

CHAPTER FOUR

CONCLUSION

In this chapter I would like to draw some points of conclusion on the positive self-presentation about the United States of America and the negative other-presentation about the terrorists. The concluding points are based on the result of the analysis in Chapter Three, which covers the macrostructure analysis, the microstructure analysis, and the superstructure analysis.

The macrostructure analysis reveals that the speech is an analytical exposition text, the function of which is “to persuade the audience that something is the case”. This speech is categorized as analytical exposition because in this speech, Bush asks the US Congress to pass the legislation on handling the terrorists. Having studied the speech carefully, I draw a conclusion that Bush believes that there is no other way to stop the terrorists except by using the program they have.

Another finding in the macrostructure analysis is that the presentation of the US and the terrorists cannot be seen clearly. The important parts of the speech, which are the thesis statement and the reiteration, do not give a clear presentation about the US or the terrorists. Bush just says that the US

government and the CIA have a program which has been set up in order to face the terrorists and stop them from attacking innocent people. Bush asks for support from the people around the world so that the US government and the CIA can continue to run the program. In my opinion, Bush's intention in delivering this speech is not to show the positive self-presentation about the US or negative other-presentation about the terrorists, but to emphasize more about the program that the US government and CIA have and he wants people around the world to support it. That is why there is no clear statement about the presentation of the self and other that can be found in the macrostructure analysis.

In doing the microstructure analysis, I find there are three dominant tools used in the speech. The tools are lexicon, overall interaction strategies, and implicitness. From all of the tools used in this analysis, it is concluded that the self-presentation about the US is positive, while the other-presentation about the terrorists is negative.

The lexicon analysis discloses that there are fourteen words and one phrase that describe the US positively and twenty-three words and three phrases which suggest negative other-presentation about the terrorists. The number of the words and phrases that represent the terrorists is more than the number of the words that represent the US, although the difference in number is not very significant. Besides, the negative words are not really strong words. In my opinion, these words are used because Bush just wants to show people around the world that all the terrorists do is intolerable and he wants to persuade people to agree with his idea that the program can stop the terrorists.

The second tool is overall interaction strategies. From the analysis, I discover that out of forty-five paragraphs, twenty-five paragraphs emphasize positive things about the self, five paragraphs de-emphasize negative things

about the self, six paragraphs emphasize negative things about the other, and two paragraphs de-emphasize positive things about the other, while seven paragraphs do not use any of the strategies in overall interaction strategies (Table 3, Appendix). The number of paragraphs Bush uses to emphasize positive things about the US is very significant. This is because Bush creates positive images about the US that can stop the terrorists' attacks. The fact that the US government has a useful program to help the government face the terrorists, as elaborated in the speech, also presents a positive image about the US. I think using the strategy of emphasizing positive things about the US also helps Bush to persuade people to consider all of the positive things about the US.

The implicitness used in the speech is aimed to reach Bush's intention in pushing through the legislation on the program. Bush wants to give the actual situation during the time that the attacks happened, but he does not want the US to be seen negatively. Therefore, he uses implicitness. In my opinion, the implicitness in this speech can persuade the audience to find that it is necessary to run the program in handling the terrorists so that the attacks like the September 11th, 2001 attacks will never happen again.

In doing the microstructure analysis, I think of the three tools used, the overall interaction strategies is more effective than the other two tools. This is because, in my opinion, by stating positive things about the US, people will see that they can depend on the US to fight the terrorists and Bush's aim can be reached since the people and the US Congress will support the program.

The superstructure analysis reveals that the schematic structure contains the three parts of the analytical exposition, which are thesis statement, arguments, and reiteration, with opening and closing statements. However, the schematic structure does not follow the conventional order. The use of this order

is meant to draw the audience's attention to Bush's first and second arguments which are considered important. Bush wants them to see how beneficial the program is, so that they will have confidence in this program which is organized to fight against the terrorists.

The speech contains three arguments. There are two complicated schemas and one simple schema. Argument 1 and Argument 3 have complicated schemas. In Argument 1, Bush elaborates the explanation and gives the examples in detail on how the program has saved lives, so that people can know the program is really useful; while in Argument 3, the schema is even more complicated because Bush explains in detail why the program deserves support from the American citizens as well as from people around the world. He also gives some proofs to show that the program is worth running. I think giving detailed explanation about the program is an effective way to persuade people. This analysis shows that Argument 2 has the simplest schema as it is presented to show that this program is a vital tool to the security of the nations. If the program is not operated, the terrorists can attack the nations whenever they want.

Lastly, I would like to give some suggestions to other researchers who will take van Dijk's Discourse Analysis as the approach of research in their theses. I suggest that they should read the text they choose carefully until they really understand what the topic is about. In addition, they should read other sources related to the topic of the text so that they can get more information and understanding about the topic being analyzed.

(1,105 words)