CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSION

In this chapter, I will give my personal comments on my findings put forward in Chapter Four. Besides, I would like to give my recommendation or suggestion for future research.

My analysis has the purpose of answering three topics which I have previously mentioned in Chapter One. The first question that my analysis answers concerns the way of President Obama building a positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation in the macrostructure analysis. It is found out that the global topic of President Obama's speech is that America will certainly prevail over terrorism with the great plans and strategies.

There are two opposing sides that are present in the global topic, which are America and the terrorists. In van Dijk's CDA, it is known that the two opposing sides can be categorized as self and other. Since the one delivering the speech is the President of the United States, it is clear that the self is America and the other is terrorists. In my opinion, immediately showing two opposing sides with one being portrayed negatively and the other one is trying to defeat the bad one is clearly a brilliant strategy. In this way, Obama successfully maximizes the self's positive presentation by the time he explains the strategies to defeat the other

because he has established a negative presentation towards the other beforehand.

The global topic also shows a positive self-presentation. This presentation can be seen from the word choice used. The word *prevail* instead of merely *winning* implies that America shows a lot of effort done to achieve the victory against terrorism. Even though both words can be defined as achieving something, the word *prevail* carries a stronger connotation than *winning*, and Obama surely realizes the effect of his word choice.

The next clever word choice is the name of the other. In this case, Obama, once again, has two options to use. He can either choose to mention the other's name as ISIL, or use the general term for this group, which is the terrorists. The fact that Obama ends up using the word *terrorist* shows how much detail Obama puts into this speech. ISIL or ISIS surely has gained fame as the terrorist group, but compared with the word *terrorist*, I believe that name is still weaker in terms of the connotation. Hence, Obama's word choice in the macrostructure shows that Obama has emphasized the positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation right from the start.

The second question that my analysis answers is how Obama builds a positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation in the microstructure analysis. In this part, I use three tools, which are lexicon, syntax, and local meanings.

The result of the analysis of the lexicon shows that there are 17 words that show positive self-presentation and 25 words that show negative other-presentation. In my opinion, Obama describes the other more than the self because

he wants to emphasizes that the other is something so dangerous, bad, and negative. He wishes to give his audience reasons to support America's wish and plans to defeat the other.

However, the number of the positive words for the self is not very small, despite being slightly fewer than the negative descriptions for the other. I think this is smart as it is useful to awaken the Americans' spirit to believe that they have what it takes to defeat the other, which surely will lead to their trust on America's plans.

The second tool is active sentence structure with President Obama, America, and ISIL or terrorists as the actors. The analysis result shows that there are 25 data where Obama uses an active sentence construction for the self and one data for the other. All of the data in which the self is the actor show a positive self-presentation and the only data in which the other is the actor shows a negative other-presentation. There is a really big gap in the data from this tool. I think this happens because Obama wants to describe the self as an active role. He wants to show that America and himself are constantly doing what they can to achieve their goal, which is to defeat ISIL or the other.

The third tool is the local meanings in which the detailed information is analyzed. Besides that, I also analyze the overall interaction strategies that Obama uses to build the presentation of both the self and the other. There are three topics that can be found in the speech, which are terrorists' attacks, what America has done regarding terrorism, and America's strategies. Among the three major topics, the topic about America's strategies is the most prominent one followed by what America has done regarding terrorism and lastly the terrorists' attacks. I believe

that this is because Obama wants to show that America is prepared to defeat the other by presenting their strategies in great detail. Moreover, as I have mentioned before, Obama wishes to gain his audience's trust in the strategies. To be able to do so, he has to explain the strategies so that his audience can perfectly understand what America is going to do to win. Obama mostly uses the strategy of emphasizing positive things about the self, which is used on two of the three topics present in the speech. This, I believe, is to show that America is capable of taking down the terrorists or the other.

The last research question that my analysis answers is how Obama builds a positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation in the superstructure analysis. The result of the superstructure analysis is that the speech follows the conventional order of a hortatory speech. The use of the conventional order will help the audience to follow the speech more easily. I think Obama purposefully does this because he wants to make sure that his audience understands what he is trying to tell them, especially because this speech is about a deadly threat that everyone, including Americans, is facing at that time. If Obama's audience understands him perfectly, it will increase the probability that they will put their trust in the great plans Obama explains.

I am aware that this analysis is still far from perfect; hence, I will provide some recommendations and suggestions for future researchers who are also interested in Critical Discourse Analysis. First, they can use another theory to analyze the speech such as Halliday's Functional Grammar. I believe that by applying another theory, a new insight and finding can be produced for this theory uses a whole different set of tools from van Dijk's theory. Moreover, there are

many other tools that can be used to complete the microstructure analysis besides the three tools I use in this analysis.

The topic of the speech that I analyze is about ISIL and terrorism, which is not only America's problem but, just like how Obama suggests, a worldwide threat. This means that there are many speeches and news reports regarding this topic that are made every single day from different perspectives from Obama's or America's perspective. By analyzing different texts from different perspectives but with the same topic, I believe it will help enrich the findings as well.