

IDEOLOGICAL REPRESENTATION IN *KATA HARI INI DISCOURSE STRUCTURE*

Mohamad Zubad Nurul Yaqin

zubadnurul@gmail.com
Fakultas Humaniora
Universitas Islam Negeri Maulana Malik Ibrahim Malang

Abstract: This study aims to describe ideological representations in the discourse structure of *Kata Hari Ini (KHI)*. The discussion focuses on the representation of ideology in the microstructure, superstructure, and macrostructure. The main data is in the form of linguistic practices that represent ideology in the *KHI* discourse structure. The source of the data is the transcription (text) of the *KHI* discourse. Data in qualitative research with a critical discourse analysis approach were collected using documentation techniques and analyzed following the van Dijk perspective critical discourse analysis model. The results show that the *KHI* discourse has its own uniqueness, especially in terms of its structure. Findings of microstructure: certain words, sentences, and figurative language are used by communicators to convey their ideological messages. Superstructure finding: *KHI* discourse consists of three parts (beginning, middle, and end). The initial part starts with simple statements (generally in the form of conceptual ideas of an object). The middle part contains justification claims. The final part contains concluding statements. Each of these sections contains certain ideological types and patterns. Macrostructure findings: the *KHI* discourse theme represents ideology as a belief system and as a system of action. In essence, linguistic and non-linguistic aspects are used by the conveyer of the discourse as a message delivery strategy so that the message can be accepted, justified, trusted, and ultimately it is hoped that it will change public attitudes and beliefs.

Keywords: representation, ideology, discourse structure

INTRODUCTION

Kata Hari Ini (KHI) program is a form of discourse broadcast through radio. This event is one of the *Yayasan Komunikasi Bersama (YKB)* programs. The focus is on spreading the Gospel in a peaceful way using various methods that can be perceived as a blessing to society.

YKB's vision is to strive to increase the dignity of life (to educate the nation) based on Christian lifestyle and ethics. *YKB's* mission is to convey the gospel through spiritual programs based on Christian ethics, to organize Christian service courses and seminars, to organize various activities that can enhance cooperation

between churches, establishing partnerships with churches or other Christian institutions, opening opportunities for Christians to express their faith through *YKB*, as well as conducting other efforts that are not against the law and do not deviate from *YKB's* vision through the mass media (print and electronic).

In relation to *YKB's* vision and mission, it is necessary to realize that Indonesia is a country with a pluralistic society (among them in terms of religion and belief). This pluralism is legal and cannot be contested by anyone. Based on these facts, it would not be an exaggeration if the *KHI* program needed further criticism, because it was allegedly 'there

something behind something' or a 'certain ideological tendency'.

Ideology in the *KHI* program is conveyed using a certain language and with a certain delivery strategy as well (not overtly or disguised). As a result, the Indonesian people (as targets/objects) do not realize that indirectly they have been dominated, regulated, and controlled by parties producing the *KHI* discourse. Or, *KHI* events are basically a form of social practice deliberately created by *YKB* for certain ideological goals or tendencies. Thus, the language used is not only a 'tool' to explain various social realities but is also used as a 'meaning production' in accordance with the goals and interests of *YKB* parties. The use of such language according to Berger and Luckman (1976) is the main mechanism in the process of social construction, is a tool for consolidating and controlling concepts.

In a review of critical discourse, *KHI* discourse can be studied from various aspects, both linguistic and non-linguistic aspects. "What is the meaning of each linguistic aspect used in the *KHI* discourse?", "Why is this linguistic aspect used?", "What is the delivery strategy?", and various other questions that can be asked to explore various phenomena in the discourse so that the real intention (tendency ideological) can be revealed.

Based on the illustration above, it seems clear that *KHI* discourse has certain 'powers' that are unnatural and not objective (relationships that are intentionally created, social relations that are constructed from intersubjective reality). The phenomenon of using such language by Berger and Luckman (1976) is referred to as "relationships in the area of power and control (as well as other areas of social and ideological structure" (See Titcher, 2000; in Ibrahim, 2009, p. 36-39). Thus, the communication event in the *KHI* program is a phenomenon that deserves further study (criticism) because it is not only related to linguistic aspects but there are other important things that are non-linguistic (certain ideological tendencies).

The *KHI* program is structured by taking into account linguistic and non-linguistic aspects. Therefore, the *KHI* program is not only seen as a text, but is seen as a discourse because it is prepared by taking into account the aspects of cohesion, coherence, intentionality, acceptability, informativity, situationality, and intertextuality aspects. Communication events are categorized as 'discourse' if they meet these criteria (See De Beaugrande & Dressler, 1981, p.1). Or, *KHI* is categorized as a discourse because it is a communication event that includes three dimensions, namely: text (speech, linguistic characteristics of the text), discursive practice (processes related to the production and consumption of text), and social practice (more area that includes communication events) (Jorgensen & Phillips; in Ibrahim, 2010, p. 126-128). Consequently, *KHI* discourse also contributes to the construction of social identity (identity function), social relations (relational function), and systems of knowledge and meaning (ideational function) (see Fairclough, 1998).

Discourse is a text in context and as evidence that must be described empirically. Therefore, discourse should be understood as action (van Dijk, 1977). In the context of Critical Discourse Analysis, this opinion is in line with Fairclough & Wodak (1997), that Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) views discourse - the language used in speech and writing - as a form of social practice, which implies a dialectical relationship between a particular discursive event. with the situation, institution, and social structure that embodies it (discursive events are formed by or also shape the situation, institution, and social structure) (see Ibrahim, 2009, p.44). Therefore, discourse is an important part of reality, and issues of power and ideology are closely related to discourse. Or, discourse has a fundamental role in the cycle of social power reproduction (see van Dijk, 2004, p.21). Based on this concept, *KHI* programs should not only be seen as 'text', but also as 'discourse'. So, the structure of the text and the meaning of the *KHI* program is an important study and cannot be separated.

More specifically, van Dijk (1983) states that the structure of discourse is closely related to 'text, context, knowledge, and ideology'. Text and knowledge are impossible without context control, and socially relevant discourse is more ideological. Therefore, it is not enough to study discourse if it only focuses on the analysis of the text alone. This is because discourse is created because of text, context, knowledge, and ideology. These elements are important in defining coherence relations between sentences to build a global structure of meaning (macro-structure/theme) and a global structure of form (superstructure/scheme). Discourse structure shows a number of certain ideas and ideologies, or discourse is a general order (macro rule). Thus, discourse does not only reflect a particular view but also reflects a coherent view, that is, it is directed at parts of discourse that mutually support each other to describe a general theme with a specific purpose. It is for these various views that van Dijk divides discourse structures into three types, namely: micro-structure, super-structure, and macro-structure. All three are a unit that supports each other to achieve certain goals.

Microstructure is the local meaning of a text that is concrete in nature which can be observed in terms of the choice of words, sentences, and style of language used in a text (van Dijk & Kintsch, 1983, p.272). Microstructure is divided into four sides, namely: semantics, syntax, stylistics, and rhetoric (see Erianto, 2001). In critical analysis, microstructure is seen as the meaning of discourse which can be observed by analyzing the words and propositions presented (sentence structure or how opinions are conveyed). Descriptive analysis includes three aspects, namely: vocabulary, grammar, and text structure (Fairclough, 1995).

Superstructure relates to the framework of the text, how the parts of the text are arranged into a complete news/story. The superstructure is knowledge related to the content area. The elements include schematics, actors, strategies, and settings. Knowledge of these elements can help birth, remember, and reproduce the macrostructure (van Dijk, 1983, p.54).

The macrostructure is the global meaning (theme/ essence) of discourse (van Dijk & Kintsch, 1983, p.52). This meaning can be seen in terms of semantic macro structure, cognitive level, grammar-semiotic, semantic meaning, macro-action, and macro-pragmatic structure (van Dijk, 1977, p.2-5). The theme (global meaning/top level) is supported by sub-themes (sub-subtopics/lowes level). And the sub-themes are supported by a series of facts that designate and describe the theme (van Dijk, 1986, p.136). The mutually supporting subsections produce a coherent and intact text. This can be studied, for example, in terms of titles, summaries, conclusions, statements, etc., each of which cannot be separated from its constituent elements, namely: words, lines, and stanzas, or words, clauses, and sentences (v. Dijk, 1985; Bown & Yule, 1996; Haliday-Hasan, 1992; Dodjosuroto, 2006, p. 25).

Referring to the division of the discourse structure above, text, social cognition, and social context are integral parts of van Dijk's framework. In this case, van Dijk intends to connect the very microstructure (discourse) with the very macrostructure (society). The argument: (1) Models of social cognition (representations of social structures that are described socially, such as actions, interpretations, and interactions that emphasize the social and cultural organization of society as a whole); (2) Social context (what situation and how one's knowledge and opinion is conveyed); and (3) Discourse structure, linguistic aspects used as a 'tool' to influence public opinion, maintain legitimacy, create support, and marginalize other communities. These three things are intended as discourse structures that are used effectively to convey certain ideological messages. In short, behind the three discourse structures, there is ideological information (knowledge and belief) (see Resnick in van Dijk, tt,c, p.14).

In relation to the *KHI* discourse, the existence of this structure is an important study because all three

is a unit that supports each other to achieve certain goals (ideological tendencies) that are expected by the parties producing the *KHI* discourse. The study of this structure can assist researchers in answering the research focus so that an overall description and explanation of *KHI* discourse (language and non-linguistic aspects) can be obtained.

The main characteristics of the *KHI* discourse are

- (1) Reflecting on a word that is scientifically discussed, brief, and interesting to hear;
- (2) The contents are very general in nature but are always oriented towards a pattern of life that is based on Christian ethics so that it can inspire fans to change their behavior;
- (3) Having a unique discourse structure;
- (4) Using a certain message delivery strategy; and
- (5) Prepared by taking into account the aspects of cohesion, coherence, specificity of diction, specificity of sentences, and peculiarity of language style. These various phenomena are interesting to study further, especially those related to ideological tendencies in them. This research was also conducted on these various considerations.

Based on the background above, the research discussion is focused on ideological representation in the *KHI* discourse structure. The general objective is to obtain descriptions, interpretations, clarifications, and explanations about ideological representations in the *KHI* discourse structure. The specific objective is to obtain descriptions, interpretations, clarifications, and explanations about ideological representations in the micro-structure (choice of words, choice of sentences, and choice of figurative language), super-structure (scheme), and macro-structure (theme).

RESEARCH METHOD

This study uses a qualitative approach because it examines communication events that include linguistic and non-linguistic aspects (ideology). The analysis utilizes van Dijk's perspective of critical discourse analysis which focuses on the existence of ideology in the structure of discourse (macro-structure, super-structure, and micro-structure). To sharpen the analysis, the theory of AWK Foucault, Fairclough, and Wodak is also utilized. A qualitative approach to this type of critical discourse analysis is used to describe,

interpret, and explain ideological representations in the *KHI* discourse structure.

The main data is in the form of linguistic practices (choice of words, choices of sentences, choices of language styles, schemes, and themes) which represent ideology in the *KHI* discourse structure. The *KHI* program was broadcast via radio which was recorded and transcribed by the researcher. So, the source of the data is in the form of transcripts (documents/texts) of *KHI* discourse which represents an ideology.

In an effort to facilitate data collection, the researcher (main instrument) equipped himself with supporting instruments in the form of tape records and data collection guides. To support accuracy in data analysis and interpretation, researchers equipped themselves with analysis charts.

Data was collected using documentation techniques by utilizing existing instruments. The document in question is in the form of written material (*KHI* text) which was not specially prepared at the request of the researcher. The stages of data collection are routine listening and recording of *KHI* broadcasts, listening to and transcribing recordings of *KHI* programs, and collecting various information related to research data. In addition, researchers also communicate with *YKB* to gain as much information as possible for research purposes.

In principle, each data is collected, classified, and analyzed according to the research focus. The technique is to collect, classify, and then analyze the data in terms of ideological representation in the *KHI* discourse structure, and then a pattern of ideological representation will appear in each discourse structure. Data verification is carried out by utilizing the triangulation technique with language experts and people who are competent with the *YKB* program.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The results of the research show that the discourse structure of *KHI* (microstructure, superstructure, and macrostructure) represents a certain ideology.

Ideological Representation in KHI Discourse Microstructure

Ideological representation in the *KHI* discourse microstructure includes word choice, sentence choice, and ideological representation in figurative language.

Ideology Representation in Word Choice

At the level of word usage, the element that appears (most dominant) is the use of the word persona (found in almost all parts of the discourse), namely the words sibling, we, he, you, and they. Also used are the words human, Indonesian, citizen, and society (variations of our words) as well as the words state, government, and organizers (variations of their words). These words were deliberately chosen (used) as a communication strategy, namely as a tool to show the position of the speaker in the public eye.

The words *saudara* and *anda* are generally used to initiate communication, convey information in the form of conceptual ideas, convey information as well as clarification on a matter, and are used by conveyers when they want to advise and at the same time persuade the public (related to attitudes and beliefs). In particular, the word *saudara* is deliberately used to establish familiarity with the public in order to create an equal position (no distance or difference in social level). Presenters of discourse generally use the word *saudara* when they want to convey ideas that are not controversial (ideas already understood by the public) and when they want to present themes (topics) that require resolution.

The word *kita* is used by the speaker in the context of wanting to convey something related to beliefs, plans, moods, attitudes, hopes, invitations, and calls. In addition, it is used in the context of wanting to provide information about something that is common and whose truth is beyond doubt, providing information as well as clarification about something, and when wanting to advise and at the same time want to persuade the public about something related to attitudes or beliefs. The use of the word *kita* results in not having a dichotomous appearance between himself and the public (thus intending to create a community between himself with the public)

so that something that becomes the idea of the speaker is also expected to become the idea of the public. At least, the public is involved in the thought process so they want to accept or reject the information conveyed. The words *manusia*, *masyarakat*, *warga negara*, *Indonesia*, and the word *negara Indonesia* are also used to mean the same thing as *kita*. The difference is, these words are used more flexibly (applies to all humans in this world).

The words *ia* and *dia* are mainly used in statements that contain examples of various factual phenomena related to the topic being discussed (as justifying claims). The words contained in almost all parts of the discourse are used with the aim of creating harmonious communication. These words are generally used to convey information, advise, and persuade the public which is done indirectly (through examples regarding the good and bad of human behavior and its impacts). This is a message delivery strategy, namely so that there is no impression of a dichotomy between the speaker and the public so that his position as the person who dominates the communication is still viewed favorably by the public, and so that he is more flexible in conveying his ideological messages.

The word *mereka* is used in the context of wanting to provide information, advise, and persuade the public in an indirect way (through examples or generalization techniques) as *ia* or *dia* said. The words *pemerintah* and *penyelenggara negara* are also used for the same purpose as the word *mereka*. The difference, the word *pemerintah* and *penyelenggara negara*, is more flexible, that is, it can be used for all governments around the world. Discourse presenters use the word *pemerintah* when expressing attitudes, appeals, and hopes as an effort to persuade the public. In particular, the word *pemerintah* is used by the speaker when conveying information related to law, state administration, public services, and protection. With the word *pemerintah* or the word

penyelenggara negara), the presenter of the discourse seems to want to place himself as the party responsible for the ongoing administration (as if he were in the position of government).

In short, the various persona words above are a message delivery strategy so that the message is acceptable, trustworthy, and justifiable, and ultimately it is hoped that the public will change attitudes and actions in accordance with the expectations of the speaker. Thus, it is clear that the choice (use) of these words has an ideological tendency. This is proof that the vocabulary aspect is not merely a technical issue but an ideological practice. The choice of words in a text marks socially and ideologically different areas of experience of the author (see Fairclough, 1995).

Ideological Representation in Sentence Choices

KHI discourse is expressed in the form of a series of sentences. Based on the purpose, sentences are expressed in the form of declarative sentences, questions, invitations, exclamations, and sentences of hope. Based on the structure, in the form of active sentences and passive sentences. Each type of sentence has ideological tendencies.

Declarative sentence (news), is a sentence whose contents tell something. The types are inverse news sentences, active news sentences, passive news sentences, etc. In *KHI* discourse, various types of news sentences are used for specific purposes (ideological tendencies), namely persuading the public to form mindsets, behaviors, and beliefs.

Interrogative sentence is a sentence whose contents ask for something, someone, a situation, or a problem. The question sentence is generally accompanied by an answer. This is a strategy to maintain the position of the presenter of the *KHI* discourse as a person who dominates communication in conveying his ideological messages. With interrogative sentences, indirectly the public is conditioned to always play an active role (always involved) in ongoing communication practices.

Invitation sentences are sentences whose contents invite the public (actions, thoughts, and attitudes). Visible nuance

is "togetherness" (the speaker wants to distance himself from the public). So, the formulation of the solicitation sentence in the *KHI* discourse does not feel forced (what is required is awareness). In order for his invitation to be accepted, this sentence is usually preceded or followed by a rationalization that is adapted to the conditions (mindset) of the public.

Imperative sentence is a sentence that contains an order to do something (the public is expected to make an appeal or something ordered, either in the form of an action or attitude). So, it seems that there is a distance (difference) between *KHI*'s conveyer of discourse and the public (discourse presenter indirectly shows his position as an actor who dominates communication events).

Hopeful sentences are sentences whose contents expect the public to be able to take actions or attitudes in accordance with the wishes of the conveyer of the discourse. If the exclamation sentence has the nuances of 'top-down', then the sentence of hope has the nuance of 'equality'. This sentence is used when the presenter of the *KHI* discourse feels that he does not have the authority to impose his will (what he wants). Instead, accept or reject being a public authority.

Passive sentences are sentences that have a subject (S), a predicate (P), and an object (O). If the subject in an active sentence is used as an object, it will become a passive sentence. In the perspective of critical discourse, the active-passiveness of sentences is not only studied based on its grammar but rather it is seen that there is 'something' (ideological exposure) that one wants to show to the public, especially the ideology of power (some are in charge and some are being ordered, some are advising and some are being advised, etc.). The strategy is by eliminating (omitting) the actor or subject in the passive voice (this is a strategy for marginalizing a community so that the image of the actor remains good in the public eye). Actors as people who regulate, dominate, dictate, etc. not raised by the speaker. It is clear that changing active sentences into passive sentences is not only related to the problem of whether or not it is easy to read or understand but indirectly there is manipulation (see Fowler, 1996).

Active sentences are sentences that have a subject (S), predicate (P), and object (O). Generally, the subject in this sentence plays an active role (does something). That is, the actor appears to dominate (as a subject capable of defining an event or a certain group) in the communication event. van Dijk calls it a top-down interaction, namely an interaction constructed by actors (actors) to build their self-image as dominators (controllers, advisers, etc.) in every communication event. In this 'top-down' interaction it will never be found that the actor (perpetrator) is in a position as a dominated person. This is in line with Fairclough (1998), who focuses on the type of grammar chosen and the actors who dominate an event. Disclosure of a social reality usually becomes a different choice in the grammatical process and participant forms that have been constructed ideologically significant. Because it is one-way (top-down), it is certain that there is construction activity on something, namely 'something' is constructed by the actor (S) to build his self-image as 'the person who dominates'.

Based on the description above, it can be emphasized that various types of sentences in *KHI* discourse are used for certain purposes (ideological tendencies). Sentences are the smallest part of discourse created by individuals (certain communities) and with a specific purpose as well. Ideas and outlooks on life are constructed under certain conditions so as to persuade the public to shape the mindset, behavior, and beliefs of a person/a community (see Foucault, 1997). So, sentences in *KHI* discourse are not only seen from a practical point of view but there is information with certain ideological content related to power. Of course, this is a conscious, planned, and deliberate effort by the speaker to maintain his position, so that his image remains good in the eyes of the public.

Ideology Representation in Language Style

Certain language styles are used by the speaker when he wants to deliver

certain emphasis so that the public can understand the message effectively. The language styles in *KHI* discourse are in the form of euphemism, pleonasm, simile,

paradox, hyperbole, parallelism, and repetition.

The language style of euphemism is the conveyance of ideas which is done by choosing words (terms) with polite connotations (fun and not offensive), as a strategy to maintain the position of the speaker of the discourse as a communication controller (this strategy is deliberately disguised). As a result, the public is not aware of it and does not think negatively (for example, they feel that they are being patronized, they feel that they are considered as people who lack knowledge, etc.).

Pleonasm language style, is the conveyance of ideas which is done by choosing words (terms) with polite connotations (fun and not offensive) with the intention of highlighting certain parts that are considered important so that the public pays special attention to something that is considered important. In practice, by repeating the same meaning (almost the same) with different words with the aim that in public there is a feeling of 'no distance' (not being seen as another person) and 'positive thoughts arise' (for example, the public will judge the speaker discourse as a person who is clever in choosing words, polite, and skilled in language).

Simile language style is conveying messages by choosing words or terms with the intention of comparing 'something' with 'something else' which is considered to have something in common so that the public can understand and at the same time want to pay attention to the message being conveyed. This method feels easy to understand and attracts attention when something used for comparison has become an issue or public opinion.

Paradoxical language style is the delivery of messages that are carried out by choosing certain words/terms with the intention of contrasting two things that are considered to have differences so that the public is always involved in the reasoning patterned by the speaker so that the message expressed gets public justification. The public is given the freedom to

think (accept or reject) the message.

Hyperbolic language style is conveying a message by choosing certain words that are considered to have 'more nuance' than the existing reality so that the public can understand and at the same time want to pay more serious attention to the message. In essence, the presenter of the *KHI* discourse wants to produce certain effects, including increasing the motivation of the public to always be involved in communication events.

Parallelism style is conveying ideas by choosing words that have parallel forms (words, groups of words, or clauses) to emphasize messages in *KHI* discourse. This 'emphasis' can have a certain effect on communication events. At the very least, the public is expected to be more motivated, more interested, more serious, and easier to understand the messages conveyed.

Repetitive language style is conveying messages by repeating certain linguistic elements (words, groups of words, clauses) because it is necessary to get emphasis. Its use is most dominant in *KHI* discourse (the words *we*, *brothers*, *he*, *humans*, *people* and words used as discourse titles). This 'emphasis' indicates that the speaker is very serious in conveying his ideological message. Or, the 'message' conveyed is seen as an important thing that must be known, must be accepted, must be believed, and must be justified by the public.

Based on the description above, it can be emphasized that *KHI* is a discourse that is prepared in earnest (not haphazardly) planning, especially its linguistic aspects (vocabulary, sentences, and style of language). This aspect of language is deliberately used as a message delivery strategy so that the message is acceptable, trustworthy, justifiable, and ultimately expected to change public attitudes and beliefs. The use of these linguistic aspects is a conscious effort of the speaker to create good cooperation in events

communication (as a strategy to maintain his position or image in the public eye). So, the linguistic aspect has a certain ideological tendency, as an effort to preserve its power and ideology. This is proof that language does have power (see Fairclough, 1989). Word choice is an

important instrument for the mass media in conveying information to the public (see Fairclough, 1995).

Ideology Representation in *KHI* Super Discourse Structure

Superstructure relates to the framework of the text (which is knowledge of the content area), namely how the parts are arranged into a complete news or story. The elements include schematic, actor, strategy, and setting.

The results of the analysis show that the *KHI* discourse scheme consists of three parts, namely: the beginning, the middle, and the end. In the beginning, start with simple statements

(explanation/application/idealization of ideas) which are generally in the form of conceptual ideas about an object. The middle section contains a more detailed description (generally by presenting factual data) as a justification claim for the ideas presented in the first section. Justification claims are made by submitting rationalizations, proving effects and impacts, and or other justification devices. The last part contains statements as a conclusion. In addition, each part of the *KHI* discourse contains exposure to certain ideologies and certain ideological exposure patterns as well, namely: ideology as a system of thought (sP), ideology as a system of action (sT), and ideology as a system of beliefs (sK). The pattern of exposure to ideology: pattern one, in the early and middle parts, contains exposure to ideology as a system of thought and the final part contains exposure to ideology as a system of action (sP-sP-sT); and pattern two, in the initial part containing exposure to ideology as a system of thought, and in the middle and end containing exposure to ideology as a system of action (sP-sT-sT).

From these findings, it can be emphasized that the *KHI* discourse was prepared in earnest (planned) and had a certain ideological tendency. It is said so because

there is uniformity in the pattern of ideological exposure in each of its superstructures. With these tendencies, it indirectly indicates that there are attempts to dominate (marginalize, dominate, etc.) certain groups (the public). Through the access they control (radio media), presenters of discourse are able to freely show, dramatize, and popularize a series of social, cultural, and whatever fragments are considered to support or preserve their ideology (see Williams, 1985, p.153). This shows that the *KHI* discourse is a form of 'social understanding and commitment', 'as a thought and perspective', as well as 'thoughts and actions'. Ideology in the *KHI* discourse creates a map of individuals or groups (public) thinking on how they should condition themselves in a certain social environment. Thus, ideology in the *KHI* discourse becomes a formulation of guidelines for public behavior and at the same time becomes a standard for the public to evaluate this behavior (see Nurdyana, 2007, p.28).

The series of ideological ideas in each part of the *KHI* discourse is of course not an ideological practice that appears suddenly (unintentionally), but is intentional. In critical discourse theory, this phenomenon is evidence that *KHI* discourse is never separated from certain interests (the inculcation of certain ideologies) from parties interested in it. In other words, in a discourse, there must be 'something behind something'.

Ideological Representation in *KHI* Discourse Macro Structure

The theme is the main idea (main thought) of the discourse (Djojuroto, 2006, p.24). The theme is the basic idea and the main purpose of writing a text (Prodokusumo, 2005, p.37). Various ways can be done in the formulation and meaning, and the formulation and meaning differ from one analyzer to another.

Knowledge of superstructure forms can help give birth, remember, and reproduce macro structures (van Dijk, 1983, p.54). The macrostructures consist of a global structure of meaning (theme/macro) and a global structure of form (superstructure/scheme). So, the macrostructure can be known after analyzing the superstructure (van Dijk, 2004,

p.1).

The results show that the exposure of ideology in the theme of the *KHI* discourse is in the form of 'ideology as a belief system' and 'ideology as a system of action'. Thus, the ideological tendency in the theme of the *KHI* discourse is to invite (intentionally and seriously planned) individuals or society (the public) to believe and behave as expected by the presenter of the discourse (*YKB*). In addition, each paragraph in all *KHI* discourses has one main idea (sub-theme) whose existence is supported by justifying claims so as to produce a coherent and intact text. This series of facts cannot be separated from the various constituent elements, namely: words and sentences in the discourse (see van Dijk, 1985; Haliday, 1992, Bown & Yule 1996; Dojosuroto, 2006, p.25).

CONCLUSION

KHI discourse has its own uniqueness, especially in terms of its structure, which always has a certain ideological tendency. In the microstructure, there are word choices, sentence choices, and certain language style choices that are used as a strategy to convey ideological messages. In the superstructure, *KHI* discourse consists of three parts, namely: the initial part (starting with simple statements which are generally in the form of conceptual ideas of an object), in the middle (containing a more detailed elaboration as justifying claims, generally by presenting factual data about the ideas presented at the beginning), as well as at the end (containing concluding statements). In the macrostructure, ideological tendencies in the *KHI* discourse theme are in the form of ideology as a system of beliefs and ideology as a system of action. Or, inviting (deliberately and plannedly) individuals or society (the public) to believe and behave as expected by the presenter of the discourse (*YKB*). Existence of structure

The *KHI* discourse (with various phenomena in it) is deliberately packaged in such a way that the ideological messages conveyed can be justified, trusted, acceptable, and ultimately it is hoped that they will change public attitudes and beliefs.

In this regard, this research can be utilized, both theoretically and practically. Theoretically, it can be an enrichment for existing discursive theories, especially those related to the existence of ideology within the discourse

structure. Practically, it can be used for a variety of purposes, namely: it can be used as input for lecturers or language teachers in discourse learning interactions, material for consideration for compilers of ideologically inclined discursive books (discourse learning, speeches, sermons, etc.), and can be used as material consideration for the speaker (preacher, priest, preacher, etc.) in planning, compiling, and conveying ideology in his lecture.

REFERENCES

- Brown G, Yule G. (1983). *Discourse Analysis*. Translated by Soetikno. 1996. Jakarta: Gramedia Pustaka Utama.
- Djojuroto, Kinayati. (2006). *Pengajaran puisi: Analisis dan Pemahaman*. Bandung: Nuansa
- Djojuroto, Kinayati. (2006). *Analisis Teks Sastra dan Pengajarannya*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka
- Eriyanto. (2001). *Analisis Wacana: Pengantar Analisis Teks Media*. Yogyakarta: Yokyakarta LKIS.
- Fairclough, Norman. (2005). *Analysing Discourse, Textual Analysis for Social Research*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Fairclough, Norman dan Wodak, Ruth. (1997). "Critical Discourse Analysis" Dalam Teun A. Van Dijk (ed.). *Discourse as Social Interaction: Discourse Studies A Multidisciplinary Introduction*. Vol. 2. London: Sage Publication.
- Fairclough, Norman. (1995). *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language*. New York: Longman Publishing.
- Fairclough, Norman. (1995). *Media Discourse*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Fairclough, Norman. (Ed). (1992). *Critical Language Awareness*. New York: Longman Publishing. Translated by Hartono. (1995). *Kesadaran Bahasa Kritis*. Semarang: IKIP Semarang Press.
- Fairclough, Norman. (1989). *Language and Power*. England: Longman Group UK. Translated by Rohmani Indah. (2003). *Relasi Bahasa, Kekuasaan dan Ideologi*. Boyan Publishing. Malang.
- Foucault, Michael. (2002). *Power of Knowledge*. Translated by Udi Santoso. Yogyakarta: Bentang.
- Haliday, MAK. (1992). *Language as Social Semiotic, The Social Interpretation of Language and Meaning*. London: The Open University Set Book.
- Jorgensen, Marianne W dan Louise J. Phillips. *Analisis Wacana: Teori dan Metode*. Translated by Imam Suyitno, et al. (Editor: Abdul Syukur Ibrahim). (2010). Surabaya: Pustaka Pelajar.
- Pradotokusumo, Partini Sardjono. (2005). *Pengkajian Sastra*. Jakarta: Gramedia Pustaka Utama

- Titscher, Stefan dkk. (Tanpa tahun). *Metode Analisis Teks dan Wacana*. Translated by Abdul Syukur Gazali, et al. (Editor: Abdul Syukur Ibrahim). 2009. Surabaya: Pustaka Pelajar.
- van Dijk, Teun A. (2004). *Ideology and Discourse: A Multidisciplinary Introduction*. Barcelona: Universitas Pompeu Fabra,
- van Dijk, Teun A. (2004). *From Text Grammar to Critical Discourse Analysis A Brief Academic Autobiography*. Barcelona: Universitas Pompeu Fabra <http://www.discoursees.org>
- van Dijk, Teun A. (1998). *Ideology: A Multidisciplinary Study*. London: Sage Publication.
- van Dijk, Teun A. (1997). *Sentence Topic and Discourse Topic*. <http://www.discoursees.org>.
- van Dijk, Teun A. (1997). *Pragmatic Macro-structures in Discourse and Cognition*. <http://www.discoursees.org>.
- van Dijk, Teun A. (1986). *Text and Context: Explanation in the Semantics and Pragmatics of Discourse*. New York: Longman
- van Dijk, Teun A. (1985). *Handbook of Discourse Analysis, Vol. 2 Dimension of Discourse*. New York: Academic Press
- van Dijk, Teun A. dan Walter Knitsch. (1983). *Strategies of Discourse Comprehension*. New York: Academic Press.
- Williams, Raymond. (1985). *Keywords: A Vocabulary of Culture and Society*. Revised edition. New York: Oxford University Press.