CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

A. Research Background

On a daily basis, people in all countries use discourse to interact one to another. Discourse is constructed upon implicit propositions which are taken for granted by participants, and which underpin its coherence (Fairclough, 1992, p.23). The UK or British parliamentary debate is the weightiest discourse made by Member of Parliaments (MPs) to retain, move, or create policies affecting social life inside and even outside the United Kingdom.

The UK parliamentary debate constitutes a legal and argumentative text. It comprises a lot of MPs’ debate speeches from various political parties. In this research, the text structure of the analysed debate speeches in the House of Commons begins with Thesis containing an introduction of the issue, Argument containing supporting evidences and then Reiteration containing thesis restatement along with Recommendation containing a suggestion. The motion in this debate is about the extension of British airstrikes in Syria against Islamic State of Iraq and Levant (ISIL).

The UK parliamentary debate is also a political discourse. A political discourse relates to properties of political structures and processes (Dijk, 2002, p. 203). This research deals with the debate forum in which hierarchical relation can be seen from the bench categorisation, sequence and duration of each debate speech. For instance, the Prime Minister as the motion proposer is a front-bencher MP whose
debate speech is put at first and given the longest duration by the Speaker of the House of Commons. It reflects the hierarchical status of the Prime Minister as the most powerful MP in the forum.

In terms of an unequal relation, this debate consists of the debaters as the text producer and the British people as the text consumer to which different proportion of contribution occurs. To carry out aspiration, British people need to talk to or possibly email their representative MP who has the authority to speak in the Parliament. The MP’s assistance can be in the form of writing the aspiration to the official, raising it inside or outside the parliament (www.parliament.uk). As we know, the debaters are the MPs whose duty is to represent constituencies in which each British citizen belongs to one constituency. The MPs have a privilege of delivering, neglecting, or even manipulating their British constituents’ aspiration. Therefore, the British people whose aspiration is not covered can only watch the debate instead of directly interrupt it. This procedure clearly describes the debaters’ power over the British people.

The highly frequent use of modality and pronoun ‘we’ is believed to be one of power-struggle indicators. This study therefore is intended to explore those indicators of power struggle and relationship further by using Critical Discourse Analysis proposed by Fairclough as the approach to analyse discourse employed by the three Tories or MPs of Conservative Party who vote for the debate motion.

Considering the indicators of power struggle in the UK parliamentary debate as described above, the focus of this research is formulated under the following problem statement.
B. Problem Statement

This study is to search the way how the Tories or members of Conservative Party who vote for the debate motion retain their influence toward other MPs who oppose the debate motion by using Critical Discourse Analysis.

The problems that were analyzed in this research are:

1. What power-struggle indicators can be found from the three Tories’ debate speeches in the British parliamentary debate?

2. How is the power relationship between the Tories who vote for the debate motion and the other participants enacted in the debate?

3. What convention of struggling can be concluded from the three Tories’ debate speeches?

In line with the problems stated above, the objectives of the study are delineated below:

C. Research Objectives

1. To determine what the power-struggle indicators in the three Tories’ debate speeches in the British parliamentary debate are.

2. To linguistically examine how the Tories who vote for the debate motion create the arguably unequal power relationship and win the debate.

3. To reveal the convention of struggling in the three Tories’ debate speeches.
By taking the power struggle as the main issue of this study into account, this research is believed to have certain significance for different groups below.

**D. Research Significance**

This research is expected to be an additional reference of CDA thesis in Sebelas Maret University with the benefits for the following groups.

1. **Students**
   - How to separate linguistic features containing power-struggle indicators
   - How to apply linguistic devices for the purpose of creating a strong impression in debate competition

2. **Teachers, lectures, and other academics**
   - Enriching preferences of discourse materials for lectures given in classes
   - Enlightening about the discourse which the nature is conflict-oriented

3. **Political parties**
   - How to make a political debate more persuasive and substantial
   - How to convey a political debate more eloquently and unequivocally

**E. Research Limitation**

The focus of this research is limited into each debate speech presented by three Tories as the debate participants who have their own floor of speaking and who vote for the debate motion. It will not concern any debate speeches presented by other MPs of different political parties or any Tories who vote against the debate motion.