

DISCOURSE COMPETITION IN THE CLASSROOM: POSTSTRUCTURALISM CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS ON STUDENT'S SPEECH DURING DISCUSSION

Alfi Syahrin¹, Ida Nur'aeni², and Abdul Wahid³

¹Universitas Al-muslim, ²Universitas Tadulako, ³Universitas Muhammadiyah Makassar
Jl. Almuslim, Matangglumpangdua, Bireuen-Aceh, Indonesia
Corresponding Author: alfisyahrin745@gmail.com



Article History:

Submitted: 19 June 2021; **Revised:** 16 July 2021; **Accepted:** 29 July 2021
DOI: 10.26858/retorika.v14i2.21505



RETORIKA: Jurnal Bahasa, Sastra dan Pengajarannya under
Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License.

ISSN: 2614-2716 (cetak), ISSN: 2301-4768 (daring)
<http://ojs.unm.ac.id/retorika>

Abstract: The gender role of a person, whether male or female, depends on the cultural values that develop in the classroom. In the patriarchal class, from the start the gender roles of male students were more dominant than girls, so there was a comparison of gender roles and in turn, men were considered more powerful than women in the class. However, poststructuralism discourse analysis views men's and women's rights equally. This paper reveals that there are differences between male and female students, as seen from the results of the analysis during class discussions. Poststructuralism discourse analysis provides equal rights and research is carried out naturally, without favoritism in learning. The teacher allows the discussion to take place so that it is clear that there is no teacher domination of male and female students.

Keyword: discourse competition, discourse analysis, poststructuralism

Critical discourse analysis emphasizes the constellation of forces that occur in the process of production and reproduction of meaning. Individuals are not considered as neutral subjects and can interpret freely according to their thoughts, because they are closely related and influenced by social forces that exist in society. Language is not understood as a neutral medium that lies outside the speaker's self. In a critical view, language is understood as a representation that plays a role in shaping a particular subject with a specific goal. Therefore, discourse analysis is used to dismantle the power that exists in the language

process, the boundaries that are allowed to become discourse, the perspectives that must be used, and the topics to be discussed (Fairclough, 1995:6). Through language, social groups fight with each other and present the truth according to their version, each of which can be learned.

According to Fairclough and Wodak, critical discourse analysis sees discourse as a social form and practice. Discourse as a social practice causes a dialectical relationship between certain discourse events and the situations, institutions, and social structures that shape them. Discourse practice may represent ideology: it can produce and reproduce unequal

power relations between social classes, men and women, majority and minority groups. Through this difference, it is represented in the social position that is displayed. Through discourse, for example, in a discourse, conditions that are racist, sexist, or social life inequality are seen as common sense, natural or natural, and indeed like the reality (Badara, 2014: 28).

Critical discourse analysis considers elements of power. Darma (2009:197), the relationship between discourse and power by van Dijk, places discourse as a means of studying the role of discourse in reproduction and resistance to domination. Discourse in the form of text, conversation, or whatever is not seen as something natural, natural, and neutral, but is a form of power struggle. The concept of power in question is one of the key relationships between discourse and society. Power in relation to discourse is important to see what is called control. The form of control over discourse can vary. Control over context, which can easily be seen from who can and should speak, and who only hears and acknowledges, or who dominates and who is dominated. Apart from context, control can also be manifested in the form of controlling the structure of discourse. This can be seen from the emphasis or use of certain words.

Critical Discourse Analysis looks at the use of spoken and written language as a social practice. Social practice in CDA (critical discourse analysis) is seen as causing a dialectical relationship between certain discursive events and situations, institutions, and social structures. This concept is emphasized by Fairclough and Wodak who see that discourse practice may display ideological effects, meaning that discourse can produce unequal power relations between social classes, men and women, majority and minority groups, so that differences are represented in social practice.

Discourse analysis is widely used in various fields of science, especially social sciences, and is often used interdisciplinary. Many discourse analyzes can no longer be categorized clearly and firmly into which field of science. Analysis of the New Order discourse can be categorized at the same time in the study of the fields of history, politics, social, culture, and even social psychology, the same thing happens in the analysis of discourse on gender, gender in mass media, discourse competition in

the classroom, and others. Discourse competition in the classroom between male and female students is an assessment of spoken language, because of what is seen in the speech in the discussion. Speech is a speech from a speaker to a speech partner while communicating (Syahrin, 2018).

The study of spoken language in classroom interaction is a discourse study. In this paper, an analysis of spoken language in classroom interaction is carried out to see the dimensions of competition contained in the practice of in-class discussion. Thus, the purpose of this paper is to describe the dimensions of competition between male students and female students that occur in class.

METHOD

This study uses a qualitative descriptive research type. Descriptive research is research to collect data about an existing symptom, namely the state at the time the research was conducted. Qualitative descriptive research aims to provide an explanation of the facts that occurred. This research is related to research data that is not in the form of numbers, but in the form of a quality verbal form in the form of speech. The subject of this research is the speech of male and female students during the discussion. Data analysis in this study used the Milles & Huberman (1992:16) model which includes three things, namely (1) data reduction, (2) data presentation, and (3) verification or drawing conclusions.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Poststructuralism Discourse Analysis

Poststructuralism contains both criticism and absorption. Absorb various aspects of structural linguistics while making it a criticism that is considered capable of transcending structuralism. In short, poststructuralism rejects the idea of a stable structure that underlies meaning through binary pairs (black-and-white, good-bad). Meaning is something that is unstable, which always slips in the process, not only limited to a single word, sentence, or text but the result of the relationship between texts. Like its predecessors, it is anti-humanist in its efforts to marginalize the unified and coherent human subject as the origin of stable meaning.

Poststructuralism discourse analysis sees that language is not only a medium of expression

but can also be used as a means of exercising domination. Language is a tool for institutions to spread power. By using this analysis, it can be seen that there is a constellation of strength in the process of forming meaning reproduction.

Michael Foucault is a sociologist of the body as well as a theorist of poststructuralism. His works are closely related to poststructuralist theories to explain that socio-cultural factors are influential in defining a body with a scientific character, universal, which depends on time and place. That the natural characteristics of the body (male and female) can have different meanings in different cultural levels. As a poststructuralist Foucault is interested in the ways in which various forms of science produce ways of life. According to him, the most significant aspect of society for being modern is not the fact that society is a capitalist economy or a new form of solidarity or rational attitude, but the way in which new forms of knowledge unknown in the era of premodernity emerged that could define modern life.

Wetherell (1998) argues that the poststructuralism approach appears to harmonize CDA (critical discourse analysis) and CA (conversational analysis). He makes a case for the synthetic approach to discourse analysis, which refers to the combined strength of the interest of CA (conversational analysis) in a deeply situated nature and is caused by a psychological orientation in oral interactions, and this CDA (critical discourse analysis) or poststructuralism is more sociopolitical, concerns with the assignment of subject positions through discourse. Although some postmodernists ignore its eclecticism to theoretical limits, it contradicts the rather modernist construction of PDA (poststructuralism discourse analysis) as something akin to social learning. Wetherell emphasized that subjects have a portfolio position that they have, still available to be brought into other contexts and conversations.

Poststructuralists argue that individuals, for example, girls, boys, teachers, and researchers, as in Baxter's writings, are not uniquely positioned unity of lessons, but are produced as relationships of opposing subjectivity. Walkerdine (1990:3), in the relationship of power that is constantly changing, makes them strong and at other times may not be powerless. Thus, speech has the

potential to adopt several positions or voices that interact with their conscious and subconscious desires, pleasures, and tensions, as well as changes in discursive contexts and social relationships. Belsey (1980: 132) states that speech should be regarded as impermanent, not unified, not autonomous, but a process, constantly under construction, constantly open to change.

The speech act is an important theory for studying dialogical texts. A basic understanding of the speech act theory relates to the view that the use of language has an extra dimension that logicians and linguists avoid, namely the performative dimension (Santoso, 2012:71).

Critical Discourse Analysis: Discourse Competition in the Classroom

Class discourse is a class discourse term associated with linguistic texts. The term class discourse is often associated with language in the classroom. This is because the term also indicates the type of register, not the type of discourse so that the language in the class is identical to the classroom register. Class discourse can also be interpreted as a discourse of text communication that occurs in the classroom, where communication occurs between speakers as an interaction between students and students and students and teachers.

Differences between female students and male students in speaking in the classroom note that the definition of an effective speaker in a public context has a relationship with common sense. In this case, the question is whether a student has the ability to acquire and use communication skills that are determined nationally. Swann (1992:79-80) has criticized the latest version of Talking and Listening. The target of achievement in the National Curriculum (in Baxter, 2002) is to build communication skills as an additive competency model that "speech can add new skills or ways of speaking to the people they already have. It also implies that girls and boys will use the same way of speaking for the same effect. The communication skills approach suggests that language can somehow be handled in isolation, as the speaking skills they possess. This ignores the fact that, in expanding their way of speaking, teachers also challenge the conventional way girls and boys relate to others".

Swann commented on the importance of the interaction of four special class discourses in the discussion of educational researchers to take PDA (poststructuralism discourse analysis) both as a theoretical framework and as a research tool. Francis (1998) says that writers often fail to explain how they categorize different discourses. A brief overview is described below, but a full account of each discourse is given in Baxter (2000). After the class, it was observed that as a consequence of the intertextuality of this discourse, certain students were more likely to be formed as 'effective speech' by their teachers and classmates, while others both boys and girls were more likely to be judged ineffective.

The first, of the four class discourses, is peer agreement. The use of this as a general term for the way students' relationships are organized in terms of popularity, personal trust, physical attractiveness and sexual reputation, friendship patterns, sports skills, and so on (Francis, 1998). Peer agreement is also established with the existence of related discourse. Second, teacher approval: that is, the extent to which a teacher appears to support or privilege one student as a speaker over another. It is clear that this is not always a source of empowerment for the recipients of students' attitudes to ideas such as teacher praise, criticism, and favoritism which are always ambiguous and contradictory. Third, complex and evolving discourses are constructed by gender differentiation (Bing and Bergvall, 1998; Davies and Bank, 1992, Francis, 1998), which do not only appear to inform sensible thinking and everyday conversation. However, it is also embedded in the discursive practice class structure. The fourth discourse is one of the collaborative speech models: that is, the expectation from the teacher and from the students themselves that all speech can be assessed should be cooperative, facilitative, and honestly supportive. The dominant expectation in the British National Curriculum is that students should be taught to speak and listen in this collaborative way (Barnes et al., 1965; Swann and Graddol, 1995; Wilkinson et al., 1990). In this regard, the fifth discourse of "fair play" in-class speech (eg Jones, 1993; Swann and Graddol, 1988) appears to govern the practice of taking turns to speak in generalized contexts such as whole-class discussions. In other words, there are a number of unwritten

rules governing how classroom discussion operates, and teachers must appear to be fair when it comes to distributing speech according to the rules that apply. In short, it is a tiring mutuality between these discourses and the degree to which they alternate between girls and boys as effective or ineffective as speakers in different societal contexts.

Here the methodological analysis as an example for PDA (poststructuralism discourse analysis) is carried out at two levels, drawing upon the practice of semiotic analysis (eg Barthes, 1993). At the first level, carry out a denotative micro-analysis of two extracts from the discussion group, making close reference to the verbal and non-verbal interactions of the speech involved. This use of an oral analysis where, on its own, has several questions with the approach adopted for the data by CA (analytical analysis). In fact, the poststructuralist analysis will add to that additional, but denotative, description which aims to be a form of interpretation that involves the choice of focus, drawing certain aspects to the attention and inevitable marginalization of others. At the second level, it performs a connotative analysis of the data, which links together additional results from interviews with students, classroom teachers, and other assessors, to represent some of the contrasting and complementary perspectives of the case (Bakhtin, 1981; Linstead, 1993).

From the attached data, the authors analyzed in terms of speech and class discourse competition between male and female students. A discourse can be both a means and a medium for one group that has dominance compared to other groups. In this condition, representation becomes an important aspect. From this one student's speech data, there is another student's empathy for the activities carried out. This is a sign that students show their attention to the ideas raised by their peers in the discussion.

There is evidence to suggest that Alysia and Edo struggle to defend their views or develop points of view in a sustainable way. Between Alysia and Edo, there is a different way of expressing a different opinion, like Alysia. *"But the material of the clothes made it itchy, then it was hot, and the socks were itchy and hot. So, there are many students who are uncomfortable, in the end ... eee it turns out ... e if the socks don't wear long. But many are told*

because it's uncomfortable. Students also often take out their clothes because of the heat (Data 9)". Meanwhile, Edo "But, if we wear uniforms, we can't keep up with trends, we can't be ourselves. Besides, if we talk politely if we wear casual clothes, it can be polite. (Data 5)". Here, what seems more challenging is Alysia even though they are from the same group. Alysia's vocabulary or diction is broader than Edo's. Alysia provides a fairly detailed and effective explanation. It appears that Alysia as a woman also has the right to express her ideas and thoughts.

Meanwhile, male students, Keren and Evan, also have and persevere with their opinions, all expressions conveyed by Alysia and Edo are always rejected by them, such as the phrase conveyed by Keren *"Well, the socks are made long so that we don't get bitten by mosquitoes. , and if we fall ... what's the name, it's not easy to get hurt. And that collar, when our neck ceremony is not hot, and the hat has a symbol ... (Data 11)"* and what Evan expressed *"Yes if we wear school uniforms, we can also wear the same clothes, and clothes. the others are still hot, the collar shows more polite (Data 12)".* Then Evan reinforces Keren, as Evan said in the conversation *"Yes, if we wear school uniforms, we can also wear the same clothes, and the other clothes are still hot, right? The collar shows more politeness".* There the male students showed their masculinity in giving opinions, did not want to accept Alysia's opinion. All responses are based on existing realities, there is no discussion out of context.

The diction that Keren and Evan used in their discussion was in accordance with the context. They can provide a broader explanation without using words that deviate from the context being discussed. In view of the analyzed data used by male and female students can be said to be the same.

Based on these data, it can be seen that there are differences of opinion between male and female students. The result of the conversation occurred dominance between the two parties in the discussion, but gave opinions according to the existing reality. However, if Alysia was going to develop a reasoned case, she couldn't because Keren always challenged Evan's opinion and supported him. And vice versa, every expression expressed by Keren is always challenged and denied by Alysia and

Edo. In the discussion, Rico as the mediator or discussion guide gave and drew a conclusion so that the discussion could be more effective. Rico is able to unite two opposing thoughts, provided that there is no favoritism towards the two groups participating in the discussion.

The variations in the sociocultural conditions of students seem to be noticed by the teacher so that student activities reflect high intellectual traits. The teacher's explanation is balanced with the emphasis on certain cultures, certain lessons, certain definitions that all justify the situation, attitude, and mindset. The teacher builds his ideology with equitable speech (no favoritism). Such speech is a way to convince and pay attention to students more easily because it touches the basic layers of speech and communication more effectively.

PDA (poststructuralism discourse analysis) provides new possibilities not only for understanding how language constructs subject identity and for learning how speech is produced, negotiated, and contested in certain social contexts, but also for creating a sense of relative helplessness or weakness experienced by minority groups. PDA (poststructuralism discourse analysis) does have links and parallels between the two approaches CA (conversational analysis) and CDA (critical discourse analysis) but ultimately results in a more complex and perhaps more difficult to change social practice (Baxter, 2002).

If we have conducted a discourse analysis of discussion data using the CA (conversational analysis) method, it will depend closely on the meaning and interpretation of participants, in this case, students, teachers, and examiners. CA (conversational analysis) will tend to draw on the common sense of the narrative in the interview data, and will thus interpret the struggles experienced by participants in their own terms. In this paper, women's speech struggles may manifest conceptualizations in their own terms either as a result of injustice in teaching (favoritism) or as a result of important differences between girls and boys. CDA (critical discourse analysis) will have more in common with PDA (poststructuralism discourse analysis) in that it will tend to interpret women's speech struggles as involved in the dominant form of cultural practice. Both CDA (critical discourse analysis) and PDA (poststructuralism discourse analysis) will

recognize the systematic institutionalization of discursive school practices for men's privileges better than women's speech in public spaces. Both would also agree that it is necessary to criticize the dominant discourse on schools to expose where their practices serve to undermine certain categories of students in schools. Finally, both CDA (critical discourse analysis) and PDA (poststructuralism discourse analysis) will argue that theory and practitioners are in a position to contest and hold them back in the meaning of policy and practice.

The difference between PDA (poststructuralism discourse analysis) and CDA (critical discourse analysis) is the perception of ambiguity and power imbalance. While CDA (critical discourse analysis) is more likely to find groups identified as oppressed are clearly helpless, such as the speech of women in a patriarchal society, PDA (poststructuralism discourse analysis) is more likely to argue that developing women are located and cannot state or play a role as not. helpless, disadvantaged, or victimized. PDA (poststructuralism discourse analysis) accepts that girls can and should not adopt relatively strong positions in certain discourses and also recognizes their agency for rejecting, challenging, and potentially overturning conventional discursive practices in their position as empowered.

Based on the data that has been previously described regarding "School Uniform", there is a debate between male and female students. However, it appears in the discussion that the results of the discussion show that there is dominance between men and women. It's just that you defend your opinion based on the existing reality. This shows that male students do not always dominate women and vice versa. The discussion went well as desired by the teacher. However, it is clear that the video shows that have been transcribed into

male students' writings can always capture and provide real reasons for the speech of female students, namely Alysia and Edo.

CONCLUSIONS

Based on poststructuralism discourse analysis in class discourse competition between male and female students, it can be seen that the two genders have differences. This study looks at the discussion without the participation of the teacher, because it looks at naturalness in learning. There are a number of unwritten rules governing how classroom discussion operates, and teachers must appear to be fair when it comes to distributing speech according to the rules. In short, it is a tiring mutuality between these discourses and the extent to which they alternate between girls and boys as effective or ineffective as speakers in the context in question.

Men have more aggression than women and have higher self-confidence. So that is what makes men stand out more when discussing or giving their opinion. In high school and junior high school, women sometimes stand out, sometimes they decline. Indeed, men are bigger and stronger, but not necessarily men are smarter than women. Girls are more diligent, especially in doing tasks compared to boys. During the growth period, women experienced a decline, while men actually increased.

Based on the data analyzed, there were no hegemony practices, high authority, marginalization, and teacher domination. Maybe the teacher thinks that students are independent, have broad insights so that their abilities need to be tested by a number of rules that can actually increase student activity and creativity. Building student creativity does not always mean male students dominate female students.

REFERENCES

- Badara, Aris. 2014. *Analisis Wacana: Teori, Metode, dan Penerapannya pada Wacana Media*. Jakarta: Kencana.
- Bakhtin, M. 1981. *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. Austin: University of Texas.
- Barnes, D., Britton, J. and Rosen, H. 1965. *Language, the Learner and the School*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Baxter, J. 2000. "Teaching Girls to Speak Out: An Investigation of the Extent to Which Gender is a Pertinent Discourse for Describing and Assessing Girls' and Boys' Speech in Public Contexts". PhD thesis, The University of Reading.
- Baxter, J. 2002. *Competing discourses in the classroom: a Post-structuralist Discourse*

- Analysis of girls' and boys' speech in public contexts.* London: University of Reading.
- Belsey, C. 1980. *Critical Practice*. London: Methuen.
- Darma, Yoce Aliah. 2009. *Analisis Wacana Kritis*. Bandung: Yrama Widya.
- Eriyanto. 2011. *Analisis Wacana: pengantar analisis teks media*. Yogyakarta: LkiS Printing Cemerlang.
- Fairclough, Norman. 1998. *Language and Power*. London and New York: Logman.
- Foucault, Michael. 2002. *Power / Knowledge*. (diterjemahkan oleh Yudi Santosa). Jogjakarta: Bintang Budaya.
- Francis, B. 1998. *Power Plays: Children's Constructions of Gender, Power and Adult Work*. Stoke-on-Trent: Trentham Books.
- Fairclough, Norman. 1995. *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language*. Harlow-Essex: Longman Group Limited.
- Miles, M. B. & Huberman, A. M. 1992. *Qualitative Data Analysis*. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications. Terjemahan Tjetjep Rohendi
- Rohidi. 2014. *Analisis Data Kualitatif*. Jakarta: Universitas Indonesia.
- Santoso, Anang. 2012. *Studi Bahasa Kritis: Mengungkap Bahasa Membongkar Kuasa*. Bandung: Mandar Maju.
- Syahrin, A. 2018. Culture Repertoire in Expressive Written Language : Study of Hypothesis of Edward Sapir and Benyamin Lee Whorf. *Budapest International Research in Linguistics and Education (BirLE) Journal*. Vol.1, No 1, Page: 25-30, 2018.
- Swann, J. and Graddol, D. 1988. "Gender Inequalities in Classroom Talk". *English in Education* 22: 48–65.
- Walkerdine, V. 1990. *Schoolgirl Fictions*. London: Verso.
- Wetherell, M. 1998. *Positioning and Interpretative Repertoires: Conversation Analysis and Post-structuralism in Dialogue*. *Discourse & Society* 9: 387–412.
- <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JcKGy7JG5zQ> di akses, 01 Desember 2020.