CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

A.1 Background of the Research

Politics is closely related to the use of language. This use of language makes influence actions and policies in government or society (Rachman & Yunisti, 2017). Various uses of political language will be very easy to find in the run up to the general election. In this process, language plays a crucial role. It is not just any straightforward language used for everyday communication, but it is believed to have its own purposes. Therefore, any political action is always prepared, accompanied, influenced and played by language. It is one of the vital tools that politicians use in order to shape the political thoughts of the electorates with the aim of selling the ideologies (Sharndama, 2015).

The language conveyed in a political atmosphere tends to be more persuasive in which the language tells the speaker’s positive side and tells the negative side of his (her) political opponent. By realizing that politicians are not merely speaking, then came a political discourse which contains someone’s power and ideology. This political discourse has many other genres apart from speeches, such as in televised press conference, in broadcast or televised interviews with politicians, in snippets on the internet (e.g., YouTube), or in reports on political events in the press. Furthermore, slogans and advertisements confront us when we are walking
down the street, and during election campaigns we are able to listen to politicians campaigning in town halls or at election rallies (Wodak, 1989).

Before talking further about the discourse, the political activity which is very clear and broad to understand what is contained in it is the activity of speakers who convey their ideas by sharing their thoughts through their arguments to the public directly. This is the basic way to do because society will know the personality of the candidates. By using speech, society feels that the candidate stands beside them and have the same thought, thus this strategy will emerge the sympathy (Rachman & Yunianti, 2017). This political speech could be defined as a speech associated with either struggle for power or maintenance/control of it (Sharndama, 2015), because this power is typically persuasive as Aristotle in Triadafilopoulos (1999) states that this political speech must be reasonable, passionate, and reflective of the character of the speakers. Thus, the audience will be able to recognize the identity of speakers whether they are eligible or not.

Political speech should bridge the gaps between the public and private sphere, passions and reason, individual interests and the common good, equity and law (Triadafilopoulos, 1999). As we know, the public and private spaces are very different, and the role at home with the role on the stage delivering the speech are totally different. Therefore, politicians are demanded to understand when to become someone who is needed by the people, and when to be someone who is doing his/her favorite activities, but what should be known in political
speech, the truth can only be disclosed in private conversations, not in the public sphere (Plato in Triadafilopoulos, 1999).

To investigate the truth conveyed through the political speech, we should understand what discourse that politicians make. Bryman in Wallstrom (2017) views “discourse” as an expression designating how a certain set of linguistic categories is related to an object and how our way of describing this object affects how we understand or interpret it. The term discourse refers to anything written or spoken under the normal usage of language. It means that surface meanings are always different from the real meanings and the aim of discourse is to bring forth how language of speech patterns are working in a particular framework and how are they being utilized in the different society (Bilal et al, 2012). To analyze these patterns, we need Discourse Analysis as a tool to investigate the case.

Discourse Analysis covers an extremely wide range of activities, from the narrowly focused investigation of how words such as “oh” or “well” are used in casual talk, to the study of the dominant ideology in a culture (Yule, 1996: 83). This investigation tends to focus on the relationship between language forms and a limited sense of context and also tend to be oriented to a narrow understanding of a larger social, cultural and ideological forces that influence our lives (Rashidi and Souzandehefar, 2010). Discourse Analysis is divided into three main focuses; Discourse Theory, Discourse Psychology, and Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). Discourse Theory is a post-structural theory that focuses on understanding the
social world through discursive constructs. The aim of Discourse Theory is to establish unambiguousness in the social world (Laclau and Mouffe in Wallstrom, 2017). Then, Discourse Psychology is a social constructive approach developed within social psychology as a critique of cognitivism. It focuses on individuals’ active parlance, in contrast to Discourse Theory which assumes texts and parlance are constructions of the world that are oriented towards social actions (Wallstrom, 2017). Meanwhile, Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) is 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 (van Dijk in Bilal et al, 2012). It goes much further toward addressing the ideological dimension of discourse rather than Discourse Analysis which only focuses on language forms and limited context.

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) sees discourse as a form of social practice (Fairclough, 1995) and argues that all linguistic usage encodes ideological positions, and studies how language mediates and represents the world from different point of view. CDA involves the connection between ideas, language, power and the ordering of relationship within society (Rashidi and Souzandehfar, 2010). Some of the most CDA approaches commonly used are Critical Linguistics was developed by Fowler, Kress, Hodge and Trew (1979), Fowler (1991, 1996), Kress (1985) and Kress & Hodge (1979). Then, the other approach was proposed by Fairclough (1989, 1992, 1995) is sociocultural approach. Wodak (1996, 2001) proposed Discourse-Historical approach. The last one, van Dijk’s framework (1998,
(2002, 2004) was based on a socio-cognitive approach. These approaches are closely related each other by more general conceptual framework.

After knowing CDA as a tool in dismantling the truth contained in a discourse, political speech becomes a very interesting discourse to be observed about what is delivered by the speaker. Even though there are other objects of CDA such as advertisements, official document, newspaper, law, political propaganda, but political speech itself can provide a lively atmosphere that we can feel while watching, as well as how the speaker delivered the speech, gestures, facial expressions, or other attitudes that can be seen while the speaker conveying the speech. The political speech will be more interesting when it is still in the campaign period where each candidate delivers his(her) vision and mission, strong persuasion, invitation, and even a promise on what project that will be run after being elected.

The use of CDA approach to political speech has been pretty much done. Including Junling Wang in 2010 who has examined the research on the Barack Obama presidential speech, then the current American President, Donald J. Trump has also been investigated by Rachman & Yunianti in 2017. Moreover, Hillary Clinton speech as the political opponent of Donald J. Trump has been also done research by Jensen et al, 2016. To make this study different from the existing ones, the researcher chose to fill the gap of what has never been observed. Election campaigns are definitely aided by many parties from all aspects, and there are
many discourses that can be used as CDA research media, such as advertising, slogans, and motto. No exception, a live partner, a wife of a presidential candidate who must engage into the political world to support her husband, she is the first lady.

The first lady has a very significant role to her husband. She has always played a basic role in politics and society as Horohoe (2011) states that:

Although not elected by any formal body, the first lady has been charged with duties ranging from hosting social functions, to serving as a representative of the president at events, to fulfilling diplomatic roles, and acting as the most trusted advisor to the president (Horohoe, 2011).

The great role that the first lady possesses makes her more often involved in the flow of politics. For instance, participate in campaigning with her husband and representing her husband to deliver a speech. Therefore, the first lady can also be called as a political woman (Burns, 2004).

Regarding to the rampant issue of Donald J. Trump wife, Melania Trump who has the similar passage of her speech over Michelle Obama speech when she was still as the nominee, it is what inspired researcher to compare their speeches, between both American First Ladies. Although, there has been recognition from the Meredith McIver as the speechwriter of the Trump Organization that was launched from newyorker.com who said that it is proved to have exactly the same passage without paraphrasing first, but the researcher tries to look at the issue and prove it linguistically, why Melania Trump uses it and doesn’t correct at the
first before conveying it to speechwriter. The prominent different background of both American First Ladies nominee will lead and strengthen the investigation. Michelle Obama was born in Chicago, Illinois, January 17th, 1964. She is an American lawyer and writer who was First Lady of the United States from 2009 to 2017. She married the 44th President of the United States, Barack Obama, and she is the first African-American First Lady. Meanwhile, Melania Trump was born in Novo Mesto, Slovenia, April 26th, 1970. She worked as a fashion model and moved to New York City in 1996. In 2001, she obtained a green card and became a lawful permanent resident of the United States. She married Donald Trump in 2005 and obtained U.S citizenship in 2006. She is the first naturalized U.S citizen to become First Lady of the United States (wikipedia.com).

Seen from different background, such as different races, different careers, making everyone have different habits and ideology they have. The prominent distinction between Michelle Obama and Melania Trump makes this issue becomes very interesting to find out the truth and the factor why Melania Trump gives some passage of Michelle Obama speech. Surely, in the presence of such phenomenon, researcher tries to investigate how they as the American First Ladies nominee bring their respective speeches while representing their husbands and themselves to persuade the nation and win the consensus. The researcher takes Melania Trump’s speech when she speaks in July 2016 at the Republican National Convention, meanwhile for Michelle Obama speech is a speech delivered on August 25th, 2008 at the Democratic National Convention which allegedly Melania
Trump has picked some passages over Michelle Obama speech when Melania Trump was having the same campaign atmosphere like Michelle Obama in 2008.

To answer how both American First Ladies nominee bring their own speeches, what power they have in their speeches, dominance and of course what ideology they carry on the pulpit, the researcher eventually links it to the Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) approach proposed by Teun A. van Dijk (2004) which focuses more on socio-cognitive in the speech. Furthermore, another theory called Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG) by M.A.K Halliday is also used to observe the linguistic features in the speeches. The comparison of these two speeches will then see the existence of similar things and the distinguished things between both American First Ladies nominee linguistically. Moreover, they already did their duty to support their husbands in the election. From this point, the researcher sought to conclude how their roles were entirely helping and representing their husbands to the public in which their victory had a very different way. Eventually, to answer all that curiosity, this research is done by the title “A COMPARATIVE CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS OF THE AMERICAN FIRST LADIES NOMINEE (SELF) REPRESENTATION SPEECH: MICHELLE OBAMA VS MELANIA TRUMP”.

A.2 Problems of the Research

From the background of the research already discussed earlier, the researcher raises the following questions:

1. What are the linguistic features of Michelle Obama and Melania Trump (self) representation speeches that indicate their ideologies and powers?
2. What are the ideologies brought by Michelle Obama and Melania Trump in their (self) representation speech?
3. What are the powers manifested by Michelle Obama and Melania Trump in their (self) representation speech?

A.3 Objectives of the Research

Objectives of the research are set as the answers of the problems of the research. The objectives of this research are:

1. To describe the linguistic features of Michelle Obama and Melania Trump (self) representation speeches which indicate their ideologies and powers.
2. To observe the ideologies brought by Michelle Obama and Melania Trump in their (self) representation speech.
3. To investigate the powers manifested by Michelle Obama and Melania Trump in their (self) representation speech.

A.4 Significance of the Research

This research aims to contribute to linguistics research studies, in particular the use of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) as a tool to observe the ideology,
dominance and power of both American First Ladies nominee, namely Michelle Obama and Melania Trump of (self) representation speech. This research is expected to be a reference for readers who are involved in any political field. Moreover, this research also aims to compare both parties in the speech representing their husband as well as themselves as the first ladies nominee to be examples for the nation. By knowing the ideologies and powers they perform, it will be seen a prominent difference between both American First Ladies where the researcher can also know the similarities between them through what they convey and the way they deliver the speech. Then, it will be concluded why the similarities emerge in the speech of the American First Ladies. Hopefully, this research can be a reference to help other researchers who want to examine other objects using the same approach.

A.5 Limitation of the Research

This research analyzes the comparison of Michelle Obama and Melania Trump’s speeches as they were still the nominees for the first ladies where Michelle Obama delivered her speech on August 25th, 2008 at the Democratic National Convention while Melania Trump delivered her speech in July 2016 at the Republican National Convention. They contribute fully in the victory of their husband as president of the United States. In observing the data, the researcher applies a Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) theory proposed by Teun A. van Dijk (2004). Furthermore, in order to make the analysis deeper, the researcher also employs another theory called Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG) by M.A.K.
Halliday. The use of these theories are believed to be able to break open the ideologies and powers of both American First Ladies in depth to produce the reliable result of the research.

A.6 Organization of the Research

In order to ease the readers to follow the idea on this research, the researcher organizes the thesis into five chapters. Chapter I is the Introduction. This chapter consists of the Background of the Research, Problems of the Research, Objectives of the Research, Significance of the Research, Limitation of the Research, Organization of the Research.

Chapter II is the Literature Review. It covers Theoretical Framework which describes the theory as a tool that is used in this research to analyze the data. Furthermore, this chapter also discusses the Review of the Related Research.

Chapter III is the Research Methodology. It contains a detailed description of method used in this research. It encompasses Type of the Research, Data and Source of the Data, Method of Collecting Data, Technique of Collecting Data, and Method of Analyzing Data.

Chapter IV is the Data Analysis. This chapter embodies Data Description, Data Analysis, and Discussion which show how the obtained data are analyzed based on the theories used and how its application to produce results that answer the problem of the research.
Chapter V is Conclusion and Suggestion. This chapter is the final part of the research report. It illustrates obviously the result of the whole research. Furthermore, this chapter also consists of the suggestion addressed to the reader or other researcher who will conduct the further research concerns to the same topic in the future.