CHAPTER FOUR

CONCLUSION

In this chapter, I would like to make some conclusions based on the result of the analysis in Chapter Three. I draw the conclusion based on my findings in the micro level analysis comprising the macrostructure analysis, the microstructure analysis, and the superstructure analysis.

First, in the macrostructure analysis, I reveal the main topic of the speech after exposing the genre of the text and analyzing the thesis and reiteration parts. From this analysis, I find that America will focus on mortifying and destroying ISIS, which has done atrocities to many people including the Americans. In my opinion, this happens because they discern that ISIS and other terrorist groups use violent actions to threaten their victims. Therefore, Americans are working together to protect one another. Thus, America is represented positively. In addition, I also assume that Obama, as president, is accountable for his duty and obligation in this war. He thinks that what ISIS and other terrorists do is insufferable. Therefore, he desires to fight these radical groups. Hence, as the one who requires to combat ISIS and terrorism, Obama, is also represented positively in this macrostructure analysis. Here, I get a bit of information about the self-

group representation in Obama's speech. This happens because I consider that the analysis is seen and examined in a global analysis form, but not in details. Nevertheless, since Obama points out his objectives directly, the audience still can understand what Obama's speech is about and what he will do in his speech.

Next, in the microstructure analysis, there are five tools to be used to analyze the speech, namely overall interaction strategies, level of specificity and degree of completeness, lexicon style, sentence syntax, and the use of deictic. Yet, I only use the style strategy to reveal the positive self-presentation, which are lexicon style and sentence syntax. In my personal opinion, these two tools are most effective to examine Obama's speech. It happens because, I think, both of the tools specifically explain and refer to positive self-presentation of America. As a result, I can obviously see how the self is presented in the speech and how the doers (the Americans, and Obama) are doing something positive. Therefore, by utilizing the style strategy, I can get further information about positive self-presentation in the speech.

The first strategy that I use is the lexicon analysis. From the data analysis in Table 3.3, Obama uses twelve paragraphs, which contain positive words and meanings in the text and context that refer particularly to all Americans. Thus, it means that America is represented positively. In my point of view, Obama uses all these positive words because he discerns the strong courage and determination of the American people in fighting this danger. It is proven when the Americans take some actions to defeat ISIS and save thousands of innocent lives. Thus, personally, I agree with Obama that America is depicted as positive self-presentation.

In my opinion, the Americans are highly professional and consistent in facing their problems. They are focused and resolute to fight severe felonies that occurred not only in their country but also around the world. Furthermore, I assume that the Americans are also strong and powerful. They do not waver to fight back the terrorist's threats to defend their nation. Therefore, it makes Obama proud as well as certain about the future of his country. Hence, this lexicon analysis helps me a lot to present the positive words addressed to the self-presentation.

Through this strategy, it highlights Obama's self-presentation. I can see his readiness and responsibility as the Commander-in-Chief, in defending and protecting his citizens from any possibilities of danger. Moreover, I can see his strong personality and commitment to assist other countries security and humanity. Thus, Obama is also represented positively in this analysis.

Next, the second strategy I use to reveal the presentation of the United States of America in the microstructure analysis is sentence syntax, which is the construction of the active sentence. From the data analysis, America, together with Obama and its allies, is portrayed as the actors who is going to banish and destroy ISIS. They also have organized some comprehensive strategies to destroy terrorism around the world. Thus, by performing these active sentences, I can discover the accurate proof that the actors are doing some positive actions. These active sentences also indicate that Obama and his citizens still uphold their values in defending their nation. Therefore, it represents the actors as positive self-presentation.

Thus, from all the strategies that Obama used in his speech, I can assume that Obama is excellent in using language to persuade and convince the Americans to agree with the arguments presented in his speech. Besides, he is careful and thoughtful in taking the efforts to deal with the radical groups such as ISIS. Thus, I think that Obama is successful in running his missions. Additionally, I assume that the Americans are also in line with what Obama has described in his speech. I personally think that American people have good characters as they have supported and done positive actions to help Obama to destroy ISIS and terrorism. Furthermore, they devote their lives to assist humanitarian missions with their allies. Therefore, from what Obama has stated positively about the Americans, people will comprehend that they can trust and depend on America to fight terrorism. As a result, what they have done to the world is represented as positive self-presentation.

The last analysis in the micro level is the superstructure analysis. From the analysis, Obama's speech follows the structure of analytical exposition which contains the thesis, argument, and reiteration. First, he begins his speech by declaring his specific purpose of the speech which is considered as the thesis. Then, he presents three arguments to support the thesis statement. Argument I is addressing about the danger of ISIS that has posed threats in the world including America. Argument II is explaining the strategies that the United States of America has made to combat the terrorists and protect their homeland. Argument III is talking about America's allies' efforts to help fight terrorism around the world. Last, Obama reminds his purpose of the speech to all Americans in the reiteration part. Based on the result of the analysis, I assume that Obama has

managed his speech orderly by giving clear objectives in confronting this danger. It is proven when Obama has provided multiple strategies that America has taken and will take to combat ISIS and terrorism in the speech. In my point of view, it happens because Obama wants his speech to be well understood so as the main purpose of his speech can be perceived and implemented thoroughly by American people as the addressee. Therefore, he follows the structure of the conventional organization intentionally.

In conclusion, after conducting the analysis by using van Dijk's Critical Discourse Analysis, I learn about how a speaker, who especially has the power, presents certain parties or themselves in their text positively or negatively. By performing this way, it indicates their position. Besides, I learn that all the words used by the speaker, have to be seen and examined in the text and context. This happens because it can refer to positive or negative evaluation and reveal the self and other presentation.

Finally, I would like to give my suggestions to linguistic students who want to take Critical Discourse Analysis as the topic of their thesis and use van Dijk's theory. I suggest their being more careful in searching the data they want to analyze. Besides, they have to make sure that the data is suitable to be analyzed through the theory. In analyzing the data, they also have to analyze in details especially in the microstructure analysis so they can reveal the representation of the positive self-group or negative other groups.

1,303 words