

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Speech and Its Influence to The Audience

Speech is defined as the oral expression of language used to communicate meaning through spoken words and sounds. It represents the spoken form of a language, unlike its written form, and is shaped by several elements such as phonetics, syntax, semantics, and pragmatics. According to Crystal (2008), speech involves real-time sound production that is influenced by social, psychological, and contextual factors. As a central part of human communication, speech plays an essential role in how people share ideas, emotions, and intentions.

The purpose of speech varies depending on the speaker's goals and the context in which it is delivered. It can be used to inform, persuade, express emotions, perform actions, or build social relationships. In linguistic studies, especially in the work of Austin (1962) and Searle (1969), speech is not only considered as a way of saying something, but also as a form of doing something. This is explained through the theory of speech acts, which shows that when someone says something like "I apologize" or "I promise," they are not just speaking but also performing a social action through their words. Speech becomes a tool not only to communicate but also to carry out acts that have real-world consequences.

In political or persuasive contexts, speech can be an incredibly powerful tool for influencing audiences. A speaker's choice of words, or lexical selection, can significantly shape how the audience feels or thinks about an issue. Words like "barbaric" or "innocent victims" can frame a situation in a particular way, evoking emotional responses that influence public perception. Fairclough (1989) argues that language is used to maintain or challenge power and ideologies in society. For instance, repetition in speech can strengthen particular ideas,

reinforcing the speaker's stance. Additionally, Lakoff (2004) highlights how conceptual framing guides the way people interpret issues, such as using the term "self-defense" instead of "attack" to shape public understanding and justify certain actions. Furthermore, emotional appeal, often used by speakers to tell personal or tragic stories, can create a strong emotional reaction from the audience, making them more likely to support or act upon the speaker's message. The credibility of the speaker, known as *ethos* in classical rhetoric, also plays a significant role in how the audience receives and trusts the speech.

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) can be used as a tool to analyze the intentions behind speech, offering insights into how power and ideology are reflected in language. CDA focuses on understanding how language shapes and is shaped by social structures, often revealing hidden power dynamics and ideological forces. When analyzing speech through a CDA lens, we can examine how language choices serve to maintain or challenge existing power relations. For example, through CDA, we might explore how a speaker's lexical choices, like those emotionally charged terms mentioned earlier, not only convey meaning but also serve to reinforce specific ideologies or social hierarchies. By analyzing the way power is represented in language, we can uncover how speakers position themselves and others in relation to power and authority.

2.2. Critical Discourse Analysis

Critical Discourse Analysis, hereafter CDA, is a type of research that focuses on analyzing how social power abuse, dominance, and inequality are expressed, reinforced, and challenged through language in both social and political contexts (van Dijk, 2001). CDA is widely recognized as an interdisciplinary research methodology that examines language not only as a tool for communication but also as a social practice that reflects deeper power structures. This approach aims to explore how language functions in real-life interactions and how it contributes to shaping the dynamics of power within different social contexts. Through

CDA, researchers can uncover the hidden ways in which language reinforces, legitimizes, or resists social hierarchies, allowing for a more critical understanding of how discourse influences societal structures.

Fairclough (1989), describes CDA as a methodological approach that studies the relationship between language, power, and social structures. He argues that discourse is not simply a neutral representation of reality but rather an active force that constructs and shapes social practices and power relations. This analytical perspective considers language as both a product of social structures and a means through which social inequalities and ideologies are maintained. The analysis of discourse within CDA is based on the idea that language is embedded in systems of power, meaning that every linguistic choice has social and political implications. By critically examining texts, speeches, and other forms of communication, CDA seeks to reveal how authority, control, and resistance are exercised through discourse. As a result, CDA is an essential tool for understanding how language contributes to the establishment and reinforcement of social order while also providing opportunities for challenging power imbalances.

Language is not perceived as an independent or neutral entity but as a complex and context-dependent process that is deeply intertwined with historical, cultural, and political realities. The study of discourse through CDA enables a thorough investigation into how power relations shape language and, conversely, how language influences the distribution of power in society. This perspective allows researchers to critically assess how dominant ideologies are transmitted and how marginalized voices can be suppressed or empowered through discourse.

Meanwhile, Huckin (1997) offers another definition of CDA, highlighting its focus on context sensitivity, democratic principles, and ethical considerations. He emphasizes that CDA should not only serve as an analytical tool but also as an approach that aims to address social issues and contribute to societal change. By integrating ethical perspectives, Huckin (1997)

underscores the importance of examining how language is used in different contexts to either maintain or challenge injustices. This definition reinforces the idea that CDA is not solely about understanding discourse but also about fostering awareness of social inequalities and advocating for change through critical analysis.

2.3. Language, Power, and Ideology

Language, power, and ideology are three important things that are connected in the study of CDA. Language is not only used for communication, but also works to build and shape society. Fairclough (1989) said that language is a kind of social activity that shows and creates social structures. For him, power is hidden in the way people speak or write, and people in higher positions often use language to keep their control and influence others. This power does not always look obvious, but sometimes it is hidden in normal conversations or texts. He also explained that ideology means the ideas and values inside language that seem normal to people, but actually support the way powerful groups think. Through language, people may follow these ideas without realizing.

Van Dijk (2008) also agrees and adds more about how power works through language. He said that power means the ability to control communication, especially in public spaces like politics and media. He thinks that groups in power can use their language to change what people know, believe, and understand. According to him, ideology can be seen in how a sentence is made, what words are used, and how the message is framed. This is why powerful people or groups can lead others to think in certain ways just by choosing specific language.

Wodak (2001), also studied language, power, and ideology but she paid more attention to the social and historical background. She believed that discourse connects with real events and situations, and this influences how ideologies are used or challenged in different times and

places. She said that the history of a place or event can shape how power is spoken or written about in that context.

Huckin (2002), said that language is never neutral, and every text has a point of view or agenda behind it. Huckin focused on how texts guide the reader to think or feel in a certain way. He explained some strategies like foregrounding and backgrounding, where some parts of information are shown clearly and other parts are hidden. This makes the reader pay attention only to what the writer wants. He also mentioned that sometimes, writers use passive voice or change verbs into nouns to hide who is responsible for an action. For example, in the news, one group might be called "*freedom fighters*" while another group is called "*terrorists*," which can change the reader's opinion even before they know the full story. Huckin said that readers need to think critically so they can see the real meaning behind the text and not be easily influenced.

2.3.1. Language and Power

Language and power are deeply connected. Language is not only a tool for communication but also a means to exert influence and control. The relationship between language and power has been extensively discussed by scholars such as Van Dijk (2001), Fairclough (1989), and Wodak (2009). According to these scholars, language is used to construct and maintain power relations in society. Power in this sense refers to the ability to control, influence, or dominate others, and language plays a central role in how power is exercised.

Van Dijk (2008) argued that power is often reflected in discourse (the way people use language in speech and writing). He suggested that those in positions of power, like politicians, often use strategies of control in their discourse. For example, they may use specific vocabulary

to frame issues in a way that supports their position or justify their actions. By doing so, they shape how the audience perceives the issue, creating a bias in their favor.

Fairclough (1989) also explored how power is embedded in language, particularly through ideology. He stated that discourse, is influenced by social structures and institutions. In other words, those with power shape the way language is used, and in turn, the language used helps to reproduce power structures. For instance, a government may use official language in laws or media that subtly favors the interests of the powerful, while marginalizing certain groups. This kind of language is often normalized over time, making it harder to question.

Wodak (2001) focused on discourse and identity, showing how language can reinforce social hierarchies. She emphasized that those in power not only control language but also define what is considered 'normal' or 'acceptable' within society. For example, political leaders often decide how issues are framed, such as labeling someone a 'terrorist' or a 'freedom fighter' and this framing can change public opinion and reinforce the power of those in control.

2.3.2. Language and Ideology

Ideology refers to a system of beliefs, values, and ideas that shape the way people think and act. According to Huckin (1997), language is ideological because it reflects and shapes these beliefs. He argued that discourse (speech and writing) is not neutral; it carries underlying assumptions and values that support certain ideological positions.

Fairclough (1989) also explained that language serves to construct and reproduce ideologies. In his theory, he described how powerful groups use language to shape society's understanding of what is normal, acceptable, or right. For example, in advertisements, companies often use persuasive language to promote their products, creating an ideology of consumerism. They may suggest that buying their product will make people happier, more

successful, or part of a certain social group. This kind of persuasive language can influence the audience's beliefs and values.

Van Dijk (2008) argued that ideology is part of the mental representation of the world, and it is embedded in the way we speak or write. He suggested that discourse structures, such as the choice of words or the way information is organized, reveal underlying ideological beliefs. For instance, political speeches often present a particular "*us vs. them*" narrative, framing one group as victims and the other as oppressors. This framing is ideologically charged because it shapes people's perceptions of the situation and their roles in it.

2.3.3. Power and Ideology

Power and ideology are closely linked because power often works through the beliefs and ideas that are promoted in society. Ideology refers to the system of beliefs, values, and ideas that influence how we understand the world. These ideas are not neutral; they serve the interests of certain groups who benefit from the existing social order. In order to maintain power, those in control spread ideologies that make their dominance seem natural, fair, or even necessary.

Van Dijk (2001) argues that power and ideology are deeply intertwined because power is often exercised through the control of ideas. He explains that those who hold power use language to shape public opinion and reinforce their dominance. By manipulating discourse, elites can make their actions seem legitimate and natural, even if they are harmful or unjust.

Fairclough (1989) highlights the importance of language in sustaining power. He suggests that power is often enacted through discourse as in the way we speak, write, and communicate. He argues that through language, powerful groups can influence how people think and how social relations are structured. Fairclough (1989)'s work on CDA demonstrates how language reflects and reproduces power relations in society.

Wodak (2009) emphasizes how language contributes to the creation and reinforcement of social identities. Wodak (2009) explains that those in power often use discourse to label groups of people in ways that make their power seem justified. For example, when one group is labeled as 'terrorists' or 'criminals,' it is easier for those in power to take actions against them without facing public resistance. Wodak (2009) points out that these linguistic choices shape public perceptions and influence the social hierarchies that exist.

2.4 Huckin Theory of Critical Discourse Analysis

Huckin (1997) perspective on CDA offers a distinctive approach that focuses on the importance of contextual understanding, ethical concerns, and the democratic function of discourse analysis. In contrast to other scholars who primarily concentrate on linguistic features or the role of power in discourse, Huckin (1997) emphasizes the way discourse is connected to broader social issues and how it can contribute to societal change. His analytical framework suggests that discourse should not only be studied from a linguistic perspective but should also be examined in relation to social, political, and ethical factors.

One of the fundamental elements of Huckin (1997)'s CDA is the sensitivity to context. He argues that discourse cannot be interpreted without considering the specific social, historical, and political environment in which it was produced. This means that a text or speech does not exist in isolation but is influenced by the circumstances surrounding it. For example, a political speech may contain certain expressions that appear neutral, but when analyzed within a historical or cultural background, they may reveal hidden ideological perspectives, power struggles, or even attempts to influence public opinion. In this regard, Huckin (1997)'s approach urges researchers to pay careful attention to these contextual aspects to gain a deeper understanding of how meaning is shaped in discourse.

Another essential characteristic of Huckin (1997)'s approach is its democratic nature. He believes that discourse analysis should not be limited to academic studies but should also be accessible to the general public. According to Huckin (1997), CDA should serve as a tool that enables individuals to critically analyze language and question dominant narratives in everyday communication. This implies that discourse analysis is not only beneficial for scholars and researchers but can also be useful for activists, journalists, and ordinary people who aim to challenge social inequalities and expose biased representations in discourse. Through this democratic perspective, Huckin (1997)'s CDA encourages individuals to engage in critical thinking and actively participate in discussions about societal issues.

In addition, Huckin (1997) places a strong focus on the ethical dimension of discourse analysis. He argues that CDA should not be treated as a neutral or objective academic exercise but should take moral responsibility in addressing issues such as social injustice, discrimination, and the abuse of power. This perspective distinguishes Huckin (1997)'s approach from other discourse analysts who may emphasize only the linguistic or structural aspects of texts. According to Huckin (1997), CDA should function as a means of revealing unfair or oppressive language practices, particularly in media representation, political communication, and institutional discourse. His approach highlights the idea that language is not merely a tool for communication but also a mechanism that reinforces or challenges power structures in society. Therefore, discourse analysts should remain aware of the ethical implications of their work and the impact of language on social relations.

Furthermore, Huckin (1997) underlines the strategic use of texts in discourse. He suggests that discourse is not always neutral, as texts are often constructed in ways that serve particular purposes or interests. For example, media organizations may present news stories using specific framing techniques to support a certain political agenda or economic objective. Similarly, advertising campaigns frequently employ persuasive language to influence

consumer behavior. By examining these strategies, Huckin (1997)'s CDA helps to uncover the ways in which language is deliberately used to shape public perception, manipulate audiences, and maintain existing power relations.

Moreover, Huckin (1997) advocates for a multi-dimensional approach to discourse analysis, which involves analyzing texts at different levels. He identifies three key levels of analysis: the micro-level, which focuses on individual linguistic features such as word choice, sentence structure, and rhetorical devices; the meso-level, which examines how texts are organized, how arguments are structured, and how coherence is maintained; and the macro-level, which considers the wider socio-political and ideological functions of discourse. By incorporating these multiple layers of analysis, Huckin (1997)'s approach enables a comprehensive understanding of how discourse operates across different contexts and contributes to the maintenance or transformation of social structures.

Huckin (1997)'s CDA can be applied to various types of discourse, including political speeches, media reports, corporate communication, legal documents, and public policies. His approach is particularly useful in identifying biased representations, misinformation, and the unequal distribution of power in communication. For instance, in political discourse, Huckin (1997)'s CDA can be employed to investigate how politicians construct narratives to gain support or discredit their opponents. In media studies, it can be used to examine how news organizations selectively present information in ways that align with ideological standpoints. Additionally, in education, Huckin (1997)'s framework can help analyze how textbooks and curricula reinforce certain dominant.

However, according to Huckin (1997), critical analysis primarily consists of two key steps: textual analysis and word-level analysis. The textual analysis stage involves examining the text as a whole rather than analyzing it on a word-by-word basis. Huckin (1997) suggests that in this step, texts should be analyzed based on their genre, meaning that texts are

categorized according to their distinct characteristics and communicative purposes. Different genres, such as news reports, political speeches, or advertisements, contain specific linguistic and structural features that contribute to their intended meaning and influence. Therefore, in this phase, the researcher focuses on identifying patterns, themes, and overall textual structures that define the discourse.

On the other hand, word-level analysis is a more detailed step that focuses on examining the grammatical and linguistic features of the text. This analysis is conducted after the textual analysis has been completed. At this stage, specific elements such as sentence structure, verb tense, modality, and lexical choices are carefully examined. These linguistic characteristics provide further insight into how meaning is constructed within the text and how certain discourse strategies are employed to influence the audience's perception.

Although Huckin (1997) primarily focuses on these two steps, contemporary approaches to CDA often include a third step known as contextual interpretation. This step goes beyond linguistic and textual features by considering the broader social, political, and ideological context in which the text is produced and interpreted. Researchers analyze how power relations, ideologies, and cultural backgrounds shape the meaning of the discourse. By integrating this additional step, a more comprehensive critical analysis can be conducted, allowing for a deeper understanding of how discourse functions in society.

2.4.1. Analyzing Text as a Whole

In the purpose of analyzing characterization in the Text as a Whole there are several criteria to identify its characteristics. Here they are:

1) Genre

Generally, genre refers to the categorization based on shared characteristics such as form, style, purpose, and types of the text. Genre on the context of textual analysis is

defined as the specifically discursual aspect of ways of acting and interacting in the course of social events (Fairclough, 1989). Moreover, genre also interprets how social matter is implied in the matter of speeches (Santoso & Aji, 2020).

Besides, Huckin (1997) defines genre as a formal feature providing a characteristic purpose. For instance, the genre can immediately identified from how persuasive language in the advertisement is used to gather their potential customer. Analysis of genre in text allows the analysis of the purpose behind several statements that appear in the text, and how it indicates its purpose of existence. Moreover, to explore more about the genre, there are two complementary theories that added, those are Monroe's (1969) theory, which explains the schematic structure of speech, and Johnston's (1989) theory, which explains linguistic features of speech.

For example:

“Our nation must unite to face challenges ahead!”

This sentence quoted from Political Speech that employs collective pronouns *“our nation”* to foster sense of unity and shared identity among listeners. The imperative *“must united”* suggests urgency and responsibility, reflecting an ideological stance that prioritize national solidarity

2) Framing

Framing refers to the way in which certain aspects of reality are emphasized on how the issue is perceived and understood (Fairclough, 1989). Framing involves the process of highlighting several kinds of issues and situations with the purpose of influencing the audience's perception and responses toward the issues. It also identifies the perspective of the speaker toward the issues in the speech. As a complementary theory, the researcher uses the theory of Entman (1993) to specify the classification of framing

into; Problem Definition, Causal Interpretation, Moral Evaluation, Treatment Recommendation, Salience, and Frame Location.

For example:

“The new law aims to protect vulnerable populations from exploitation.”

This sentence using connotation as Framing Technique. The use of “*protect*” and “*vulnerable populations*” carries positive connotations, suggesting virtue and care. This framing positions the law as a moral imperative, potentially prevent any complexity or criticisms regarding its implementation or effectiveness.

3) Presupposition

Presupposition tends to use to manipulate the audience. Presupposition is how the use of language in a way appears to take certain ideas for granted as if there were no alternative (Huckin, 1997). It persuades the audience through the involvement of information without explicitly stating the underlying facts. In the purpose of narrowing the analysis of Presupposition, the theory of Yule (1996) was added. It categorized the Presupposition into several classifications; Existential Presupposition, Factive Presupposition, Non-factive Presupposition, Lexical Presupposition, Structural Presupposition, Counterfactual Presupposition.

For example:

“The new law will finally put an end to the rampant corruption in our government.”

This sentence presupposes that corruption is currently rampant within the government. Stating “*put an end to the rampant corruption*”, it assumes the existence of widespread corruption as a given fact, which frames the new law as a necessary and urgent response. This can influence public perception by reinforcing a negative view of the

government while promoting the idea that legislative action is both justified and overdue.

4) Foregrounding/ backgrounding

Foregrounding is used by the speaker to emphasize several concepts by adding textual prominence and de-emphasizing others (Huckin, 1997). Textual prominence on this context came from how the genre works in the text. It is commonly create a space that prominence fulfil its space.

For example:

“In response to public outcry, officials announced new measures to improve safety.”

This sentence highlights public engagement. The phrase *“In response to public outcry”* is foregrounded, emphasizing that officials are reacting to citizen concerns. This posit public opinion as the driving force behind policy changes, which can enhance trust in governance but may also obscure whether these measures are adequate or merely performative.

5) Discursive Difference

Discursive difference refers to the several different kinds of language use and meanings that arise from various contexts, social practices, and power relations. It shows how issues can be perceived through several different views considering on the discourse community or ideological perspective.

For example:

“In light of recent events, it is essential for businesses to prioritize employee safety.”

The phrase *“In light of recent events”* suggests that there has been a significant trigger for this call to action, creating a sense of urgency. However, this framing may also

imply that businesses had previously been complacent regarding employee safety. The discursive difference here highlights a shift in narrative from neglect to immediate action, which can affect how stakeholders perceive corporate responsibility.

2.4.2. Analyzing Text from The Word Level

After considering the analysis through Text as a Whole, the text subsequently analyzed through Word-level analysis. In terms of analysing using Word-level Analysis there are several characteristic to identify. Here they are:

1) Topicalization

Word-level topicalization works to analyze which matter that commonly brought into the text. The most frequent matter that appears on the text identify as the topic of the text. The topic of one sentence tends to continues as the topic of the next, reinforcing its importance in the text (Huckin, 1997).

For example:

“Community engagement plays a vital role in local governance.”

The phrase *“Community engagement”* is the focal point of the sentence. By starting with community engagement, this sentence highlights its importance in governance processes. This framing suggests that active participation from citizens is important for effective governance, which can encourage civic involvement and highlight the value of community voices in decision making.

2) Agency

According to Huckin (1997), agency is identified as the most frequent agent in the text. This agent indicates not only by how it repeatedly appears in the text, but also how this agent actively arises between the sentences, while the other agents remain passively.

For example:

“The government launched a new initiative to combat.”

The agent here is “The government”, which is explicitly identified as the active force behind the initiative. This sentence emphasizes the government’s proactive role in addressing homelessness, framing it as a responsible and necessary action. Highlighting the government’s agency, it suggests accountability and commitment to social issues. However, it may also disguise complexities and systemic factors contributing to homelessness, simplifying the narrative around governmental responsibility.

3) Deletion/Omission

Agent-deletion occurs most often through nominalization and the use of passive verbs (Huckin, 1997). Deletion refers to the action of the speaker to omit the existence of agents in the purpose of manipulation and hand more spotlight to the other agent.

For example:

“The policy was implemented to improve public health.”

The agent responsible for implementing the policy is omitted. Using passive voice allows this sentence to not specifically implement the agent who involve in this policy, which can obscure accountability. This omission can lead readers to infer that the action is a routine governmental procedure, thereby minimizing the role of specific individuals or groups who may have resisted the policy.

4) Presupposition

Presupposition also appears in the analysis of word-level in the purpose of persuasion and manipulation. According to Huckin (1997), presuppositions are notoriously manipulative because they are difficult to be questioned.

For example:

“Everyone knows that exercise is essential for maintaining good health.”

The phrase “everyone knows” presupposes a general consensus on the importance of exercise for health. This framing suggests that acknowledging exercise’s benefits is a widely accepted truth, which can marginalize those who may have differing views or experiences regarding health. It positions exercise as an unquestionable norm, influencing how individuals perceive their own health practices.

5) Insinuation

Insinuation is comments that are slyly suggestive (Huckin,1997). It is implicitly implied in the text in form of multi-interpretation statement. In this kind of situation the purpose of involvement still lingers in influencing the audience, but through insinuation, the speaker takes less responsibility due an abstract intention behind the statement.

For example:

“It’s interesting how people seem to find time to protest but can’t find time to vote.”

This sentence insinuates that those who protest are neglecting their civic duty to vote. The phrase “*some people seem to find time*” suggests a judgment about the priorities of protesters, implying that their actions are less valid or responsible compared to voting. This insinuation can serve to delegitimize the protests by framing them as distractions from more important civic responsibilities.

6) Connotation

Connotation refers to the process of labelling the agents or situation towards particular context. The use of connotation frequently involves metaphor or other figures of speech.

For example:

“Despite challenges, the community rallied together in support of the new park project.”

The word “*rallied*” has a positive connotation of unity and collective action, suggesting strength and solidarity. This framing highlights the community’s resilience and commitment to improving their environment. However, it also subtly acknowledges that there were challenges, which could imply that not all community members were initially supportive or that significant obstacles had to be overcome, thus adding depth to the narrative of community engagements.

7) Register

Register is defined as the level of formality or informality in a text, its degree of technicality, and its subject field. Articles are produced using specific approaches, such as formal, semi-formal, or informal styles. Readers can be deceived by a false register, one designed to evoke misplaced trust. Additionally, the selection of pronouns such as the first person (e.g., *I, me, my, we, our*) or the third person (e.g., *he, she, they, their, his, hers, him, her*) is recognized as having an impact on the overall register of a text.

For example:

“We must take immediate action to address the climate crisis.”

The use of “must” indicates a formal and urgent tone, characteristics of persuasive discourse often found in political or environmental advocacy contexts. This sentence employs a high register, reflecting seriousness and authority. The formal language suggests that the speaker is addressing an audience that is expected to respond to a call to action, reinforcing the importance of the issue at hand.

8) Modality

Modality is recognized as an important feature of discourse that should be analyzed for critical purposes. It is understood to refer to the tone of statements in relation to their degree of certainty and authority. This feature is primarily expressed through words and phrases such as *may, might, could, will, can, must, maybe, probably, it seems to me, without a doubt*, and *it is possible that*. Through the use of these modal verbs and phrases, some texts are observed to convey a sense of strong authority, while others, in contrast, present a tone of deference.

For example:

“We should consider implementing stricter regulations on emissions.”

The use “should” indicate a suggestions or recommendations rather than a command. This modality conveys a sense of obligations or necessity but not demanding. This framing can influence the audience’s perception of urgency regarding environmental policy, positioning the speaker as a concerned advocate rather than a authoritarian figure.

2.4.3. Analyzing Text through Contextual Interpretation

The broader socio-cultural context of articles must be carefully considered to gain a comprehensive understanding of their meaning and impact. This context is recognized as a reflection of the values, norms, and beliefs inherent in the community, which are naturally captured by the reporter as an active member of that social environment. The interpretation of this context plays a critical role in analyzing the deeper significance of the text, as it reveals how societal dynamics and cultural frameworks influence the creation and reception of the article. Such an analysis helps to uncover the underlying motivations, biases, and ideologies embedded in the discourse.

Although Huckin (1997) method for elaborating contextual interpretation lacks a structured set of guidelines, it provides essential insights into how context should be approached. The socio-cultural backdrop of the article is suggested to be examined by considering the circumstances in which it was published. These circumstances include the specific social and political conditions of the time, which often shape the tone, content, and purpose of the discourse. By exploring the interplay between the article and its historical moment, critical readers are better equipped to understand how external influences contribute to the article's construction and the ways it reflects or challenges prevailing societal norms. This approach underscores the importance of situating textual analysis within its larger cultural and political framework.

2.5. Background of The Conflict between Israel and Palestine

To better understand the purpose behind a speech that not only shares an opinion but also tries to influence how people see a current issue, it is important to know the background of the conflict. It is also necessary to learn about the background of the speaker. By doing this, we can get a clearer idea of what the speaker really wants to say through his speech.

The Israeli-Palestinian conflict is not only about religion. It started long ago, even before the creation of Israel in 1948. During the time of the Ottoman Empire, which ruled over Palestine for hundreds of years, Muslims, Christians, and Jews lived in the land. In the 15th century, Jews who were forced to leave Spain after the Alhambra Decree found safety in Ottoman territories, including Palestine. The Ottoman Empire allowed them to stay and practice their religion freely (Waxman, 2019). At this time, Jews and Arabs lived together in peace under Ottoman control.

In the 19th century, a new political movement called Zionism started. Zionism was not only about religion—it was a nationalist movement. Many Jews wanted to return to their

ancient homeland and create a Jewish state. This happened while the Ottoman Empire was still in control. At first, the Jewish population in Palestine was small, but Zionist leaders encouraged Jews from Europe to move there and buy land (Klein, 2014). Some Arab Palestinians welcomed them at first, but tensions grew as more land was bought and more people arrived.

During World War I, the British government made many promises to different groups. First, they promised Arab leaders that if they helped UK fight against the Ottoman Empire, they would get independence after the war. Second, UK signed the Sykes-Picot Agreement with France, dividing Arab lands between them. Third, in the Balfour Declaration of 1917, UK promised Zionist leaders that it would help build a Jewish homeland in Palestine (Waxman, 2019). These promises all gave control of the same land to different groups. This caused confusion and betrayal, especially for Palestinians who expected independence.

After the war, the Ottoman Empire collapsed, and UK took control of Palestine through the League of Nations Mandate in 1920. Instead of giving Palestinians independence, UK supported the Jewish national home idea. Jewish immigration increased, especially during the 1930s and 1940s, when Jews were escaping the Holocaust and Nazi rule in Europe (Klein, 2014). Palestinians started to feel like they were being pushed out of their own land. Violence broke out between Jewish and Arab communities. British forces tried to stop the fighting, but they could not control the situation.

In 1947, the United Nations offered a plan to divide Palestine into two states—one for Jews and one for Arabs. Jewish leaders accepted the plan, but Arab leaders rejected it. They believed it was unfair to give away land that belonged to Palestinians. In 1948, Jewish leaders declared the independence of Israel. This caused the first Arab-Israeli war. Hundreds of thousands of Palestinians were forced to leave or fled from their homes during this time. They became refugees in nearby Arab countries and were not allowed to return (Waxman, 2019).

Since then, the conflict has continued for many years. Palestinians still want their own country and the right to return to their homes. Israel, on the other hand, wants to stay strong and secure. Both sides have suffered wars, terrorism, and peace failures. The original promises made by the British created the root of the problem: two different groups were promised the same land. That betrayal still affects the people today (Klein, 2014).

2.5.1. Prolonged Conflict Between Israel and Palestine

Although both have declared their independence, armed conflict in terms of territorial struggle still occurs to this day. This armed conflict tends to be dominated by Israel, which has received full support from the United States over the years, making Israel's strength far greater than that of the Palestinians. This support also gives Israel the freedom to act arbitrarily in Palestinian territory.

This arbitrary action is characterized by Israel's unwillingness to attack and intimidate civilians for military purposes. Not only that, in 2007 Israel imposed a strict blockade on the Gaza Strip which froze access to food, electricity. Nor clean water, and access to health facilities both by land, water and air (Carter, 2007).

In the blockade, people are prohibited from leaving the Gaza region, while people from other regions are prohibited from entering the Gaza region. This strict restriction of movement has earned Gaza the nickname 'Open Prison'. The impact of the blockade is not only about the difficulty of accessing the daily needs of the Palestinians in Gaza, but also making it difficult for outsiders to channel aid into Gaza. During the blockade, the Israeli military often committed abuses against Palestinian civilians.

Palestinians' anger is further fueled when Israel consistently attacks and massacres civilians. Israeli soldiers often enter and attack refugee camps, hospitals, and even intimidate worshipers of Al-Aqsa mosque under the pretext of targeting militants. Until 2022 alone, more

than 200 Palestinian civilians have been victims of the Israeli military's aggressive behavior in the West Bank and Gaza.

After 75 years of suffering experienced by the Palestinian people, militant groups began to emerge that fought Israeli atrocities through armed conflict (Carter, 2007). One of them is the Hamas group, which is a militant group that triggered the counterattack that occurred on October 7, 2023.

2.5.2. Hamas Counterattacks and Their Impact to Date

Hamas, or *Harakat al-Muqawwamatul Islamiyah*, is an Islamist Palestinian organization that was founded on December 14, 1987, by Shaykh Ahmed Yasin and Abdel Aziz al-Rantissi. It was established as an alternative to the Palestinian Liberation Organization (PLO), which many considered too secular and open to negotiations with Israel. Hamas was created with the main purpose of resisting Israeli control over Palestinian territories, and it has adopted both political and military strategies to achieve this goal. Unlike the PLO, Hamas takes a more hardline stance, rejecting the existence of Israel and refusing to compromise on Palestinian land (Waxman, 2019).

Internationally, Hamas is seen in very different ways. The United States, the European Union, Canada, and several other countries officially designate Hamas as a terrorist organization because of its use of violence, including suicide bombings, rocket attacks, and armed assaults targeting civilians. In contrast, countries such as Iran, Turkey, and Qatar view Hamas as a legitimate resistance movement fighting for the rights of Palestinians under occupation (Carter, 2007). These contrasting views have created diplomatic tensions and made the conflict even more complex.

Since its founding, Hamas has carried out numerous attacks against Israel and has been involved in several major conflicts, including wars in 2008–2009, 2012, 2014, and 2021. It also

gained significant political power after winning the 2006 Palestinian legislative elections. This victory allowed Hamas to control the Gaza Strip, where it has governed since 2007. Over time, Hamas has developed a large and organized military wing, known as the Izz ad-Din al-Qassam Brigades, which coordinates many of its armed operations.

One of the most significant recent events occurred on October 7, 2023. During the Jewish holiday of Simchat Torah, Hamas, along with other Palestinian militant groups, carried out a large-scale attack on Israel from the Gaza Strip (Le Monde, 2023). This event marked a significant escalation in the ongoing Israeli-Palestinian conflict. The attack began with an extensive launch of rockets targeting multiple Israeli cities and towns, causing widespread alarm and destruction. Following the rocket attacks, Hamas militants proceeded with a coordinated ground assault. They forcefully breached the barrier separating Gaza and Israel using explosives and heavy machinery, enabling them to enter Israeli territory. Reports suggest that approximately 2,500 militants participated in this operation, using firearms, grenades, and improvised explosive devices (IEDs) to engage in violent confrontations. The attack led to over 1,200 Israeli casualties, including both military personnel and civilians, while numerous others sustained injuries. This incident became one of the deadliest attacks in Israel's history, creating an atmosphere of fear and uncertainty throughout the region.

In response to this offensive, the Israeli military immediately launched extensive airstrikes throughout the Gaza Strip, aiming to weaken Hamas by targeting its infrastructure, military bases, and key figures within the organization (Asmar, 2023). Additionally, the Israeli Defense Forces (IDF) mobilized ground troops along the Gaza border, indicating a possible large-scale invasion. The Israeli retaliation resulted in severe consequences for the Palestinian population. Reports indicate that more than 48,000 Palestinians lost their lives due to Israeli airstrikes and military operations. Furthermore, the attacks led to the displacement of nearly 90% of Gaza's population, forcing hundreds of thousands of civilians to flee their homes in

search of safety. The Israeli bombardments caused widespread destruction, affecting essential infrastructure such as homes, hospitals, schools, and other public facilities, thereby worsening the humanitarian crisis in Gaza.

Despite attempts by international mediators to facilitate ceasefire negotiations, hostilities between the two sides persisted, leading to ongoing bloodshed and deepening the historical animosity between Israel and Palestine. The events of October 7 and their aftermath have drawn global attention, sparking debates on issues such as the proportionality of Israel's response, human rights violations, and the broader implications for regional stability. Many international organizations have expressed concern over the high number of civilian casualties, particularly among Palestinian women and children, raising ethical and legal questions regarding the conduct of war. These events have further demonstrated the fragile nature of peace efforts and the deep-rooted complexities of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, making the prospects for a long-term resolution increasingly difficult.

2.5.3. Global Responses to the Current Conflict between Israel and Palestine

The global reaction to the outbreak of violence between Israel and Palestine on October 7, 2023, was diverse, with leaders, international organizations, and public figures expressing a range of perspectives. This response highlights the complexity and sensitivity of the situation, as well as the differing political and historical contexts influencing global reactions.

Beyond individual nations and figures, major international organizations, including the United Nations, called for an immediate cessation of violence. The UN emphasized the urgent need to protect civilian lives and urged all parties to adhere to international humanitarian law (United Nations, 2023). These appeals reflect the broader global concern that the conflict could escalate into a wider regional crisis, making de-escalation efforts and diplomatic engagement crucial.

Several leaders from Western nations strongly condemned the attacks carried out by Hamas. For instance, according to The Straits Times (2024) Ursula von der Leyen, the President of the European Commission, and French President Emmanuel Macron explicitly denounced these actions, categorizing them as acts of terrorism. They reaffirmed Israel's right to defend itself and emphasized the importance of security for its citizens. Similarly, the Then Prime Minister of India, Narendra Modi, expressed his shock over the events and extended solidarity with Israel, signaling his government's stance on the conflict (Ganguly & Blarel, 2023).

On the other hand, responses from actors within the Middle East and surrounding regions varied significantly. Jordan's Foreign Minister, Ayman Safadi, emphasized the importance of addressing the root causes of the conflict, particularly the ongoing Israeli military actions in the West Bank. He warned that the escalation could lead to further instability unless underlying political grievances were resolved. Meanwhile, the Lebanese political and militant group Hezbollah declared its support for the Palestinian resistance, viewing the attacks as a reaction to what it considers the continued occupation of Palestinian territories. Hezbollah also framed this as a message to nations seeking to normalize diplomatic relations with Israel, arguing that such agreements undermine the Palestinian cause.

At the broader international level, Iran publicly endorsed the actions taken by Palestinian groups. Advisers to Iran's Supreme Leader, Ali Hosseini Khamenei, congratulated those involved in the attacks, reinforcing Iran's historically strong stance in opposition to Israel. These statements reflect Iran's long-standing geopolitical rivalry with Israel and its alignment with Palestinian factions in regional conflicts. In contrast, some public figures in the entertainment industry and media expressed their personal support for Israel. For example, Israeli actress Gal Gadot used her platform to speak out in solidarity with Israel, underscoring the personal and emotional impact of the conflict on individuals with connections to the region.

Some parties also use official speech to show their position after the conflict began. One example is Rishi Sunak, the Then Prime Minister of the United Kingdom. In his official speech on October 10, 2023, he clearly showed his support and solidarity with Israel. He said that what happened in Israel was very cruel and sad, and as Then Prime Minister, he wanted to help protect the people in Israel. He also strongly criticized Hamas, calling their actions “barbaric” because many people were killed.

This speech caused a big controversy. Many people in the United Kingdom actually stand against Israel. It looked like the government and the citizens had very different opinions about the conflict. Because of this difference, a large protest happened on October 15, 2023. The protest was not only to disagree with the government’s position, but also to ask for a ceasefire. People also made a petition, and one of the demands was for the UK to support the ceasefire to stop the war.

The wide range of responses to the conflict on October 7, 2023, underscores the deep divisions and alliances that characterize global perspectives on the Israel-Palestine situation. The event serves as a reminder of the ongoing challenges in achieving a peaceful resolution to the conflict, as historical grievances, territorial disputes, and political dynamics continue to shape the region’s future. The reactions from different countries and organizations highlight the complexity of international diplomacy in addressing one of the most persistent and contentious conflicts in modern history.

2.5.4. The Then Prime Minister of the United Kingdom and His Speech Responding to The Conflict

Rishi Sunak is a British Then Prime Minister who made history because he is the first person with South Asian background and also a Hindu to become a leader in the UK. He was born on May 12, 1980, in Southampton, England. His parents are from Indian origin and they

moved to the UK from East Africa in the 1960s. His father worked as a general doctor, and his mother managed a family pharmacy. He studied at Stroud School and Winchester College during his early education. After that, he continued his study at Lincoln College, Oxford, where he got a degree in philosophy, politics, and economics. Then, he studied again in the United States and got an MBA degree from Stanford University with a Fulbright scholarship.

Before joining politics, Rishi Sunak worked in the financial field. He was an analyst at Goldman Sachs and later became a partner in some hedge fund companies, like Theleme Partners. He was also a director at Catamaran Ventures, a company that belongs to his father-in-law, Narayana Murthy, who is the founder of Infosys, a big tech company in India. His political career started in 2015 when he became a Member of Parliament (MP) for Richmond, Yorkshire, from the Conservative Party. His career grew quickly. In 2019, he was chosen as Chief Secretary to the Treasury, and in 2020, he became Chancellor of the Exchequer, where he helped the UK handle the economy during the COVID-19 pandemic. After Liz Truss resigned, Sunak became Prime Minister in 2022. However, his time as Prime Minister was not long. In the 2024 general election, the Conservative Party lost badly to the Labour Party, ending 14 years of their government.

In foreign policy, especially about the situation in the Middle East, Rishi Sunak gave strong support to Israel. When the war between Israel and Hamas started in October 2023, Sunak said in public that Israel had the full right to protect itself. He also sent support from the British military to the East Mediterranean. He gave more than one speech to show his support, like on October 10 and October 19, 2023. In those speeches, he not only supported Israel but also criticized the violent actions by Hamas. He used strong words like "brutal" and "barbaric action" to describe Hamas. These speeches can also be studied through a language perspective, especially in the field of linguistics. One part of linguistics called CDA can be used to understand how Sunak used language to show power and political ideology in his speeches.

2.6. Qualitative Approach

Qualitative research is a research approach that focuses on exploring and understanding the meaning behind human behavior, social interaction, and cultural phenomena. According to Creswell (2014), qualitative research is an approach for exploring and understanding the meaning individuals or groups ascribe to a social or human problem. It means that the researcher tries to understand how people make sense of their experiences, thoughts, and realities. This approach uses non-numerical data, like words, texts, observations, or images, and interprets them to get deeper understanding.

The purpose of qualitative research is not to measure or test hypotheses, but to explore, describe, and interpret. It helps the researcher to get deep insight into the topic, especially when the topic is complex, sensitive, or difficult to be quantified. In qualitative research, the role of the researcher is very important, because the researcher is the one who collects, interprets, and presents the data. The data can come from many sources, such as interviews, observations, field notes, or documents.

Creswell (2014) also explains that qualitative research has several characteristics. First, it is naturalistic, which means the research is done in the real-world setting. Second, it is interpretive, meaning that the researcher interprets the meaning of the data. Third, it is flexible and can be adjusted during the research process. Lastly, it focuses on meaning, not just facts.

One of the most common methods in qualitative research is **document analysis**. According to Bowen (2009), document analysis is a systematic procedure for reviewing or evaluating documents, both printed and electronic (computer-based and Internet-transmitted) material. In document analysis, the researcher interprets the content of the text to understand the ideas, messages, or ideologies inside the document. The documents can be speeches, reports, letters,

articles, news, diaries, transcripts, or any written text that can give information related to the research topic.

Document analysis is useful when the data is already available and when the researcher wants to examine how language is used to create meaning, ideology, or power relations. It is often used in CDA, which studies how language reflects social practices, structures, and ideologies. Huckin (1997) explains that language in texts can hide or show power relations, and that texts can be analyzed to reveal those hidden meanings. That is why document analysis is often used when the researcher wants to examine political speeches, media articles, or institutional texts. Document analysis is especially useful when the data is historical or cannot be observed directly, the topic is sensitive or political, or the researcher wants to see how language is used to shape reality or opinions.

In this study, document analysis is used to analyze a political speech delivered by Rishi Sunak. The speech is examined using Critical Discourse Analysis to uncover the power relations, ideology, and rhetorical strategies used in the text. By using qualitative approach and document analysis method, the researcher is able to explore how language is used not only to communicate, but also to influence and control.

2.7. Previous Study

1. Critical Discourse Analysis on Jokowi's Speech Using Thomas N. Huckin's Theory (2020)

This research analyzed President Joko Widodo's speech about the importance of human resources and the plan to relocate the capital city to Kalimantan. The researchers used Huckin's (1997) model of CDA by analyzing the speech at three levels: text as a whole, sentence level, and word level. The results showed how language in the speech reflected power and ideology. For example, Jokowi used inclusive pronouns like "we" and "us" to emphasize unity and shared responsibility. The study concluded that the speech represented Jokowi as a reform-oriented and visionary leader, and that the language used in the speech helped construct a positive image of national development.

1. Islamophobia in the West: A Critical Discourse Analysis of Imran Khan's UNGA Speech (2022)

This study used van Dijk (2001)'s Ideological Square to analyze how Imran Khan represented the West and the Muslim world in his 2019 UN speech at the United Nations General Assembly. The researchers found that Khan used strong rhetorical devices to build a contrast between "us" (Muslims) and "them" (the West). He emphasized positive things about Islam and Muslims while criticizing Western attitudes toward Islamophobia. The study revealed that Khan also used connotation, repetition, and moral contrast to highlight the issue. The findings supported van Dijk's (2001) idea that ideology is often shown through discourse strategies like polarization.