourse analysis, also some theories by famous experts.

**CONCLUSION**

To sum up, as described above, CDA is a special approach in discourse analysis which focuses on the discursive conditions, components, and consequences of power abuse by dominant (elite) groups and institutions. It studies discourse and its functions in society and the ways society, and especially forms of equality, are expressed, repressed, represented, legitimated or reproduced in text and talk.

Then again, CDA has its own aims, research programs, theoretical frameworks, and methods. It may highlight the relevance of power and dominance in studying text and talk, or of social arrangements and the social order in general in their relative to language use and communication.

Fairclough’s line of study is oriented discourse analysis (TODA), to distinguish it from philosophical enquires not involving the use of linguistics methodology, is specially anxious with the mutual effect of formally linguistic textual properties, sociolinguistic speech genres, and formally sociological practices. Norman Fairclough divided the framework of Critical Discourse Analysis to three-part of frameworks namely text, discourse practice, and socio cultural practice.

Principles of CDA: Language is a social practice through which the world is represented; Discourse/language use as a form of social practice in itself not only represents and signifies other social practices but it also constitutes other social practices such as the exercise of power, domination, prejudice, resistance and so forth.
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