



2024 Ina-PrA Congress and 1st Ina-PrA International Conference:  
Pragmatics and Language Use: Locally elaborated, globally connected.

Vol.01, No.01, 2024: December: 194-204

## Analysis Model in Critical Pragmatics

1. **Ramdan Sukmawan** 2. **Dadang Suganda** 3. **Nani Darmayanti**, 4. **Muhamad Adji**

<sup>1,2,3,4</sup> Department of Linguistics, Faculty of Cultural Sciences, Universitas Padjadjaran, Indonesia

Email: [ramdan18001@mail.unpad.ac.id](mailto:ramdan18001@mail.unpad.ac.id)

### Submission Track:

Received: 01-10-2024, Final Revision: 15-12-2024, Available Online: 30-12-2024

Copyright © 2024 Authors



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/).

### ABSTRACT

Pragmatics examines human language use. The study in pragmatics continues to develop by involving other fields of science, that Cummings (2005) mentions pragmatics in multidisciplinary scope. The study is not only limited to micropragmatics but also in macropragmatics that concerns to language use in sociocultural (Chen, 2020, p. 10). The studies of pragmatics keep exploring in teaching academic writing (Harwood & Hadley, 2004), ESL of classroom talk in a High School (Talmy, 2010), and discursive power and dominance (Melefa et al., 2014). The studies are called critical pragmatics. The critical pragmatics studies try to investigate language use not only in what it is but in what language it is as well. The paper aims at describing analysis models in critical pragmatics. The research methodology applied descriptive qualitative to comprehend the use of analysis models. Analysis model in critical pragmatics applied analysis approach which combined pragmatics study and other study, they are (1) pragmatics, critical pragmatics, and critical in English for Academic Purposes (EAP), (2) conversation analysis (CA) and Fairclough critical discourse analysis (CDA), (3) analysis critical pragmatics in the framework of Fairclough critical discourse analysis (CDA), (4) pragmatics and critical discourse analysis (CDA), (5) critical discourse analysis (CDA) and pragmatics, and (6) critical issues in language use in works of pragmatic phenomena to find ideology.

**Keywords:** *analysis, critical pragmatics, models*



**2024 Ina-PrA Congress and 1st Ina-PrA International Conference:  
Pragmatics and Language Use: Locally elaborated, globally connected.**

Vol.01, No.01, 2024: December: 194-204

## **INTRODUCTION**

Pragmatics is the branch of linguistics that studies language use in communication which concerns meaning is uttered by speaker and interpreted by addressee. Pragmatics analyzes the utterance meaning of speaker to hearer based on background context. Cummings (2005) explores the study of pragmatics to other sciences named pragmatics in multidisciplinary scope. The studies and topics are not only limited to language use in micropragmatics anymore but also in face-to-face interaction (Verschuren, 1999, p. 203). Yet, the studies has been in macro-level pragmatics which concerns to the issues of language use socio-culturally in public places on public discourse (Chen, 2020, p. 10).

The area of study in macro-level pragmatics keeps conducting and developing such as in language use of teaching academic writing (Harwood & Hadley, 2004), English as social identity in teaching at High School that related to micropolitics in language and education (Talmy, 2010), power and dominance in the structure of ideology practices in interparticipant conversation (Melefa et al., 2014), and the arguments of Indonesian presidential candidates in debate in 2019 (Setyaningsih & Rahardi, 2020). The studies of pragmatics mentioned above are called critical pragmatics.

The studies of critical pragmatics attempt to research language use not only in what language is but also in what language it is to be studied. Language becomes something that is very important to be criticized in usage. Mey (2001) It emphasizes how language functions in society's life to be understood from its usage. Critical issues in language use can be analyzed in pragmatics perspective based on context, culture, and society (Al-Hindawi & Meldi, 2018). Language is not merely seen as a structure but as social practice. As social practice, language is not able to be seen in level of linguistic analysis only but it must also be seen in context and social interaction, what in language text itself (Fairclough, 1989).



**2024 Ina-PrA Congress and 1st Ina-PrA International Conference:  
Pragmatics and Language Use: Locally elaborated, globally connected.**

Vol.01, No.01, 2024: December: 194-204

The term of critical in pragmatics derives from continental European conception is the science of language use (Fairclough, 1989, p. 9). Moreover, Ariel (2010) divides pragmatics into two approaches; the first is to determine the research topic, then take pragmatics becomes the study from the research topic and the second is to determine the fundamental pragmatics research aspects, then take pragmatics as research study with its fundamental aspects.

The two approaches that used by Ariel, in Mey (1993, 2001) is differentiated into what he is called with the term of micropragmatics and macropragmatics. Cap (2011) stated the different between micropragmatics and macropragmatics is the scope, analysis, and research contribution. Regardless with research design in micropragmatics and macropragmatics, Cap (2011, p. 55) makes an example of speeches of the American cold war presidents Harry S. Truman or Dwight D. Eisenhower as follows.

A micro-level analysis of utterances making up to a large number of deictic, referential, anaphoric markers, and direct speech acts. A macro-analytic implicatures and presuppositions inspect the extralinguistic context of the cold war presidents address to ideology.

In conjunction with the development of critical pragmatics, Cummings (2005) offers a pragmatics multidisciplinary concept that is possible to reach another discipline science, such as philosophy, psychology, artificial intelligent, and language pathology. It means there is critical view from Cummings that pragmatics can study other fields not only to a micro-level of language use such as deixis, implicatures, presupposition, speech acts, discourse, cooperative principle, politeness principle, and other communication principle (Leech, 1983; Levinson, 1983). Habermas (1998) mentions the term of his universal pragmatics uses to refer to reconstruct the universal of language use. Mey (1993, p. 181) said pragmatics in macro-level is to dig down the text not explicitly expressed in ways that are difficult to



**2024 Ina-PrA Congress and 1st Ina-PrA International Conference:  
Pragmatics and Language Use: Locally elaborated, globally connected.**

Vol.01, No.01, 2024: December: 194-204

analyze, or even see, with the naked eye. Therefore, from Cummings's (2005) critical view, Habermas (1998), and Mey (1993) in pragmatics signifies there is critical nuances on pragmatics studies which keeps developing.

The sameness about critical development in pragmatics as said by Chen (2020, p. 26) as follows.

Pragmatics has explored presupposition, implicature, politeness in relation to a variety of factors like rank of imposition, power relations, and social distance, it has ignored other issues underlying language use, namely unhealthy ideologies, discrimination, deception, vulgarity, harmony, and civilization.

To what Chen has expressed, pragmatics must involve in ideology studies in what language text is. Fowler (1996) formulates a public discourse analysis is an analysis designed to find out ideology in context of social form. Verschueren (1999, p. 238) said that ideology as any constellation of fundamental or commonsensical, and often normative, beliefs and ideas related to some aspect(s) or (social) 'reality'. Every human language use is clearly having ideology to reflect the reality. Each language use supposed to be studied in critical pragmatics to find meaning or hidden intention.

Korta & Perry (2011) explains how language study in critical pragmatics fit of human thought and human action. In their critical pragmatics is based on the concept of language is a mean to do things relates with words where human can achieve communicative goal. Language is an action. To comprehend an utterance needs speaker understanding process on addressee communicative goal by referring to inference from utterance illocution force.

Meanwhile, Subagyo (2010) formulates critical pragmatics is the ability to reveal discourse language social meaning that reflects human as language user. Santoso (2012, p. 43) stated critical pragmatics is used in a wide definition, namely language use relates to a real social dimensions in equality of power relation between participants. In a real



2024 Ina-PrA Congress and 1st Ina-PrA International Conference:  
Pragmatics and Language Use: Locally elaborated, globally connected.

Vol.01, No.01, 2024: December: 194-204

communication between participants, there is a real competition. These dimensions become a study of critical pragmatics. Therefore, in the end critical pragmatics studies discourse in human daily life, such as discourse in media, politics, gender, education, war, gossip, bureaucracy, etc.

### **RESEARCH METHOD**

This article discusses critical pragmatics study relates to an approach of analysis model. Some studies have been collected and written down as a research object. They are: (1) Critical pragmatism and the teaching of academic writing (Harwood & Hadley, 2004), (2) Critical pragmatic combination pragmatic and critical discourse analysis (Subagyo, 2010), (3) A critical pragmatics analysis of a classroom talk in a high school (Talmy, 2010), (4) A critical pragmatic analysis of discursive (Melefa et al., 2014), (5) Analytical model in critical pragmatics (Al-Hindawi & Meldi, 2018), (6) Critical pragmatic in maintaining culture identity (Handayani et al., 2020), (7) Critical pragmatics and Stephen Toulmin's perspective (Setyaningsih & Rahardi, 2020), (8) Critical pragmatic studies on Chinese public discourse (Chen, 2020), (9) A critical pragmatic analysis of fans' online expressions (Wang, 2020), (10) A critical pragmatic in American sexism (Mehdi, 2020), (11) A critical pragmatic analysis of women oppression (Dhayef, 2021), (12) A critical pragmatic analysis combines interpersonal pragmatics and critical linguistics (Mardiana et al., 2021), (13) A critical pragmatic study of hate speech (Hassan & Muhammed, 2022), (14) A critical pragmatic study of sarcasms (Rashid, 2022), and (15) Korta and Perry critical pragmatic in social, politics, law's argumentation (Setyaningsih, 2024).

Sudaryanto (1992) mentioned that concepts method in research was divided into three, namely descriptive, comparative, and structural. The concept of descriptive method was applied to see analysis's model in critical pragmatics study. The data was gathered by



**2024 Ina-PrA Congress and 1st Ina-PrA International Conference:  
Pragmatics and Language Use: Locally elaborated, globally connected.**

Vol.01, No.01, 2024: December: 194-204

collecting some articles using taking note technique. The selection data of analysis's model in critical pragmatics were gathered and analyzed. The analysis method to be used to analyze the data was the contextual analysis methods. The contextual analysis was used to interpret data article from the perspective of analysis's model in critical pragmatics.

Data analysis was applied qualitative data analysis technique namely data condensation, data display, and drawing and verifying conclusion. With this analysis, the collected data was easier to be proceeded so that the research aim could be achieved (Miles et al., 2014). The steps were as follow:

1. Data condensation was applied by selecting and simplifying data. In this process, it was determined the relevant and irrelevant data. This activity was done continuously as long as data collection process. In this step, data summaries were made and investigated as well as classification of article related to analysis's model in critical pragmatics.
2. Data display was applied by presenting data in matrix so that it made easy to check and comprehend the data of analysis's model in critical pragmatics.
3. Drawing and verifying conclusion was applied by concluding and comprehending data that contained analysis's model in critical pragmatics which was presented in data matrix. Therefore, the real conclusion could be arranged.

## **DISCUSSION**

Based on the critical pragmatics previous studies, for research approach in critical pragmatics is used an approach of analysis model that which combines pragmatics study and other study, there are (1) pragmatics, critical pragmatics, and critical in English for Academic Purposes (EAP), (2) conversation analysis and Fairclough critical discourse analysis, (3) analysis critical pragmatics in the framework of Fairclough critical discourse analysis, (4) pragmatics and critical discourse analysis, (5) critical discourse analysis and pragmatics, and (6) critical issues in language use in works of pragmatic phenomena to find ideology.



**2024 Ina-PrA Congress and 1st Ina-PrA International Conference:  
Pragmatics and Language Use: Locally elaborated, globally connected.**

Vol.01, No.01, 2024: December: 194-204

Analysis of critical pragmatic model in teaching of English for Academic Purposes (EAP)) had been conducted by Harwood & Hadley (2004) who combined three approaches of pragmatic EAP, critical pragmatic EAP, and critical EAP. Harwood & Hadley (2004, p. 355) mentions three approaches to the teaching of English for Academic Purposes (EAP) are identified, the Critical approach, the Pragmatic approach, and the Critical Pragmatic approach. The combination of three approaches pragmatic, critical pragmatic, and critical in (EAP) aim at helping students in understanding of writing aspect in English for Academic Purposes.

The widely approach in critical pragmatic analysis is ethnography perspective has been used in classroom talk in a high school. Talmy (2010) combined conversation analysis interaction, membership categorization analysis, and Fairclough's critical discourse analysis (1989) in language context and education policy in Hawaii. Talmy (2010) stated that learning English as a second language has an implication to process of language ideology either micro or macro linked to the politics of language and education in Hawaii and the US more generally.

Analysis approach in critical pragmatic framework by applying Norman Fairclough's critical discourse analysis had also been conducted by Melefa et al., (2014) who examined discursive of power and dominance in the novel Chinua Achebe's Arrow of God. This is done because the critical pragmatic framework propounded by Mey (2001) relies on critical discourse analysis. Critical discourse analysis studies the relation of power in every group of society based on social aspect in language use. Dimension of power structured between participant interaction in power discursive practices is the mobilization of the orally transmitted by British imperialism through ideology discourse to have a dominance and oppressiveness people in Nigeria.

The approach of critical pragmatics analysis which combines pragmatic and critical discourse analysis was also conducted by Subagyo (2010). This approach is used because



**2024 Ina-PrA Congress and 1st Ina-PrA International Conference:  
Pragmatics and Language Use: Locally elaborated, globally connected.**

Vol.01, No.01, 2024: December: 194-204

pragmatic analysis is not enough to study a discourse that has ideology motive. Therefore, the deepen analysis is needed another approach namely critical discourse analysis. It is proven with two approaches of pragmatic analysis and critical discourse analysis can form critical pragmatic analysis that reveal discourse language social meaning that reflects human as language user.

It is not only Subagyo (2010) who combines pragmatic and critical discourse analysis to reach the deepen critical pragmatic analysis. Chen (2020) did the same thing in his critical pragmatic analysis. He combines critical discourse analysis and pragmatic by emphasizing on pragmatic issues. Pragmatic is not enough to analyze public discourse. That's why it is needed empirical study and critical investigation on importance issues on Chinese public discourse. The issues that have been concerned by Chen (2020, p. 166) are social mentalities behind business names, pragmatic traps in commercial advertisements, suspected discrimination in news reports, and the subjectivity of reporters in journalistic discourse.

Another analysis approach that has been applied is analysis approach on critical issues in language use to pragmatic phenomena. Pragmatic phenomena are used to reveal ideology of racists or sexists. Al-Hindawi & Meldi (2018) offered analytical model in critical pragmatic on language use to find ideology in the political discourse in the American context. Pragmatic aspects are applied in the third American presidential debate of Donald Trump and Hilary Clinton in 2016 as critical strategies to reveal ideology of racists or sexists. Pragmatic aspects such as: speech acts, reference, strategic maneuvering and implicature in addition to their strategies are chosen as the pragmatic phenomena to understand how critical issues are conveyed via language (Al-Hindawi & Meldi, 2018, p. 166).

## **CONCLUSION**

It can be concluded that critical pragmatics is pragmatics design which tries to reach things relates to language not only to be finalized in a micro-level but also needs a deepen



**2024 Ina-PrA Congress and 1st Ina-PrA International Conference:  
Pragmatics and Language Use: Locally elaborated, globally connected.**

Vol.01, No.01, 2024: December: 194-204

study in a macro-level that involve the study of other sciences so that it has a result or a novelty from critical perspective in analysis that fit with the reality of human language use nowadays. Besides, critical pragmatics is an approach that concerns to critical issues in language use. The aim of analysis is to reveal social function of language in society. Critical issues can be studied in pragmatic framework based on context, culture, and society (Al-Hindawi & Meldi, 2018). Critical pragmatics is useful to analysis text that is provided with background of ideas and human thought (Korta & Perry, 2011).

Regardless with the studies in analysis models of critical pragmatics which has been conducted, it is better to do analysis approach to combine pragmatics and other study such as conversation analysis, pragmatic, and critical discourse analysis that studies textual structure. Analysis is not only focused to linguistic features of vocabulary such as: meaning relations, euphemistic expressions, markedly formal or informal words, or metaphors, and grammatical such as: nominalizations, active or passive, positive or negative, relational modality, or expressive modality but also is focused to textual structures which discusses interactional conventions in turn-taking and participant controls in face-to-face interaction.

## **REFERENCES**

- Al-Hindawi, F. H., & Meldi, W. S. (2018). Towards an Analytical Model in Critical Pragmatics. *Arab World English Journal*, 9(4), 162–176.  
<https://doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol9no4.11>
- Ariel, M. (2010). *Defining Pragmatics*. Cambridge University Press.
- Cap, P. (2011). Micropragmatics and Macropragmatics. In W. Bublitz & N. R. Norrick (Eds.), *Foundations of Pragmatics* (pp. 51–76). De Gruyter Mouton.
- Chen, X. (2020). *Critical Pragmatics Studies on Chinese Public Discourse*. Routledge.
- Cummings, L. (2005). *Pragmatics A Multidisciplinary Perspective*. Edinburgh University Press.
- Dhayef, Q. A. (2021). A Critical Pragmatic Analysis of Women Oppression. *Ilkogretim Online - Elementary Education Online*, 20(5), 149–162.



**2024 Ina-PrA Congress and 1st Ina-PrA International Conference:  
Pragmatics and Language Use: Locally elaborated, globally connected.**

Vol.01, No.01, 2024: December: 194-204

<https://doi.org/10.17051/ilkonline.2021.05.14>

- Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and Power*. Longman Group UK Limited.
- Fowler, R. (1996). On Critical Linguistics. In Caldas-Coulthard, R. Carmen, & M. Coulthard (Eds.), *Texts and Practices: Reading in Critical Discourse Analysis* (pp. 3–14). Routledge.
- Habermas, J. (1998). *On the Pragmatics Communication*. Massachusetts Institute Technology.
- Handayani, V. T., Suganda, D., & Darmayanti, N. (2020). Critical Pragmatic: Maintaining Culture Identity Kampung Traditional Kuta Ciamis. *Jurnal KATA: Penelitian Tentang Ilmu Bahasa Dan Sastra*, 4(1), 33–43. <https://doi.org/10.22216/kata.v4i1.4760>
- Harwood, N., & Hadley, G. (2004). Demystifying institutional practices: critical pragmatism and the teaching of academic writing. *English for Specific Purpose*, 23(4), 355–377. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2003.08.001>
- Hassan, A. F., & Muhammed, W. S. M. (2022). A Critical Pragmatic Study of Hate Speech in Some Selected American Movies. *Journal of Positive School Psychology*, 6(6), 5338–5354. <https://journalppw.com/>
- Korta, K., & Perry, J. (2011). *Critical Pragmatics An Inquiry into Reference and Communication*. Cambridge University Press.
- Leech, G. N. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics*. Longman.
- Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge University Press.
- Mardiana, D., Rokhman, F., Rustono, & M, H. B. (2021). Interpersonal Pragmatics and Critical Linguistics: A Critical Pragmatic Analysis. *International Conference on Science, Education and Technology*, 7 (1), 737–742. <https://proceeding.unnes.ac.id/ISET/issue/view/42>
- Mehdi, W. S. (2020). American Sexism: A Critical Pragmatic Perspective. *European Journal of Literature, Language and Linguistics Studies*, 4(3), 120–139. <https://doi.org/10.46827/ejll.v4i3.225>
- Melefa, O. M., Michael, T., & Chukwumezie, E. (2014). A Critical Pragmatic Analysis of the Discursive Expression of Power and Dominance in Chinua Achebe's Arrow of God. *OKIKE An African Journal of New Writing.*, 1 November(52), 153–175.
- Mey, J. L. (1993). *Pragmatics: An Introduction*. Blackwell.
- Mey, J. L. (2001). *Pragmatics: An Introduction (Second)*. Blackwell Publishing.



**2024 Ina-PrA Congress and 1st Ina-PrA International Conference:  
Pragmatics and Language Use: Locally elaborated, globally connected.**

Vol.01, No.01, 2024: December: 194-204

- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldana, J. (2014). *Qualitative Data Analysis A Methods Sourcebook* (Third Edit). SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Rashid, B. N. (2022). A Critical Pragmatic Study of Sarcasms in American and British Interviews. *Journal of Strategic Research in Social Science*, 8(1), 55–72.  
<https://doi.org/10.26579/josrss.8.1.4>
- Santoso, A. (2012). *Studi Bahasa Kritis Menguak Bahasa Membongkar Kuasa*. CV. Mandar Maju.
- Setyaningsih, Y. (2024). Memerikan Fungsi Argumentasi Bidang Sosial, Politik, dan Hukum Momentum Prapemilu 2024: Perspektif Pragmatik Kritis Korta & Perry. In Yanti & C. Manara (Eds.), *Konferensi Linguistik Tahunan Atma Jaya (KOLITA) 21* (pp. 312–322). Pusat Kajian Bahasa dan Budaya Universitas Katolik Indonesia Atma Jaya.  
<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.25170/kolita.21.4863>
- Setyaningsih, Y., & Rahardi, R. K. (2020). Quality of Arguments Used in the First-Round Presidential Debate: Critical Pragmatics and Stephen Toulmin's Perspective. *International Journal of Engineering and Advanced Technology*, 24(2), 716–715.  
<https://doi.org/10.35940/ijeat.E1102.0585C19>
- Subagyo, P. A. (2010). Pragmatik Kritis: Paduan Pragmatik dengan Analisis Wacana Kritis. *Linguistik Indonesia*, 28(2), 177–187.
- Sudaryanto. (1992). *Metode Linguistik Ke Arah Memahami Metode Linguistik*. Gadjah Mada University Press.
- Talmy, S. (2010). Achieving Distinction Through Mock ESL: A Critical Pragmatics Analysis of Classroom Talk in a High School. In *Pragmatics & Language Learning* (pp. 215–254). University of Hawaii, National Foreign Language Resource Center.
- Verschuren, J. (1999). *Understanding Pragmatics*. Edward Arnold.
- Wang, M. (2020). A Critical Pragmatic Analysis of Fans' Online Expressions. *International Journal of Frontiers in Sociology*, 2(6), 58–66.  
<https://doi.org/10.25236/IJFS.2020.020608>