

CHAPTER FOUR

CONCLUSION

This chapter contains the summary of this thesis, reveals the result of the analysis, and gives personal comments, limitation of the study, and recommendation. The purpose of this study is to find out which utterances are categorized as doublespeak in Hillary Clinton's presidential speeches, the types of doublespeak she used, and what her intention of using doublespeak. The theory used for this research is doublespeak by William Lutz.

This study aims to reveal Hillary Clinton's intention in her particular utterances of her presidential campaign speeches. It is a common thing for the politicians to put doublespeak in their speeches in order to gain the audience's attention.

From the four types of doublespeak, Hillary Clinton mostly uses inflated language in her speeches. In Chapter Three there are sixteen data that have been analyzed and fifteen data are considered inflated language. Only one data is considered jargon. In my opinion, in the political world, especially during the conditions in which someone wants to run for president, he or she must show that

they are great and qualified to lead a country. In other words, the candidates will definitely try to attract the public's attention. The candidates will deliver a speech in such a way in order to make the audience touched and interested to vote for them through their speeches. In this thesis, it reveals that Hillary Clinton gives a speech, with the aim of attracting sympathy and attention of the Americans. In brief, Clinton mostly uses inflated language in order to make things impressive and as a result Clinton tries to put an air of importance to many particular sections in accordance with what inflated language is for.

Only one data is considered jargon in Clinton's speeches. In my opinion, Clinton does not use many jargons in her speeches maybe because she does not want to put herself as an exclusive person. In the analysis where the jargon is found, the phrase "across the aisle" means not all people can understand the jargon because it is only used in the political area. I research on the web and mostly only adults can understand it and Clinton uses jargon because she meant to aim adults and get their attention.

In my opinion, the use of inflated language in Clinton's speeches is effective to gain the audience's vote. The analysis shows that Clinton puts an air of importance to particular people, for example the fire fighters and police officers (Data 1), and makes something become more impressive in her speeches. For example, the use of the word *privilege* to gain troops' and veterans' attention and to make them feel proud (Data 7). In the speeches I find it difficult to find euphemism. It might be because the data are the speeches that have the purpose of putting interest to the audience, and not covering up something or clarifying statement. In my opinion, Clinton's speeches are not military speeches which for

example remark on war, in which usually the speaker uses many forms of euphemism to avoid something harsh into inoffensive word in order to keep a good image. It is definitely not the type of speech that Clinton delivered.

I also did not find any gobbledygook in Clinton's speeches. In my opinion, Hillary Clinton is a smart person who most of the time speaks logically. Clinton does not want to use many gobbledygooks in her speeches because she does not want to show that she is a long-winded person. In Clinton's speeches, Donald Trump is said to be a person with bombast. That is why Clinton tries to deliver her speeches straight to the point. She does not want the audience to see that Clinton talks nonsense, just like Donald Trump, who likes rambling out nowhere with no clear meaning.

The first speech was delivered in 2016 and the second speech in 2015. Both speeches talk mostly about similar things, for examples, to make the economy work for everyone especially for the middle class to thrive, to respect veterans and troops, and to give free tuition fee for young people. The result shows that since campaigning from 2015 until 2016, Clinton won in her primary against Sanders and was nominated as the candidate from the Democratic Party for the election. After the Democratic National Convention speech, the closest election polls after the speech according to New York Times, Hillary Clinton had the chance to win about 45.4% across America (Times, 2016). However, the result of the election that was held on 8 November 2016 is that it is Donald Trump who wins the election and becomes the next President of the United States. If Clinton had won the election, it would support the fact that the use of doublespeak in her campaign speeches is effective.

From the result of the analysis in Chapter Three, I cannot generalize that Hillary Clinton always uses doublespeak while she speaks in public. The first reason is I cannot analyze further because of the limited data. I only use two of her speeches to analyze whereas actually Clinton delivered much more than that in the presidential campaign period. The second is the data are taken only from the presidential campaign, whereas, Clinton, in fact also made speeches for other purposes. Last, I only focus on one aspect, which is analyzing doublespeak in her speeches.

My recommendation for this thesis is first, future researchers can find more data about Hillary Clinton's presidential campaign speeches and compare them all to make better generalization. Second, they can find Clinton's speeches that have other purposes to see if her style of speaking in public is still the same. Otherwise, it may mean that she uses different styles for different intentions depending on the conditions and circumstances. Last, they can also focus on other aspects, for example the implicatures of her utterances, rhetorical meaning, positive and negative representative or other linguistics features to reveal Hillary Clinton's true public speaking style.

(990 Words)