

CHAPTER FOUR

CONCLUSION

In this chapter, I would like to draw a conclusion based on my analysis which I have analyzed in Chapter Three. It begins with the summary of the findings and a general conclusion of the analysis. In addition, it also presents my personal comments on the analysis, the limitation of this present study as well as some recommendations for future research.

The data I used in my thesis are taken from advertisement taglines. The taglines come from six different brands of chips, which are Popchips, Ruffles, Oishi, Lay's, Pringles and Bingo. There are eight data out of the six brands that are analyzed in this thesis. The purpose of my study is to know the types of rhetorical figures contained in America's chip advertisement taglines and also to know how the rhetorical figures support the persuasive function in chip advertisement taglines.

Based on my analysis the use of schematic operation are dominates the whole data. Scheme takes up 70% of the whole data, and while there are two types of scheme which are repetition and reversal, it is found that the taglines of chips advertisements in my data only use repetition category (100% of the whole

schematic operation) to interest their consumers. In my opinion the use of repetition in several taglines is good because it plays an important role on promoting the products as it makes the customer remember it.

The repetition operation found in my thesis are consonance, rhyme, and also conduplicatio, in which rhyme as the one used most often by the producer (70%). I believe that this is due to the fact that the rhyme operation is very creative in the placement of word order to create a pleasing sound when spoken or read. Another reason for it to be used often is the use of rhyme makes it easier for the consumer to remember the tagline as the repetition of sounds is very catchy and memorable. The repetition itself helps the tagline to grab the consumers' attention. Furthermore, it is good for the brands to use the rhetorical figures because it is easy to understand because it will make people remember and become familiar with it. The more people feel familiar with the tagline, the better it is for the sale.

In the schematic operation, conduplicatio is the one that is least used by the producer as a rhetorical figure in their taglines. I think the reason for this is that conduplicatio does not produce a great enough effect to the tagline, or, most probably it is a little bit complicated for the producer to keep repeating (a) certain keyword(s) in such short taglines. I believe that the ineffectiveness of this rhetorical device plays a role in the reason it is not chosen very often.

Aside from conduplicatio, another rhetorical figure that is only found in one data is the rhetorical figure of hypophora. However, this rhetorical figure does not belong in the schematic operation. Hypophora belongs in the tropic operation, which takes only about 30% of the whole data. The reason why companies do not use hypophora often most probably is because hypophora is not easy to remember

and it comes up with a question and answer which makes people have to think about what the tagline is about.

As a whole, trope is a rhetorical operation that is rarely found in my data, it is because when we use trope then it needs time for customers to understand it. Trope needs people imagination and it based on the customers point of view. There are two type of trope which are substitution and destabilization. However, the data shows that only substitutions are found in the taglines. In my opinion, the reason for the use of substitution as a preffered choice compared to destabilization is because despite having to make adjustment to understand the meaning behind it, substitution is easier to understand as they are mostly common phrases that do not create different meanings for each consumer. Still, of course, compared to the schematic operation, overall the rhetorical operation of the trope is a bit more difficult to understand. It is not as simple as scheme.

In my opinion by analyzing rhetorical figures can add our knowledge about language that is used in some media like advertisements, newspaper or magazine. The knowledge itself help us to be aware to respond the taglines that promote the products. The use of rhetorical figures on that area is very important with the purpose to promote their product that can help increase sales. By using rhetorical figures it also helps to grab consumers' attention and makes them interested.

There are some limitations in the writing of my thesis. Due to the time constraint, I have to limit the data that I use in the writing of my thesis. This leads to the next limitation, which is the number of data. In my thesis I only analyze eight advertisement taglines which are taken from only six different brands of chips. I believe that this limits the generalization of my findings as there are a lot of other

unanalyzed taglines from a number of other brands. The next factor that becomes a limitation is the fact that I only focus on analyzing the taglines using the theories by Robert A. Harris (2010) book and McQuarrie and Mick's (1996) journal article. This fact, I believe may also play a factor in how the final findings and conclusion are drawn.

Based on the stated limitations above, there are several recommendations that I would like to propose for the future research in this topic. I believe that the more number of data is better because it will help in giving a more accurate conclusion about the use of rhetorical figure in taglines. It is also important to choose more varieties of brands as it will help to find a more diverse variety of advertisements taglines to be analyzed. The theories used also play a factor in an analysis, therefore I suggest that future researchers use other rhetorical and other stylistics devices in order to have a better understanding on the style and effect of style in advertisements.

Total words: 1021