INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF SOCIETY, CULTURE & LANGUAGE

Power Dynamics in a Classroom Interactions Context: Critical Discourse Analysis

Irma Syahriani[1,2], Supriadi Supriadi[1,3], Mutakhirani Mustafa[4,5], Aceng Ruhendi Saifullah[1], Hasria Riski[6], Yasir Mubarok*[1,7]

[1]Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia, Indonesia, [2]Institut Teknologi dan Bisnis Bina Adinata, Indonesia, [3]Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Amkop Makassar, Indonesia, [4]Universitas Padjadjaran, Indonesia, [5]Universitas Islam Negeri Siber Syekh Nurjati Cirebon, Indonesia, [6]Universitas Pejuang Republik, Indonesia, [7]Universitas Pamulang, Indonesia

Abstract A lecturer has power in class interactions to control the class, but students resist power. This research aims to reveal the power dynamics and negotiations between a lecturer and students in classroom interactions. The study employs a qualitative method. The primary sources in this study were 40 undergraduate fifth-semester students. The study employed a purposive sampling approach. The data was collected from September to December 2023 within a specific time frame. The data was gathered from recordings of classroom interactions between the lecturer and students. These sources were transcribed and analyzed using Van Dijk's text analysis framework. The findings revealed that students dominate power at the macro and superstructure levels. In the microstructure, the lecturer and students negotiate power in classroom interactions, resulting in power equality. This study demonstrated that individuals can exercise power through language use, unnecessarily considering social backgrounds, and that power dynamics can have positive effects.

Keywords: *Power relations, Power negotiation, Language, Classroom interaction, Critical discourse analysis*

***Corresponding Author:**
Irma Syahriani
yasir.mubarok@upi.edu

Received: June 2024
Revised: August 2024
Accepted: August 2024
Published: September 2024

© 2024 Syahriani, Supriadi, Mustafa, Saifullah, Riski, and Mubarok.
This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY).

1. Introduction

Power refers to an individual's ability to influence others or groups to follow their will. According to Van Dijk (2000), power has a cognitive dimension, which influences the thoughts of others, while according to Foucault (1981), power is everywhere and can come from anywhere. Cervero and Kockelman (1997) found that lecturers dominate and control the class too much. Lecturers determine the topics and lecture activities, while students only listen and follow the lecturer's instructions. Lecturers also frequently interrupt students while speaking, so they have less opportunity to express their ideas and thoughts; in this situation, students participate less in class interactions (Clark, 2010).

https://doi.org/10.22034/ijscl.2024.2037993.3632

According to Taylor et al. (2018), power can occur anywhere, including within the classroom. The classroom serves as a space for everyday language use (Gee, 2005; Van Langenhove & Harré, 1999), patterns and variations in conversation between teachers and students, and broader views of relationships and values. This can shape a power relationship. Power relations are a very broad dimension. Power is not always about oppression, but we must recognize that there are many sources of power (Foucault, 1980). This implies that power dynamics are inherent in human interactions and consistently entail resistance (Adams & Rau, 2004). The aspect of resistance, in this case, involves each individual's negotiating power. Bourdieu (2011) argues that the symbolic status of power has a strong appeal in the use of the national language. Bourdieu also states that a person's power in choosing the language to be used is determined by interests that allow them to use that language. This opinion is supported by Desky et al. (2017), who observed relations in the use of native and foreign languages. The findings indicated that the interactions between students can be more harmonious as a result of the native language relationship, which can fortify the relationship between students, instructors, and parents. They are of the opinion that the native language has the potential to fortify ethnic networks during negotiations.

Multiple academics have undertaken numerous studies on critical discourse analysis (CDA), particularly focusing on political speech (Chaka & Adanlawo, 2023; Mekt et al., 2024; Nigatu & Admassu, 2023; Zhang, 2023), power relations (Panayiotopoulos & Lichrou, 2023; Peng et al., 2024), media (Feng & Duncan, 2024; Wang & Ouyang, 2023; Zehra et al., 2023), and English context (Fauzan & Nadia, 2024; Herdiawan & Rofi'i, 2023; Riser, 2024; Sapkota, 2024). In this study, the researchers tried to extend the application of CDA to explore power dynamics and negotiations between the lecturer and students in classroom interactions. Therefore, the researchers conducted research in the Indonesian language context as the national language. This research was conducted in the Civic Education program at Universitas Negeri Jakarta. The researchers chose this program because it often discusses social life issues that serve as the basis for classroom interactions, making it interesting as a discussion material that facilitates the identification of power dynamics between the lecturer and students.

2. Theoretical Framework

2.1. Power Concept

Foucault (1980) states that power is everywhere; it is not an institution, not a structure, or a specific force that we possess. According to him, power is not possessed but practiced within a field where many positions strategically relate to one another and constantly undergo shifts. The analysis of power draws attention to the exercise of authority and resistance. According to Foucault (1980), resistance is at the center of power relations, and any power relationship can be resisted. Foucault (1980) stated that:

> Power is that it is not solely negative (working to repress or control people); it is also highly productive. Power produces resistance to itself; it produces what we are and what we can do, and it produces how we see ourselves and the world. (Danaher et al., 2000, p. xiv)

Foucault offers a new perspective on power, where power is understood as rational, positive, productive, and discursive relationships, such as creating new identities for individuals and generating new forms of knowledge. He challenges the "repressive hypothesis" that conceptualizes power as "limiting freedom and restricting individuals", and questions if power only oppresses, is there anyone who would obey it (Mills, 2003, p. 36).

Several studies have been conducted by various researchers on power dynamics in classroom interactions. Agustina and Cahyono (2016) indicated that the majority of lecturers produced face-saving utterances more frequently than face-threatening utterances. They also stated that legitimate power can be excessively exercised through the selection of lecturers' classroom discourse and that students anticipate courteous expressions from their lecturers. Fajar and Nadhillah (2023) proved that the lecturer utilized the dominant role to establish the students' power structure. Therefore, the lecturer could assert his authority, making social relationships unequal. Oral (2013) illustrated how various forms of classroom behavior were used to negotiate power. His interview data also demonstrated the correlation between the norms of classroom behavior that the teacher aimed to establish and the conventional

teacher-centered, control, and authority-based professional discourses. Pomeroy (1999) believed that power dynamics need to be re-evaluated in order to develop a sequence of encounters that both stress the unique obligations of instructors, such as providing care, and acknowledge that pupils are not children.

In summary, the literature review underscores the significance of power dynamics in classroom interactions. Consequently, this investigation is required to offer a thorough comprehension of the current state of power dynamics in classroom interactions within the Indonesian context.

2.2. Critical Discourse Analysis

CDA deals with social issues. According to Wodak, CDA regards discourse as a social practice that involves the use of language in speech and writing (Alyahya, 2023). Van Dijk (2000) indicates that CDA addresses issues of power abuse, domination, inequality, and so on, reflected in discourse production within social contexts. Van Dijk (2015) extends the definition of CDA and describes it as "analytical research" that not only detects levels beyond linguistic dimensions but also shows ways, methods, and types of power resistance during interactions, social contexts, and legal and political contexts by adopting an explicit stance. Fairclough (1989) states that the goal of critical discourse analysis is to demonstrate hidden relationships among people, such as the relationship between language and power. Fairclough also believes that discourse is seen as a practice that entails reciprocal influence between discourse and the social situation. He further discloses that the CDA approach operates under the assumption that language is an integral component of social existence and intricately linked with other aspects of social life, hence establishing a connection between language analysis and social research (Pendri et al., 2024). Van Dijk defines CDA as the examination of the connection between discourse, power dynamics, control, social disparities, and the role of the discourse analyst within these social interactions (Pendri et al., 2024).

Studies on CDA have provided some new insights. First, in educational contexts, CDA is an effective method for examining authority structures and social relations (Brooks, 2016). Second, Liao (2015) argues that CDA is capable of disclosing information regarding the curriculum and the power dynamics between language instructors and learners. Third, through the utilization of CDA approaches, it becomes possible to integrate the viewpoints of teachers and the power dynamics inside the classroom, so yielding valuable insights into the intricate relationship between the individual classroom conversations and the broader professional conversations (Oral, 2013).

2.2.1. Macrostructure

Macrostructure is the general meaning of a text. Van Dijk (1983) stated the importance of macrostructure in texts and conversations. Macrorules are semantic mapping rules and can be used to transform microstructure into macrostructure through three types of macro rules, namely deletion, generalization, and construction. Deletion, according to Van Dijk (1977, 1980, 1983), is a rule that serves to delete propositions from the discourse text base and conversation. Generalization is fundamentally defined as a collection of numerous concepts that appear to be similar in a single set. In other words, the sequence of propositions can be generalized by the arguments and predicates (Van Dijk, 1977). The final rule in the macro analysis is construction. Propositions at the micro level are taken together by combining them as a whole, by replacing or forming new macro propositions that represent global facts containing micro propositions (Van Dijk, 1980).

2.2.2. Superstructure

Superstructure is the system of content that incorporates a presentation, body, conclusion, and schematic conclusions. Van Dijk (2000) and Richardson(2007) contend that content is the etymological realization of talk that takes after a particular pattern or structure from beginning to the conclusion. According to Van Dijk (2014) and Richardson (2007), by and large, writings have two major patterns, specifically rundown and story. Rundown is characterized by the title and lead, which demonstrate the common subject the creator extraordinary to display or emphasize within the news. The lead serves as a presentation or outline of what will be passed on within the whole news substance. The story is the complete substance of the news, speculatively isolated into two subcategories. The primary subcategory

consists of a portrayal of the circumstance of occasions, and the moment comprises comments displayed within the content.

2.2.3. Microstructure

In micro-level analysis, Van Dijk (1983, 2000, 2009, 2016) does not provide detailed guidelines on how micro-level structure analysis is conducted. Van Dijk (2016) explains that any analysis that can unravel or explain texts at the micro-level can be accepted within his analytical framework. According to him, the micro-structure can be approached through any analysis that can elaborate on realizations at a more detailed level than the macro-structure. From this perspective, it can be interpreted that analysis in the micro-structure section can be filled with aspects covered in pragmatic studies. The pragmatic study referred to is the analysis of locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary acts by Searle (1969). According to Searle, locutionary acts (prepositional acts) are speech acts that are solely related to meaning. Speech acts that explain or inform something clearly without any other meaning within them. Illocution (illocutionary act) is a speech act that not only informs something but also does something. This speech act is called the act of doing something (Chaer, 2015). There are several types of illocutions, according to Searle (1979), namely assertive, directive, commissive, expressive, and declarative. Perlocution (perlocutionary act) is the result or effect caused by speech (to the listener). This speech act is also referred to as the act affecting someone.

3. Methodology

3.1. Participants

This research was conducted in the Civic Education program at Universitas Negeri Jakarta, Indonesia. The primary sources in this study were 40 undergraduate fifth-semester students aged 21–25 and one lecturer. The study employed a purposive sampling. It is believed that the researchers' ability to pick participants who meet specific criteria and have the necessary knowledge, experiences, viewpoints, or expertise to add to the research study will determine how well this technique works (Bibi & Sartini, 2023).

3.2. Materials

This study was conducted by analyzing Indonesian classroom interactions. The data consisted solely of textual structures, encompassing vocabulary, sentences, propositions, and paragraphs. The afore-mentioned data in the form of speech acts were the utterances produced by the lecturer and students during the classroom interaction. The researchers investigated the materials to reveal and critique the use of power by the lecturer and students and to examine how the lecturer and students use language to negotiate power.

3.3. Procedures

The researchers recorded the lecturer-student interactions during the teaching and learning process in the current study without interfering with the classroom interaction. One of the researchers witnessed the intended classes. The interaction was recorded using a video recorder. The speeches spoken by the lecturer and students during the classroom observation were subsequently transcribed. After collecting the data, the researchers analyzed the data according to the framework of Van Dijk's CDA theory (1982, 2000, 2009). Van Dijk describes texts on three levels: macrostructure, superstructure, and microstructure. The data were analyzed and classified based on locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary speech acts. Subsequently, the researchers assessed the response number and frequency. To maintain ethical standards, this research ensures the anonymity and identity of the students and lecturers who contributed to the research.

4. Results

The analysis reveals the power dynamics between the lecturer and students when engaging in power negotiation during classroom interactions. Three schemes are used to reveal power in classroom interactions: macrostructure, superstructure, and microstructure (Van Dijk, 1982, 2000, 2009).

4.1. Macrostructure Analysis

Macrostructure analysis identifies the lecturer and students' representation through the text's discourse topic system (Van Dijk, 2000). Analysis of the representation of lecturers and students in discourse, or in Van Dijk's terms (2015), as cognitive units that display text characters. Here are the data for macrostructure analysis in classroom interaction to evoke global topics.

Table 1
Macrostructure Analysis in Classroom Interaction

Speaker	Microproposition	Macro Rule	Macropososition (Facts)
Lecturer	Guys, now we're entering the dimension of collaborative learning, so we'll keep striving for you to be collaborative, of course, without neglecting your learning quality. Now, since we're entering the group presentation period, I'll hand it over directly to the presenters' group, or I'll hand it over directly to our moderator for today. Please, go ahead and start.	Deletion	Now, we are entering the dimension of collaborative learning, so we will continue to strive for you to collaborate and maintain quality in your learning.
Student	Sure, just a moment, sir.	Zero	
Lecturer	Okay, please go ahead, Rasti.	Zero	
Student	Okay, sure, sir. Thank you for the opportunity. This time, I might continue the presentation, yeah. Well, good afternoon, Mr. Fauzi, and everyone. As the moderator, I will guide the discussion.	Deletion	Alright, sir, thank you for the opportunity, and we will proceed with the presentation. As the moderator, I will guide the discussion.
Lecturer	Or Rafi, let me try to add the statement, Okay?	zero	
Student	Okay, sir, you may proceed	zero	
Lecturer	I'll hand it back to you guys. If there are any questions, please feel free to ask. If not, let's continue, Rafi.	Deletion, construction	If there any questions, feel free to ask, and if not, let's continue.
Student	Okay, thank you, sir, for the response and also for the additional input regarding the question from Ms. Salsa. For the next question from Anggi, I will answer it myself, sir.	Deletion, construction	I will answer the question from Anggi.
Lecturer	Okay, well, thank you, Mr. Fauzi for the opportunity and your time. That's all from group 4. Apologies for any shortcomings. I'll hand it back to Fauzi.	deletion	Thank you for the opportunity and your time. That's all from group 4. Apologies for any shortcomings.
Lecturer	Okay, guys, let's give a round of applause to the presenters. Let me review the presenters' performance first. Asmi's opening was good. The Q&A session was also good. One thing that could be added to polish the performance is that Rafi's answer should be conveyed to his teammate in writing here.	construction	The presenter's performance in the class discussion was good
Lecturer	Let's conclude today's meeting. Once again, thank you very much for everything we've experienced and gained today. Hopefully, it will be a lesson for all of us. So, with that, we close today's meeting.	deletion	Let's conclude this meeting, and whatever we've gained may become a lesson.

4.1.1. Macrostructure (First Level) M-1

M1: Now we are entering the dimension of collaborative learning, so we will continue to strive for you to collaborate and maintain quality in your learning
M2: Just a moment, sir.
M3: Okay, please go ahead, Rasti.
M4: Alright, sir, thank you for the opportunity, and we will proceed with the presentation. As the moderator, I will guide the discussion.
M5: Or Rafi, let me try to add the statement, okay?
M6: Okay, sir, you may proceed.
M7: If there are any questions, feel free to ask, and if not, let's continue.
M8: I will answer the question from Anggi.
M9: Thank you for the opportunity and your time. That's all from group 4, apologies for any shortcomings.
M10: The presenter's performance in the class discussion was good.
M11: Let's conclude this meeting, and may whatever we've gained become a lesson.

4.1.2. Macrostructure (Second Level) M-2

m1: We are entering the dimension of collaborative learning and continue to strive for our friends to collaborate and maintain quality in learning (from p1).
m2: Alright, sir, thank you for the opportunity, and we will proceed with the presentation. As the moderator, I will guide the discussion (from p2, p3, and p4 through integration).
m3: I'll try to add the statement, and if there are any questions, please feel free to ask, but if not, we'll just continue (from p5, p6, p7, p8 through integration and construction).
m4: Thank you for the opportunity and your time. That's all from group 4. Apologies for any shortcomings (from p9).
m5: The presenter's performance in the class discussion was good, and may whatever we've gained become a lesson (from p10, p11 through integration).

Table 2
The Macrostructure of the Second Level (m-2) with Representation as the Global Topic

No	Global Topic	Preposisi	Total
1	Lecturer	m3	1
2	Student	m2, m2, m5	3
3	Lecturer and Student	m1	1

The second level (M-2) is generated through two macro rules, namely integration and construction, resulting in five macro propositions that indicate the actual global topic of the text. In m1, both lecturer and student are included in the global topic, as seen in the proposition *"we are entering the dimension of collaborative learning"*, which shows the involvement of both lecturer and student. In m2, m4, and m5, students are the global topic in each proposition of student speech, such as *"we will proceed with the presentation, that's it from group 4, apologies for any shortcomings, the presenters' performance in the class discussion was good"*. These speeches indicate the level of student involvement as the central topic of classroom interaction. Meanwhile, m3 makes the lecturer the global topic in the text, as seen in the proposition *"I'll try to add the statement"*, which means the lecturer has authority in the topic of class activities.

Van Dijk (1980) stated that macro rules are recursive, meaning to reduce the number of macro propositions, second-level macro rules can be repeatedly applied to summarize and condense information to its essence. Through this process, power dynamics between the lecturer and students are identified by representing them as the global topics in classroom interaction, thus revealing students dominating as the global topic. It can be concluded that in the macrostructure schema, students dominate power relations more than the lecturer.

4.2. Superstructure Analysis

The superstructure is the framework of the text, such as the introduction, content, and conclusion. This stage reveals the power dynamics from the beginning to the end of classroom interaction. This study follows the ideas of Van Dijk (1983) on superstructure or schematic structure. As explained, the macrostructure in the text revolves not only around global structure but also schematic structure. Below is the analysis of superstructure schema data for lecturer and student interaction in the classroom.

Table 3
Superstructure Schema Data of Lecturer and Student Interaction in the Classroom

Opening			
Speaker	Data	Schematic Structure	
Lecturer	Now, we are entering the sixth week of this course. We will continue our agenda to listen to the presentations and then discuss the material presented by each group. Next, I will hand it over to the presenters. Please proceed, presenters' group.		
Student	All right, sir, thank you. Just a moment, sir. (After a few moments, the student opens the discussion) We, from group 5, will discuss about autonomy versus shame.	Lead	Summary
Content			
Student	That concludes our presentation for today. We will open the floor for further discussion so that we can have a better understanding together. Thank you, Ana and Cikui, for the presentations today. Next, shall we open the question andanswer session, or should I hand it back to Mr. Fausi first?	situation	
Lecturer	Let' 's continue for now	situation	
Student	Alright, thank you, sir. We request permission to be given time to find the answer.	situation	
Student	That's my explanation. Does Mr. Fausi have anything to add or respond to Ajeng's question?	situation	
Lecturer	Okay, Ajeng asked about what if 'there's a conflict, right? It was already well explained by Feni, "I'll just add a little bit". (after the lecturer adds clarification, the student continues) "Perhaps some of you still have unclear points before I move on to Ajeng's second question, clear?	situation	story
Student	It is clear sir	comment	
Student	Let' 's just give the floor directly to Mr. Fausi to answer and add it	situation	
Lecturer	Okay, thank you, Feni and the others. Alright, it has been answered by Cikui, right? (adding a little bit of Cikui's response to Poleman's question).	situation	
Lecturer	That might be the response to Poleman's question, or is there anything else to respond to Poleman?	situation	
Student	It is enough sir.	comment	
Closing			
Lecturer	Perhaps someone has a question before this class ends, maybe the last question before we finish this class? Anyone? No one?	situation	
Student	I want to ask a question sir	situation	

Lecturer	That's it... It's already past time. So, I appreciate group 5. As usual, I will provide some feedback (evaluating each student's performance). Earlier, Feni delivered the opening well.	situation
Lecturer	Let's give them a round of applause, and hopefully, the next group can deliver even better. Alright, that's all, guys. Thank you to you all, especially the presenters.	situation

The lead schema in the opening section serves as a summary of what is conveyed in the overall classroom interaction discourse, which includes both the lecturer's and students' speech within this schema. This is evident in the statement, *"We will continue our agenda to listen to the presentations and then discuss the material presented by each group"*. This speech emphasizes learning activities centered around the students, further supported by the student's speech determining the discussion of lecture material. The story schema, whose informational content depicts the situation and comments in classroom interaction, places students in a dominant power position in the comment schema. This is evident in the prepositions that represent students as the subjects providing comments. Meanwhile, the situation schema reveals the classroom interaction process, positioning the lecturer and students in an equal power relationship where each has six texts representing their respective positions. The results of the analysis indicate that students dominate more than lecturers. This finding aligns with Van Dijk's proposition (2000) that the semantic mapping of macrostructure will be encompassed within a specific superstructure that can define discourse meaning. The dominant finding of the lead schema reinforces that students play a primary role in the entire narrative. Moreover, this is supported by the finding of the comment schema, which shows a significant emergence of students compared to the lecturer.

4.3. Microstructure Analysis

Microstructure refers to the meaning of discourse that can be examined by analyzing the constituent parts of discourse and complex sentences and using paraphrases within them (Van Dijk, 2009). Researchers analyze each sentence uttered by students and the lecturer to uncover power negotiations in classroom interactions.

Extract 1

> ***Context**: The lecturer opens the class*
>
> *Lecturer: Guys, now we are entering the dimension of collaborative learning, so we will try our best to collaborate and, of course, not overlook the quality of our learning. Since we have entered the group presentation period, I will hand it over to our moderator for today. Please go ahead and start.*
>
> *Student: "Just a moment, sir".*
>
> *Lecturer: "Okay, please go ahead, Rasti".*

The lecturer's statement, *"Now we are entering the dimension of collaborative learning"*, constitutes a locutionary act informing the students about the collaborative learning activity to be undertaken. The utterance *"I will hand it over to our moderator for today. Please go ahead and start"* serves as an illocutionary act functioning as a directive. The lecturer instructs the students to begin the classroom discussion. This utterance indicates the lecturer's dominance at the opening of the lecture.

The student's statement, *"Just a moment, sir"* serves as an illocutionary act functioning as a request for additional time to comply with the lecturer's instruction. This statement represents the student's negotiation with the lecturer. The lecturer's statement, *"Okay, please go ahead, Rasti"* constitutes a declarative illocutionary act implicitly stated by the lecturer to grant permission for additional time to the student before starting the classroom discussion and simultaneously indicates that this utterance is dominated by the student.

Extract 2

> ***Context****: During the learning process, the lecturer instructs the students to present the material they will present.*
>
> *Lecturer: "How about the others? Has no one from the presenting team appeared yet?"*
>
> *Student: "It seems no response yet, sir".*
>
> *Lecturer: "Okay, let's skip this group; we consider it failed and proceed to the next group, Rasti".*
>
> *Student: "Alright, good afternoon, Mr. Fauzi and everyone. I, as the moderator, will guide this discussion".*

The lecturer's utterance *"Has no one from the presenting team appeared yet?"* is an interrogative locution that inquires about the presence of the student presenters in the forum. This utterance represents a negotiation of power by the lecturer over the students, expecting a response from them. The student's response *"It seems no response yet, sir"* is an effect of the perlocutionary act of the lecturer's question. This proposition reveals that the lecturer's position dominates the power dynamic over the students.

The lecturer's utterance, *"Okay, let's skip this group; we consider it failed and proceed to the next group, Rasti"* is a directive speech act, where the lecturer's position dominates over the students. Meanwhile, the student's utterance, *"Alright, good afternoon, Mr. Fauzi and everyone. I, as the moderator, will guide this discussion"*, demonstrates a locutionary utterance containing a statement as a form of negotiation by the students over the lecturer's power, thus placing the students in a dominant position. The level of dominance between the lecturer and the students in this interaction is equal.

Extract 3

> ***Context****: The student presenter has been asked questions by each group regarding the presented material.*
>
> *Student: May I have your permission, Mr. Fauzi, to kindly ask for 5 minutes to discuss it first?*
>
> *Lecturer: Please go ahead.*

The student's statement, *"May I have your permission, Mr. Fauzi, to kindly ask for 5 minutes to discuss it first?"* reflects a directive speech act that entails requesting permission to be given time to discuss before answering questions from other students. This utterance constitutes a form of negotiation and dominance by the student in the classroom interaction.

Extract 4

> ***Context****: The student has just answered a question from their peer, and suddenly, the lecturer requests permission to add the statement.*
>
> *Lecturer: "Or Rafi, may I add the statement?"*
>
> *Student: "Okay, please go ahead".*

The lecturer's utterance *"Or Rafi, may I add the statement?"* falls under the category of illocutionary act functioning as a request. It implies that the lecturer is asking permission from the student presenter to add to the answer given by the student questioner. This utterance represents the lecturer's negotiating power over the students' authority in the classroom interaction. Meanwhile, the student's response, *"Okay, please go ahead"*, belongs to the illocutionary act category and functions as a declarative. This utterance implies granting permission to the lecturer to comment on the student's question; thereby, through negotiation, the lecturer dominates this interaction.

Extract 5

> ***Context****: The lecturer has already provided additional answers from the students.*

Lecturer: "I'll return it to you. If anyone has questions, please feel free to ask, and if not, Rafi can continue".

Student: "Okay, thank you, sir, for the response and the additional input regarding Sister Salsa's question. For the next question from Anggi, I will answer it myself, sir".

The lecturer's statement, *"If anyone has questions, please feel free to ask"*, is a commissive illocutionary act functioning as an offer. The lecturer is offering to ask the students questions if they have any material that they still don't understand. The statement, *"if not, Rafi can continue"* is a directive illocutionary act. The lecturer is instructing the students to continue answering questions from other students. This indicates that the lecturer is negotiating power over the students, and the lecturer's position in this interaction is more dominant than the students. This can be observed from the student's response, *"Okay, thank you, sir"*, which is the perlocutionary effect of the lecturer's utterance, indicating that the lecturer is more dominant in this speech act.

Extract 6

***Context**: The presenter allows the lecturer to respond to student questions.*

Student: Alright, if no one wants to argue about the previous question, perhaps Mr. Fauzi could respond to or add to Anggi's question.

Lecturer: Okay, let me directly ask you. At what age do trust and mistrust occur in babies?

Student: Babies aged 0-1.5 years, and even up to 2 years, sir.

The student's statement, *"Perhaps Mr. Fauzi could respond to or add to Anggi's question"*, is an illocutionary directive act functioning as an imperative sentence. This utterance reveals that the student holds authority in the classroom interaction.

Extract 7

***Context**: The class will end.*

Student: OK, thank you very much, Mr. Fauzi, for the opportunity and your time. That's all from group four, I apologize for any shortcomings.

Lecturer: Ok, everyone, let's give a round of applause to the presenters. Let me quickly review the performance of our colleagues. It started well with Asmi's opening. The Q&A session was also good. One thing to add to improve the presentation is that each of Rafi's answers should be delivered well to his friends. We conclude today's meeting once again, thank you all for everything.

The student's speech, *"Thank you, Mr. Fauzi, for the opportunity and also your time"*, and *"I apologize for any shortcomings"* are illocutionary speech acts expressing gratitude and apology. These propositions indicate that the student is dominated by the lecturer.

The lecturer's speech, *"Okay, everyone, let's give a round of applause to the presenters"*, falls under the expressive illocutionary speech act, which aims to praise the students' performance and as a form of student dominance. The speech that can be added to polish the performance is *"each of Rafi's answers should be delivered well to his friends"* which is a directive illocutionary speech act that represents lecturer dominance. The speech *"we conclude today's meeting once again, thank you all for everything"* is an expressive illocutionary act that indicates that the lecturer is dominated by the students.

Extract 8

***Context**: The student has answered a question from their peer and offered the lecturer to add to their answer.*

Student: That's my explanation, Mr. Fauzi. Would you like to add a question from Ajeng?

Lecturer: Okay, Ajeng asks about what if there's a conflict, right? It was already well explained by Feni, I'll just add a little bit. (after the lecturer adds clarification of the student statement) Perhaps some of you still have unclear points before I move on to Ajeng's second question, clear?

Student: It is clear Sir.

Student's speech *"Mr. Fauzi, would you like to add a question from Ajeng?"* falls under the directive illocutionary speech act. The student asks the lecturer, expecting information. This speech reveals that the position of the student is dominating because, based on the context of the sentence, it is included in the command sentence. Whereas the lecturer's speech, *"Perhaps some of you still have unclear points before I move on to Ajeng's second question, clear?"* falls under the directive illocutionary speech act containing the meaning of a question as well as an offer to the students. This speech indicates that the lecturer's position is dominating and negotiating power with the students. The student's response, *"It's clear, sir"* is a perlocutionary speech act effect of the lecturer's questioning speech containing the meaning of providing information that the lecturer's explanation is clear to them. This speech shows that the students dominate power in this interaction.

Extract 9

***Context**: The lesson will soon come to an end*

Lecturer: Perhaps someone has a question before this class concludes, perhaps the last question before we end this class. Anyone? No one?

Student: I want to ask Sir.

The lecturer's speech, *"Perhaps someone has a question before this class concludes"* includes the form of illocutionary speech acts that contain directive meaning, which offer and negotiate power to students, thus reducing the lecturer's power relationship and clarifying the student's speech *"I want to ask, sir"*, which functions to provide statements as a form of negotiation outcome so that the speech between the lecturer and the student has a level of equality.

Table 4
Representation of Dominance and Negotiation Power of the Lecturer and Students

Extract	Representation of Lecturer Dominance	Representation of Student Dominance	Lecturer Negotiation	Student Negotiation
1	1	1		1
2	2	1	1	1
3		1		1
4	1		1	
5	1		1	
6		1		
7	2	2		
8		1	1	
9	1	1	1	
TOTAL	**8**	**8**	**5**	**3**

The micro-level analysis indicates that the level of power dominance between the lecturer and students is equal. Both the lecturer and students negotiate power in the process of classroom interaction. The lecturer` negotiates five times while students negotiate three times. The lecturer negotiates through questioning to obtain information from students, negotiates through requesting permission to respond to or to add to students' questions, negotiates by allowing students to ask questions if the material is unclear, and offers students the chance to respond to their opinions. Meanwhile, students negotiate with the lecturer by providing informative statements in class discussions, requesting permission for additional time to answer class discussion questions, and negotiating with the lecturer for comments. Microstructure analysis is reinforced by the opinions of Martin (1992) and Martin and Rose (2007)

about negotiation, stating that resources for negotiating meaning in dialogue, taking up speech roles in conversation-making statements, asking questions, offering services, and demanding goods.

5. Discussion

This research aims to reveal the power dynamics and negotiations between the lecturer and students in classroom interactions. The study employs a qualitative method based on Van Dijk's CDA model, which is divided into three parts: microstructures, superstructures, and macrostructures.

According to the study's findings, it may be inferred that at the macro and superstructure levels, students tend to dominate power. This is different from previous studies, which found that there is an unequal teacher-student power relationship (Agustina & Cahyono, 2016; Brooks, 2016; Fajar & Nadhillah, 2023; Liao, 2015; Oral, 2013; Pomeroy, 1999; Read, 2008) and that instructors have more power than students. It is revealed that power is not limited to just one individual. This is supported by Foucault's opinion (1981), which states that power is not owned by anyone and can be exercised by many different people at specific times and places. This research also indicates that language is one of the tools that can be used to gain power in social relationships. As Bourdieu (1989) states, language itself expresses the state of relations of symbolic power. The resistance shown by students using language as power expands Van Dijk's theory (2015), which demonstrates ways, methods, and types of power resistance.

Furthermore, the microstructure shows that the lecturer and students negotiate power in classroom interactions, resulting in power equality. The lecturer negotiates through questioning, seeking information from students, requesting permission to respond to or add to students' questions, providing opportunities for students to ask questions if the material is unclear, and offering students the chance to respond to their opinions. Meanwhile, students negotiate with the lecturer through statements in class discussions and negotiations for additional time to answer class discussion questions and provide negotiation to the lecturer for comments. Power in this study is seen as having a positive effect. This is in line with what Foucault (1980) said. He states that power must be analyzed as something circulating or alternating. This research also demonstrates that power has positive effects. Therefore, power can be resisted, as Danaher et al. (2000) suggest that any power relationship can be resisted. In this regard, power no longer carries a negative view and repressive connotations (Lilja & Vinthagen, 2014). This is in line with This is in line with Foucault's opinion (1980) that power and knowledge are intrinsically interconnected. In their research, Bahar and Setiawan (2021) discovered that teacher power can positively impact student learning motivation by providing encouragement and motivation through the teacher's power, which includes coercive power, referent power, reward power, expert power, and legitimate power.

The implication of research requires a re-evaluation of the power dynamics of the interaction, which permits unequal interactions and relationships between lecturers and students in the classroom. The research serves as a reminder to the readers of the importance of equal rights in the classroom. Additionally, CDA is a viable approach to scrutinizing power structures and social relations in educational settings, particularly in specific languages. This paper also aims to assist instructors (lecturers) and students in re-evaluating and becoming more aware of the manner in which they interact with one another during classroom interactions.

It is important to recognize specific limitations in this investigation. First, the investigation investigated the power dynamics and negotiations between the lecturer and students in the classroom interactions of a single class, rendering it essentially a case study. Consequently, future research is encouraged to conduct a more thorough examination of a greater number of classes and lecturers. Second, the research was conducted with a specific focus on university undergraduate students majoring in Civic Education, and the results may not be generalizable to the entire population or individuals from various age groups or social backgrounds. The scope of future research could be broadened to encompass a more diverse sample. Third, more research is anticipated to look at nonverbal cues, including tone, imitation, and gestures, to examine how instructors and students create those expressions that support what they say. Finally, the selection of data may have been biased as a result of the fact that only one researcher assumed the participant-observation role. Additionally, participants may have altered their conduct in response to their awareness of being observed as a result of her presence.

Disclosure Statement

The authors claim no conflict of interest.

Funding

The first and second authors of this study thank the BPPT Ministry of Education, Culture, Research, and Technology and the LPDP Ministry of Finance of the Republic of Indonesia for supporting their education.

References

Adams, G., & Rau, B. (2004). Job seeking among retirees seeking bridge employment. *Personnel Psychology*, *57*(3), 719–744. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2004.00005.x

Agustina, S., & Cahyono, B. Y. (2016). Politeness and power relation in EFL classroom interactions: A study on Indonesian learners and lecturers. *International Journal of Language and Linguistics (IJLL)*, *3*(2), 92-100.

Alyahya, A. F. (2023). Critical discourse analysis of newspaper articles declaring the outbreak of war in Ukraine: The Washington Post vs. The Moscow Times. *International Journal of Society, Culture & Language*, *11*(2), 47–59. https://doi.org/10.22034/ijscl.2023.1982871.2969

Bahar, O. P., & Setiawan, S. (2021). A qualitative study into teacher power use in EFL classrooms: The impact for learning motivation. *Rigeo*, *11*(8). https://rigeo.org/menu-script/index.php/rigeo/article/view/1542

Bibi, F., & Sartini, N. W. (2023). Gender and social power dynamics in compliment responses: A cross-cultural pragmatic study of university students in Indonesia and Pakistan. *Cogent Arts & Humanities*, *10*(1), Article 2262076. https://doi.org/10.1080/23311983.2023.2262076

Bourdieu, P. (1989). Social space and symbolic power. *Sociological Theory*, *7*(1), 14–25. https://doi.org/10.2307/202060

Bourdieu, P. (2011). *Choses dites: Uraian dan pemikiran* [Choses tested: Description and thoughts]. (N. R. Sjams, Trans.). Kreasi Wacana.

Brooks, C. F. (2016). Role, power, ritual, and resistance: A critical discourse analysis of college classroom talk. *Western Journal of Communication*, *80*(3), 348–369. https://doi.org/10.1080/10570314.2015.1098723

Cervero, R., & Kockelman, K. (1997). Travel demand and the 3Ds: Density, diversity, and design. *Transportation Research Part D: Transport and Environment*, *2*(3), 199–219. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1361-9209(97)00009-6

Chaer, A. (2015). *Linguistik Umum* [General linguistics]. Rineka Cipta.

Chaka, M., & Adanlawo, E. F. (2023). Interculturalism and the building of nation of national identity: A critical discourse analysis of President Nelson Mandela's speeches. *Journal of Nation-Building and Policy Studies*, *7*(1), Article 85. https://doi.org/10520/ejc-aa_jonps_v7_n1_a5

Clark, F. A. (2010). Power and confidence in professions: Lessons for occupational therapy. *Canadian Journal of Occupational Therapy*, *77*(5), 264–269. https://doi.org/10.2182/cjot.2010.01.77.5.2

Danaher, G., Schirato, T., & Webb, J. (2000). *Understanding Foucault*. Allen & Unwin.

Desky, A. F., Pujiati, P., Simanihuruk, M., Ismail, R., & Manurung, R. (2017). Language as a status symbol of power in social interactions at a multicultural school in the city of Medan. *Jurnal Ilmu Sosial Dan Ilmu Politik*, *20*(3), 264–277. https://doi.org/10.22146/jsp.27210

Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and power*. Longman Group.

Fajar, M., & Nadhillah, F. (2023). Revealing power relations in online learning: A critical classroom discourse analysis. *English Education: Journal of English Teaching and Research*, *8*(1), 63–76. https://doi.org/10.29407/jetar.v8i1.18422

Fauzan, U., & Nadia, N. (2024). A critical discourse analysis of religious moderation values in the Indonesian EFL classroom: Teachers' perspective. *International Journal of Religion*, *5*(1), 557–566. https://doi.org/10.61707/n9jwg685

Feng, O., & Duncan, L. R. (2024). Newspaper media representations of athlete experiences with eating disorders: A critical discourse analysis. *Qualitative Research in Sport, Exercise and Health*, *16*(3), 300–317. https://doi.org/10.1080/2159676X.2023.2296475

Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings, 1972-1977*. Pantheon Books.

Foucault, M. (1981). The order of discourse. In R. Young (Ed.), *Untying the text: A post-structuralist reader*. Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Fraenkel, J. R., & Wallen, N. E. (2006). *How to design and evaluate research in education*. McGraw-Hill.

Gee, J. P. (2005). The new literacy studies: From 'socially situated' to the work of the social. In D. Barton, M. Hamilton, & R. Ivanic (Eds.), *Situated literacies: Theorising reading and writing in context* (pp. 177–193). Taylor and Francis.

Herdiawan, R. D., & Rofi'i, A. (2023). Pre-service teachers' power dominance and interaction strategies in EFL classroom discourse. *Visipena, 14*(1), 29–39. https://doi.org/10.46244/visipena.v14i1.2062

Liao, H. C. (2015). What are course syllabi telling students? Critical discourse analysis of classroom power relationships. *TCI (Transnational Curriculum Inquiry), 12*(1), 13–27. https://doi.org/10.14288/tci.v12i1.185668

Lilja, M., & Vinthagen, S. (2014). Sovereign power, disciplinary power and biopower: Resisting what power with what resistance? *Journal of Political Power*, *7*(1), 107–126. https://doi.org/10.1080/2158379X.2014.889403

Martin, J. R. (1992). *English text: System and structure*. John Benjamin Publishing.

Martin, J. R., & Rose, D. (2007). *Working with discourse: Meaning beyond the clause* (2nd ed.). Bloomsbury.

Mekt, Y., Getahun, A., & Meseret, T. (2024). A critical discourse analysis (CDA) of a political speech of Mr. Christian Tadele speech in the parliament. *Journal of Education, Social & Communication Studies*, *1*(2), 56–62. https://doi.org/10.58881/jescs.v1i2.16

Mills, S. (2003). *Michel Foucault (Routledge critical thinkers)*. Routledge.

Nigatu, B. A., & Admassu, M. T. (2023). Critical discourse analysis of the second inaugural speech of Ethiopia's Prime Minister Abiy Ahmed. *Cogent Arts & Humanities*, *10*(1), Article 2172805. https://doi.org/10.1080/23311983.2023.2172805

Oral, Y. (2013). The right things are what I expect them to do: Negotiation of power relations in an English classroom. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, *12*(2), 96–115. https://doi.org/10.1080/15348458.2013.775877

Panayiotopoulos, A., & Lichrou, M. (2023). From the streets to the classroom: Power analysis as a tool for critical pedagogy. *Journal of Marketing Management*, *39*(1–2), 92–107. https://doi.org/10.1080/0267257X.2022.2085769

Pendri, A., Andayani, A., Wardani, N. E., & Suhita, R. (2024). A critical discourse analysis of online media discourse on educational problems during the COVID-19 pandemic. *International Journal of Society, Culture & Language*, *12*(2), 14–27. https://doi.org/10.22034/ijscl.2024.2018254.3305

Peng, A. Y., Wu, C., & Chen, M. (2024). Sportswomen under the Chinese male gaze: A feminist critical discourse analysis. *Critical Discourse Studies*, *21*(1), 34–51. https://doi.org/10.1080/17405904.2022.2098150

Pomeroy, E. (1999). The teacher-student relationship in secondary school: Insights from excluded students. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, *20*(4), 465–482. https://doi.org/10.1080/01425699995218

Read, B. (2008). 'The world must stop when I'm talking': Gender and power relations in primary teachers' classroom talk. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, *29*(6), 609–621. https://doi.org/10.1080/01425690802423288

Richardson, J. E. (2007). *Analysing newspapers*. Macmillan Education UK.

Riser, P. (2024). Teachers embodying acceptance for marginalised students in the English language arts classroom. *Changing English*. https://doi.org/10.1080/1358684X.2024.2378857

Sapkota, C. N. (2024). Critical discourse analysis on language and power in Nepali public ELT classroom. *Madhyabindu Journal, 9*(1), 11–23.

Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language*. Cambridge University Press.

Searle, J. R. (1979). *Expression and meaning: Studies in the theory of speech acts*. Cambridge University Press.

Taylor, L. A., Vlach, S. K., & Mosley Wetzel, M. (2018). Observing, resisting, and problem-posing language and power: Possibilities for small stories in in-service teacher education. *Linguistics and Education, 46*, 23–32. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2018.05.006

Van Dijk, T. A. (1977). *Text and context*. Longman.

Van Dijk, T. A. (1980). *Macrostructures: An interdisciplinary study of global structures in discourse, interaction, and cognition*. Erlbaum.

Van Dijk, T. A. (1982). Episodes as units of discourse analysis. In D. Tannen (Ed.), *Analyzing discourse: Text and talk* (pp. 177–195). Georgetown University Press.

Van Dijk, T. A. (1983). Discourse analysis: Its development and application to the structure of news. *Journal of Communication, 33*(2), 20–43. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.1983.tb02386.x

Van Dijk, T. A. (2000). *Ideology: A multidisciplinary approach*. SAGE Publications.

Van Dijk, T. A. (2009). *Society and discourse: How social contexts influence text and talk*. Cambridge University Press.

Van Dijk, T. A. (2014). Discourse, cognition, society. In J. Angermuller, D. Maingueneau, & R. Wodak (Eds.), *The discourse studies reader*. John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Van Dijk, T. A. (2015). Critical discourse analysis. In D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen, & H. E. Hamilton (Eds.), *The handbook of discourse analysis* (pp. 466–486). Wiley.

Van Dijk, T. A. (2016). Discourse and racism: Some conclusions of 30 years of research. In A. Capone & J. L. Mey (Eds.), *Interdisciplinary studies in pragmatics, culture and society* (pp. 285–295). Springer.

Van Langenhove, L., & Harré, R. (1999). Introducing positioning theory. In R. Harré & L. Van Langenhove (Eds.), *Positioning theory: Moral contexts of international action* (pp. 14–31). Blackwell.

Van Lier, L., & Matsuo, N. (2000). Varieties of conversational experience: Looking for learning opportunities. *Applied Language Learning*, *11*(2), 265–288.

Wang, Q., & Ouyang, H. (2023). Counter-discourse production in social media: A feminist CDA of a Weibo post. *Discourse & Communication*, *17*(3), 319–335. https://doi.org/10.1177/17504813221150187

Zehra, M., Khan, F., & Naureen, S. (2023). Exploring stigmatizing discourses of mental illness in Pakistani newspapers through CDA lens in psychology. *Sir Syed Journal of Education & Social Research (SJERS)*, *6*(2), 1–10. https://doi.org/10.36902/sjesr-vol6-iss2-2023(1-10)

Zhang, J. (2023). How to build a “dream” in political speech? A critical discourse analysis of the discursive construction of the Chinese dream speech. *Critical Arts*, *37*(3), 95–113. https://doi.org/10.1080/02560046.2023.2220364