

CHAPTER FOUR

CONCLUSION

The research being studied has the purpose of revealing how the self and other are represented by analyzing the macrostructure, microstructure, and superstructure of the speech. In this chapter, I will present the findings of the analysis.

First, in the macrostructure analysis, I analyze the thesis statement and recommendation part in order to get the global meaning of the speech. From this analysis, it is discovered that Michelle Obama makes a contrast between Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump and people should vote for Hillary Clinton instead of Donald Trump. As Hillary Clinton is mentioned as someone who should be voted; hence, Hillary Clinton is represented positively. On the other hand, Donald Trump is mentioned as someone who should not be voted; thus, Donald Trump is represented negatively. As the thesis statement is delivered explicitly, the audience can easily understand what the speech is about so that the audience will not get confused. I consider Michelle Obama has made a good start by giving a clear message of what the speech is about.

Furthermore, the microstructure analysis uses several tools so that thorough analysis can be achieved. The tools are level of specificity and degree of completeness, lexicon, and syntactic structure. From the level of specificity and degree of completeness, it is found that Michelle Obama gives specific and complete information about what Hillary Clinton has done for the United States of America. Through this tool, I am of the opinion that overall Hillary Clinton is depicted as someone who is professional, a prepared person, and successful in her jobs. Hillary Clinton is also willing to sacrifice her time to do her works and she devotes her life to do public services. She gives great impact to the Americans. To sum up, Michelle Obama wants to tell the audience that Hillary Clinton commits herself to help the American people and she does her job whole-heartedly. From the details given, it is evident that Hillary Clinton is represented positively.

In my opinion, Michelle Obama uses this tactic to tell the Americans in a very specific way all the great things that Hillary Clinton has done for America. Besides, by giving the complete information about the positive things that Hillary Clinton has done, Michelle Obama gets the chance to convince the audience to believe that Hillary Clinton is the right person to be their next president. From my perspective, this is the basic yet useful maneuver to win the American people's vote for Hillary Clinton.

In lexicon analysis, Michelle Obama intentionally sends her idea about Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump by choosing words of her interest to influence the audience's perception about the two candidates. Michelle Obama uses words containing positive evaluation for Hillary Clinton; while for Donald Trump, she uses words which contain negative evaluation. This means that Hillary Clinton is

represented positively, whereas Donald Trump is represented negatively. Michelle Obama states that Hillary Clinton is a brave person, caring mother, and a hard worker; while, she depicts Donald Trump as someone who is morally wrong, not normal, and a disgraceful person. Her lexicalization might influence the audience's perspective. Nevertheless, Michelle Obama does not mention about what Donald Trump has said about women; thus, some of the audience who have no background knowledge about what Donald Trump has said will probably get confused why Michelle Obama uses strong negative diction in describing Donald Trump. From my personal standpoint, it is better if Michelle Obama presents not only the dictions to influence the audience's perspective but also the detailed information so that the audience will get clearer information and she also could achieve her goal.

Furthermore, Michelle Obama uses more positive-self representation rather than negative-other representation. I personally think that it is okay to tell the audience about bad things that the other candidate has on the condition that she still focuses on the good things they have. I consider Michelle Obama to have use a good strategy which shows more about good things that Hillary Clinton has done rather than elaborate more about the negative things Donald Trump has done. This approach will probably make the audience realize that Hillary Clinton is a competent candidate.

Besides, in syntactic structure, Michelle Obama emphasizes that Hillary Clinton is the actor of several positive things that she has done for America and Donald Trump is the actor who talks about women in a demeaning way. It seems to me that Michelle Obama uses this tactic to give an emphasis to the audience

that it is Hillary Clinton who has done all those positive things and it is Donald Trump who has bad behavior. Michelle Obama probably realizes the importance of syntactic structure so that she can boost positive representation of Hillary Clinton and negative representation of Donald Trump.

Last, I will cover the finding of superstructure analysis. Michelle Obama uses recommendation in her speech. Michelle Obama recommends the audience to vote for Hillary Clinton in the election day. Since the recommendation part is put in the last part of the speech, I consider Michelle Obama uses this maneuver to give an emphasis to the audience because the message that is put in the last part will be emphasized. In the superstructure part, I think Michelle Obama cleverly knows where is the right part to put her message so that the audience can get her message better.

From the finding of this analysis, it is clear that Hillary Clinton is basically represented as a qualified person to be the next president of America because she has good character and she has done her jobs successfully. On the other hand, Donald Trump is represented as someone who is degrading to women because he has said inappropriate words toward women.

Overall, I think the way Michelle Obama delivers her message in the speech is interesting. She elaborates her ideas orderly. However, when she describes the other, who is Donald Trump, she does not give the information about what he has said, when and where it happens. The information is needed, especially for the audience who do not know the case. The audience who do not know the case will lose the message she tries to deliver.

What is more, in delivering a speech, a speaker might try to transfer his or her knowledge to the audience because the same knowledge will create the same action. Therefore, I think it is important to analyze the self and other presentation so that people can be more analytical in receiving knowledge from a speaker which then leads them to better action. I have several suggestions for the other researchers who want to do similar research. The researchers have to understand the theory they use. Besides, they have to find information that can support their analysis. What is more, a researcher of Critical Discourse Analysis has to do the analysis completely and give attention to details in doing their analysis.

Word Count: 1, 151 Words

