



Discourse War on People's Welfare: Pros and Cons of Political Parties Against the Ratification of UU Cipta Kerja in Virtual Space

Cosmas Gatot Haryono^(✉) and Linna Friska Marbun

Departement of Communication Sciences, Bunda Mulia University, Jakarta, Indonesia
cgharyono@gmail.com

Abstract. The ratification of UU Cipta Kerja has split Indonesian society between the pros and cons of the Law. Many politicians convey their rhetoric and discourse to the public through various forms of media. There are two interesting political views, namely the views of Agus Harimurti Yudoyono (Chairman of the Democratic Party) and Airlangga Hartarto (Chairman of the Golkar Party). Both represent groups who are for and against the passage of this law. The researcher is interested in exploring how the discourse developed by the two national political figures using Van Dijk's critical discourse analysis which is part of the qualitative research method. The results show that both political figures on both sides build the impression that they are on the side of the people. Both parties act on behalf of the people's interests by claiming to be the parties who defend people and involved in the "war on people's welfare" through their political views in the media. So, the researchers suggest to the public that intelligent people "read" the political messages of politicians and do not let the people only be used for the interests of politicians.

Keywords: Critical Discourse Analysis · Political parties · UU Cipta Kerja

1 Introduction

October 5, 2020 became a historic day for the Indonesian because on that day the Omnibus Law Draft or the Job Creation Bill became law by the House of Representatives (DPR) in the first session of the DPR Plenary Meeting for the 2020–2021 period. In the trial which was marked by the drama "walk out" from the Democratic Party faction, seven of the nine political parties expressed support and the remaining 2 political parties rejected the ratification of the Job Creation Bill at the Plenary Meeting, namely the PKS party and the Democratic Party. Although it is called the Employment Goals Act or also often referred to as the Omnibus Law itself, it does not only regulate employment issues. It regulates a number of problems in Indonesia. Some of the issues regulated in it and highlighted by the public include: halal products, nuclear power, patent rights, immigration, spatial planning, customary rights, and others.

© The Author(s) 2023

S. Rochmat et al. (Eds.): AREISSH 2021, ASSEHR 681, pp. 22–33, 2023.

https://doi.org/10.2991/978-2-494069-17-6_4

The Omnibus Law itself departs from President Jokowi's concern about so many regulations that make the management of the State too bureaucratic. The Omnibus Law was initiated by the Government to simplify the existing laws and regulations in Indonesia which are hyper-regulated and lead to smooth investment in Indonesia [1]. Jokowi said that Indonesia has around 8,451 central regulations and 15,985 regional regulations which have caused the government and business world to be less agile because of bureaucratization [2]. The spirit of the Omnibus Law is to cut, organize and harmonize the law so that the "chaos" and overlapping regulations that hinder investment and the movement of the economy can be overcome.

The ratification of the Job Creation Bill immediately reaped various rejections from various circles of society. Starting from the analysis, opinions, discourses and demonstrations, both the pros and cons of the ratification of the Job Creation Act, quickly adorned the mass media. So it is not surprising that the wave of public rejection of the Omnibus Law of the Job Creation Law which has just been passed is so large in the public sphere. Civil society and students called for a vote of no confidence against the DPR and the government through social media. The labor group resisted by holding a strike. Various major cities in Indonesia, namely Jakarta, Makassar, Surabaya, Yogyakarta and Medan simultaneously on October 8, 2020 held demonstrations against the Omnibus Law of the Job Creation Law.

The mass actions of students, workers, and the public protested the approval of the Job Creation Bill which was deemed not pro-poor and on the other hand, provided too much "convenience" for investors or investors. The demonstrators are concerned that the job creation law will harm workers' rights, increasing deforestation in Indonesia because it is felt that it can reduce environmental protection. They demanded that the government revoke the Job Creation Act for the sake of the people's welfare. Not a few of these demonstrations were colored by clashes, riots and acts of vandalism (damaging and burning public facilities).

According to Fathimah Fildzah Izzati (LIPI), the ratification of the Job Creation Law will reduce the level of public trust in parties, the DPR and government institutions with the passage of the Job Creation Act. Moreover, political parties whose public trust has been eroded, increasingly eroded [3]. Furthermore, Fildzah also considered that the political parties affected were not only those who supported it. But even two parties that refuse can be dragged away. The reason is that the party seems to be just making a gimmick in front of the public. Not making the job creation bill their main agenda. These parties are considered only playing in a gray area. On the other hand, not a few parties welcomed and agreed to the ratification of the Omnibus Law. They think that the ratification of the Job Creation Law will ensure ease of investment and the creation of job opportunities. Simplification of rules will make industry and investment develop rapidly. The end of it all is the creation of people's welfare.

It is interesting to see how they use various issues related to the interests of the people as an echoed discourse. Even though their positions are opposite, but they (both pro and contra) feel that they are both on behalf of the people. They both feel that they are fighting for the benefit of society, through their respective attitudes. Several national figures always appear in the mass media with this discourse. Starting from NGO groups,

academics, political observers, to politicians and heads of political parties. They do war of discourse in virtual space.

Researchers are very interested in researching this matter by using Van Dijk's discourse analysis to see the message structure and discourse behind the political views, both pro and con of the Job Creation Law. In this case, the researcher chose two party leaders, namely the General Chairperson of the Golkar Party (Erlangga Hartanto) who was pro with the Job Creation Law and the Democratic Party Chairperson (Agus Harimurti Yudoyono) who was against the Job Creation Act. The two parties (Golkar and Demokrat) represented a "big vote" for and against. Golkar, as a party member of the Jokowi government coalition, has always consistently supported the ratification of the law. Through the general chairman, who is also the Coordinating Minister for the Economy, he always emphasizes the benefits that will be obtained by the community with the enactment of the Job Creation Law. Meanwhile, the Partai Demokrat and PKS have always consistently rejected the Job Creation Act. This party always provides arguments that highlight the losses that will be suffered by the people as a result of the ratification of the Act.

By looking at the two parties representing the pros and cons, it is hoped that the strongest will be how the people are always used for political purposes. The people are always used to achieve the political goals of political parties. Thus, the public can be made aware not to get involved in the discourses that are deliberately developed by politicians. People can be "literate" in politics so that they are not always used or exploited for the benefit of politicians.

2 Research Method

This study uses a critical paradigm, which in science is placed on the epistemology of Marxism criticism in its research [4]. The critical paradigm sees the real world as an illusion. The reality we currently live in is not the true reality; rather, it is the product of many structures made by the persons concerned. The critical paradigm tries to define social science as a process that critically seeks to uncover the real structures of illusions, false needs that appear from the material world with the aim of forming a social awareness in order to improve and change the conditions of human life [5].

The method used in this research is Van Dijk critical discourse analysis. Through this critical discourse analysis, the researcher wants to explore how the discourse structure is built through the attitudes of politicians towards the UU Cipta kerja. As is well known, to perform empirical research on the connections between discourse and social and cultural development in various social domains, critical discourse analysis offers ideas and methodologies [6]. Critical discourse analysis tends to only describe the structure of a discourse and explore the reasons why a discourse has a certain structure, which will ultimately lead to an analysis of social relations between the parties included in the discourse [7].

According to Van Dijk, exploring a discourse based solely on text analysis is not enough, because basically text is only the result of a production practice [8]. So, what is no less important is to observe how a text is produced [9]. The process of text production always involves a process known as social cognition [10]. The text is formed in a discourse practice, namely the practice of discourse. Here there are two parts, namely

the micro text that represents a problem topic in the news, and the large element in the form of social structure [6, 11].

Van Dijk makes a bridge that connects the large elements in the form of social structures with micro discourse elements with a dimension called social cognition [12, 13]. Social cognition itself has two meanings: on the one hand, he shows how the process of the text is produced by the media; and on the other hand he describes the values of the community that are spread and absorbed by communicators and finally used to construct the text [14, 15]. The social structure, dominance, and power groups that exist in society and how cognition/thought and awareness play a very important role in shaping and influencing media texts [16].

The choice and use of certain words, sentences, or styles is not only seen as a way of communicating, but as a communication politics [17]. Elections are a tool to sway public opinion, build support, boost legitimacy, and get rid of rivals or opponents. Discourse structure is a useful tool for understanding the rhetorical and persuasion techniques used while communicating a message [18].

Van Dijk divides the structure of the text into three levels, namely the macro structure, superstructure, and micro structure. The framework is often understood as an analysis at the level of text, social cognition, and social context [19]. Macro structure is the general meaning of a text that can be observed by looking at the topic or theme that is put forward in a news story. Van Dijk calls this structure a "semantic macrostructure" which is the global meaning of a discourse.

Superstructure is a discourse structure that relates to the framework or scheme of a text and how the parts of the text are arranged into the news as a whole. This structure is used to organize topics by arranging sentences or news units based on the desired order or hierarchy. Superstructure is usually easily seen from how the story line or how the texts are told. While the microstructure is the meaning of discourse that can be observed from a small part of a text, namely words, sentences, paraphrases and others. Microstructure is a local meaning that can be obtained by looking at several important elements used in the text, such as: syntactic, semantic, lexicon, and rhetorical aspects. The three structures are an integral unit that cannot be separated when analysing the text. All these elements are interconnected and mutually support each other [6].

3 Result and Discussion

This study analyzes the attitudes of the General Chairperson of the Democratic Party, Agus Harimurti Yudhoyono (AHY) and the Chairperson of the Golkar Party, who also serves as Coordinating Minister for the Economy, Airlangga Hartarto. First of all, it must be understood that actually both of them express their views regarding the UU Ciptakerja through different media. AHY uses Twitter as a medium to express his views (13 October 2020); Meanwhile, Airlangga Hartarto uses television media in the Rosi Talkshow program on Kompas TV (11 October 2020). Even though it was carried out through two different media, it is very clear that each party tried to convince the public or lead public opinion to justify their attitude. Table 1 is a table of analysis that the researchers conducted on the views of each character.

From the Table 1, it appears that at the macro level of AHY's statement, it appears that he is trying to take advantage of the "information chaos" atmosphere that has colored

Table 1. Analysis of Teun Van Dijk's Critical Discourse on the Views of Agus Hari Murti Yodoyono (AHY)

No	Discourse Structure	Element	Analysis
1	Macro Structure	<i>Thematic:</i> Theme/to pic	Disinformation of the Draft UU Ciptakerja circulating in the community causes "chaos"
2	Superstructure	<i>Schematic:</i> Scheme	The title summarizes the entire content: "Information Chaos in the community due to the Unclearness of the Final Draft of UU Ciptakerja" The twitter begins with an introduction leading readers to disinformation about the job creation bill that has created a hoax war. The contents describe the intelligence of today's society, the importance of democracy and the denial that AHY masterminded the Copyright Act demo. Even though it is against the government, the attitude of the Democratic Party is based on the interests of the people, nation and state. Closed is the appeal for the community to express their aspirations in an orderly manner, encouraging the government to listen to the aspirations of the community through dialogue efforts because the goal is the same, namely realizing equitable economic growth.
3	Micro Structure	<i>Semantics:</i> Setting, Detail, Intent, Presumption, Nominalization	The background element discusses disinformation that causes chaos in society. The Detail element discusses the lack of communication efforts from the government and the many hoaxes that have emerged in the community regarding the UU Ciptaker, including the hoax that AHY was the mastermind behind the UU Citaker demonstration. The element of the intent of this tweet is that the Democratic Party denies that AHY is the director behind the UU Ciptaker demonstration. The presupposition element explains the losses suffered by the community and the state. The nominalization element is seen in the words: decision making, information ambiguity, handling pandemics, saving the economy, and managing information

(continued)

Table 1. (continued)

No	Discourse Structure	Element	Analysis
		<i>Syntax:</i> Sentence Form, Coherence, Pronoun	The form of the sentences used in the tweets is dominated by news sentences and rhetorical sentences, with a deductive pattern in which the sentences display elements of ambiguous information prominently and are then clarified with explanatory sentences. The element of coherence is tried to be built by building a related message structure from the introduction, the main message content, to the closing. The pronouns used are only the first person pronoun, but in three types, namely the first person singular pronoun (I), the first person plural pronoun (us and we).
		<i>Stylistics:</i> Lexicon (Word Choice)	Some of the lexicon elements in this tweet include: formal defects, information chaos, fake accounts, baseless accusations, hoaxes.
		<i>Rhetorical:</i> <i>Graphic,</i> <i>Metaphor,</i> <i>Expression</i>	Graphic elements: Kompas newspaper, AHY photo and the symbol of the Democratic Party. The element of metaphor is used to emphasize the discourse, with the phrases: "drowned in the war of information & hoax war", "just economic growth", and "keeping this country from making mistakes". Elements of expression: AHY's photos are repeated with expressions explaining something.

the discussion and ratification of UU Cipta kerja. AHY is trying to build this discourse through data regarding the confusion of information during the discussion of UU Cipta Kerja. At the superstructure level, AHY has built a scheme of attacking his political views from the start. The scheme he uses includes a plot without resolution, which is a plot that usually begins by introducing a problem, then followed by presenting a series of events until it reaches the climax, but is not accompanied by the presentation of a resolution [20]. AHY started his post by trying to lead readers about the large amount of disinformation during the discussion of the draft job creation bill, thus creating a hoax war in the community. This situation is very intolerable because the results will definitely not benefit the community.

However, AHY also praised the intelligence of today's society which is not consumed by hoax. He also emphasized the importance of democracy and the involvement of the wider community in the discussion of the Citakerja Bill. Interestingly, there was one issue that was highlighted specifically because it involved him, namely the hoax which stated that AHY directed the demonstration against the job creation law. He denied that he was behind the demonstrations on the Copyright Law which ended in chaos in several cities in Indonesia. He stated that even though it was against the government, the

Democratic Party's stance was based on the interests of the people, nation and state. To convince the public about his attitude, in his attitude, AHY urges the public to convey their aspirations in an orderly manner and at the same time encourages the government to listen to the aspirations of the people through dialogue efforts because the goal is the same, namely realizing equitable economic growth.

At the micro-structure level, AHY highlights several important aspects, both in terms of semantic, syntactic, stylistic, and rhetorical. In the semantic aspect, AHY highlighted the losses suffered by the community and the state through the ratification of the law. Here, he discusses in detail about the lack of communication efforts from the government and the many hoaxes that have emerged in the community regarding UU Cipta Kerja, including the hoax that AHY was the mastermind behind the demonstration of UU Cipta Kerja. In the syntactic aspect, AHY uses the form of the sentence used in the tweet, which is dominated by news sentences and rhetorical sentences, with a deductive pattern in which the sentences display ambiguous elements of information prominently and are then clarified with explanatory sentences. The news sentence can be seen from how AHY explains or describes events. Meanwhile, rhetorical sentences appear in AHY's statements which do not require confirmation from the reader. All sentences are arranged with strong coherence, starting from the introduction, the main message content, to the closing.

Several elements of the lexicon (stylistic elements) also emerged, among others: formal defects (the formation of UU Cipta kerja was not in accordance with the provisions in UU No. 12 concerning the Formation of Legislations), information chaos (message of information), truth of information (information that has been verified), fraudulent accounts (accounts that are diligent in commenting on other parties' social media, but never upload anything on their social media accounts), baseless accusations (allegations that are not based on facts), directing demos (being the designer and funder of the demo), hoax (fake news that is engineered to cover certain things).

The rhetorical element appears in the graphic aspect used, namely the source of information used (Kompas Newspaper) and who is loudly speaking (AHY and the Democratic Party); metaphorical elements are used to reinforce the discourse, with the phrase: "drowned in the war of information & hoax war" (illustrating the fear of the Indonesian people will fall into the hoax war); "just economic growth" (equal distribution of the economy in a number of sectors that can reduce economic inequality by encouraging equality and equality of access to improve the quality of life of the lowest social groups). "keeping this country from making a wrong move" (to illustrate that the rejection of the job creation law is also part of an effort to remind the government not to go wrong); and the expression aspect is used to show that AHY is clarifying something (you can see AHY's photo being repeated with an expression explaining something).

From the Table 2 it appears that Airlangga Hartarto, as the Coordinating Minister for the Economy of the Jokowi government and at the same time the chairman of the Golkar Party, tried to convince the public that this law was very important and even became part of efforts to restore the national economy, especially in the context of transforming the Indonesian economy. So it is not surprising that data on the unemployment rate, the labor force and the required job opportunities are used as the main body to convince the public.

Table 2. Van Dijk's Critical Discourse Analysis on Airlangga Hartanto's View

No	Discourse Structure	Element	Analysis
1	Macro Structure	<i>Thematic:</i> Theme/to pic	UU Cipta kerja is part of the national economic recovery, especially the economic transformation.
2	Super-structure	<i>Schematic:</i> Scheme	The introductory section begins with an affirmation that UU Cipta kerja is a means of restoring the national economy, then continues with an explanation of the discussion of the job creation law in the midst of a pandemic. The content section highlights the urgency of work creation and the process of discussing the Act has gone through 64 meetings and is transparent. UU Cipta kerja is obligatory considering the increase in the number of the workforce in Indonesia. Answering various Hoaxes related to it. While the closing part is done by stressing that it is impossible for everyone to agree with UU Cipta Kerja, but there is no need to force an opinion. There is a judicial review mechanism that is used to test
3	Micro Structure	<i>Semantics:</i> Setting, Detail, Intent, Presumption, Nominalization	The background element discusses the pros and cons of UU Cipta Kerja and the hoaxes related to it. The detailed elements that are highlighted are the increase in layoffs, employee housing, the number of the workforce and work needs, and the denial of hoaxes. The element of intent shows the urgency of UU Cipta Kerjs and the objections to hoaxes surrounding it. The element of presumption shows the importance of the UU Cipta kerja for the stability of the community's economy. While the elements of nominalization can be seen in the words: economic recovery, economic transformation, transfer of power, empowerment, eradication of corruption, and simplification of public services.
		<i>Syntax:</i> Sentence Form, Coherence, Pronoun	The form of the sentence used is a news sentence that contains information related to the urgency of UU Cipta kerja with a neutral intonation. Sentences are spoken slowly. There is a lot of data but tends to be fragmented and without direct coherence between sentences. Just inserting the word later between sentences and between clauses as a liaison. The pronouns used are first person plural pronouns: we (kita and kami)

(continued)

Table 2. (continued)

No	Discourse Structure	Element	Analysis
		<i>Stylistics:</i> Lexicon (Word Choice)	The existing lexicon elements include: economic transformation, reset and rebooting, task force, labor intensive, anarchist action, structural reform, agrarian reform, sector, complicated licensing, extortion, and bureaucratic obesity.
		<i>Rhetorical:</i> Graphic, Metaphor, Expression	There is no graphic element in Airlangga Hartarto’s statement. While the element of metaphor is seen in several expressions: “recovery of the national economy”, “kok ndilalah”, “public participation is opened as wide as possible”, “simplification of licensing obesity”, “ridden by anarchic actions”, “open to change”. Airlangga Hartarto’s expression was very flat.

At the superstructure level, Airlangga Hartato builds a schema of his political views with the flow of events, namely by directly showing the emergence of problems, then the climax (the problem peaks) and closing with a resolution or problem solving [20]. Airlangga started by highlighting the complicated issues facing the government at the moment, including the Covid-19 pandemic, soaring layoffs, employee housing, the number of the workforce and work needs. Then he tried to answer several hoaxes that developed in the community and displayed the urgency of UU Cipta Kerja as a solution to economic recovery. At the end, it is emphasized the need for political maturity by utilizing the judicial review mechanism to examine the law, rather than forcing the opinions of each party in the public sphere.

Meanwhile, at the micro-structure level, Airlangga highlights a different aspect. On the semantic element, Airlangga Hartarto highlighted the urgency or importance of UU Cipta Kerja for the economic stability of the Indonesian people. In detail, he explained the soaring layoffs, increasing employee housing, the number of the workforce and the need for work. He also emphasized UU Cipta Kerja as the most appropriate solution to overcome all of this and at the same time provided a rebuttal to the hoaxes circulating around it. In his political view, Airlangga uses the form of news sentences containing information related to the urgency of UU Cipta Kerja with neutral intonation (sematic elements). Sentences are spoken slowly. There is a lot of data but tends to be fragmented and without direct coherence between sentences. Just inserting the word later between sentences and between clauses as a liaison.

The stylistic elements in the speech can be seen from the lexicon aspects, including: economic transformation (to describe the urgency of UU Cipta Kerja), resetting and rebooting (to describe the nation’s economic development), task force (to describe the special unit formed), labor-intensive (work sectors that require a lot of energy), anarchist actions (to describe demonstrations that tend to damage, burn and disturb the public interest), structural reforms (describe changes or reforms to the structure of society), agrarian

reform (to describe changes in governance management of national land), the informal sector (to describe the informal economic sectors), complicated licensing (to describe the long and inefficient licensing process), extortion (acromin of illegal payments that is always present in every licensing process), and bureaucratic obesity (to describe how 'fat' the bureaucratic system is democracy in our system of government).

While the rhetorical element is not used optimally (tends to be ignored). This can be seen in the absence of graphic elements in Airlangga Hartarto's statement and the lack of aspects of expression shown by Airlangga Hartarto (very flat and not showing certain gestures). However, the metaphorical aspect is still used. This can be seen in several expressions: "recovery of the national economy" (to describe how important UU Cipta Kerja is for the sustainability of the national economy. With a good economy, there will be a lot of job opportunities so that it is easy for people to find work); "kok ndilalah" (a term in Javanese that describes something that is not planned); "public participation is opened as wide as possible" (illustrating how the process of discussing UU Cipta Kerja is transparent and the public is involved in the discussion); "simplification of licensing obesity" (to illustrate that this law is one way to bypass licensing that is cumbersome and fraught with extortion); "ridden by anarchic actions" (to describe the concern that resistance actions are controlled by certain parties); "open to change" (illustrating the hope that students open themselves to change without refusing).

From the analysis above, it is clear that both parties (both pros and cons) always bring "people's welfare" in their political views. They act in the name of the struggle for the benefit of the people. Both sides share the discourse on the welfare of the people through their political rhetoric. AHY acts in the name of interests with the rhetoric of "just economic growth"; while Airlangga Hartarto used the rhetoric of "national economic recovery". Both want to convince the public that they are on the side of the people and are all fighting for the people.

AHY has a discourse that UU Cipta Kerja will not prosper the people, instead it will harm the community because from the start the process has been filled with various ambiguities. So he encouraged the government to be more open and open channels of communication so as to create equitable economic growth. This can only be done by encouraging equality and equality of access to improve the quality of life of the lowest community groups.

Meanwhile, Airlangga Hartarto discussed the urgency of UU Cipta Kerja as a means for national economic recovery that will transform the national economy. He believes that the Law is a solution for creating job opportunities and eliminating extortion practices, as well as eliminating complicated briocracy (especially business licenses). Therefore, he hopes that the public (especially students) will not be too afraid of change and force their opinion. There is a judicial review mechanism that legally guarantees every citizen to examine the law, including UU Cipta Kerja.

4 Conclusion

From the discussion that has been carried out, it can be concluded that both parties, both pros and cons against the ratification of UU Cipta Kerja, build the impression that they are on the side of the people. Both parties act on behalf of the people's interests by

claiming to be those who defend and fight for the welfare of the people. Through their political rhetoric, both AHY and Airlangga Hartarto create the impression as people's fighters who are willing to "fight" for the welfare of the people. It's just that the war they do is not on the battlefield; but on the battlefield of discourse. They both carry out "war on people's welfare" through their political views in the mass media and social media. They use virtual space for their own benefit.

Through this research, it is hoped that the community will be more thorough and not easily influenced by parties who always say they represent the people or on behalf of the people in a national political polemic. The public must be smart to "read" the political messages of politicians, because both the pros and cons will usually claim to be people's fighters who create people's welfare. There must be political awareness and literacy because in the end, the people will only be used for their political interests. Don't let, because of ignorance, society will fall into endless conflicts; even anarchic actions that actually destroy the life of the nation and state.

References

1. Cakra, I. P. E., & Sulistyawan, A. Y. (2020). Kompabilitas Penerapan Konsep Omnibus Law Dalam Sistem Hukum Indonesia. *Jurnal Crepido*, 02(02), 59–69.
2. Darmawan, D. (2020). UU Cipta Kerja, Kepentingan Publik atau Kartel Politik? *Money*. Retrieved November 19, 2020, from <https://money.kompas.com/read/2020/11/19/050500226/uu-cipta-kerja-kepentingan-publik-atau-kartel-politik>
3. Bayhaqi, A. (2020). Buntut UU Cipta Kerja, Seberapa Besar Efek Elektoral Buat Partai? *Merdeka*. Retrieved October 6, 2020, from <https://www.merdeka.com/politik/buntut-uu-cipta-kerja-seberapa-besar-efek-elektoral-buat-partai.html>
4. Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2000). *Handbook of qualitative research*. Sage Publication.
5. Gita, L., & Haryono, C. G. (2019). Komodifikasi sensualitas dalam tayangan Kimi Hime di media sosial Youtube. *Semiotikan: Jurnal Komunikasi*, 13(1), 89–105.
6. Haryono, C. G. (2020). Analisis Teks: Ragam Metode dan Implementasinya dalam Penelitian Komunikasi, Kuningan: Goresan Pena.
7. Schiffrin, D. (1994). *Approaches to discourse*. Blackwell.
8. Fatmawati, R., Sukarno, & Setiawan, I. (2017). Revealing the gender inequality in Patricia MC. CORMICK'S SOLD critical discourse analysis. *Haluan Sastra Budaya: Jurnal Ilmiah Ilmu-ilmu Humaniora*, 1(1).
9. Haryono, C. G. (2017). Praktek Produksi Hegemoni Militer melalui Film Jenderal Soedirman. *Bricolage: Hurnal Magister Ilmu Komunikasi*, 3(01), 30–42.
10. Rovino, D., Nur Afifah, F., & Anin, T. A. (2021). Fear rhetoric in the online news discourse on the covid-19 pandemic in Teun van Dijk's critical discourse analysis. *Journal of English Language and Culture*, 11(02).
11. Jahedi, M., Abdullah, F. S., & Muku, J. (2014). An overview of focal approaches of critical discourse analysis. *International Journal of Education and Literacy Studies*, 2(4), 28–35.
12. Liu, K., & Guo, F. (2016). A review on critical discourse analysis. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 6(5), 1076–1084.
13. Rogers, R., Schaenen, I., Schott, C., & O'Brien, K. (2016). Critical discourse analysis in education: A review of the literature, 2004 to 2012. *Review of Educational Research*, 84(4), 1192–1226.
14. Eriyanto. (2001). *Analisis Wacana: Pengantar Analisis Teks Media*. LkiS.

15. van der Heijden, L., & Bondarouk, T. (2020). Critical discourse analysis of airbnb reviews: Exploring value co-creation. In *Sustainable hospitality management (advanced series in management)*, Vol. 24, pp. 11–26). Emerald Publishing Limited.
16. van Dijk, T. A. (2009). Critical discourse studies: A sociocognitive approach. In *Methods of critical discourse analysis*. Sage Publication.
17. Aikaterini, N. (2021). The meaning of work in 'crisis-ridden' Greece. A bottom-up critical discourse analytical perspective. *Critical Discourse Studies*, 18(4), 445–460.
18. Malik, R. K. (2019). Analisis Wacana Van Dijk Terhadap Animasi religi “Negerara Islami” (Karya CISFORM UIN Sunan Kalijaga & PPIM UIN Jakarta. *Jurnal Komunikasi*, 7, 58–77.
19. Sari, N. (2016). Imperialisme Budaya Dalam Media. *Jurnal Penelitian Pers dan Komunikasi Pembangunan*, 19(3), 170.
20. Putri, A. S. (2020, September 28). Ragam Alur Cerita Fantasi. Kompas. Retrieved May 21, 2021, from <https://www.kompas.com/skola/read/2020/09/28/194500869/ragam-alur-cerita-fantasi>

Open Access This chapter is licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>), which permits any noncommercial use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license and indicate if changes were made.

The images or other third party material in this chapter are included in the chapter's Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the chapter's Creative Commons license and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder.

