

CHAPTER FOUR

CONCLUSION

In this chapter I would like to present my personal opinion and comments on the findings elaborated in Chapter 3, which is about the representation of Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump in Hillary Clinton's remarks based on the macrostructure, microstructure, and superstructure analysis.

Firstly, in the macrostructure analysis, I have found that the genre of the text is hortatory exposition, which has the thesis statement, arguments, and recommendation in accordance with a hortatory exposition conventional structure. In my opinion, Hillary Clinton uses this kind of conventional structure because the speech is a campaign speech and a campaign speech should give a clear message as well as clear suggestions to the audience after the message is conveyed.

This can be seen when Hillary Clinton has given a clear message in her thesis statement part that she is ready to become the president of the US because she has all the experiences needed, while the other candidate, Donald Trump, is in

contrast with her. This message is excellent as it makes the audience aware of the purpose of the speech from the beginning. It is then strengthened by the recommendation part, which talks about Hillary Clinton's efforts to persuade the audience that are present there to vote for her and they can do it right away. Besides, in the recommendation Hillary Clinton also persuades the audience to make Donald Trump's voters vote for her instead, and to make the audience sign up as volunteers and ask them to go to her personal website to know how to get involved. Then, Hillary Clinton finishes the persuasive effort by giving an obvious statement "I want to be your partner as well as your president".

The global topic of the remarks can then be drawn after the thesis statements and the recommendations have been found. From this global topic, I find that Hillary Clinton is portrayed positively, whereas Donald Trump is represented negatively. This happens because this is Hillary Clinton's speech, and as I have stated before, a campaign speech should give a clear message and suggestion to the audience. Hence, by saying that she herself is a good candidate and Donald Trump is a bad one, Hillary Clinton is being very clear that the audience should vote for her instead of Donald Trump.

In the microstructure analysis, to reveal the representation of Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump, I use six tools which are classified into three aspects, namely syntactic, semantic, and stylistic aspects. In the syntactic aspect I only use wording as the tool and find two data that can be analyzed using this tool. From the first and the second data, we can see Hillary Clinton's intention to emphasize Donald Trump's negative actions by giving him an actor's role and by mentioning

him at the beginning of the sentence. Here, of course Hillary Clinton wants to make her rival seen as a bad person so that the audience will vote for her.

In the next aspect, the semantic aspect, I use two tools which are perspective and the level of specificity and degree of completeness. In the perspective area I have found four data, in each of which, Hillary Clinton always views Donald Trump negatively when talking about patriotism, racism, personal traits, and sexism. Hillary Clinton does this to highlight that Donald Trump has a lot of bad reputations in respective areas; thus, he is not suitable for being a president.

The next semantic tool is the level of specificity and degree of completeness. By using this tool I can find two data. However, these data are very different from the previous data. Here, Hillary Clinton mentions all her positive experiences in many fields in an over-completed self description. In my opinion, Hillary Clinton does this to obviously contrast herself from Donald Trump semantically. Previously we can see how Hillary Clinton highlights all his bad reputation, while now Hillary Clinton emphasizes all her positive experiences. This is a clever strategy so as to support the idea of the striking contrast between her and Donald Trump. This is certainly done to make the audience sure about whom to vote for, in this case, Hillary Clinton.

The next aspect is the stylistic aspect. In this aspect I use three tools, namely rhetorical figures, lexical style, and deixis. In the first area, rhetorical figures, by using anaphora and parison I have found two data. Here, we can see how Hillary Clinton uses the repetition pattern of the word *I* and the conjunction

and which are followed by her positive experiences. In my opinion, Hillary Clinton uses the repetition patterns to mention all her positive experiences to make the audience remember well all the positive experiences that she has mentioned.

The next aspect is the lexical style, where we can see Hillary Clinton's word choice. In this aspect ten adjectives are used by Hillary Clinton. Eight adjectives are used to portray Donald Trump negatively while the other two are used to portray Hillary Clinton positively. In this aspect, mostly, Hillary Clinton just wants to show Donald Trump's negative qualities in many fields, while sometimes she compares it to hers, which is, of course, the opposite quality. Hillary Clinton does this no other than to make the audience believe that she is much better than Donald Trump in many fields so as to make the audience vote for her.

The last aspect in this area is the deixis aspect, the act of pointing via language. However, in this speech I only analyze the person deixis and only analyze the pronoun 'we', in which it can be divided into two types, 'inclusive we' and 'exclusive we'. In this speech I have found the 'inclusive we' is very dominantly used. Through this, Hillary Clinton wants to make her position equal to the audience and make a closer relationship with them so as to make herself portrayed positively. The various tools used in the microstructure analysis are great as they show how skillful Hillary Clinton is in highlighting the main message of the speech.

The last one is the superstructure analysis, in which the schematic structure of the text is analyzed. As mentioned above, the structure of a hortatory exposition is thesis statement – arguments – recommendation. In the schematic structure of the speech, we can see there are thesis statements being mentioned first and then there are six arguments, all of which talk about the negative points of Donald Trump. Finally the speech is closed by the recommendation at the end.

Hillary Clinton opens the speech by saying her intention to be the next president, then bashing on Donald Trump throughout the speech, then closing it by asking the audience to vote for her. This schematic structure is brilliantly used in her campaign speech and it is actually what I believe what campaign speeches are for: to promote oneself and to degrade the other and to make sure the audience that are present will vote for the candidate.

In the future, if there are other researchers on discourse analysis of a presidential campaign, I suggest they should analyze the representation of the candidates not only from one candidate's side but also compare it with the other candidate's side so as to make the analysis fair and wider in scope. (1207 words)