# A CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS OF DEROGATION IN *ZOOTOPIA* MOVIE

**THESIS**

By:

**Robbi Nur Aida**

NIM 13320033

**DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LITERATURE**

**FACULTY OF HUMANITIES**

**UNIVERSITAS ISLAM NEGERI MAULANA MALIK IBRAHIM MALANG**

**2021**

# A CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS OF DEROGATION IN *ZOOTOPIA* MOVIE

**THESIS**

Presented to

Universitas Islam Negeri Maulana Malik Ibrahim Malang

in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of *Sarjana Sastra* (S.S.)

By:

Robbi Nur Aida

NIM 13320033

Advisor:

**Zainur Rofiq, M.A.**

NIP 19861018201802011180

**DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH LITERATURE**

**FACULTY OF HUMANITIES**

**UNIVERSITAS ISLAM NEGERI MAULANA MALIK IBRAHIM MALANG**

**2021**

# STATEMENT OF AUTHENCITY

The undersigned,

|  |  |
|---|---|
| Name | : Robbi Nur Aida |
| Student Number | : 13320033 |
| Department | : English Literature |
| Faculty | : Humanities |

Hereby, declare that the thesis I wrote entitled "A Critical Discourse Analysis of Derogation in *Zootopia* Movie" to fulfill the requirement for the degree of *Sarjana Sastra* (S.S) in English Letters Department, Faculty of Humanities, Universitas Islam Negeri Maulana Malik Ibrahim Malang, is truly my original work. It does not incorporate any material previously written or published by other person, except that indicated theory, quotation, and bibliography. Due to this fact, I am the only person responsible for the thesis if any objection or claim for others.

Malang, January 27, 2021

Robbi Nur Aida

# APPROVAL SHEET

This to certify that Robbi Nur Aida's thesis entitled **A Critical Discourse Analysis of Derogation in Zootopia Movie** has been approved for thesis examination at Faculty of Humanities, Universitas Islam Negeri Maulana Malik Ibrahim Malang, as one of the requirements for the degree of *Sarjana Sastra* (S.S.).

Malang, December 28, 2020

Approved by

Advisor,

Zainur Rofiq, M.A.
NIP 19861018201802011180

Head of Department of English Literature,

Rina Sari, M.Pd.
NIP 197506102006042002

Acknowledged by

Dean,

Dr. Hj. Syafiyah, M.A.
NIP 196609101991032002

# LEGITIMATION SHEET

This is to certify that Robbi Nur Aida's thesis entitled **A Critical Discourse Analysis of Derogation in *Zootopia* Movie** has been approved by the Board of Examiners as one of the requirements for the degree of Sarjana Sastra (S.S.) in Department of English Literature.

Malang, December 28 2020

the Board of Examiners

Signatures

1. Dr. Hj. Rohmani Nur Indah, M. Pd
   NIP 197609102003122003      (Main Examiner)

2. Agwin Degaf, M.A
   NIP 198805232015031004      (Chair)

3. Zainur Rofiq, M.A
   NIP 19861018201802011180      (Advisor)

Approved by

Dean of Faculty of Humanities

Dr. Hj. Syafiah, M.A.
NIP 196609101991032002

iii

# MOTTO

"Done is better than perfect"

**(Sheryl Sandberg)**

# DEDICATION

This thesis is especially dedicated to my parents Fahrur Rozi and Mujayanah and my

only sister Naila Nur Izzah for their endless love, support, and encouragement.

# ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

All praise is to Allah, the Lord of the world, the Master and the Creator of everything in the universe, the Destroyer of all oppressors, and the Hope of all oppressed. Shalawat and salam are also delivered to Muhammad SAW the prophet of ummah who has inherited Islam as a peace and blessing to the entire universe. Due to the mercy He gives through His chosen prophet, I am finally able to accomplish this thesis.

I would like to express my greatest gratitude to the people who have helped me in accomplishing this thesis, especially my thesis advisors, Zainur Rofiq, M.A. and Irham, M.A., who are always willing to help, to guide, to share ideas, and to spend their busy time for this thesis. I would also like to extend my gratitude to:

1. Dr. Hj. Syafiyah, M.A., the dean of Faculty of Humanities of Universitas Islam Negeri Maulana Malik Ibrahim Malang.

2. Rina Sari, M.Pd, the head of English Literature Department and my guardian lecturer.

3. All respectful lecturers of English Letters Department for their insightful knowledge, teachings, guidance, discussion, and inspiration they share throughout my study at the university.

4. My parents Fahrur Rozi and Mujayanah, my sister Naila Nur Izzah, my uncle Moh. Anas Kholish and his wife, Siti Rohmah, and the other members of Bani HAMKA and Bani Kamsi family for always giving me their endless love, support, and encouragement.

5. My friends from English Literature Department especially Putri Novita, Niken, Sofi, Fafa, Fachris, and Fadly for the experience we have been sharing together during these years.

6. My boarding house friends especially Nadiya, Alak, Ika, Aida, Akma, and Dewi, who always support and help me when I had difficult times in Malang.

7. My choir friends especially Nisa, Fajril, Iqbal, Sarah, and Mila who show me their passion in singing that could help me finding my piece of happiness.

Finally, I, as ordinary human being, realize the imperfections and weakness found in the thesis I write. Therefore, any criticism and suggestions are mostly welcome. Hopefully, this study can provide an insight for students of English Literature and to open up a brand new academic discussion to conduct similar research.

Malang, April 09, 2020

Robbi Nur Aida

# ABSTRACT

Aida, Robbi Nur. 2020. *A Critical Discourse Analysis of Derogation in Zootopia Movie.* Undergraduate Thesis. Department of English Literature, Faculty of Humanities, Universitas Islam Negeri Maulana Malik Ibrahim Malang. Advisor Zainur Rofiq, M.A.

*Key word: Critical discourse analysis, derogation, zootopia*

Movie is one of the media that is sought after by many people as entertainment and relieving fatigue. In the film itself, there are many genres up to the age limit that is suitable for the audience to be enjoyed ranging from children, adolescents, to adults. One example of a movie for children is Zootopia which is an animation movie that tells the story of a rabbit's dream of becoming a police. However, behind the film packaging that is interesting for children to watch, there are expressions of derogation contained in the movie.

Derogation is an utterance that is rude, belittling, insulting, and despising others. Seeing from this definition, it is unfortunate if the animated film contains utterances that are inappropriate for children to hear. As for the derogation itself, it is necessary to have discursive moves that will form the derogation.

This research aimed to: (1) identify the discursive moves and the function of derogation used in Zootopia move, (2) find out and to analyze the motive behind the derogation used in Zootopia movie. To achieve the objectives mentioned, the researcher used conversational analysis approach because the researcher investigated the interaction among the characters in the movie through their conversation. The method used in the research is critical discourse analysis to obtain deeper analysis results. The data collection is done by selecting dialogues containing derogation remarks that is analyzed using critical discourse analysis.

The result of the research shows the discursive moves used in Zootopia movie are actor description, empathy, humanitarianism, polarization, number game, self-glorification, and implication. While the functions of derogation in Zootopia movie are insulting, showing distaste, expressing anger or irritation, criticizing, and delivering information. Moreover, the motive behind the derogatory remarks in the Zootopia movie is because of the distrust of the predators for the ability of prey overconfidence in taking strategic roles in the egalitarian Zootopia civilization.

# ABSTRAK

Aida, Robbi Nur. 2020. *Analisis Wacana Kritis tentang Derogasi dalam Film Zootopia.* Skripsi. Jurusan Sastra Inggris, Fakultas Humaniora, Universitas Islam Negeri Maulana Malik Ibrahim Malang. Pembimbing: Zainur Rofiq, M.A.

*Kata kunci: Analisis wacana kritis, derogasi, zootopia*

Film merupakan salah satu media yang diminati oleh banyak orang sebagai hiburan dan penghilang kepenatan. Dalam film itu sendiri terdapat banyak genre hingga batasan usia yang sesuai bagi penonton untuk dapat dinikmati mulai dari anak-anak, remaja, hingga dewasa. Salah satu contoh film untuk anak-anak adalah Zootopia yang merupakan sebuah film animasi yang bercerita tentang mimpi seekor kelinci untuk menjadi polisi. Namun, dibalik kemasan film yang menarik untuk ditonton anak-anak, terdapat ujaran derogasi yang terkandung di dalam film tersebut.

Derogasi sendiri merupakan ujaran yang kasar, meremehkan, menghina, dan menganggap rendah orang lain. Melihat dari definisi tersebut, sangat disayangkan jika dalam film animasi tersebut mengandung ujaran yang tak pantas didengar oleh anak-anak. Adapun dalam derogasi itu sendiri diperlukan adanya pergerakan diskursif yang akan membentuk ujaran derogasi tersebut.

Tujuan penelitian ini adalah untuk: (1) mengidentifikasi pergerakan diskursif dan fungsi derogasi yang digunakan dalam film Zootopia, (2) mengetahui dan menganalisa motif dibalik penggunaan derogasi dalam film Zootopia. Untuk mencapai tujuan tersebut, peneliti menggunakan pendekatan analisis percakapan karena peneliti akan menginvestigasi interaksi di antara aktor dalam film melalui percakapan mereka. Peneliti menggunakan metode analisis wacana kritis untuk mendapatkan hasil analisis yang lebih dalam. Adapun pengumpulan data dilakukan dengan memilih dialog-dialog yang mengandung ujaran derogasi yang kemudian akan dianalisa menggunakan analisis wacana kritis.

Hasil dari penelitian ini sendiri adalah ujaran derogasi yang ada dalam film Zootopia menggunakan pergerakan diskursif penggambaran aktor, empati, kemanusiaan, polarisasi, permainan nomor, glorifikasi diri, dan implikasi. Sedangkan fungsi derogasi yang ada dalam film Zootopia adalah untuk menghina, menunjukkan kebencian, mengekspresikan kemarahan dan iritasi, mengkritik, dan menyampaikan informasi. Adapun motif di balik penggunaan derogasi dalam film Zootopia dalam perspektif analisis wacana kritis adalah motif ketidakpercayaan para predator terhadap kemampuan para binatang yang menjadi mangsa yang terlalu percaya diri dalam mengambil peran strategis di dunia peradaban zootopia yang egaliter.

# مستخلص البحث

عائدة، ربي نور. 2020. *تحليل الخطاب النقدي على التقييد في فيلم زوتوبيا*. رسالة البكالوريوس. قسم الأدب الإنجليزي، كلية العلوم الإنسانية، جامعة مولانا مالك إبراهيم الإسلامية الحكومية مالانج.

المشرف: زين الرفيق، الماجستير.

الكلمات الرئيسية: زوتزبيا، تحليل الخطاب النقدي، التقييد.

يعد الفيلم من أحد الوسائط يميل إليها بعض الناس للترفيه وتخفيف التعب. وللفيلم أنواع مختلفة بحسب حدود خاصة حتى الحد العمري المناسب للجمهور للاستمتاع بدءًا من الأطفال والمراهقين والبالغين. أحد الأمثلة على فيلم للأطفال هو زوتوبيا (Zootopia)، وهو خرافة متحركة تروي قصة حلم الأرنب في أن يصبح شرطة. ومع ذلك، يتصور وراء عبوة الفيلم التي تثير اهتمام الأطفال بمشاهدتها تعبير عن التقييد الوارد في ذلك.

أما التقييد (derogation) فهو تعبير عن خشن وتحقير وإهانة وتطليل على الآخرين. أساسا على ذلك المفهوم، يتأسف أن كان لذلك الفيلم محتوى على عبارات لا ينبغي سماعها للأطفال. وينبني التقييد هذا من حركة خطابية حتى يرد كما كان.

فيهدف هذا البحث: 1) تحديد الحركات الخطابية ووظائف التقييد فيلم زوتوبيا، 2) الكشف والتحليل عن الدوافع الكامنة وراء استخدام التقييد في فيلم زوتوبيا. ليحصل البحث على الأهداف المذكورة، تجري الباحثة على نهج تحليل المحادثة لتتحرى التفاعلات بين الممثلين في الفيلم من خلال محادثاتهم. وتستخد الباحثة طريقة تحليل الخطابي النقدي للحصول على نتائج أدق وأعمق. يتم جمع البيانات عن طريق اختيار الحوارات التي تحتوي على عبارات التقييد التي يقوم تحليلها بعد ذلك باستخدام تحليل الخطاب النقدي.

ويستنتج هذا البحث على أن العبارات التقييدية في فيلم زوتوبيا تستعمل الحركات الخطابية لتصوير الممثلين، والتعاطف، والاستقطاب، والألعاب العددية، وتمجيد الدولة، والتأثير. أما وظيفة التقييد في فيلم زوتوبيا فهي الإهانة وإظهار الكراهية والتعبير عن الغضب والتهيج ، والتلميح والنقد ونقل المعلومات. وتكون الدوافع لاستخدام التقييد في فيلم زوتوبيا بمنظور تحليل الخطاب النقدي هي دافع على عدم الثقة في الحياوانات المفترسة لقدرة فريساتها التي تتوثق في القيام بدور استراتيجي في مساواة حضارة زوتوبيا.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

# CHAPTER I

# INTRODUCTION

## A. Background of the Study

Nowadays, the movie becomes one of the media that people choose to entertain themselves. There are some genres of movies that can be watched, such as comedy, drama, horror, comedy, et cetera. Because of the interest of people towards the movie, there are so many movies produced, including Zootopia. It is an animation movie that tells about a rabbit that wants to be the police. Her family opposed her dream because Rabbit was a small and weak mammal, so there was no Rabbit became a police officer. However, Judy did not give up, and finally, she became a police officer and moved to Zootopia city where everyone can be anything.

There are some subtle messages in the movie, such as the dream, the importance of forgiveness, and watch our words, especially when it comes to talking about other people. However, there is also some adverse concern in the movie, such as violence, sex/nudity, and the language (Wilson, 2016). There are some reviews on the same website: "This movie was adorable, which is why it was such a disappointment. I saw racial messages, as well as homosexual messages throughout the movie. As others have said, it used God's name in vain multiple times and had a very out with the old (traditional values) and in with

1

the new message." (Valerie in Wilson, 2016) and "Am I the only viewer who noticed the pentagram on the floor in one scene? Also, the derogatory remark about speaking in tongues, which is a gift of the Holy Spirit? It amazes me how cleverly these so-called family movies get certain messages across, and no one seems to notice or care." (Nancy in Wilson, 2016).

Based on the reviews above, the researcher is interested in investigating the derogatory remarks that can lead to the intolerance, impoliteness, racial expression, et cetera. The researcher investigated using one of the discursive strategies, namely derogation. It is because, according to Van Dijk in Rahimi and Sahragard (2006), to reveal the sources of dominance and inequality observed in the society by analyzing text is to find the discursive strategies that are utilized to construct or maintain such inequality or bias in different contexts.

The discursive strategy is the way the discourse is formed and the way it influences the receiver of the text, including for marginalize the minority and maintain the power of the majority through discourse strategy. There are two discursive strategies: negative other-presentation (derogation) and positive other-presentation (euphemism) (Van Dijk, 2006). According to Anne in Degaf (2014), negative other-presentation is humiliated, disrespect, disgrace, underestimate other people, and see them as inferior. While positive other-presentation is spoken up by using sweet words that give a good impression, those two discursive strategies are materialized through some discursive moves, such as actor description, authority, burden, empathy, evidentiality,

humanitarianism, implication, number game, norm expression, and disclaimer, etcetera. (Van Dijk, 2000). For the functions of derogation, according to Zollner in Degaf (2016), are expressing anger or irritation, criticizing, satirizing, accusing or blaming, conveying information, etcetera.

It is interesting to investigate Zootopia movie from a derogation point of view because the movie itself is for all ages, including the children. However, the dialog of the movie contains the derogation. It will be dangerous if the children imitate what they saw and heard about the derogation that they do not know about it. Therefore, the researcher analyzed the dialog of the movie. The dialogs were analyzed using the derogation strategy. The researcher categorized the dialog based on the discursive moves of derogation that are used in the movie.

The researcher finds some previous studies with a similar topic and different subjects. Some previous studies are conducted in the psychology field. On the one hand, according to Jenkins (2002), the more contact African Americans had with Whites in the form of daily interactions, the more ethnocentrism, ingroup favoritism, and outgroup derogation they displayed. On the other hand, the more contact African Americans had with White in the form of White friends, the less ethnocentrism and outgroup derogation they displayed. Second, among Italian South Tyroleans, those who expressed greater out-group derogation were led to experience more substantial negative self-directed effect when they rated a low-conflict out-group, but not when they

rated a high-conflict out-group, compared to participants whose out-group derogation was less (Costarelli & Colloca, 2004).

Besides, some previous studies are conducted in the language field. First, derogation has been used to vilify the Pope and render him inferior and mundane. In contrast, euphemization has been employed to portray him as an altruistic, holy, and even unearthly phenomenon (Rahimi & Sahragard, 2006). Second, the derogation strategy is used through some discursive moves in Crash movie, such as actor description, consensus, empathy, evidentiality, humanitarianism, implication, norm expression, number game, and disclaimer. The euphemization strategy is used through some discursive moves such as actor description, authority, consensus, self-glorification, polarization, and illustration. The function of derogation is to humiliate the opponent, emotive reaction to the anger, disappointment, or something unexpected and undesirable. Related to the euphemization strategy, there are some functions found in the data that include: to hide the facts, show respect, satirize, show concern, convey information, criticize, and warn—that where such functions are used to provide positive label in-group favoritism (Degaf, 2014).

From the previous studies that the researcher found, the present study is almost the same as the previous study. However, the researcher focused more on derogation strategy and the reason behind the existence of derogation in the movie.

Based on the above discussion, the researcher proposed the derogation with Zootopia movie to investigate because investigating it will obtain new findings. The research is expected to contribute to the broad knowledge and deep understanding of derogation. Also, it is expected to give more information about the word chosen in order to avoid the derogatory remark.

**B. Research Questions**

Based on the background of the study, the research questions are:

1. What are the discursive moves and the function of derogation used in Zootopia movie?

2. What is the motive behind the derogation used in Zootopia movie?

**C. Objectives of the Study**

Related to the research questions, the objectives of the study are:

1. To identify the discursive moves and the function of derogation used in Zootopia move

2. To find out and to analyze the motive behind the derogation used in Zootopia movie

**D. Significance of the Study**

The purpose of the study is to give both theoretical and practical contributions for readers. Theoretically, the researcher expects that it would be useful for others who want to analyze the text by using the derogation strategy.

Through the study, the other researchers who are interested in similar studies of derogation can use the study as an additional reference.

Practically, it can be used as information to get better knowledge and understanding of the derogation strategy for the readers. Besides, the study will raise the reader's awareness and understanding of the word choice to communicate with other people in order to avoid derogatory remarks.

## E. Definition of Key Terms

To avoid misunderstanding on what discussed in this research, it is important for the researcher to provide the definition of key terms.

**Derogation** : utterances containing harsh words that aim to humiliate others.

**Discursive Move** : the way derogation and euphemism are materialized

**Zootopia** : an animation movie produced in 2016 about a rabbit named Judy who want to be a police in a city where everyone can be anything named Zootopia city.

## F. Previous Study

The researcher finds some previous studies with a similar topic and different subjects. The first is done by Costarelli and Colloca (2004). They examined the self-directed negative effect that members of an Italian group experienced after they evaluated members of the german and Albanian groups. They examined the effect as a function of out-group derogation. They found that among Italian South Tyroleans, those who expressed greater out-group

derogation were led to experience more substantial negative self-directed effect when they rated a low-conflict out-group, but not when they rated a high-conflict out-group, compared to participants whose out-group derogation was less.

The second is done by Jenkins (2002). He investigated factors associated with the degree to which African Americans engaged in ethnocentrism, ingroup favoritism, and outgroup derogation. He found that the more contact participants had with Whites in the form of daily interactions, the more ethnocentrism, ingroup favoritism, and outgroup derogation they displayed. On the other hand, the more contact participants had with White in the form of White friends, the less ethnocentrism and outgroup derogation they displayed.

The third is done by Rahimi and Sahragard (2006). They explained how the death of the Pope, John Paul II, is presented and viewed differently by people having a range of religious and political perspectives reflected in their email. The pejorative or derisive words (derogation) have been used to vilify the Pope and render him inferior and mundane while euphemistic words (euphemization) have been utilized to portray him as an altruistic, holy and even unearthly phenomenon (Rahimi and Sahragard, 2006, 64).

The last is done by Degaf (2014). He investigated the derogation and euphemization strategies and the functions of derogation and euphemization strategies. The derogation strategy is used through some discursive moves such

as actor description, consensus, empathy, evidentiality, humanitarianism, implication, norm expression, number game, and disclaimer. Second, the euphemization strategy is used through some discursive moves such as actor description, authority, consensus, self-glorification, polarization, and illustration. The function of derogation is to humiliate the opponent, emotive reaction to the anger, disappointment, or something unexpected and undesirable. Related to the euphemization strategy, the functions found in the data include: hide the facts, show respect, satirize, showing concern, convey information, criticize, and warned. That where such functions are used to provide positive label in-group favoritism.

## G. Scope and Limitation

This research analyzes the discursive strategy used in the dialog of Zootopia movies. The researcher focused on the function of derogation, discursive moves of derogation because it materializes the discursive strategies used, which contain derogatory remarks in the movie, and the reason derogation is used in the movie.

## H. Research Method

### 1. Research Design

In this study, the researcher used qualitative research as the method of the research. It is because the researcher analyzed the text. The researcher used Van Dijk's theory about the discursive moves for

the first research question and Zollner's theory about the function of derogation for the second research question.

The method researcher used is critical discourse analysis, and the approach is conversational analysis. It is because the researcher investigated the interaction among the characters in the movie through their conversation. The researcher classified the dialog based on the discursive move and the function of derogation used in the movie. Before classifying the dialog, the researcher needs to analyze the dialog that has the explicit and implicit meaning, which is relevant to the derogatory remarks then classify it.

**2. Research Subject**

The researcher used the dialog of Zootopia characters use in the movie as the subject. The main characters do not limit the dialog, but the researcher analyzed the dialog used by any characters that contain derogatory remarks.

**3. Data Source**

The data source of this study is the utterances that show the derogatory remarks in the dialog of Zootopia movie. The movie was produced by Walt Disney Animation Studios and released by Walt Disney Pictures on March 4, 2016, in the United States that the running time is an hour and 48 minutes. While the researcher got the movie from lk21.org and the script from subscene.com, also, to support the

discussion, the researcher used some related textbooks, journals, and other written materials from the internet that are related to the theory used by the researcher.

4. **Research Instrument**

In this study, the researcher is the main instrument of the study. It is because the researcher watches the movie, reads the script, and analyzes the data. Besides, while analyzing, the researcher needs to read the script and watch the movie to get a deep understanding of the use of discursive move and the function of derogation in Zootopia movie.

5. **Data Collection**

For obtaining the needed collecting data, the following stages will be done. First, the researcher downloads the movie from lk21.org since there is no full video in the official link. Second, the researcher finds the script of the movie in subscene.com. The researcher chooses to find the script on the internet to minimize the data missing.

6. **Data Analysis**

The collected data was analyzed in the following steps. First, the researcher chooses data that are suitable for the research question. The researcher chooses data that contain the worst derogatory remarks regardless of who said it, whether he/she is the main character or not. Second, the researcher classifies the data based on the discursive moves and the function of derogation. From the data that are obtained, the

researcher classifies the discursive moves, and the function of derogation used in the movie. Third, the researcher interprets the data about the discursive moves using the Van Dijk's theory and the functions of derogation using Zollner's theory descriptively. After classifying the discursive moves and the function of derogation, the researcher explains the data. Last, the researcher analyzed the reason behind the existence of derogation in the movie. After analyzing the function, the researcher explains the reason behind the existence of derogation. Thus, the final stage of data analysis is to draw conclusions on the data according to the theories mentioned above

## CHAPTER II

## REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

### A. Discourse Analysis

Before explaining the terms and terminology of discourse analysis, in this context, the researcher began by defining what is meant by discourse, according to some experts. The term discourse is a word that has several meanings depending on different disciplines. From a linguistic perspective, according to Foucault, discourse is a language unit that is larger than a sentence. Discourse is a term used in linguistics to describe the rules and conventions that underlie the use of language in text and oral. In another meaning, discourse is linguistic feedback between speaker and listener as an individual activity that cannot be released with social goals. Still, according to Foucault, he defines that discourse is the full statement of individuals or groups in regulatory practices (Foucault in Eriyanto, 2001: 2).

The emergence of interdisciplinary studies relating to the analysis of the relationship between discourse and social practice is driven by the emergence of discourse in social practice. Moreover, Language is a social practice and not a phenomenon external to society to be adventitiously correlated with it. That language seen as a discourse rather than as

accomplished text compels us to take account not only of the artifacts of language, the products that we hear and see, but also the conditions of production and interpretation of texts. In sum, the process of communicating in which the text is only a part. This emphasis is on the central importance of linguistics (Fairclough, 1989: 76).

Furthermore, discourse analysis is only understood as the study of the unity of language in sentences. Usually, the expansion of this term is always connected to a broader context that fully entices the meaning of the following expression. Interdisciplinary studies related to this phenomenon are referred to as Discourse Analysis (DA).

Earlier, the abstract structures of (written) texts, many contemporary approaches, especially those that are influenced by the social sciences, favor a more dynamic study of (spoken, oral) talk in interaction become the focus of discourse studies, for instance in text linguistics (Fairclough,1989: 14). The investigation of the relationships between forms and functions is the commitment of the development of Discourse Analysis.

The term discourse analysis now has come to be used with a wide range of meanings that cover a wide range of activities. It is used to describe activities at the interaction of disciplines as diverse as sociolinguistics, psycholinguistics, Philosophical linguistics, and computational linguistics.

The Fairclough (2003) approach to discourse analysis (critical discourse analysis version) is based on the assumption that language is a fundamental part of social life that is dialectically interconnected with other elements of social life, so social analysis and research must pay attention language interests. It means that one productive way of doing social research is through a focus on language by using some form of discourse analysis. Furthermore, discourse analysis is only understood as the study of the unity of language in sentences. Usually, the expansion of this term is always connected to a broader context that fully entices the meaning of the following expression. Interdisciplinary studies related to this phenomenon are referred to as Discourse Analysis (DA). His approach to discourse analysis has gone beyond the division between works inspired by the social theory, which tend not to analyze texts and works that focus on the language of texts but tend not to be involved with social theoretical problems. So, text analysis is an essential part of discourse analysis, but discourse analysis is not just a linguistic analysis of texts. Fairclough sees discourse analysis as "oscillating between a focus on specific texts and a focus on the order of discourse, the relatively durable structuring of language which is itself one element of the relatively durable structuring and networking of social practices" (Fairclough, 2003: 2).

According to Gee, discourse analysis involves asking questions about how language, at a particular time and place, is used to interpret aspects of a

network of situations as realized at that time and place and how aspects of the situation network simultaneously give meaning to the language. Then, discourse analysis involves six development tasks (Gee, 1999: 92). These tasks include: (Gee, 1999: 85-86)

1. The building of semiotic

    Collecting situated meanings about what semiotic (communicative) systems, systems of knowledge, and ways of knowing, are here and now relevant and activated by using clues or cue.

2. The building of word

    Assembling situated meanings about what is here and now (taken as) 'reality,' what is here and now (taken as) present and absent, concrete and abstract, 'real' and 'unreal,' probable, possible and impossible by using clues or cue.

3. The building of activity

    Collecting situated meanings about what activity or activities are going on, composed of what specific actions by using clues or cue.

4. The building of socioculturally-situated identity and relationship

    Collecting situated meanings about what identities and relationships are relevant to the interaction, with their contemporary

attitudes, values, ways of feeling, ways of knowing and believing, as well as ways of acting and interacting by using clues or cues.

5. The building of political

> Constructing the nature and relevance of various 'social goods' such as status and power and anything else taken as a 'social good' here and now (e.g., beauty, humor, specialist knowledge, etcetera.) by using clues or cues.

6. The building of a connection

> Interactions always have some degree of continuous coherence by using the cues or clues to make assumptions about how the past and future of interaction, verbally and non-verbally, are connected to the present moment and each other after all.

Van Dijk argues that discourse analysis is essentially a contribution to the study of language in use: "Besides - or even instead - of an explication of the abstract structures of texts or conversations, we witness a concerted interest for the cognitive and especially the social processes, strategies, and contextualization of discourse taken as a mode of interaction in highly complex socio-cultural situations."(Van Dijk in Almufadda). Of course, this different view shows that discourse analysis has now emerged as a diverse field of study, with various approaches in several disciplines and scholars working in various disciplines that tend to concentrate on various aspects of discourse.

1. **Critical Discourse Analysis**

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) begins with critical language theory, which sees the use of language as a form of social practice. All social practices are related to a particular historical context and are a means for existing social relations to be reproduced or contested and different interests provided. These are questions related to interests: What is the position of the text, or what is its position? Whose interests are served by this positioning? Whose interests are negated? What are the consequences of this positioning? All of this relates to power relations. CDA seeks to understand how discourse engages in power relations. Critical discourse studies originate from three overlapping intellectual traditions, each emphasizing linguistic shifts in social science.

However, CDA is not a single theory or methodology but relies on a different theory. There are various definitions of discourse concerning text, ideology, and power, and all this makes CDA dynamic. It is an interdisciplinary approach to language and social studies that explores social interactions that are manifested in linguistic forms. CDA views discourse as a form of social practice, which in turn is influenced by and influences discursive practices. Discursive practices are shaped and influenced by social institutions and social structures. Discursive practices, as part of the discourse, influence the ideology which is further responsible for power relations.

CDA has roots and principles in various traditional theories. It is a type of analytic discourse research that mainly studies the ways of social power; harassment, domination, and inequality are enforced, reproduced, and opposed by texts and speech in social and political contexts (Van Dijk in Hussein). It is one of the approaches in CDA that combines textual, linguistic analysis, and detailed social analysis.

Therefore, the CDA focuses on social issues and issues. This explains the social and discursive structure. CDA follows a unique approach to social problems because it seeks to make explicit power relations visible, which usually re-rooted in social relations and does this by emphasizing, specifically, the context of the text. CDA refers to additional linguistic factors like culture, society, and ideology. The notion of context has many meanings. The context includes all the social and psychological dimensions of culture. The notion of context gives rise to the assumption of a relationship between language and society. This relationship between society and language is seen as dialectics, which is a substantive point that makes CDA very different.

2. **Approaches in Critical Discourse Analysis**

CDA is diverse and interdisciplinary, comprising some approaches based on different experts. CDA must not be understood as a single method but rather as an approach, which constitutes itself at different expert. The methodology of CDA can, therefore, only be presented regarding particular

approaches and about their specific theoretical backgrounds. There are four approaches, in particular, that may be identified based on Christopher Hart's identification: Critical Linguistics, the socio-semiotic approach, the discourse-historical approach, and the socio-cognitive approach (Hart, 2010: 14). However, the researcher elaborated approaches to CDA proposed by Van Djik.

Van Dijk's models try to describe aspects of the discourse to make it workable and practical. This model is called Social Cognition. It connects textual, cognitive, and social structures. For textual structure and social structure are mediated by social cognition. However, what is more, important for general interaction theory is the fact that various types of social structures, such as social contexts and interaction frameworks, rules, conventions, norms, and various categories of participants such as functions or roles, may be related to global action and not always to action local individual. This approach, which becomes his main brand approach in CDA, is the discourse analysis which does not only cover the text structures; rather it also has to do with the mental consciousness of the speaker or a discourse maker in its production process Social cognition is defined as the system of mental representations and processes of group members (Van Dijk in Eriyanto, 2001: 259).

Van Dijk does not study or analyze texts as a single phenomenon, but he also pays more attention to how texts are produced. Discourse, the

use of language and communication do play a special role in such a process of reproduction. However, ideology is also expressed and reproduced by social and semiotic practices aside from text and speech.

For Van Dijk, the text is only a representation of production practices that must be analyzed. Indeed, to explain how socially constructive texts presuppose something that connects textual structure with social cognition and social cognition with social structure. The social-cognitive approach consists of two main elements of the model or scheme and memory. Van Dijk explained that discourse makers tend to use certain models or schemes in presenting oral or written texts. The scheme is as follows:

**a.** Person schema

How someone views and portrays others as positive or negative. Such conditions certainly affect how someone designs and makes other people's representations in the text.

**b.** Self-schema

How a person sees himself/herself in a text which, usually, is modified to meet the desired interest and has better representation than the real self.

**c.** Role schema

How someone describes others' role-played personally or in-group of

society. Such a portrait often affects the meaning of a certain discourse in general.

**d.** Event schema

How someone describes an event then modifies it based on his/her interests or ideologies.

Accordingly, a medium by which one can communicate ideologies in society is served by discourse, "thereby helps reproduce power and domination of specific groups or class." There are certain ideologies shared in discourse situations. According to Van Dijk, ideology is the basic framework for regulating social cognition shared by members of social groups, organizations, or institutions. This is articulated in a conceptual triangle that connects society, discourse, and social cognition within the framework of critical discourse analysis. As a system of principles governing social cognition, ideology is assumed to control, through members' minds, the group's social reproduction.

## B. Derogation in Critical Discourse Analysis

Power and domination is an important thing in CDA. Van Dijk argued the main direction of critical discourse analysis is the study and critique of social inequality. It focuses the role of discourse in the (re)production and the challenge of dominance. Here, dominance is defined as the exercise of social power by elites, institutions or groups, that results in social inequality,

including political, cultural, class, ethnic, racial, and gender inequality (Van Dijk, 1993).

The mechanism of ideological manipulation is materialized through different techniques one of which is the dual classification of derogatory and euphemistic terms. According to Anne in Degaf (2014), derogation is disgraceful, humiliating, disrespect, underestimate, and see them as inferior. While euphemism is using good words to others that give them a good impression.

Van Dijk defines derogation in CDA is strategy in positive self-presentation and Negative Other-Presentation. The main concern of these two strategies is to investigate participants as social groups rather than being mere individuals and presenting the participants in terms of Us versus Them

This discursive polarization is typically characterized by enhancing the positive properties of Us, the ingroup, and the negative properties of Them, the outgroup. At the same time, the negative properties of the ingroup and the positive ones of the outgroup are typically de-emphasized, toned down, mitigated, or simply ignored or hidden. We thus obtain an ideological square that may be applied at all levels of the discourse: positive topics about Us (how tolerant, modern, advanced, peaceful, or intelligent We are), negative topics about Them (how intolerant, backward, aggressive, etc. They are), and avoid negative topics about Us (e.g., our racism or our international aggression, or their contribution to our economy and welfare). The same goes for the words or

metaphors we use, or what information is explicit or remains implicit, foreground or background, among many other discourse structures. Even the syntax of active or passive sentences may thus be used to emphasize our good properties or to hide or background the bad properties of people talked about (Van Dijk, 2016).

The overall strategy of positive self-presentation and negative other presentation is very typical in this biased account of the facts in favour of the speaker's or writer's own interests, while blaming negative situations and events on opponents or on the Others (immigrants, terrorists, youths, etc.). This strategy can be applied to the structures of many discourse levels in the usual way (Van Dijk, 2006: 373) :

1. Overall interaction strategies

   - Positive self-presentation

   - Negative other-presentation

2. Macro speech act implying Our 'good' acts and Their 'bad' acts, e.g. accusation, defence

3. Semantic macrostructures: topic selection

   - (De-)emphasize negative/positive topics about Us/Them

4. Local speech acts implementing and sustaining the global ones, e.g. statements that prove accusation.

5. Local meanings Our/Their positive/negative actions

- Give many/few details

- Be general/specific

- Be vague/precise

- Be explicit/implicit

6. Lexicon: Select positive words for Us, negative words for Them

7. Local syntax

   - Active vs passive sentences, nominalizations: (de)emphasize Our/Their positive/negative agency, responsibility

8. Rhetorical figures

   Hyperboles vs euphemisms for positive/negative meanings

   Metonymies and metaphors emphasizing Our/Their positive/negative properties

9. Expressions: sounds and visuals

   - Emphasize (loud, etc.; large, bold, etc.) positive/negative meanings

   - Order (first, last; top, bottom, etc.) positive/negative meanings

   These strategies and moves at various levels of discourse are hardly surprising because they implement the usual ideological square of discursive group polarization (de/emphasize good/bad things of Us/Them) one finds in all ideological discourse.

## 1. Discursive Moves

Derogation and euphemism are materialized through some discursive moves, such as actor description, authority, burden, empathy, evidentiality, humanitarianism, implication, number game, norm expression, disclaimer, consensus, example/illustration, fallacies, lexicalization, self-glorification, negative other-presentation, polarization, Us-Them categorization, populism, reasonableness, and victimization (Van Dijk, 2000).

a. Actor Description

All discourse on people and action involves different types of actor description (Van Leeuwen in Van Dijk, 2000). Therefore, actors can be described as members of groups or as individuals, by first or family name, function, role, or group name, as specific or unspecific, by their actions or (alleged) attributes, by their position or relation to other people, etcetera. Descriptions of Others may be racist, or they may more delicately express. Descriptions have semantic, rhetorical, and argumentative functions in expressing opinions and points of view about the discourse that make the description itself never neutral.

b. Authority

Many speakers/writers in an argument have the alternative of mentioning authorities to support their argument, usually organizations or

people who are above the fray of party politics, or who are generally recognized, experts or moral leaders. The individual or the group who often have the role are international organizations, scholars, the media, the church, or the courts.

c. Burden

Argumentation is often based on various standard arguments, which represent premises that are taken for granted, as self-evident and as enough reasons to accept the conclusion.

d. Empathy

The expression of empathy may be mostly strategic and serve, primarily to manage the speaker/writer's impression with the listener/reader. Besides, the word "but" – the hint for this discursive move – will give the empathy feel to the listener/reader.

e. Evidentiality

By presenting some evidence for someone's knowledge or opinion, a person's claim or point of view in arguing becomes more credible. It can occur by referring to authority figures or institutions, or by various forms of evidence: How or where did he/she get information.

f. Humanitarianism

The human rights' defense, and critique of those who violate or ignore such rights, and the formulation of general norms and values for the humane treatment of people. Since it may be a conventional,

recognizable strategy, we may also categorize the argument as a topos (in the same way as law and order would be one for the right).

g. Implication

Speakers do not need to say everything they know or believe for many pragmatic reasons. Indeed, much of the discourse remains implied, and the recipient can conclude the implied information from shared knowledge or attitudes and thus be constructed as part of their mental models of the events or actions represented in the discourse.

h. Number Game

The primary means in our culture to persuasively show objectivity is by using numbers and statistics. They represent the facts against mere opinion and impression.

i. Norm Expression

Anti-racist discourse is strongly normative and decries racism, discrimination, prejudice, and anti-immigration policies in sometimes explicit norm-statements about what is 'we.'

j. Disclaimer

Expression's submission for disclaiming the opinion in the discourse.

k. Consensus

Claims about agreement or decision chosen by particular parties.

l. Example/Illustration

Providing concrete examples is an excellent step in arguing, often in the form of sketches or short stories, which illustrate or make more sense the general points maintained by the speaker/writer. More than general truth, concrete examples not only have the power to be easily imagined and more comfortable to remember but also to suggest forms of empirical evidence that encourage (Van Dijk, 2000).

m. Fallacies

In disputes about various points of view and opinions being debated are filled with normative violations of the right argument, that is, by fallacies. It can relate to any element of an argumentative event, that is, the nature of the premise, the relationship between the premise and the conclusion, the relationship between the speaker and the receiver, etcetera.

n. Lexicalization

Expressing the concepts and underlying beliefs in certain lexical matters is needed at the local analysis level. As a function of context features, the same meaning can be expressed varying in different words, based on position, role, purpose, point of view, or the speaker's opinion.

o. Self-Glorification

Various forms of self-glorification: Positive references or praise for one's own country, its principles, its history, and its traditions can implement positive self-presentation.

p. Negative Other-Presentation

The overall strategy of derogation or negative other-presentation, which has been found on the discourse about minorities and immigrants, influences the representation of any level of analysis, such as in lexical and semantic terms.

q. Polarization, Us-Them Categorization

Few semantic strategies about Others are as common as the expression of polarized cognitions, and the categorical division of people in in-group (Us) and out-group (Them). Polarization may also apply to good and evil, sub-categories of out-groups (as is the case for friends and allies on the one hand, and enemies on the other). Also, by attributing properties of Us and Them that are semantically each other's opposites may rhetorically enhance the polarization when expressed as a clear contrast.

r. Populism

Populism is one of the dominant overall strategies of conservative. There are some variants and component moves of the strategy. The basic strategy is to claim (for instance, against the Labour opposition) that "the people" (or "everybody") does not support further immigration, which is also a well-known argumentation fallacy.

s. Reasonableness

A familiar move of argumentative strategies is not only to show that the arguments are sound, but also that the speaker is 'sound,' in the sense of rational or reasonable. The move also has a function in the overall strategies of positive self-presentation and impression management because the move is especially relevant when the argument itself may seem to imply that the speaker is unreasonable or biased.

t. Victimization

Together with Polarization, discourse on ethnic relations is primarily organized by the binary Us-Them pair of ingroups and outgroups. It means that the ingroup needs to be represented as a victim of such a threat when Others tend to be represented in negative terms, and mainly when they are associated with threats.

## 2. The Function of Derogation

The functions of derogation are expressing anger or irritation, criticizing, satirizing, accusing or blaming, delivering information, insulting/taunting or sharpening the insult, showing distaste, exaggerating, and showing evidence (Zollner in Degaf, 2016).

a. Expressing Anger or Irritation

The function of derogation as expressing anger or irritation occurs when somebody feels angry and irritates and expresses it through the rough word he/she used.

b. Criticizing

The critic in this context refers to the derogation that is used to criticize someone or the particular of parties by using descriptions, opinions, and consideration of the good and bad with a sharper or ruder expression.

c. Satirizing

Satirizing in this context means the derogatory word that is used say a thing or a person implicitly using ruder or more impolite words.

d. Accusing or Blaming

Accusing or blaming in this context means to accuse or to blame someone or certain parties upon the incident of the event or phenomenon using negative words.

e. Delivering Information

Delivering information related to derogatory is to give information and to describe the event and phenomenon that happens in the community.

f. Insulting/Taunting or Sharpening the Insult

Derogatory that contains insult means particular humiliating parties while humiliating itself means making fun of particular parties. Derogatory that contains to sharpen the insult means using harsh or taboo words to sharpen the insult and derision to certain parties.

g. Showing Distaste

Showing distaste related to derogatory means to express distaste against particular parties, either in the type of character or action.

h.  Exaggerating

Exaggerating in this context is use a negative or more rugged word to exaggerate events, phenomena, or topics.

i.  Showing Evidence

Showing evidence in this context is to show evidence straightening about the phenomenon being discussed, with a negative view.

## CHAPTER III

## FINDING AND DISCUSSION

### A. Finding

In this section, the researcher presented the discursive moves and the function of derogation found in Zootopia movie. The researcher found 7 discursive moves and 6 functions of derogation used in Zootopia movie. The discursive moves the researcher found in the movie are actor description, empathy, humanitarianism, implication, number game, self-glorification, and polarization. While the function of derogation the researcher found in the movie are expressing anger or irritation, criticizing, delivering information, insulting, and showing distaste.

### 1.     Discursive Moves Used in Zootopia Movie

In the Zootopia movie, there are a lot of derogatory remarks that are said by the characters. The derogatory remarks in the movie often said by the predator to the prey. Here are some dialogs that contain the derogatory remarks and the discursive moves used in Zootopia movie that the researcher managed to identify:

a.   Actor Description

The first dialog using actor description as discursive move is the dialog said by Gideon to Judy.

33

> *Judy: "And I can make the world a better place. I am going to be… A police officer!"*
> *Gideon: "**Bunny cop**? That is the most stupidest thing I ever heard!"*

The dialog said by Gideon indicated actor description as the discursive move because he called Judy not by her name, but the nickname Bunny cop after Judy revealed her dream to be a police officer. In addition, according to CAD, the word bunny is the child's word for rabbit. It shows that Gideon wanted to convey a cuter image that contrasts with the image of a police officer.

The second dialog using actor description as discursive move is the dialog said by the coach to Judy.

> *Coach: "You're dead **carrot face**. Frigid ice wall. You're dead **farm girl**. Enormous criminal. You're dead. Dead. Dead. Dead."*
> *Judy: "Whoohhh…!"*
> *Coach: "Filthy toilet. You're dead, **fluff butt**. Just quit and go home, **fuzzy bunny**."*
> *Judy: "Never."*

What the coach said in the dialog are categorized as actor description because the coach using carrot face, farm girl, fluff butt, and fuzzy bunny to call Judy instead of Judy's real name. Those nicknames are chosen by the coach because Judy could not pass the challenges in the academy which made the coach called her such a cute name that shows that Judy is a weak animal and not strong enough to be a police officer.

The third dialog using actor description as discursive move is the dialog said by the elephant to Nick.

> *Elephant: "Look, you probably can't read, **fox**, but the sign says, WE RESERVE THE RIGHT TO REFUSE SERVICE TO ANYONE! So, beat it!"*
> *Customer: You're holding up the line."*

Here, the way the elephant called Nick is categorized as actor description because he called Nick not by his name. The way the elephant treat Nick is because influenced by the stigma of fox behavior which is known to be cunning both in the real form and in the form of mythology or legends found in the animal world

The fourth dialog using actor description as discursive move is the dialog said by the citizen to Judy.

> *Deer: "I was 30 seconds over!"*
> *Mouse: "Yeah, you're **a real hero**, lady."*

The noun phrase a real hero is categorized as actor description because according to CAD, hero means a person who is admired for having done something very brave or having achieved something great. However, in this context, we can see that the mouse actually feels annoyed toward Judy, so it is an expression of sarcasm for Judy.

The fifth dialog using actor description as discursive move is the dialog between Judy and Nick.

> *Nick: "Actually, I just remembered, I have a pal at the DMV. Flash is the fastest guy in there. You need something done he's on it."*

> *Judy: "I hope so. We are really fighting the clock and every minute counts. Wait. They're all **sloths**? You said this was going to be quick!"*
> *Nick: "What, are you saying just because he's **a sloth** he can't be fast? I thought in Zootopia anyone could be anything. Flash, Flash, Hundred Yard Dash! Buddy, it's nice to see you."*

Here, the word sloth Judy mentioned can be categorized as actor description because the way Judy emphasized the word sloth. She mention the word sloth with the shocking tone because she could not believe that the DMV employees that require the employees to work quickly.

The sixth dialog using actor description as discursive move is the dialog said by Chief Bogo to Judy and Nick.

> *Chief Bogo: "The savage jaguar?"*
> *Judy: "Sir, I know what I saw. He almost killed us!"*
> *Chief Bogo: "Or maybe any aggressive predator looks savage to **rabbits**? Let's go!"*
> *Judy: "Wait! Sir! I'm not the only one who saw him. Nick.*
> *Chief Bogo: You think I'm gonna believe **a fox**?"*

What Chief Bogo said to Judy and Nick can be categorized as actor description because Chief Bogo could not trust Judy and Nick's report about the jaguar, even he did not trust Judy and Nick to handle the case in the first place. Thus, because of those reasons, made Chief Bogo called Judy and Nick not by their name.

The seventh dialog using actor description as discursive move is the dialog said by a scout member to Nick.

> *Nick: "What? No, no! What did I do wrong, you guys? No, please tell me what did I do wrong. What did I do?"*
> *Scout member: "If you thought we would ever trust **a fox without a muzzle**? You're even dumber than you look."*

Here, the way the scout member called Nick can be categorized as actor description because as in the previous example, Nick was called by her name. Again, the reason the scout member using the word fox when he refers to Nick because the stigma about Nick as a fox. In addition, the additional phrase "without muzzle" he used because Nick was forced wear a muzzle (moth guard) by the other scout members.

The eighth dialog using actor description as discursive move is the dialog said by Lionheart to Bellwether.

> *Lionheart: **"Smellwether!"***
> *Bellwether: "Ah. That's a fun little name he likes to use. I called him Lionfart once, he did not care for that. Let me tell you, it was not a good day for me. Yes, sir."*

The dialog said by Lionheart is categorized as actor description is because he changed Bellwether's name with Smellwether. In addition, the word Smellwether is a pun from Bellwether. From the meaning of the pun that is made by Lionheart, it can be seen that he did not treat Bellwether well. It is different when Bellwether told Judy

and Nick about the nickname she gave for Bellwether. Bellwether's reason for telling them is not because she had bad intention to Lionheart, but because she did not want to lose her dignity in front of them.

The ninth dialog using actor description as discursive move is the dialog said by a citizen to another citizen.

> Pig: "Go back to the forest, **predator***!"*
> Tiger: "I am from the savannah."

What the pig said to the tiger is categorized as actor description. It because the way the pig calling the tiger as a predator after the case Juudy revealed that the predator can be a savage according to their DNA.

b. Empathy

The first dialog using empathy as discursive move is the dialog said by Chief Bogo to his subordinates.

> Chief Bogo: "All right. All right. Everybody sit.
> I've got three items on the docket. First, we need
> to acknowledge the elephant in the room.
> Francine. Happy birthday."
> Police officers: "Huh. Oh, yeah!"
> Judy: "Oh."
> Chief Bogo: "Number two. There are some new
> recruits with us I should introduce, **but I'm not
> going to because… I don't care**. Finally, we have
> 14 missing mammal cases. All predators."

Here, it is obvious that Chief Bogo underestimate Judy and did not like Judy for being the police officer. Chief Bogo was nice when

he announced about Francine's birthday. While when it came to Judy, he was not interested to talk about it even did not introduce her to others.

The second dialog using empathy as discursive move is the dialog said by the elephant to Nick.

> *Elephant: "Look, you probably can't read, fox, **but the sign says, WE RESERVE THE RIGHT TO REFUSE SERVICE TO ANYONE! So, beat it**!"*
> *Customer: You're holding up the line."*

In this dialog, it shows the elephant emphasizes about the sign to Nick. He shows that in a bad way because he did not want to serve Nick. Again, the reason is because Nick is a fox.

The third dialog using empathy as discursive move is the dialog said by Yax.

> *Nick: "Oh boy. Does this make you uncomfortable? Because if so, there's no shame in calling it quits."*
> *Judy: "Yes, there is."*
> *Nick: "Boy, that's the spirit."*
> *Yax: "Yeah, some mammals say the naturalist life is weird. **But you know what I says is weird? Clothes on animals!** Here we go! As you can see, Nangi is an elephant, so she'll totally remember everything. Hey, Nangi. These dudes have some questions about Emmit the otter."*

Yax was a member of naturalist that exist in Zootopia. Hearing what Judy and Nick said, Yax expressed what he felt about others' opinion about the naturalist. From what he said, it shows that Yax did

not agree about naturalist was a weird animals. He stated that the one who is weird is the animal who wear clothes, not the naturalist.

The fourth dialog using empathy as discursive move is the dialog between Judy and Nick.

> *Nick: ""Clearly there's a biological component?"*
> *"These predators may be reverting back to their primitive, savage ways?" are you serious?"*
> *Judy: "I just stated the facts of the case. I mean, it's not like a bunny could go savage."*
> *Nick: "Right, **but a fox could?** Huh?"*
> *Judy: "Nick, stop it, you're not like them."*
> *Nick: "Oh, there's a 'them' now?"*

Here, Judy gave statement that the predator could go savage but Bunny could not go savage. Nick, after hearing what Judy said, Nick conclude by saying "but a fox could?" with his disappointed and angry tone.

The fifth dialog using empathy as discursive move is the dialog said by Bellwether to Judy.

> *Bellwether: "We're on the same team, Judy. Underestimated. Underappreciated. Aren't you sick of it? Predators. They may be strong and loud. **But prey outnumber predators 10 to 1**. Think about it. 90% of the population united against a common enemy. We'll be unstoppable."*

What Bellwether said can be categorized as empathy. It because she said about how strong the predator are then said about how much the prey are. Here, from Bellwether's perspective, the prey are better

than predator so she believed that she could turn the prey to be strong one in Zootopia.

c. Humanitarianism

The dialog using humanitarianism as discursive move is the dialog said by Gideon to Judy.

> *Judy: "And I can make the world a better place. I am going to be... A police officer!"*
> *Gideon: "Bunny cop? That is **the most stupidest thing** I ever heard!"*

The dialog said by Gideon can be categorized as humanitarianism. It because what Gideon said to Judy with the mocking tone can be meant that in Gideon's opinion, Judy cannot be a police officer. It showed that as if Judy had no rights to be what she wants.

d. Implication

The first dialog using implication as discursive move is the dialog said by Nick to Judy.

> *Nick: "Actually, I just remembered, I have a pal at the DMV. Flash is the fastest guy in there. You need something done he's on it."*
> *Judy: "I hope so. We are really fighting the clock and every minute counts. Wait. **They're all sloths**? You said this was going to be quick!"*
> *Nick: "**What, are you saying just because he's a sloth he can't be fast? I thought in Zootopia anyone could be anything.** Flash, Flash, Hundred Yard Dash! Buddy, it's nice to see you."*

There are two implications in the dialog. First, Judy was shocked because the employees of DMV was sloths. Judy was shocked because she thought that the DMV's employees would work quickly. However, what she saw when they were in the DMV was the employee was the sloth and it showed that Judy underestimated the sloth's work.

Second, Nick's sarcasm about Judy's reaction towards the sloths. Nick said that in Zootopia, there is no impossible thing even sloths could work as a employee of DMV. In addition, Nick's sarcasm implicitly means that Judy's opinion about the sloths was same as netizens' opinion about Judy.

The second dialog using implication as discursive move is the dialog said by a citizen to another citizen.

> Pig: "**Go back to the forest**, predator!"
> Tiger: "I am from the savannah."

Here, the pig told the tiger to go back to the forest implicitly means the tiger and other predators should go back where they should be, the forest, and no longer deserve to be in Zootopia city.

e. Number Game

The first dialog using number game as discursive move is the dialog said by a citizen to Judy.

> Deer: "**I was 30 seconds over!**"
> Mouse: "Yeah, you're a real hero, lady."

In this dialog, the deer complained to Judy for giving him the parking violation ticket. By mentioning the exact time of how long he over the limitation of the parking time, the deep emphasize how strict Judy was.

The second dialog using number game as discursive move is the dialog said by news anchor.

> *News anchor: "More bad news in this city gripped by fear. A caribou is in critical condition. The victim of a mauling by a savage polar bear. This, **the 27th such attack**, comes just one week after ZPD Officer, Judy Hopps connected the violence to traditionally predatory animals."*

Here, the news was giving a report about the case of the predator had gone savage. By mentioning the exact number of attack, it could make the prey felt more afraid to the predator which made the prey stay away from the predator.

The third dialog using number game as discursive move is the dialog said by Bellwether to Judy.

> *Bellwether: "We're on the same team, Judy. Underestimated. Underappreciated. Aren't you sick of it? Predators. They may be strong and loud. **But prey outnumber predators 10 to 1**. Think about it. **90% of the population** united against a common enemy. We'll be unstoppable."*

In the dialog, Bellwether attempted to persuade Judy to side with her by mentioning the number of population in Zootopia as the affirmation of her persuasion and showed to Judy that they were the

majority in Zootopia and have a right to against the predator, the minority, that discriminated them.

f. Self-Glorification

The first dialog using self-glorification as discursive move is the dialog said by Yax.

> *Nick: "Oh boy. Does this make you uncomfortable? Because if so, there's no shame in calling it quits."*
> *Judy: "Yes, there is."*
> *Nick: "Boy, that's the spirit."*
> *Yax: "Yeah, **some mammals say the naturalist life is weird. But you know what I says is weird? Clothes on animals!** Here we go! As you can see, Nangi is an elephant, so she'll totally remember everything. Hey, Nangi. These dudes have some questions about Emmit the otter."*

Here, Yax who heard Judy and Nick conversation told about how others see the naturalist as a strange animal while, in naturalist' opinion, the strange one is the one who wears clothes. From that dialog, it shows that Yax and citizens who do not agree with the naturalist ideology glorify their parties that lead to seeing other parties that do not have the same ideology as they are false.

The second dialog using self-glorification as discursive move is the dialog said by a scout member to Nick.

> *Nick: "What? No, no! What did I do wrong, you guys? No, please tell me what did I do wrong. What did I do?"*

> *Scout member: "**If you thought we would ever trust a fox without a muzzle? You're even dumber than you look**."*

Here, the scout member said that they would never trust Nick to join them. They felt proud about their party, prey, and did not want to let Nick, the only predator in the group, to be a member of Boy Scouts.

The third dialog using self-glorification as discursive move is the dialog said by Judy.

> *Nick: ""Clearly there's a biological component?" "These predators may be reverting back to their primitive, savage ways?" are you serious?"*
> *Judy: "I just stated the facts of the case. I mean, **it's not like a bunny could go savage**."*
> *Nick: "Right, but a fox could? Huh?"*
> *Judy: "Nick, stop it, you're not like them."*
> *Nick: "Oh, there's a 'them' now?"*

In the dialog, Judy answer Nick question about Judy's statement that lead to misunderstanding about the predator's attack with the statement that there will no Bunny go savage. From the answer itself shows that Judy glorifying her party, prey especially bunny, would not go savage like the predator.

The fourth dialog using self-glorification as discursive move is the dialog said by Bellwether to Judy.

> *Bellwether: "We're on the same team, Judy. Underestimated. Underappreciated. Aren't you sick of it? Predators. They may be strong and loud. **But prey outnumber predators 10 to 1**. Think about it. **90% of the population united against a common enemy. We'll be unstoppable**."*

In the dialog, Bellwether try to persuade Judy to join her against the predator. Here, Bellwether mentioned the number of prey population to made it easier to persuade Judy. Of course, it also shows that in the Bellwether's perspective, prey was better than predator.

g. Polarization

The first dialog using polarization as discursive move is the dialog said by a scout member to Nick.

> Nick: *"What? No, no! What did I do wrong, you guys? No, please tell me what did I do wrong. What did I do?"*
> Scout member: *"If you thought **we** would ever trust a fox without a muzzle? You're even dumber than you look."*

Here, Nick got bad treatment from the scout members because he is the only predator. The scout members who are entirely prey animals felt that they did not need a predator, especially a fox to join them.

The second dialog using polarization as discursive move is the dialog said by Nick to Judy.

> Nick: *""Clearly there's a biological component?" "These predators may be reverting back to their primitive, savage ways?" are you serious?"*
> Judy: *"I just stated the facts of the case. I mean, it's not like a bunny could go savage."*
> Nick: *"Right, but a fox could? Huh?"*
> Judy: *"Nick, stop it, you're not like them."*
> Nick: *"Oh, there's a **'them'** now?"*

After Judy giving statement about the case, Nick criticized Judy that what she said could lead to misunderstanding. In their argument, Judy said that Nick was different from them, other predators, which made Nick angry because Judy had indirectly distinguished between prey and predators.

The third dialog using polarization as discursive move is the dialog said by Bellwether to Judy.

> *Bellwether: "We're on the same team, Judy. Underestimated. Underappreciated. Aren't you sick of it? Predators. **They** may be strong and loud. But prey outnumber predators 10 to 1. Think about it. 90% of the population united against a common enemy. **We**'ll be unstoppable."*

Here, as the researchers mentioned earlier, Bellwether tried to persuade Judy by mentioning the data and comparing the strengths of each group. However, Bellwether not only compared each strength but also downgraded another class, predators.

2. **The Function of Derogation in Zootopia Movie**

After knowing the discursive moves used in Zootopia, the derogatory remarks used in the Zootopia can be separated from the function of derogation. Here are the function of derogation researcher found in Zootopia movie:

a. Expressing anger or irritation

The first dialog showing the derogatory remark that has a function as expressing anger or irritation is the dialog said by the coach to Judy.

> *Coach: "**You're dead carrot face**. Frigid ice wall. **You're dead farm girl**. Enormous criminal. You're **dead. Dead. Dead. Dead**."*
> *Judy: "Whoohhh…!"*
> *Coach: "Filthy toilet. **You're dead, fluff butt. Just quit and go home, fuzzy bunny**."*

The coach called Judy as carrot face, farm girl, fluff butt, and fuzzy bunny because the coach was annoyed because of Judy's weakness even Judy fell in the toilet. Besides, the coach was also annoyed by Judy because of her stubbornness about her dream to be a police officer and did not want to quit from the academy as the coach said to her.

The second dialog showing the derogatory remark that has a function as expressing anger or irritation is the dialog said by a citizen to Judy.

> *Deer: "**I was 30 seconds over!**"*
> *Mouse: "Yeah, you're a real hero, lady."*

In this dialog, the deer complained to Judy for giving him the parking violation ticket. By mentioning the exact time of how long he over the limitation of the parking time, the deep emphasized how strict Judy was and showed that he was angry to Judy for giving him the parking violation ticket.

The third dialog showing the derogatory remark that has a function as expressing anger or irritation is the dialog said by Yax.

> *Nick: "Oh boy. Does this make you uncomfortable? Because if so, there's no shame in calling it quits."*
> *Judy: "Yes, there is."*
> *Nick: "Boy, that's the spirit."*
> *Yax: "Yeah, **some mammals say the naturalist life is weird. But you know what I says is weird? Clothes on animals!** Here we go! As you can see, Nangi is an elephant, so she'll totally remember everything. Hey, Nangi. These dudes have some questions about Emmit the otter."*

Yax, who was a member of naturalist that exist in Zootopia, expressed what he felt about others' opinion about the naturalist after hearing what Judy and Nick were talking about. He said his opinion with angry tone to express his anger or irritation toward others' opinion.

The fourth dialog showing the derogatory remark that has a function as expressing anger or irritation is the dialog said by Nick to Judy.

> *Nick: ""Clearly there's a biological component?" "These predators may be reverting back to their primitive, savage ways?" are you serious?"*
> *Judy: "I just stated the facts of the case. I mean, it's not like a bunny could go savage."*
> *Nick: "Right, **but a fox could? Huh?"***
> *Judy: "Nick, stop it, you're not like them."*
> *Nick: "**Oh, there's a 'them' now?"***

Here, Nick who was shocked by Judy's statement, showed her anger because of Judy's statement that Nick was not like other

predators that could be savage. However, what Judy said made Nick angrier than before because Judy openly differentiate prey and predator.

b.  Criticizing

The dialog showing the derogatory remark that has a function as criticizing is the dialog said by Nick to Judy.

> *Nick: ""Clearly there's a biological component?"*
> *"These predators may be reverting back to their primitive, savage ways?" are you serious?"*
> *Judy: "I just stated the facts of the case. I mean, it's not like a bunny could go savage."*
> *Nick: "Right, **but a fox could? Huh?"***
> *Judy: "Nick, stop it, you're not like them."*
> *Nick: "Oh**, there's a 'them' now?"***

Here, Judy gave statement that the predator could go savage but Bunny could not go savage. Nick, after hearing what Judy said, Nick replied to Judy's words with his disappointed and angry tone. In addition, the words Nick said also indicate that Nick want to criticize Judy because in his opinion, Judy's statement was wrong.

c.  Delivering Information

The dialog showing the derogatory remark that has a function as delivering information is the dialog said by a news anchor.

> *News anchor: "More bad news in this city gripped by fear. A caribou is in critical condition. The victim of a mauling by a savage polar bear. This, **the 27th such attack**, comes just one week after ZPD Officer, Judy Hopps connected the violence to traditionally predatory animals."*

As the researcher mentioned before, the news anchor was reporting about the attack. The news anchor was delivering the information about the attack by mention the name that led the prey felt unsafe near the predator.

d. Insulting

The first dialog showing the derogatory remark that has a function as insulting is the dialog said by Gideon to Judy.

> *Judy: "And I can make the world a better place. I am going to be… A police officer!"*
> *Gideon: "**Bunny cop? That is the most stupidest thing I ever heard!**"*

What Gideon said after Judy revealed her dream, Gideon made fun of Judy by saying the rude comment. In addition, it shows that Gideon wanted to convey a cuter image that contrasts with the image of a police officer.

The second dialog showing the derogatory remark that has a function as insulting is the dialog said by an elephant to Nick.

> *Elephant: "Look, you probably can't read, **fox, but the sign says, WE RESERVE THE RIGHT TO REFUSE SERVICE TO ANYONE! So, beat it!**"*

Here, what the elephant said to Nick was very rude. Not only about the words he said, but also the way he talk to Nick by yelling at

is also rude. Thus, it could be said that Nick was insulted by the elephant.

The third dialog showing the derogatory remark that has a function as insulting is the dialog said by Judy.

> *Nick: "Actually, I just remembered, I have a pal at the DMV. Flash is the fastest guy in there. You need something done he's on it."*
> *Judy: "I hope so. We are really fighting the clock and every minute counts. Wait. **They're all sloths? You said this was going to be quick!**"*
> *Nick: "What, are you saying just because he's a sloth he can't be fast? I thought in Zootopia anyone could be anything. Flash, Flash, Hundred Yard Dash! Buddy, it's nice to see you."*

Here, Judy was shocked because the employees of DMV was sloths. Knowing about the employees of DMV, Judy could not hide her disappointment because she was in a rush and it showed that Judy underestimated the sloth's work.

The fourth dialog showing the derogatory remark that has a function as insulting is the dialog said by Chief Bogo to Judy and Nick.

> *Chief Bogo: "The savage jaguar?"*
> *Judy: "Sir, I know what I saw. He almost killed us!"*
> *Chief Bogo: "**Or maybe any aggressive predator looks savage to rabbits?** Let's go!"*
> *Judy: "Wait! Sir! I'm not the only one who saw him. Nick.*
> *Chief Bogo: **"You think I'm gonna believe a fox?"***

In this dialog, it was obvious that Chief Bogo downgraded Judy and Nick's work in the case that they did. Chief Bogo downgraded Judy and Nick's work is because of the fact that Judy was a rabbit that in his opinion that she was not compatible to be a police officer and Nick who was a fox that was stereotyped as a liar.

The fifth dialog showing the derogatory remark that has a function as insulting is the dialog said by a scout member to Nick.

> *Nick: "What? No, no! What did I do wrong, you guys? No, please tell me what did I do wrong. What did I do?"*
> *Scout member:* **"If you thought we would ever trust a fox without a muzzle? You're even dumber than you look."**

The way the scout member called Nick can be categorized as actor description because as in the previous example, Nick was called by her name. Again, the reason the scout member using the word fox when he refers to Nick because the stigma about Nick as a fox. In addition, the scout members were making fun of Nick when Nick was forced to wear a muzzle (moth guard) by the other scout members.

The sixth dialog showing the derogatory remark that has a function as insulting is the dialog said by Lionheart to Bellwether.

> *Lionheart:* **"Smellwether!"**
> *Bellwether: "Ah. That's a fun little name he likes to use. I called him Lionfart once, he did not care for that. Let me tell you, it was not a good day for me. Yes, sir."*

In this dialog, the word Smellwether is a pun from Bellwether. From the meaning of the pun that is made by Lionheart, it can be seen that he was insulting Bellwether and did not treat Bellwether well. The seventh dialog showing the derogatory remark that has a function as insulting is the dialog said by a citizen to another citizen.

> *Pig: **"Go back to the forest, predator!"***
> *Tiger: "I am from the savannah."*

Here, the pig told the tiger to go back to the forest implicitly means the tiger and other predators should go back where they should be, the forest, and no longer deserve to be in Zootopia city. In addition, the pig called the tiger predator that made it even worse. Thus, the function of derogatory remark used by the pig to the tiger is insulting.

e.  Showing Distaste

The first dialog showing the derogatory remark that has a function as showing distaste is the dialog said by Gideon to Judy.

> *Judy: "And I can make the world a better place. I am going to be... A police officer!"*
> *Gideon: **"Bunny cop? That is the most stupidest thing I ever heard!"***

Here, what Gideon said after Judy revealed her dream, Gideon made fun of Judy by saying the rude comment. In addition, it shows that Gideon wanted to convey a cuter image that contrasts with the image of a police officer. It also shows that Gideon did not like the idea about Judy being the police officer. Thus, the function of derogatory

remark said by Gideon is not only for insulting, but also for showing distaste.

The second dialog showing the derogatory remark that has a function as showing distaste is the dialog said by Chief Bogo to his subordinates.

> *Chief Bogo: "All right. All right. Everybody sit. I've got three items on the docket. First, we need to acknowledge the elephant in the room. Francine. Happy birthday."*
> *Police officers: "Huh. Oh, yeah!"*
> *Judy: "Oh."*
> *Chief Bogo: "Number two. There are some new recruits with us I should introduce, **but I'm not going to because… I don't care**. Finally, we have 14 missing mammal cases. All predators."*

In the dialog, it is obvious that Chief Bogo underestimate Judy and did not like Judy for being the police officer. Chief Bogo was nice when he announced about one of his subordinates' birthday. While when it came to Judy, he was not interested to talk about it even did not introduce her to others. Thus, it is obvious that the function of derogatory remark said by Chief Bogo is for showing distaste.

The third dialog showing the derogatory remark that has a function as showing distaste is the dialog said by Bellwether to Judy.

> *Bellwether: "We're on the same team, Judy. Underestimated. Underappreciated. Aren't you sick of it? Predators. They may be strong and loud. **But prey outnumber predators 10 to 1**. Think about it. **90% of the population united against a common enemy**. We'll be unstoppable."*

Here, Bellwether try to persuade Judy to join her against the predator. Bellwether mentioned the number of prey population to make it easier to persuade Judy. Of course, it also shows that in the Bellwether's perspective, prey was better than predator. In addition, it is obvious from what Bellwether said that she did not like the predator.

## B. Discussion

In this section, the researcher discussed the finding of the research using the theory of discursive move by Van Dijk and the function of derogation by Zollner. After analyzing the derogatory remarks using Van Dijk and Zollner's theories, the researcher did a deeper examination about the motive behind the derogatory remarks used in Zootopia movie.

### 1. The Discursive Moves and the Function of Derogation Used in Zootopia Movie

Before further discussion about the discursive moves and the function of derogation, the researcher would recall the concept of derogation from a theoretical perspective. According to Anne in Degaf (2014), negative other-presentation is humiliated, disrespect, disgrace, underestimate other people, and see them as inferior. According to Anne's statement, if it is linked to the Zootopia movie, Zootopia movie is the hegemonic-derogatory expression using the preys' power that is dominated by the predators before, turn out the predators are dominated by the prey.

Some derogatory remarks are obviously shown in Zootopia movie. The curse, the scolding, and the distrust from the citizen to the preys in power become an interesting exemplar to study. On the other hand, the derogatory remarks in Zootopia movie are not only for the prey but also for the predator, e.g., fox. It is because the background of the fox in real life is as an opportunist and cunning animal. It could be proved by some legends and western and eastern mythologies that often describe the fox as the cunning and wicked animal.

Here is the first example of derogation that is said by Zootopia citizens, and the social structure as the form of the critic to the prey is the derogation that is said by Gideon to Judy.

> Judy: "And I can make the world a better place. I am going to be… A police officer!"
> Gideon: "**Bunny cop**? That is **the most stupidest thing I ever heard!**"

In the dialog, Gideon Grey used the word Bunny cop to underestimate Judy's dream. The phrase Bunny cop that he used shows that there has never been a rabbit become a police officer. While the rabbit is known as a cute and small mammal. Also, the word bunny feels cuter that has the contrast image of the police. Furthermore, calling Judy as a Bunny cop shows that he wanted to emphasize how weak the rabbit is to be a police officer. In addition, the Giedon's comment by saying that Judy's dream is the stupidest thing he's ever heard made his words more offensive to Judy.

It also state that Judy could not do what she wants. Thus, to change the dialog without derogatory remarks, it would be better if the noun phrase *a bunny cop* is changed to *a cop* and the noun phrase *the most stupidest thing* is changed to *the first time*

From the analysis above, if it is linked to Van Dijk's discursive moves, the derogatory remark that is said by Gideon is included in the actor description. According to Van Dijk (2000), actors can be described as members of groups or as individuals, by first or family name, function, role or group name, as specific or unspecific, by their actions or (alleged) attributes, by their position or relation to other people, etcetera. Descriptions of Others may be racist, or they may more delicately express. Descriptions have semantic, rhetorical, and argumentative functions in expressing opinions and points of view about the discourse that make the description itself never neutral.

In addition, the derogatory remark that is said by Gideon is also included in the humanitarianism. According to Van Dijk (2000), humanitarianism is the human rights' defense and critique of those who violate or ignore such rights, and the formulation of general norms and values for the human treatment of people.

Besides, based on the function of derogation, the derogatory remark that Gideon uses to Judy is to insult and show distaste. According to Zollner in Degaf (2016), insulting regarding the function of the derogation is

particularly humiliating parties, while humiliating itself means making fun of particular parties. While showing distaste is to express distaste against particular parties, either in the type of character or action. In the dialog, Gideon Grey used the word Bunny cop to underestimate Judy's dream. The phrase Bunny cop that he used shows that there has never been a rabbit become a police officer. While the rabbit is known as a cute and small mammal. In addition, the word bunny feels cuter that has the contrast image of the police. Furthermore, calling Judy as a Bunny cop shows that he wanted to emphasize how weak the rabbit is to be a police officer.

The second example of the derogatory remark that is used to Judy is from a polar bear, the coach of a police academy. The derogatory remark said by the coach is because the coach was annoyed by Judy's capability that is far from the expectation as the police officer. The derogatory remarks that are said by the coach to Judy are:

> *Coach: "You're dead **carrot face**. Frigid ice wall.*
> *You're dead **farm girl**. Enormous criminal. You're dead.*
> *Dead. Dead. Dead."*
> *Judy: "Whoohhh…!"*
> *Coach: "Filthy toilet. You're dead, **fluff butt**. Just quit*
> *and go home, **fuzzy bunny**."*
> *Judy: "Never."*

In the dialog, the coach called Judy as carrot face, farm girl, fluff butt, and fuzzy bunny. The coach chooses those nicknames because Judy could not pass the challenges in the academy, which made the coach called her such a cute name that shows that Judy is a weak animal and not strong

enough to be a police officer. To make the dialog be less offensive, the noun phrase "*carrot face", "farm girl", "fluff butt"* and *"fuzzy bunny"* can be replaced with "Judy".

Also, the coach called Judy as a stupid carrot-farming dumb bunny that showed how annoyed the coach toward Judy because of Judy's weakness even Judy fell in the toilet. Besides, the coach was also annoyed by Judy because of her stubbornness about her dream to be a police officer and did not want to quit from the academy, as the coach said to her. The nickname also emphasizes how weak Judy was. Judy's weakness as the animal in the lowest food chain hierarchy that was having a dream as a police officer, in the coach's opinion, looks like a castle in the air. Almost none of the criteria or characteristics of police attaches to Judy. Here, the noun phrase "*a stupid carrot-farming dumb bunny"* can be replaced with *"a rabbit"* to make the dialog not too rude.

The discursive move of derogation used by the coach to Judy is actor description with the function of derogation is expressing anger or irritation. According to Zollner in Degaf (2016), expressing anger or irritation regarding the function of derogation is the derogation that occurs when somebody feels angry and irritates and expresses it through the rough word he/she used.

The third example of the derogation also occurs between the prey that is the derogatory remark said by Chief Bogo to Judy. It occurred when

Chief Bogo introduced Judy in their morning briefing to the other polices.

However, the tone he used to introduced Judy shows his ignorance.

> *Chief Bogo: "All right. All right. Everybody sit. I've got three items on the docket. First, we need to acknowledge the elephant in the room. Francine. Happy birthday."*
> *Police officers: "Huh. Oh, yeah!"*
> *Judy: "Oh."*
> *Chief Bogo: "Number two. There are a new recruit with us I should introduce, **but I'm not going to because… I don't care**. Finally, we have 14 missing mammal cases. All predators."*

In the dialog, Chief Bogo did not care about Judy. It is seen from his treatment toward his subordinates. He congratulated Francine for his first birthday while he simply introduced Judy without calling her name. Also, his way of introducing Judy seems rude by saying *"There are a new recruit with us I should introduce, but I'm not going to because… I don't care*". He knew that he should introduce his new subordinate, but he did not care because his new subordinate was Judy, the first rabbit police officer. The sentence *"but I'm not going to because… I don't care"* can be changed to *"her name is Judy Hopps"* to make the dialog harmless.

The discursive move of derogation used by the coach to Judy is empathy with the function of derogation is showing distaste. Furthermore, according to Van Dijk (2000), the expression of empathy may be mostly strategic and serve, primarily to manage the speaker/writer's impression with the listener/reader. Besides, the word "but" – the hint for this discursive move – will give the empathy feel to the listener/reader.

The fourth example of derogation in the Zootopia movie also said by the prey, elephant, to the predator, Nick. Here are the derogatory remarks said by the elephant.

> *Elephant: "Look, you probably can't read, **fox, but the sign says, WE RESERVE THE RIGHT TO REFUSE SERVICE TO ANYONE! So, beat it!"***
> *Customer: "You're holding up the line."*

The derogation used by the elephant to Nick, none other than the stigma of fox behavior known as the cunning animal. Therefore, the elephant did not trust Nick because of that stigma that leads to the elephant refuse to serve Nick. Also, the word but he used in the dialog show that he wanted to emphasize the sign and address it directly to Nick. His act shows how he did not want to serve Nick because of that stigma. Here, the noun *"fox"* and the sentence *"but the sign says, WE RESERVE THE RIGHT TO REFUSE SERVICE TO ANYONE! So, beat it!"* can be replaced with *"sir"* and *"but the sign says we can refuse service to anyone"* to make the dialog not too rude.

The discursive move of derogation used by the coach to Judy is actor description and empathy and the function of derogatory remarks used by the elephant is insulting.

The fifth example of the derogatory remark address to Judy also occurred even when she did her job as a police officer. Judy that did her job

to give a payment ticket got many critics from the citizen who got the ticket payment.

> *Deer: "**I was 30 seconds over!**"*
> *Mouse: "Yeah, you're **a real hero**, lady."*

In the dialog, the dear complained to Judy by mentioning the time because the dear wanted to show how strict Judy was. In addition, the mouse called Judy as a real hero. According to CAD, the hero means a person who is admired for having done something fearless or having achieved something great. However, in this context, we can see that the mouse feels annoyed toward Judy, so it is an expression of sarcasm for Judy. It is because, in her opinion, Judy is too strict that make most of Zootopia citizens got the note of the punishment for parking too long. Therefore, Judy is called the real hero because she can give so many tickets of payment for parking too long for the citizen who breaks the rule. Thus, to make the dialog less offensive, the sentence *"I was 30 seconds over!"* and the noun phrase *"a real hero"* can be replaced with *"I was a few seconds over!"* and *"a police officer"*.

The discursive move of derogation used by the coach to Judy is actor description, and the number game with the function of derogation is expressing anger or irritation. According to Van Dijk (2000), The primary means in our culture to persuasively show objectivity is by using numbers and statistics. They represent the facts against mere opinion and impression.

The sixth example of the derogatory remark in the Zootopia movie occurred when Judy and Nick visited the place where the naturalist gather. They visited the place in order to meet the elephant known for his strong memory. When they are on their way to meet the elephant with Yax, who accompanied them, they were having a conversation about the naturalist, and here is where the derogatory remark show.

> Nick: "Oh boy. Does this make you uncomfortable? Because if so, there's no shame in calling it quits."
> Judy: "Yes, there is."
> Nick: "Boy, that's the spirit."
> Yax: "Yeah, some mammals say the naturalist life is weird. **But you know what I says is weird? Clothes on animals!** Here we go! As you can see, Nangi is an elephant, so she'll totally remember everything. Hey, Nangi. These dudes have some questions about Emmit the otter."

In the dialog, Nick, Judy, and Yax were having a conversation about the naturalist. Nick, knowing Judy's expression that looks uncomfortable, started to talk about the naturalist to Judy. Yax, who heard it told about how others see the naturalist as a strange animal while, in naturalist' opinion, the strange one is the one who wears clothes. From that dialog, it shows that Yax and citizens who do not agree with the naturalist ideology glorify their parties that lead to seeing other parties that do not have the same ideology as they are false. Actually, the sentence "*But you know what I says is weird? Clothes on animals!*" can be changed to *"But we are same"* to make the dialog not too offensive.

The discursive move of derogation used by the coach to Judy is empathy, and self-glorification with the function of derogation is expressing anger or irritation. According to Van Dijk (2000), positive references or praise for one's own country, its principles, its history, and its traditions.

Judy says the seventh example of the derogatory remark in Zootopia. Here, the derogatory remark occurred when Judy and Nick were in DMV, and Judy was shocked knowing the DMV employees were sloths.

> *Nick: "Actually, I just remembered, I have a pal at the DMV. Flash is the fastest guy in there. You need something done he's on it."*
> *Judy: "I hope so. We are really fighting the clock and every minute counts. Wait. **They're all sloths**? You said this was going to be quick!"*
> *Nick: "What, are you saying just because he's **a sloth** he can't be fast? I thought in Zootopia anyone could be anything. Flash, Flash, Hundred Yard Dash! Buddy, it's nice to see you."*

There are two implications in the dialog. First, Judy was shocked because the employees of DMV were sloths. Judy was shocked because she thought that the DMV's employees would work quickly, just like what Nick said to Judy. However, what she saw when they were in the DMV was that the employee was the sloth that was known as the animal with the slowest movement in the world (Lax, 2017). Knowing about the employees of DMV, Judy could not hide her disappointment because she was in a rush, and it showed that Judy underestimated the sloth's work. Thus, the sentence

*"They're all sloths?"* can be replaced with *"Are they the DMV employees?"* to make Judy's dialog not too rude.

Second, Nick's sarcasm about Judy's reaction towards the sloths. Nick said that in Zootopia, there is no impossible thing even sloths could work as an employee of DMV. He said about the sloths after Judy expressing her disappointment toward the employee of DMV. Besides, Nick's sarcasm implicitly means that Judy's opinion about the sloths was the same as netizens' opinion about Judy.

The discursive move of derogation used above is actor description and implication with the function of derogation is expressing anger or irritation. According to Van Dijk (2000), Speakers do not need to say everything they know or believe for many pragmatic reasons. Indeed, much of the discourse remains implied, and the recipient can conclude the implied information from shared knowledge or attitudes and thus be constructed as part of their mental models of the events or actions represented in the discourse.

The eighth example of derogatory remark used in Zootopia movie is said by Chief Bogo, a prey, to Judy and Nick that were prey and predator. The derogation occurs because Chief Bogo did not trust Judy and Nick. Here, Chief Bogo did not care about Nick as a predator because, in Zootopia, Chief Bogo had power over Nick, who was just a citizen.

*Chief Bogo: "The savage jaguar?"*

*Judy: "Sir, I know what I saw. He almost killed us!"*
*Chief Bogo: "Or maybe any aggressive predator looks*
*savage to **rabbits**? Let's go!"*
*Judy: "Wait! Sir! I'm not the only one who saw him.*
*Nick.*
*Chief Bogo: You think I'm gonna believe **a fox**?"*

In the dialog, it is evident that Chief Bogo downgraded Judy and Nick's work in the case that they did. It can be seen from the way Chief Bogo calls Judy as rabbit and Nick as a fox. In this case, Chief Bogo does not trust Judy's report to Clawhauser about the Jaguar that go savage. It is because Chief Bogo did not see the Jaguar, as Judy told him. Besides, Chief Bogo downgrades Judy and Nick's work is because Judy was a rabbit that, in his opinion that she was not compatible with being a police officer and Nick who was a fox that was stereotyped as a liar. In order make the dialog to be less offensive, the word *"rabbit"* and *"a fox"* can be replaced with *"you"*.

The discursive move of derogation used above is actor description with the function of derogation is insulting.

The ninth example of derogatory remark used in Zootopia is the derogatory remark said by boy scouts members to Nick when he was going to be a boy scout member. He, as the only one predator in the club, got discrimination from other members who are the prey.

*Nick: "What? No, no! What did I wrong, you guys? No,*
*please tell me what did I do wrong. What did I do?"*
*Scout member: "If you thought we would ever trust **a fox***
***without a muzzle**? **You're even dumber than you look.**"*

From the dialog above, it shows that Nick got the discrimination from his friends in the boy scout club that can be categorized as bullying. Even the derogation that is addressed to Nick is from the members that are the prey. Here, they used the derogation to Nick was just because Nick was a fox. The members of the boy scout club thought they could not accept Nick as a club's member because he was a fox even they mocked Nick said that he was a fool as well. Here, to make the dialog less offensive, the noun phrase *"a fox without muzzle"* can be changed to *"you"*. In addition, he did not need to say "you're even dumber than you look" to Nick.

The discursive move of derogation used above is actor description, self-glorification, and polarization with the function of derogation is insulting. According to Van Dijk (2000), few semantic strategies about Others are as common as the expression of polarized cognitions, and the categorical division of people in in-group (Us) and out-group (Them). Polarization may also apply to good and evil, sub-categories of out-groups (as is the case for friends and allies on the one hand, and enemies on the other). Besides, by attributing properties of Us and Them that are semantically each other's opposites may rhetorically enhance the polarization when expressed as a bright contrast.

Lionheart said the tenth example of a derogatory remark to Bellwether. Bellwether, a sheep, was underestimated by Lionheart, a lion, as

his assistant. Bellwether, that was as Lionheart's assistant, often got terrible treatment from Lionheart.

> *Lionheart: **"Smellwether!"***
> *Bellwether: "Ah. That's a fun little name he likes to use. I called him Lionfart once, he did not care for that. Let me tell you, it was not a good day for me. Yes, sir."*

In the dialog, Lionheart called Bellwether as Smellwether, showing the disrespect toward Bellwether as his deputy mayor of Zootopia. It can be mean that Lionheart usually mock Bellwether that can be seen from the reaction of Bellwether. However, it is different when Bellwether called Lionheart as Lionfart. When it comes to Bellwether, the purpose of she tells about the name she uses to call Lionheart to Judy and Nick is to explain that Lionheart calls him Smellwether is not to mock her but just a joke to her. It also could be mean that Bellwether did not want her authority as Lionheart's assistant goes down in front of Judy and Nick if they knew that she got bad treatment from Lionheart. Here, the noun *"Smellwether"* can be replaced with *"Bellwether"* to make Lionheart's dialog harmless.

The discursive move of derogation used above is actor description with the function of derogation is insulting.

The eleventh example of a derogatory remark in Zootopia movie is said by Nick and Judy. Nick was showing his anger to Judy because she made a wrong statement about predators.

> *Nick: ""Clearly there's a biological component?" "These predators may be reverting back to their primitive, savage ways?" are you serious?"*
> *Judy: "I just stated the facts of the case. I mean, **it's not like a bunny could go savage**."*
> *Nick: "Right, **but a fox could? Huh?"***
> *Judy: "Nick, stop it, you're not like **them**."*

From the dialog above, it shows that Nick is against Judy's statement to the journalist about what happened to the missing mammal. Nick repeated what just Judy said to the journalists about some points that can lead to the misunderstanding to others that there was a biological component in the body of missing mammals that were predators and the possibility of predator revert back to their primitive which was being savage. Judy's statement to the journalists offended Nick, who also categorizes as a predator as if they were a savage animal that was dangerous for the prey. Following the statement about predator as a dangerous animal for prey, it could lead the prey did not want to live with the predators anymore. The possibility occurred because the one who made the statement was Judy, who was police handling the case that made whatever she said will be trusted by others.

Nick, who was shocked by Judy's statement, showed her anger that leads to Judy's statement that Nick was not like other predators that could be savage. However, what Judy said made Nick angrier than before because Judy openly differentiates prey and predator. Here, to make the dialog less offensive, the sentence *"it's not like a bunny could go savage"*, *"but a fox*

*could?"*, and the pronoun *"them"* can be replaced with *"I've never seen a bunny could go savage"*, *"but I could?"*, and *"you're different"*.

The discursive move of derogation used above is polarization, empathy, self-glorification, with the function of derogation is expressing anger and criticism. According to Zollner in Degaf (2016), criticism in derogation is derogation that is used to criticize someone or the particular parties by using descriptions, opinions, and consideration of the good and bad with a sharper or ruder expression.

The twelfth example of derogatory remark is derogation that occurred because of media framing to the predator. Here, the media had the power of what happened in Zootopia. By mention the number of attacks, the media highlighted how horrible the terror is in Zootopia by the predators to the prey.

> *News anchor : "More bad news in this city gripped by fear. A caribou is in critical condition. The victim of a mauling by a savage polar bear. This, **the 27th such attack**, comes just one week after ZPD Officer, Judy Hopps connected the violence to traditionally predatory animals."*

In the dialog above, the news anchors mentioned the number of attacks in Zootopia. By mention the number, it showed how horrible the predators were being savage and attacked the prey. Because of this media framing, the predator got a bad image in Zootopia that made the prey avoided predators because they were scared of being the victim of the predator's

attack. Thus, to make the dialog harmless, the verb phrase *"the 27ᵗʰ such attack"* can be replaced with *"the attack"*.

The discursive move of derogation used above is number game with the function of derogation is delivering information.

The thirteenth example of a derogatory remark is said by prey to the predator as the effect of chaos in Zootopia.

> *Pig:* **"Go back to the forest, predator!"**
> *Tiger: "I am from the savannah."*

In the dialog, it showed that the pig drove out the predators of the Zootopia by stressing the predator word as ridicule to the predator because of the bad image the predator had. Also, the pig said to the predator to go back to the forest, showing that the predator should go back to their habitat and go out from Zootopia. The sentence *"Go back to the forest, predator!"* can be replaced with *"Stay away from us!"* to make it not too offensive. Although the substitute sentence still feels rude, but from the researcher perspective, it is less offensive than the original sentence.

The discursive move of derogation used above is actor description, and implication with the function of derogation is insulting.

Bellwether says the fourteenth example of derogatory remark. Bellwether, as the one behind the chaos in Zootopia, attempted to persuade Judy to side with Bellwether.

> *Bellwether: "We're on the same team, Judy. Underestimated. Underappreciated. Aren't you sick of*

> *it? Predators. They may be strong and loud.* **But prey**
> **outnumber predators 10 to 1**. *Think about it.* **90% of the**
> **population** *united against a common enemy. We'll be*
> *unstoppable."*

In the dialog, it could be seen that Bellwether attempted to persuade Judy to side with her by mentioning the number of population in Zootopia as the affirmation of her persuasion and showed to Judy that they were the majority in Zootopia and have a right to against the predator, the minority, that discriminated them. Bellwether, being aware of the power Judy hold, attempted to persuade Judy to strengthen her position in Zootopia as the Mayor of Zootopia. She did it because she wanted revenge on predators for their bad treatment to the prey, and she wanted to rule Zootopia as well. Here, the sentence *"but prey outnumber predators 10 to 1"* and the noun phrase *"90% of the population"* can be replaced with *"but prey outnumber predators"* and *"the most of population"* to make the dialog not too rude.

The discursive move of derogation used above is number game, self-glorification, polarization, and empathy with the function of derogation is showing distaste.

From the explanation above, the discursive move that is used most often is actor description. While for the function of derogation, the most of the function is insulting. It indicated that the most of dialog in the Zootopia contain the racial expression because of the stereotype of the prey or even

the predator itself. Thus, the ideology contains in the Zootopia move is racism.

2.    **The Motive Behind the Derogatory Remarks Used in Zootopia Movie**

After identifying the various derogatory remarks that occurred in Zootopia movie, with the discursive moves and the function, therefore, in this subchapter, the researcher did a deeper examination about the motive behind the derogatory remarks used in Zootopia movie. The researcher decides to use critical discourse analysis as the research approach to see the class relation discourse that developed in Zootopia civilization by a critical perspective. The social relation which is built between the prey and predator in Zootopia movie can not only be seen naturally and just the way it is, but it should be seen critically to reveal the popular discourse which is framed in structural-functionalism (Parsons). Besides, like what Fairclough and Wodak said that critical discourse analysis sees discourse on the use of language in speech and writing as a form of social practice. In line with their opinion, Van Dijk also elaborates critical discourse analysis is "a type of discourse analytical research that primarily studies the way social power abuse, dominance, and inequality are enacted, reproduced, and resisted by text and talk in the social and political context." What is said by Fairclough, Wodak, and VanDijk above is very relevant to be used as an optic for revealing the class structure that is

occurred between prey and predator in Zootopia movie which is the structure of class relation is one of the factors the derogatory remarks appear in the Zootopia movie.

In the optic of critical discourse analysis, Zootopia movie is a movie that the characters are acted by the various animals that live in Zootopia's civilization. The selection of the title in this movie is portrayed by the relationship between predator and prey. In real life, the domination and hegemony of animals are dominated by the predator. However, in this movie, domination and hegemony are dominated by the prey because, in this movie, it is described the animals' life in their peak of civilization. The relation between the predator and prey are equal. However, ironically, animals like sheep (Bellwether), buffalo (Chief Bogo), and rabbit (Judy) that are in real life held the position as the lowest food chain. On the contrary, it comes into hegemonic for the predator. The portrait of the relationship between prey and predator is certainly a social relationship in the life of a utopian animal. Therefore, the title of this movie uses Zootopia diction as the title. Besides, according to the Cambridge dictionary, utopia means *"(the idea of) a perfect society in which everyone works well with each other and is happy*." According to the Merriam-Webster dictionary, utopia means *"a place of ideal perfection, especially in-laws, government, and social conditions"*.

In subjective perspectives, the movie is written by Jared Bush and Phil Johnston about the lives of prey animals and predators living side by side in Zootopia until, at one point, there was a mysterious disappearance of 14 predatory animals. Judy, who was assisted by Nick, was tasked with finding one of the missing animals, Mr. Otter. After various searches they did, Judy and Nick managed to find Mr. Otter, who was cooped up in a room with 13 other missing animals. Not only that, it turns out Judy and Nick also found that Lionheart was the one who gathered the animals and asked for doctor's help to examine the nature of the animals that turned wild. Judy and Nick overheard what the doctor said to Lionheart that the missing animals, all predators, have something in their DNA that makes them return to their primitive nature, which is to be wild. Lionheart, who was advised by the doctor to reveal the incident to the public, strongly rejected the proposal because he felt his position would be threatened because he was a predator. Judy and Nick, who know that Lionheart was behind the disappearance of the animals, directly arrested Lionheart. Lionheart, who served as mayor, led to the removal of Lionheart from his position, and his assistant, Bellwether, replaced the position. Judy, who managed to find the animals, became the public spotlight, and what she said would be valid in the point of view of the citizens, including the statements about something in the DNA of predators that could turn it into a wild animal. However, Judy's statement made Zootopia in a mess. The

prey feels predators are dangerous animals and try to stay away even expel them from Zootopia, and the preys discriminate against the predators. Zootopia became a chaotic city where prey and predators could not coexist as before. Judy, who felt she was the cause of the chaos, felt very sad because she wanted to make Zootopia a better place. Amid her sadness, Judy accidentally knew that there had been a case of a savage rabbit caused by *Midnicampum holicithias* or commonly called Night Howlers. Judy, who tried to make Zootopia's condition the way it was before, tried to find out about the flower, hoping that it was the cause of the animals being savage. Together, Judy and Nick managed to find several sheep that make the flower as a serum. Judy and Nick, who knew this immediately, told Bellwether the cause of the animals being savage. Nevertheless, what they get is that Bellwether is behind all the chaos because Bellwether feels a grudge against predators who sometimes act arbitrarily against prey, while in Zootopia, there is 90% prey which should be enough to dominate predators in Zootopia.

The above scenario certainly cannot only be seen with natural perspectives, because almost all movies have moral messages and social criticism that the directors want to convey. Language and symbols in the context of Zootopia movies must be viewed with multiple perspectives, both structural and post-structural perspectives.

From the perspective of the CDA, prey such as sheep and rabbits in the real world is an absolute subaltern with a population quantity so large but powerless. Even because they are helpless against the threat of wild animals, they have to get asylum from humans by being used as livestock or domesticated (Harari, 2011). While in the portrait of Zootopia's civilization which is no longer a savage and a non-savage structure between predators and prey, it is precisely the prey animals that were once oppressed try to take a role in the structure superior social namely by taking the most strategic role in the governance of the civilization of Zootopia. The strategic position controlled by the prey animals became the forerunner to the emergence of derogatory remarks from predators that assess their performance is prolonged. Therefore, the way the prey animals to silence the predator's derogatory remarks is by making a conspiracy of the emergence of savage predators caused by the Night Howlers flower to impress the predators become the accused actor to revive their simple structure.

# CHAPTER IV

## CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

### A. CONCLUSION

Based on the description of the findings and discussion above, the researcher tries to conclude this research by answering the questions in the formulation of the problem that the researcher raised in chapter one. The conclusions in this study are;

1. The discursive move category and the derogation function in the Zootopia movie can be seen from the variety of dialogues such as;

   a. The dialog between Gideon Grey with Judy is categorized in actor description and humanitarianism while the functions are as insulting and showing distaste,

   b. The dialog between coach and Judy is categorized in actor description and has a function as expressing anger or irritation, the dialogs between Chief Bogo and Judy are categorized as empathy and actor description and have the function as showing distaste and insulting,

   c. The dialog among the citizens are categorized in actor description, empathy, polarization, number game, and implication and have the function as insulting, the dialogs between Nick and Judy are categorized

in actor description, polarization, implication, and self-glorification and have the function as insulting, expressing anger, and criticizing,

d.  The dialog among Nick, Judy, and Yax is categorized in empathy and self-glorification and has the function as expressing anger or irritation,

e.  The dialog between Nick and the scout's members is categorized in Actor description, self-glorification, polarization and has the function as insulting,

f.  The dialog between Lionheart and Bellwether is categorized in actor description and has the function as insulting,

g.  The dialog between news anchors is categorized in the number game and has the function as delivering information,

h.  The dialog between Bellwether and Judy is categorized in Number game, self-glorification, polarization, empathy, and has the function as showing distaste.

2.  The motive behind the derogatory remarks in the Zootopia movie in the perspective of CDA is because of the distrust of the predators for the ability of prey overconfidence in taking strategic roles in the egalitarian Zootopia civilization, such as Judy who became the police and Bellwether who was the mayor's assistant. From the perspective of CDA, prey such as sheep and rabbits in the real world are absolute subalterns with such a large but oppressed population quantity. Even because they are helpless against the threat of wild animals, they have to get asylum from humans by being made

livestock or domesticated. During the loss of non-violent and straightforward structures in animal relations, sheep and rabbits appear superior and hegemonic to predators in their way. That condition reaps the emergence of derogatory remarks that are spoken by citizens to the prey. In terms of ideology, it seems that the nuances of racism between predators and prey are still quite strong. The effort to alienate and segregate each other is a strong racial indicator in this film.

## B. SUGGESTION

Based on the finding of this study, it shows that there are various kind of discursive move and the function of derogation of some characters in the Zootopia movie, but the researcher do not pay attention to analyze one way communication. Therefore, the researcher recommends the next researchers who study the same theme of this study to sharpen their study through one way communication so that the nuances of discursive move and the function of derogation can be seen comprehensively.

# REFERENCES

Almufadda, A. *Discourse, Discourse Analysis, and C.D.A.* Retrieved from https://www.academia.edu/41087213/DISCOURSE_DISCOURSE_ANALYSIS_AND_C.D.A_2.1_Discourse_in_linguistics

Costarelli, S. and Colloca, P. (2004). Intergroup Conflict, Out-Group Derogation, and Self-Directed Negative Affect Among Italian South Tyroleans. *The Journal of Social Psychology*. 144(2). pp. 181-189.

Degaf, A. (2014). *Derogasi dan Eufemisasi pada Movie Crash*. Yogyakarta: Universitas Gadjah Mada.

Degaf, A. (2016). *The Functions of Derogation and Euphemism Found in Hollywood Movie*. Presented at The 3rd Forum on Linguistics and Literature, 27th October 2016, Fakultas Humaniora UIN Maulana Malik Ibrahim Malang. Retrieved from http://repository.uin-malang.ac.id/1688/2/1685.pdf

Eriyanto. (2001). *Analisis Wacana: Pengantar Analisis Teks Media*. Yogyakarta: LKiS Yoogyakarta.

Fairclough, N. (2003). *Discourse and Social Change*. UK & USA: Polity Press.

Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and Power*. Harlow: Longman.

Hart, C. (2010). *Critical Discourse Analysis and Cognitive Science: New Perspectives on Immigration Discourse*. UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Hussein, S. Critical Discourse Analysis. Retrieved from https://www.academia.edu/9320728/Critical_Discourse_Analysis

James Paul Gee. (1999). *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis: Theory and Method*. London: Routledge.

Jenkins, C. E. (2002). *The Relationship of African American Group Identity with Ingroup Favoritism and Outgroup Derogation*. Colorado: University of Colorado.

Lax, A. (2017). *10 Facts about Sloths, Nature's Slowest Animals*. Retrieved from https://www.worldanimalprotection.us/news/10-facts-about-sloths-natures-slowest-animals

Noah Harari, Y. (2011). *Sapiens: Sejarah Ringkas Umat Manusia dari Zaman Batu hingga Perkiraan Kepunahannya*. Harper.

Parsons, T. *Structural functionalism*. Encyclopaedia Britannica.

Rahimi, A. and Sahragard, R. (2006). A Critical Discourse Analysis of Euphemization and Derogation in Emails on the Late Pope. *The Linguistics Journal*. Vol. 1. No. 2. (pp. 29-87).

Van Dijk, T. A. (1993). Prrinciples of Critical Discourse Analysis. *Discourse & Society Special Issue: Critical Discourse Analysis*. Vo. 4. No. 2. (pp. 249-253). London: Sage.

Van Dijk, T. A. (2000). The Reality of Racism. *Für die Wirklichkeit (=Festschrift for Siegfried Schmidt)*. (pp. 211-226). Wiesbaden: Westdeutscher Verlag.

Van Dijk, T. A. (2006). *Discourse and Manipulation*. London: Sage.

Van Dijk, T. A. (2016). *Ideology*. Spain: Pompeu Fabra University.

Wilson, B. (2016). *Movie Review Zootopia*. Retrieved from http://christiananswers.net/spotlight/movies/2016/zootopia2016.html

# CURRICULUM VITAE

Robbi Nur Aida was born in Lamongan on November 16, 1994. She graduated from MA Taerbiyatut Tholabah Lamongan in 2013. During her study at the Senior High School, she actively participated in OSIS as the secretary and in IPPNU as the vice chairman. She started her higher education in 2013 at the Department of English Literature UIN Maulana Malik Ibrahim Malang and finished in 2020. During her study at the University, she actively participated in Paduan Suara Mahasiswa Gema Gita Bahana (PSM GGB) as the secretary and got some medals from several competition.

# APPENDIX

| No. | Text | Discursive Moves | Function |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | *Judy: And I can make the world a better place. I am going to be… A police officer!*<br><br>*Gideon: **Bunny cop**? That is **the most stupidest thing** I ever heard!* | Actor description, humanitarianism | Insulting, showing distaste |
| 2. | *Coach: You're dead **carrot face**. Frigid ice wall. You're dead **farm girl**. Enormous criminal. You're dead. Dead. Dead. Dead.*<br><br>*Judy: Whoohhh…!*<br><br>*Coach: Filthy toilet. You're dead, **fluff butt**. Just quit and go home, **fuzzy bunny**.*<br><br>*Judy: Never.*<br><br>*Coach: You're just **a stupid carrot-farming dumb bunny**.* | Actor description | Expressing anger or irritation |
| 3. | *Chief Bogo: All right. All right. Everybody sit. I've got three items on the docket. First, we need to acknowledge the elephant in the room. Francine. Happy birthday.*<br><br>*Police officers : Huh. Oh, yeah!*<br><br>*Judy: Oh.*<br><br>*Chief Bogo: Number two. There are some new recruits with us I*<br><br>*should introduce, **but I'm not going to because… I don't care**. Finally, we have 14* | Empathy | Showing distaste |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | *missing mammal cases. All predators.* | | |
| 4. | *Elephant: Look, you probably can't read, **fox, but the sign** **says, WE RESERVE THE** **RIGHT TO REFUSE** **SERVICE TO ANYONE! So,** **beat it!*** *Customer: You're holding up the line.* | Actor description, empathy | Insulting |
| 5. | *Deer: **I was 30 seconds over!*** *Mouse: Yeah, you're **a real** **hero**, lady.* | Actor description, number game | Expressing anger or irritation |
| 6. | *Nick: Oh boy. Does this make you uncomfortable? Because if so, there's no shame in calling it quits.* *Judy: Yes, there is.* *Nick: Boy, that's the spirit.* *Yax: Yeah, some mammals say the naturalist life is weird. **But** **you know what I says is weird?** **Clothes on animals!** Here we go! As you can see, Nangi is an elephant, so she'll totally remember everything. Hey, Nangi. These dudes have some questions about Emmit the otter.* | Empathy, self-glorification | Expressing anger or irritation |
| 7. | *Nick: Actually, I just remembered, I have a pal at the DMV. Flash is the fastest guy in there. You need something done he's on it.* *Judy: I hope so. We are really fighting the clock and every* | Actor description, implication | Insulting |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | *minute counts. Wait. They're all* **sloths***? You said this was going to be quick!*<br><br>*Nick: What, are you saying just because he's* **a sloth** *he can't be fast? I thought in Zootopia anyone could be anything. Flash, Flash, Hundred Yard Dash! Buddy, it's nice to see you.* | | |
| 8. | *Chief Bogo: The savage jaguar?*<br><br>*Judy: Sir, I know what I saw. He almost killed us!*<br><br>*Chief Bogo: Or maybe any aggressive predator looks savage to* **rabbits***? Let's go!*<br><br>*Judy: Wait! Sir! I'm not the only one who saw him. Nick.*<br><br>*Chief Bogo: You think I'm gonna believe* **a fox***?* | Actor description | Insulting |
| 9. | *Nick: What? No, no! What did I do wrong, you guys? No, please tell me what did I do wrong. What did I do?*<br><br>*Scout member: If you thought* **we** *would ever trust* **a fox without a muzzle***? You're even dumber than you look.* | Actor description, self-glorification, polarization | Insulting |
| 10. | *Lionheart:* **Smellwether!**<br><br>*Bellwether: Ah. That's a fun little name he likes to use. I called him Lionfart once, he did not care for that. Let me tell you, it was not a good day for me. Yes, sir.* | Actor description | Insulting |

| 11. | Nick: "Clearly there's a biological component?" "These predators may be reverting back to their primitive, savage ways?" are you serious? <br><br> Judy: I just stated the facts of the case. I mean, **it's not like a bunny could go savage**. <br><br> Nick: Right, **but a fox could**? Huh? <br><br> Judy: Nick, stop it, you're not like them <br><br> Nick: Oh, there's a **'them'** now? | Polarization, empathy, self-glorification | Expressing anger, criticizing |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 12. | News anchor 1: More bad news in this city gripped by fear. A caribou is in critical condition. The victim of a mauling by a savage polar bear. This, **the 27th such attack**, comes just one week after ZPD Officer, Judy Hopps connected the violence to traditionally predatory animals. | Number game | Delivering information |
| 13. | Pig: **Go back to the forest, predator!** <br><br> Tiger: I am from the savannah. | Actor description, implication | Insulting |
| 14. | Bellwether: We're on the same team, Judy. Underestimated. Underappreciated. Aren't you sick of it? Predators. They may be strong and loud. **But prey outnumber predators 10 to 1**. Think about it. **90% of the population** united against a common enemy. We'll be unstoppable. | Number game, self-glorification, polarization, empathy | Showing distaste |