

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents introduction which discusses background of the study, limitation of the study, research questions, aims of the study, research method, and organization of the paper.

1.1 Background of the Study

In 2004, U.S President George W. Bush and U. S Senator John F. Kerry were two central figures in U.S 2004 Presidential election as the presidential candidates. Kerry won the Democratic nomination to run for President of the United States against incumbent George W. Bush. Both of them have been political figures who received not only endorsement from most Americans but also heated criticism regarding their policy and statements.

Bush is known with his global *War on Terrorism* program and an invasion of Afghanistan and Iraq program that sparked much controversy around the world. Meanwhile, Kerry is known for his endorsement on abortion rights for women and same-sex marriage that have triggered pros and cons. In facing the election, the two controversial figures were met in a presidential debate that was scheduled by a non-profit corporation namely the Commission on Presidential Debate.

Since the 1976 general election, debates between presidential candidates have been assumed as one of important things in a presidential campaign. Hornby (2000) describes a debate as a formal discussion at a public meeting regarding

some issues where two or more speakers express their opposing views. A debate also includes persuasion which appeals to the emotional responses of the audiences.

Fiske (1994, cited in McGregor, 2004) stated, “Our words are never neutral”. It means we will never speak, read or hear others’ words, without being conscious of the underlying meaning of the words. Henry & Tator (2002 cited in McGregor, 2004) argued that whether we are aware or not, our words are politicized, because they carry the power that reflects the interests of those who speak. Therefore, some media such as Washington Post, New York Times, MSNBC and ABC News stated that the race was influenced by the three presidential debates especially the third debate as the final one, since every word the debaters uttered during the debate affects the voters of presidential election.

Hence, the researcher is interested in identifying the effect of presidential debates to the presidential election voters, especially the effect of its linguistic features. According to Eggins (2000), the speaker’s attitude towards what he or she says can be analyzed through the use of modalization. The present study examines Modalization that was used by Kerry and Bush explicitly, which is called by Halliday (1985) as the metaphor of modality.

1.2 Limitation of the Study

This study only investigates the explicitness of the speakers, Kerry and Bush, in expressing their position during their third debate. It is not devoted to investigate the speaker’s claim to the truth. The debate was held on October 13 at

Arizona State University. Fairclough (1989) stated that the most essential thing in CDA is the depth and the breadth of the analysis. It means that although this study only discusses one text, it was analyzed in more depth and breadth. By using the Hallidayan theory in terms of metaphor of modality, the present study only focuses on the attitude of the speakers, in this case their explicitness, when they express their certainty and obligation.

1.3 Formulation of the Problems

The problems of the present study are formulated in the following questions:

- a. what types and values of metaphor of modality were used by Bush and Kerry in the Third Bush-Kerry Presidential Debate?
- b. how the use of metaphor of modality reveal the speakers' explicitness in expressing their positions?

1.4 Aims of the Study

Based on the research questions formulated above this study is aimed at:

- a. finding the implementation of the metaphor of modality concept by Kerry and Bush in the Third Bush-Kerry Presidential Debate.
- b. revealing the speakers' explicitness in expressing their positions through the metaphor of modality use.

1.5 Research Method

Since CDA has the characteristics of qualitative studies (Gunawan, 2003), this study mainly employs qualitative approach as the method; however, some descriptive quantification is also employed. According to Straus and Corbin (cited in Kurniawan: 2004), the qualitative method can be used to more fully describe something beyond a phenomenon and to gain a new perspective on issue that is already common

The source of the data is a transcript of the third Bush-Kerry Presidential Debate that was taken from <http://www.debates.org/pages/trans2004d.html>. The transcript was chosen because it contains information and language features needed for data analysis in this research.

In this study, the transcript was analyzed by drawing upon metaphor of Modality theory of Halliday (1985) to reveal the speakers' explicitness in expressing their position. Then, the library research was carried out to search for some appropriate texts that raise the issue. Some relevant data regarding critical discourse analysis especially about metaphor of modality were also obtained.

1.6 Organization of the Paper

The paper is presented in five chapters. The first chapter is Introduction that consists of background, limitation of the study, research questions, aims of the study, research method, and organization of the paper. The second chapter is theoretical foundation. It provides the description of discourse, Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), functional grammar and explanation about polarity and modality

especially the metaphor of modality. The third chapter is methodology that discusses the research method, technique of data collection and technique of data analysis. The fourth chapter is findings and discussions that embodies the analysis of the text and discussion of the findings. The last chapter is conclusions and suggestions that present the conclusions and suggestions for further study.

