

## **EUPHEMIZATION AND DEROGATION IN TEACHER STUDENTS' DIALOGIC DISCOURSE: A CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS**

**Chet Narayan Sapkota, M.Phil**

Madhyabindu Multiple Campus, Kawasoti

### **Abstract**

*Critical discourse analysis (CDA) has become a widely used academic research method in the social, political, educational, and linguistic sciences. This paper aims to explain how teacher-student dialogic discourse is presented and evaluated differently to persuade the students. Van Dijk's (2004) framework, is used to identify discursive structures that lead to ideologically based parochial, context, ideology, and social cognition. The CDA of the teacher students' dialogic discourse has highlighted the reality that ideologies are expressed, performed, sustained, and inculcated through discursive frameworks. In terms of measuring attitudes and opinions, the macro methodologies of positive self-representation and negative other representations have proven to be precise. Euphemism and derogation are frequently used in ideological language manipulations that aiming to portray the self and others negatively and positively. They show how positive self-representation or negative other-representation can serve ideological purposes. The CDA applied to the teacher and students' dialogic discourse in this article shows these in-group/out-group distinctions. The outcomes of this study could help students and teachers improve their critical thinking skills in language comprehension and production, as well as revitalize the undervalued idea of language competency.*

**Key Words:** *Ideology, Euphemization, Derogation, Discursive Structures, Critical Discourse Analysis, Positive self-representation vs. negative other-representation*

### **Background of the Study**

To identify ideological manipulations in texts, a variety of methods are used, including the classification of derogatory and euphemistic phrases. Euphemism is described by Rahimi and Sahragard (2007) as "words and expressions used to soften or mitigate the reality of the ideas transmitted to an audience," while derogatory is defined as "showing a critical attitude toward others, or insulting (p. 35)."

The ideological function of euphemization is to show the other as inferior or mediocre. It is a technique for favorably describing the speaker. Euphemization, as mentioned by Richardson (2008) is a technique for manipulating the meaning of a term by switching one word to another. Furthermore, derogation is used as an ideological function to depict oneself as superior to others. It is used by the speaker to represent the other groups in unfavorable

### 34 *The Journal of Madhyabindu Multiple Campus, Vol. 8, No. 1, 2023*

images. Since, commonly, language has been an effective tool employed in written and spoken texts, researching both of these strategies in student and teacher dialogic discourse helps to recognize the form of positive in-group representation or negative out-group representation in student teachers' dialogic discourse.

Any ideology that demonstrates the status quo by legitimizing power representation through dialogic discourse between teachers and students needs to use derogation and euphemization (Sahmeni, & Afifah, 2019). Today, every group or individual tries to portray themselves as strong and dominant. They want to encourage people to join them or at least support them. Derogation and euphemization are common in today's educational sessions, as seen by dialogic interaction between teachers and students. Derogation and euphemization can be successful ways of influencing each other through academic institutions.

Derogation is defined as making someone or something seem inferior, disparaging them, and communicating in a way that humiliates them (Indriana & Muttaqin, 2019). Words having negative implications are also uncommon in educational circles. As a result, dehumanization, racism, and violence are significant academic by-products that are manifested through euphemisms and derogatory language (Rahimi & Sahragard, 2007).

In the efforts for people's knowledge and ultimate emancipation, critical discourse analysis and critical approaches have a great deal in common. Widdowson (2000) defines CDA as the discovery of implicit ideologies in texts. It exposes the underlying ideological preconceptions and, the power exercised in texts. To understand the strategies and processes used, it must be stated that coercive language styles build and naturalize power relationships, ideologies, and identities. It is expected of students and academics combined to be able to interpret and comprehend the writers' and speakers' essential intents. They must have some means of detecting manipulative and ideologically biased discourse.

The dichotomous categorization of 'euphemistic' and 'derogatory' concepts, which is part of any language's semantic component, is one of the most common and effective approaches to naturalizing ideologies (Hodge & Kress, 1993). Derogatory is defined as "showing a critical attitude toward others, or insulting," and euphemism is defined as "an indirect word or phrase that people often use to refer to something embarrassing or unpleasant, sometimes to make it seem more acceptable than what it is" (Hornby, 2004, p.339). Derogation is the discursive strategy for enhancing or neutralizing negative traits, and they serve to ideologically mark discourse. Derogation, on the other hand, is a discursive technique that is closely linked to another semantic device suggested by

van Dijk, "victimization of others" (van Dijk, 2004, p.253)

Similarly, euphemism is an indirect word or phrase that people frequently use to speak about something uncomfortable or unpleasant, sometimes to make it appear more acceptable than it is. They are a necessary and universal characteristic of language use and usage; people from various cultures and communities use euphemistic phrases to talk about or write about things that are uncomfortable, terrifying, or taboo. Euphemisms can also be used to raise and promote the prominence of an event or occurrence. It is, nonetheless, frequently employed to speak inferentially about things whose explicit description is seen as particularly improper.

Sensitivity to this dichotomy and attention might lead to an understanding of the words' negative and positive implications. Writers and speakers use these shades of meaning to influence events and situations, as well as elicit varied thoughts and reactions from the audience. This mechanism allows people from other perspectives and mental models to present the same event or phenomenon in very diverse ways (Van Dijk, 2004). It should be noted, however, that this dichotomy may be found in a variety of fields, including politics, religion, law, and education.

### **Research Questions**

1. How can we determine that euphemization and derogation are used to manipulate realities and ideologies in the

text?

2. How are teachers and students represented in euphemisms and derogatory expressions?

### **Statement of Problem**

Effective exclusionary reading and writing are of paramount importance in the modern era because of the prevalence and exposure to information. Students, and even some academics, have turned their attention to the nuances and intricacies of discourse production and comprehension. As a result, individuals or institutions with this knowledge can control and subjugate people with impunity (Foucault, 1975); they can use language as a very powerful tool to materialize the people's wishes and aspirations. Furthermore, Van Dijk (2000) believes that any language's semantic component is extensively and effectively used for these purposes. The negative (derogatory) and positive (euphemistic) applications of words are a part of this component. Despite their importance, these semantic elements have received limited study. While producing discourse or being exposed to it, students and teachers are largely unconcerned and uninformed about the significance of various shades of meaning. They must get acquainted with the significant impact that any individual word can have. Under the scrutiny of CDA, and notably, its semantic embodiment of derogation and euphemistic processes, the seemingly interchangeable vocabularies reveal to be vastly

### **36 *The Journal of Madhyabindu Multiple Campus, Vol. 8, No. 1, 2023***

different. Misrepresentation, prejudice, subordination, and disgust, among other emotions and occurrences, are undoubtedly the results of unfamiliarity with this issue, and that is monumentally motivating and informative in teacher-student dialogic discourse. Van Dijk (2005) explains that in CDA research, the study of ideologically biased discourses and how they polarize the representation of "us" (ingroup) and "them" (outgroup) are frequent topics of interest. Thus, both at the level of global and local meaning analysis, we frequently see a generalized approach of positive "self" presentation and negative "other" presentation, in which our good qualities and their bad qualities are stressed and our bad qualities and their good qualities are deemphasized.

#### **Review of the Literature**

The dialogical language of teachers and students is analyzed using critical discourse analysis, a research paradigm that is judgmental of the various forms of verbal repression, including manipulation, dominance, propaganda, and hidden agenda.

#### **Critical Discourse Analysis**

The primary objective of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) is to highlight discourse opaqueness that supports the exercise, preservation, or reproduction of unequal power relations (Fairclough & Wodak, 1997, p. 258). Or, to put it another way, confused and ambiguous phrases are made clear to show their perhaps

beneficial role in the unequal power structures of society. CDA is a dissection or post-mortem technique that reveals the harmful, crippling elements that are concealed beneath the surface of discourse that appears neutral and innocent. CDA examines participants' preconceptions about the institutional process of making them aware of institutional norms, as well as how they ultimately euphemize and derogate in the dialogic discourse of teachers and students.

Critical Discourse Analysis is an approach that expresses an overt political commitment and reflects a specific ideology (Bucholtz, 2001). It is defined as "the identification of implicit ideologies in texts" (Widdowson, 2000). De Malo Resende (2009) defines CDA as a "theoretical framework for language in modernity (p. 252)." Its primary purpose is to explore how language functions in social situations. Billig (2008) mentions that discourse analysts often examine the discursive and linguistic elements of given texts rather than the processes of producing and consuming texts. CDA focuses on sociocultural settings and the contextual use of language to crystallize a particular ideology (Taki, 2008). This paper investigates the rhetorical use of language following van Dijk's concept, which he termed "positive self and negative other representation" (van Dijk, 2005). The fundamental principles of a research approach known as "Critical Discourse Analysis" were also applied to the study to

reveal how the teacher students' discourse reflects societal power, uses language for self-glorification, and praises their actions, regimes, and programs while expressing the structures of their dialogue in derogatory or insulting terms. Most discursive formulations of teacher-student dialogic discussion are recognized to exhibit this polarization of ingroup and outgroup. So, by viewing language as discourse and social practice, the researcher is committing not only analyzing texts and the production and interpretation processes, but also to analyzing how text, processes and their social conditions of institutional and social structure, related to one another.

The goal of critical discourse theory and analysis is to actively participate in and reflect on the function of discourse. There are reasonable grounds to place discourse research within the realm of critical social research as mentioned by Rogers and Schaenen (2015). First, Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) allows us to interpret language based on its social context as well as what it can tell us about that context. Second, Critical Discourse Analysis shifts from describing inequities and power/knowledge relationships in interactions to explaining and interpreting them. Critical Discourse Analysis gives the means to investigate inside language processes. This procedure allows the analyst to examine the inner workings of language, the refined linguistic codes, the operation of cultural signs, and the embeddedness of ideology. Third, this paradigm enables the

analyst to contextualize public discourse and identify connections between texts and circumstances. Furthermore, discourse is extremely intertextual, implying significant previous relationships in both oral and written language. Fourth, this approach elucidates the structure of social discourse orders, as well as how they interact and position one another. It raises concerns and assumptions, notably about people's perceptions of their relationships to and with societal systems. As essential complement to economic and political power is ideological power, which is ability to represent one's actions as universal and common sense. It is important in this situation since it is used in the dialogic discourse between the teacher and student.

Even though all types of studies conducted using the CDA approach have common ground, there is a wide range of CDA frameworks' more general objectives as well as their more specific goals. Moreover, different types of texts necessarily require various analytical frameworks. Van Dijk (2001) insists that CDA intends to focus on the ways that social dominance is secured, sustained, or reproduced through the manipulation and construction of specific discourse structures. Another important issue that CDA is interested in, as van Dijk (2002) mentions, is determining the relationship between discourse and knowledge; and because discourse and knowledge are both complex phenomena, they require thorough analyses from various perspectives,

including linguistic ones.

Texts are not merely employed to inform us about the reality around us. They also construct reality based on the ideological perspectives of the people, organizations, and other entities involved in their formation. One of the main tenets of CDA is to reveal the sources of dominance and inequality observed in society by analyzing written or spoken texts. It is to identify the rhetorical techniques that are used to create or sustain inequality or bias in various contexts. According to Van Dijk (1997), a text is "merely the tip of the iceberg," and it is up to the discourse analyst to reveal the text's hidden meaning (p. 9). CDA is not only a critique of discourse but also a critique of the contemporary social reality (including its discourse) that begins with a critique of discourse (Fairclough 2014; Gee 2005; Reisigl & Wodak, 2009). By contesting prevailing ideologies, CDA seeks to solve current societal issues. It takes the viewpoints of people who suffer the most and critically examines those in positions of authority, those who are in charge, and those who have the power and opportunity to address these issues and change the situation (Wodak & Meyer, 2005). Therefore, critical theories in general and CDA in particular serve as guidelines for human activity with the simultaneous goals of freedom and illumination. They seek to free these agents from any hidden compulsion in texts and place them in a position where they may determine their genuine interests.

### **Research Method**

A qualitative research approach based primarily on critical discourse analysis was used to discover how euphemization and derogation were represented in the teacher students' dialogic discourse, as well as an analysis of the language used by teachers and students. In this case, CDA was essential for detecting, assessing, evaluating, and analyzing the text's social life (Luke, 2002). CDA, in the words of Dijk (1998a), can use in both written and oral texts to show inequity, injustice, power, and biases, as well as to preserve, reproduce, and modify sources within a specific context.

Using content analysis to describe the data the descriptive qualitative approach was used in this study. This method was helpful to find, identify, analyze, and define derogatory and euphemistic terms used by teachers and students in dialogic interaction. In collecting data, the qualitative technique is used to describe a situation, event, or occurrence. To analyze the data and to examine the derogation and euphemization of teachers' and students' dialogic discourse Van Dijk's framework (2004) was used.

### **Sources of Data and Data Analysis Procedure**

Three teachers and six students were chosen using a purposive sampling strategy for this study. They were then critically evaluated using the framework chosen. The researchers chose these texts

because they fit within the CDA paradigm of euphemization and derogation. The language employed in such conversations was emotionally and authorially charged, and it was full of derogatory and euphemistic tactics, as well as negative other-representation and positive self-representation. In other words, they were filled with evaluative and ideologically manipulative terminology. The author appeared to identify with particular attitudes and ideas and attempted to persuade the audience using crucial linguistic strategies.

The study mapped out the discursive practices and activities for which CDA proved to be a useful tool for analyzing teachers' and students' dialogic discourse. Critical discourse analysis, as Rodgers (2004) mentions that it entails not just a description of the situation but also an examination of why and how speech works. As a result, CDA examines the connection between language use and the social context in which it occurs.

The research focuses on the discursive strategies of euphemization and derogation, which were employed to realize the discourse maker's objectives. The data was initially classified according to discursive tactics based on study questions, with each discursive tactic's concept and construction based on euphemistic and derogatory frameworks. The data chosen for this study are relevant to be analyzed, described, and interpreted using Teun A. van Dijk's (2004) CDA model analysis.

He consists of the three core CDA characteristics of context, ideology, and social cognition. These components make it easier to understand how a text-based discursive strategy is applied in the dialogic discourse between teachers and students.

The data was examined using an interpretative phenomenological approach that focused on the participants' lived experiences of the dialogic discourse, particularly cognition, and language, as described by Eatough and Smith (2008). The purpose of the interpretive phenomenological approach was to learn more about people's personal and social lives. This study explored the meanings of various experiences, occasions, and attitudes in the discourse of teachers and students. A thorough evaluation of the participant's lifeworld and personal experience is necessary as part of the phenomenological approach.

### **Analytical Framework**

The framework used in this research was van Dijk's (2004). He outlines twenty-seven ideological techniques in the framework, with the duality of 'euphemization' and 'derogation' standing out. The underlying technique of 'self-positive-representation' and 'other negative representation' is extremely well implemented using this categorization. The former is an ideological function used to show oneself as superior to others; the latter, on the other hand, is used to portray others as inferior or mediocre. Positive

**40** *The Journal of Madhyabindu Multiple Campus, Vol. 8, No. 1, 2023*

self-representation, also known as an in-group preference, is a semantic macro-strategy employed to maintain one's 'face' or manage one's 'image' (van Dijk, 2004). Negative other-representation is another semantic macro-strategy used to divide in-groups and out-groups into 'good' and 'bad,' superior and inferior, US and THEM. The application of ideologically laden norms and values is integrated into this. To put it in other words, euphemization and derogation are semantic methods for emphasizing or deemphasizing ideological meanings, resulting in the polarization of 'the in-group and out-group (positive self-representation and negative other-representation) (van Dijk, 2000). These are discursive strategies for enhancing or minimizing undesirable characteristics, and hence ideologically mark discourse. To semantically implement positive self-representation, euphemization, a rhetorical strategy employed to avoid the production of negative impressions, is used. It avoids the formation of unfavorable attitudes and opinions about the ruling powers. This ideological function, according to van Dijk, is a semantic maneuver following another discursive structure known as self-glorification.

Derogation, on the other hand, is a discursive technique that is closely linked to the "victimization of others," another semantic device defined by van Dijk. As the name implies, the allegedly ordinary features of others are exaggerated and brought to the surface. It's worth mentioning

that the macro-strategy of Positive self and Negative other representation is enabled by other discursive techniques.

**Finding, and Discussions**

The contextual, semantic, and lexicogrammatical features of the teacher-student discourses revealed language use that appears convincing but is self-glorifying, projecting the speakers as powerful. The language uses elements that are relevant to people's aspirations to establish consensus (hegemony).

**Derogation and Euphemization to manipulate realities and ideologies**

The expression of rage or displeasure is one of the functions of the derogatory strategy. It occurs when someone wishes to express their rage and irritation through harsh language. Here are some instances of euphemism strategies for expressing annoyance.

T: (Interrupting) Now, you are not confident whether you will be successful to go there or not, in such a situation also, why are you dying to go there, what special thing do you find to go there? What special thing will you get there abroad? How did the consultancy and peers counsel you? What special factor allures you to go there? Tell.

S: ...like this...

The words 'not confident,' 'dying,' and 'allure' are employed in this excerpt as



derogatory terms because it is expressions used to insult students at academic institutions. The usage of the words is interpreted as a teacher's displeasure with the student's perspective. It was used to express dissatisfaction and anger to the interlocutor since the speaker was enraged by the student's alleged interest in studying overseas. It shows the derogatory strategy for the teacher's use of questions in a row. The question "Why are you dying to go there" is used to express anger and irritation. Another datum indicating the use of derogatory strategy is 'What special thing will you get there in abroad?', the speaker shows his annoyance with the student who insisted to go abroad for further study. So, derogatory refers to degrading, disrespecting, criticizing, disparaging, and considering others as inferior (Dimulescu (2009). Degaf (2016) mentioned that derogatory has a relationship between individuals and groups, which is a communication function that is directly related to the participant's goals and interests.

Students are similarly exposed to derogatory tactics. In this context, students refer to any derogatory term used to criticize the actions of teachers, followed by descriptions, comments, and analyses of the good and bad with a sharper or ruder attitude. The following is an example of a derogatory strategy to criticize the student.

**T:** You too, planned to go abroad?

**S:** What to do, sir? After completing a bachelor's also, we will not get any job in Nepal. (Laughs).

The teacher asked the student why he was interested to go abroad but the student commented about the education system when he said 'What to do, sir?' The speaker criticizes the educational system by proposing a cleverer concept to take the place of the interlocutor's stance during the discussion. The speaker indicated that the skill level of schooling in his country is lower than that of a foreign country. The speaker has made sharp criticism of teachers regarding the education system.

Satire employs a derogatory tactic as well. In this context, satirizing involves employing pejorative phrases to indirectly or implicitly criticize something or someone while using ruder or impolite words. Here are some instances of satirical insulting techniques.

**S:** Sir, I need a transfer letter.

**T:** for what purpose? Tell me in detail.

**S:** I am a student in my BA third year but two months ago, I was married in Nawalparasi Susta West and unable to read here.

**T:** Oh, you have married, and what does your husband do?

**S:** He has his own business.

The information shown here

42 *The Journal of Madhyabindu Multiple Campus, Vol. 8, No. 1, 2023*

illustrates some examples of derogative tactics. For example, when the speaker says, 'Oh, you've married, and what does your husband do?' she doesn't have to conform because she has already revealed her problem. The teacher's inquiry is intended to mock the student for being unable to continue her studies after marrying. 'Tell me detail' is another one that uses question derogators to position oneself as superior to her speaking partner. The purpose of the inquiries is to show her interlocutor that she is unable to complete her studies because she is married.

Another function of a derogative approach is to accuse or blame. Using derogatory words to accuse or blame someone or a specific party for the occurrence of an event or phenomenon is a derogative approach. The following are some examples of defamatory tactics used to accuse or condemn someone.

T: So, you are applying for April intake if possible.

S: Yes,

T: Yes, why are you especially want to go abroad? Suppose, you don't like the teaching style of campus or you don't see any future here, or do you think, after completing a bachelor's degree, you don't see any future possibilities or job opportunities or anything else?

S: Not so, I have been planning to

go abroad at once from starting.

The information shown above demonstrates various derogatory techniques that are used to accuse or criticize others. When the teacher learned that the student had applied for the April intake, he indirectly blamed the student by asking, 'why are you especially want to go abroad? Suppose, you don't like the teaching style of campus or you don't see any future here, or do you think, after completing a bachelor's degree, you don't see any future possibilities or job opportunities or anything else?' The teacher's questioning technique is significant in establishing oneself as superior to others.

Another role of disparaging tactic is to demoralize, tease, or amplify the insult. In the insulting disparaging tactic, certain parties are humiliated, whilst the degrading strategy makes fun of specific parties. A disparaging strategy that serves to heighten the humiliation is using harsh or illegal terms to intensify the speaker's insult and derision of a certain party. Here are a few examples of humiliating practices used to insult, ridicule, and exaggerate humiliation.

T: You applied once earlier and failed from there? Yeh, there is a belief that there is a low chance to go there in further application.

S: Yes

T: I think you don't get a chance to

go there reapplying for it.

S: Yes, (Nodded head).

T: Once, when a student is rejected, there is some reason for it. It may be because of the embassy, or immigration. Are you rejected from college or immigration or the embassy?

The data show the use of derogatory words in teacher students' discourse which serves to insult, taunt, and sharpen the insult while the student showed his interest to apply for a second time for further study abroad. 'You applied once earlier and failed from there? Yeh, there is a belief that there is a low chance to go there in further apply' is the example of derogatory that serves to insult the student. This question was used by the speaker to mock a common student expression. Degaf (2016) mentioned that dysphemism's purpose is to degrade the interlocutor by an expressive reaction to anger, disappointment, or anything unexpected and unwelcome, resulting in the intended party's disgrace. Its use has become an insult when the question is associated with the speech context. Here the teacher seemed to humiliate the student on her second application to go abroad. He again replied 'I think you don't get a chance to go there reapplying for it' The speaker wanted to insult her desire of applying for further study and this shows clearly how the speaker prejudiced against the student's will.

Meanwhile, euphemism refers to the use of a nice or pleasant term to convey a positive message. One of the goals of the euphemism technique is to conceal the truth. Hiding the truth through euphemism is substituting a term or phrase that is considered secret or publicly inaccessible for ideological or political reasons. The following are a few examples of euphemism tactics employed to hide the acts that were discovered.

T: You have spent so much money here, and you are going to spend that much money there too for the same purpose. You have to spend a lot of time on this there too. The most important thing is time. We can earn money later too. You will not return the valuable time; you have spent in this period. Still, you can think about it. So, think and make a decision.

The teacher convinced her student not to be over-ambitious and continue her study at the same institution because she has spent money for this purpose. The speaker used the sentence 'we can earn money later, too' to indicate that he and his group were speaking. The use of euphemism in this example conceals the fact that the speaker was attempting to gently display the group's authority. The speaker was trying to hide the fact that he

#### 44 *The Journal of Madhyabindu Multiple Campus, Vol. 8, No. 1, 2023*

had mistreated students verbally. The word 'we' was used to manipulate the meaning to make it appear like not only the speaker but also the speaker's group, was abused.

Euphemisms can be used to express admiration or derision. Euphemism refers to the substitution of a term or phrase for one that is thought to generate a negative response from the interlocutor, or to honor the issue under discussion. Satirizing in the sense of employing euphemisms to say something or someone indirectly or implicitly, but with a more polite word. Here is an example of admiration and derision.

S: Hmm... In Australia.

T: Oh! in Australia. Did you take your IELTS exam?

S: Yes sir.

T: How many marks did you score in IELTS?

S: Um...ha... 6.5

T: Oh! that sounds good. What is your purpose for going there? For e. g. study, work, or earn? Isn't it good to go there after completing your bachelor's level, since you have only a year for completion? I think you are a good student of Major English and you will surely complete your bachelor level within a year, won't you?

S: That's alright sir, I have passed

all the exams regularly.

T: (Interrupting) Then, you have to complete the bachelor level first and you can apply for the master level there.

This excerpt shows an example of a euphemism strategy agreeing with the student's idea and agreeing with the student at the same time "Oh! in Australia. Did you take your IELTS exam?" in a speech. This is related to the powers whose position is higher than that of the speaker so the use of this strategy is necessary. The function of the use of this euphemism is to show respect to the interlocutor "Oh, in Australia". "Oh! that sounds good" also shows how euphemism strategy is used to show respect towards the interlocutor. He could have used this sentence to show a positive response to the student. Similarly, using euphemisms to convey something or someone indirectly or implicitly is expressed as 'What is your purpose of going there? For e. g. study, work, or earn? Isn't it good to go there after completing your bachelor level, since you have only a year for completion?' is used in a bit polite manner following a convincing strategy.

Euphemism can also be used to express concern. This concern is demonstrated through the use of euphemisms to worry about societal events or phenomena. The following are some instances of satirical euphemism strategies.

T: I have provided recommendation

letters to many students but all of them strongly desire to go abroad for the first time, I find you different from others.

**S:** In fact, I want to complete my master's degree but I remember the song "Life is not what you think it ..." (Laughs)

**T: (Laughing)** But you can convince your father-in-law and mother-in-law to call him back to do something together in your hometown.

**S:** But he is not ready. He always dreams of being together and does not ready to listen to me.

The above excerpt shows an example of a euphemism strategy utilizing convincing the student as "I have provided recommendation letters to many students but all of them strongly desire to go abroad but for the first time, I find you different from others" in the conversation. The sentence is intended to soften or reduce the reality of the idea being sent to the recipient. The use of such conversation euphemistically serves to demonstrate concern which in this context, the speaker wants to show concern over the phenomenon concerning the speaker.

### **Critical Discourse Analysis of Dialogic Discourse**

Considering the euphemistic sentences and favorable conversational

description of the teacher and students' dialogic discourse, the conversation led to believe the significant ideological impact. The ideological impact can be seen in the given conversation.

**T: (Interrupting)** It would be better to go abroad after completing a bachelor's degree to join in a master's degree or after completing a master's for a Ph.D. or further research purposes. Don't you think so...? You are dropping out in the studying period... for e. g. you completed your +2 from this college, yeh... and were admitted at bachelor level, paid the first year's registration fees, participated in the first-year examination, and came to the second year, again admitted in the second year, filled final exam form of this year too. You have already paid the first- and second-year total fees. In this period, you have paid 55 to 60 thousand rupees. Now, to admit 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> years you don't need much money. Then, what will happen to going abroad after completing a bachelor's degree in two years?

In the above conversation, the teacher explains the student's situation while he asked for a recommendation letter from the college for further study. He reminded the fee structure as '...you have paid 55 to 60 thousand rupees.' This is a rhetorical strategy of convincing used for

**46 *The Journal of Madhyabindu Multiple Campus, Vol. 8, No. 1, 2023***

objectifying his ideas.

First, he states 'It would be better to go abroad after completing bachelor's degree to join in master's degree or after completing master for Ph.D. or further research purpose.' Here he attached the great significance of completing his study and tried to show his feeling through the description of the events and unprecedented occurrence 'Don't you think so?' in an interrogative tone. He also asked other questions to convince the reasons for its importance. He has made the implication or indirect assumption that these ideas are indicative of the student's betterment. To present his unfavorable ideological stance against the students, the teacher employs many compelling arguments supported by semantic devices (Degaf, 2016). Based on the critical discourse of teacher students conversation, it can be interpreted as an endeavor to achieve more power ideologically in an academic setting. More technically the positive self-representation is achieved through the ideological move of the conversation.

Afterward, the teacher stated 'You are dropping out....,' he has opted for the word 'dropout' and no other derogatory counterparts that have been used to refer to the situation of the student who is uninterested in further study at the college. The semantic features of the phrase 'would better at the beginning of the dialogue gives a euphemistic tone to create a pleasant request for a fascinating

experience. So, the teacher tried to affect the student's mental model related to a specific academic situation. However, the student also depicts the tranquil situation that shows in the following conversation.

S: It is not such a matter, in the beginning, I knew that I am going to be rejected.

T: How much did you spend on the processing till now while you were applying for abroad study? What obstacles did you bear in the time of processing and documentation? You might have spent more money applying abroad and you were rejected once but again why are you planning to go there? I mean what is the reason? Can't we do something here?

The student pointed out that she was sure that she would not get the visa and the teacher asked four questions for further information. First of all, the student used the word 'rejected' which invokes the feeling of agitation, distress, and consternation. This semantic feature courses the meaning, effect, and interpretation of the word to be derogatory and negative. To corroborate the student's argument, the teacher asked 'What obstacles did you bear in the time of processing and documentation?' The word 'obstacles' depicts the sorrowful and tranquil situation and proves the significance and undeniable situation of the student.

By making claims supported by semantic, pragmatic, and statistical facts, the teacher's dialogic discourse attempts to establish positive and negative opinions. Ingroup-outgroup, authority, comparison, euphemization, lexicalization, polarization, Positive Self-Representation, and Negative Other-Representation are all micro strategies that support the macro strategies of Positive Self-Representation and Negative Other-Representation.

Negative Other Representation's semantic technique is reinforced by derogatory discursive frameworks and lexicalization. Teachers are presented as ideologically powerful social actors or agents through the discursive semantic method of actor description. As a result, they use derogatory language to present their argument. Furthermore, lexicalization, a style-related discursive technique, is a form of negative other representation. Some lexicalization processes used in dialogic communication between teacher and student include the following:

**T:** It seems you are not willing to go there but your husband forced you to go there, isn't he?

**S:** Yes sir, I have planned to complete my master's degree here but unfortunately...

**T:** Can't you convince your husband? What is his academic qualification?

In the above dialogue, the teacher used the term 'forced' to protect his opinion. He utilized lexicalization as he said her husband forced but she was unwilling to go abroad. He did so as he wanted to give an impression of an ideologically empowered person in the institution in an attempt to persuade the student. Moreover, when the student took an interest in continuing the study, the teacher used the word 'convince' to describe the positive quality of the student. Chaerunnisa, & Dewi, (2019) mentioned that the opposing approaches to definition can also be classified as polarization because this technique characterizes people who belong to 'us' as having excellent traits and those who belong to 'them' as having negative qualities.

Furthermore, the student also used a negative other representation strategies by illustrating the example. The dialogue follows presents this situation.

**S:** My parents also have a dream of earning more money. They struggle throughout their life but they gained nothing. They always give me the example of my neighbor's son who had gone out and earned more money. My parents only blame me because I am lazy. So, I planned to go abroad.

The student elaborated on his justification for going abroad by giving illustrations or examples when he described

his compulsion of going abroad. Using such a strategy, the student illustrates how he was treated as a representative of the house. At the first glance, it does not seem to have a negative connotation, however looking at the context, he presented himself as a person who has been chosen to work for someone.

### **Conclusions**

The analysis of the dialogic discourse between the teacher and the students led to the conclusion that the dialogue utilized in the conversation was entirely purposeful. The dialogue chosen specifically fulfilled the purpose of reflecting and expressing the speaker's preferred ideology and point of view. Furthermore, the speaker intended for those words to have the ability and the desired effect on the listeners. The results show that the discourse of teacher students uses derogation and euphemism to strengthen in-group positions and ideologies as well as to downgrade or mitigate the power, authority, and strengths of the out-group members. This demonstrates the in-groups' intention to dominate and marginalize the out-groups. The teachers employ the description, number game, disclaimers, implication, norm expression, and negative lexicalization methods for derogation, whereas they employ evidentiality, and disclaimers for euphemization.

The study of the dialogic discourse utilizing van Dijk's (2004) paradigm revealed that the teachers and students

utilize various euphemisms and disparaging words. Teachers appear to utilize their ideological pinning to persuade students, but students are also forced to build positive relationships. Both the teacher and the students used good self-presentation and negative other presentations to explain their positions. However, for the most part, the teacher ideologically presented the ideas to influence the students. The most used discursive strategies in presenting the negative are implication, lexicalization, and example/illustration. In this conversation, both the teachers and students positively represented themselves. As a result, they used the divisive macro strategy of "us" vs "them."

According to the CDAs performed, the discourses depicted in dialogic discourse were appealing and propitiating or calculating certain ideologies and reinforcing specific feelings of the speaker. In the discussion under examination, discursive structures such as euphemization and derogation have been used to materialize the major ideological function of Negative other representation vs positive self-representation. Other discursive frameworks of polarization, which is a semantic approach used in assessing others, are closely linked to this dichotomy. According to the findings of the study, euphemization and derogations are exposed through methods such as actor, evidentiality, polarizations, presupposition, and propositions.

Finally, certain possible messages



have been developed through the use of derogatory and euphemistic practices. To begin with, there is a conflict of interest between teachers and other dominating groups who strive to dominate others, particularly students. Second, the method of prioritizing student persuasion is not neutral in an academic setting. Inclusion and exclusion are influenced by positive and negative self-representation. This study has provided descriptive knowledge of euphemization and derogative tactics used by teachers and students when addressing

academic issues.

The current study employs Teun van Dijk's derogation and euphemization theory, although the analysis results are still too generic in an educational environment. Furthermore, other scholars can conduct in-depth research on CDA issues like political, social, and economic issues using the same theory. Furthermore, CDA strategies reveal the discursive strategies used by teachers and students in their dialogic discourse, as well as their socio-political implications.

### References

- Billig, M. (2008). The language of critical discourse analysis: The case of nominalization. *Discourse & Society*, 19(6), 783-800. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926508095894>
- Bucholtz, M. (2001). Reflexivity and critique in discourse analysis. *Critique of Anthropology*, 21(2), 165-183. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0308275X0102100203>
- Chaerunnisa, A., & Dewi, H. D. (2019). How Duterte states his view on the Philippines and other countries relation: A discursive strategy analysis. *JEELS (Journal of English Education and Linguistics Studies)*, 6(2), 215-240. <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/8598/1baffc717059f53e507c1115d8159302cdf2.pdf>
- Degaf, A. (2016). The functions of derogation and euphemism found in Hollywood movies. <http://repository.uin-malang.ac.id/1692/2/1692.pdf>
- De Melo Resende, V. (2009). It's not a matter of inhumanity: A critical discourse analysis of an apartment building circular on homeless people. *Discourse & Society*, 20(3), 363-379. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926509102407>
- Dimulescu, C. (2009). a CA Versus a CDA approach to cross-gender talk-in-interaction. *von Kopp, B.: Texts and the Art of Translation. The Contribution of Comparative*, 2, 183. <http://webbut2.unitbv.ro/bu2009/BULETIN2009/Series%20IV/BULETIN%20IV%20PDF/Binder1.pdf#page=179>
- Fairclough, N., & Wodak, R. (1997). Critical discourse analysis. In T. van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse studies: A multidisciplinary introduction*, (pp. 258-84). Sage.
- Fairclough, N. (2014). What is CDA? Language and power twenty-five years on. *Language and Power*.
- Gee, J. P. (2005). *An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method* (2nd ed.). Routledge.

**50** *The Journal of Madhyabindu Multiple Campus, Vol. 8, No. 1, 2023*

- Hodge, B. & Kress, G. (1993), (2nd ed.). *Language as ideology*. Routledge.
- Hornby, A.S. (2004). *Oxford advanced learner's dictionary*. Oxford University Press.
- Indriana, I., & Muttaqin, W. M. (2019). Critical discourse analysis on Donald Trump's strategy against his addressee to win the US election. *IJOTL-TL: Indonesian Journal of Language Teaching and Linguistics*, 4(1), 27-38. <https://doi.org/10.30957/ijotl.v4i1.554>
- Luke, A. (2002). 5. Beyond science and ideology critique: Developments in critical discourse analysis. *Annual review of applied linguistics*, 22, 96.
- Rahimi, A., & Sahragard, R. (2007). *Critical discourse analysis*. Jungle Publications.
- Reisigl, M., & Wodak, R. (2009). The discourse-historical approach. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (2nd ed., pp. 87–121). Sage
- Richardson, J. E. (2008). Language and journalism: An expanding research agenda. *Journalism studies*, 9(2), 152-160. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14616700701848139>
- Rogers, R., & Schaenen, I. (2014). Critical discourse analysis in literacy education: A review of the literature. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 49(1), 121-143. <https://doi.org/10.1002/rrq.61>
- Sahmeni, E., & Afifah, N. (2019). Using Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) in Media Discourse Studies: Unmask the Mass Media. *REiLA: Journal of Research and Innovation in Language*, 1(2), 39-45. <https://doi.org/10.31849/reila.v1i2.2764>
- van Dijk, T. (ed.). (1997). *Discourse studies: A multidisciplinary introduction, Volume 2*. Sage.
- van Dijk, T. A. (1997). Political discourse and political cognition. Congress Paper on Political Discourse, Aston University July 1997. <http://www.let.uva.nl/~teun>
- van Dijk, T. A. (1998). Critical discourse analysis. <http://www.hum.uva.nl/teun/cda.htm>
- van Dijk, T. A. (2000). Ideology and Discourse. <http://www.discourse-in-society.org/teun.html>
- van Dijk, T. A. (2001). Discourse, ideology, and context. (Second draft, July 3, 2001). [www.hum.uva.nl/teun/cda.htm](http://www.hum.uva.nl/teun/cda.htm)
- van Dijk, T. A. (2002). The discourse knowledge interface. Paper for a book edited by Gilbert Weiss and Ruth Wodak, " Theory and interdisciplinarity in CDA".
- van Dijk, T. A. (2001). Multidisciplinary CDA: A plea for diversity. In R. Wodak & M. Meyer (Eds.), *Methods of critical discourse analysis*. Sage Publications.
- van Dijk T. A.(2004). Politics Ideology and Discourse. <http://www.discourse-in-society.org/teun.html>
- Widdowson, H. (2000). Critical practices: on representation and the interpretation of text. *Discourse and social life*, 102-120.