

CHAPTER IV CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

4.1. Conclusion

This research examines the distribution of the transitivity system that might happen in the two speech discourses delivered by two United States presidential candidates. They are Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton. Subsequently, this research also describes the comparison of the two speeches. The comparison is related to what process dominates the most in the two speech discourses. Based on the process types, participant functions, and circumstantial elements, the researcher also discusses the image of terrorists from the two speech discourses.

The finding of this research indicated that there were 168 processes obtained from the two speeches, 102 of which were processes in Trump's speech and 66 were processes proposed by Hillary. The 102 processes in Trump's speech included material process (66.67%), mental process (17.64%), relational process (10.78%), verbal process (3.92%), and existential process (0.98%). While the 66 processes in Hillary's speech included material process with percentages (66.07%), mental process (12.12%), relational process (16.67%), behavioral process (1.51%) and verbal process (4.54%). The dominant process in the two speech discourses was the material process with a percentage (66.07%). The next dominant processes are mental process (15.47%), relational process (13.09%), verbal process (4.17%), material process (0.59%) and behavioral process (0.59%). The existential process and behavioral process are found to be the least occurring processes in both speech discourses. Participants who were involved in the material process also dominated the two speech discourses, namely actor

participants with a percentage (23.15%). The results showed that there were 89 elements of circumstances that were obtained from the two discourses of the speech, 62 of which were circumstantial elements in Trump's speech and 27 were proposed by Hillary. The 62 circumstantial elements in Trump's speech included circumstantial element of location (67.74%), circumstantial element of manners (9.67%), circumstantial element of role (8.06%), circumstantial element of matter (6.45%), circumstantial element of cause (4.83%), circumstantial element of extent (1.61%), and circumstantial element of accompaniment (1.61%). While the 27 circumstantial elements in Hillary's speech included circumstantial element of location with percentages (66.67%), circumstantial element of manners (11.11%), circumstantial element of accompaniment (11.11%), circumstantial element of role (7.40%), and circumstantial element of extent (3.70%). The circumstantial element of location was the most dominant element in the two speech discourses with a percentage (67.41%). The dominations of the next circumstantial elements are the circumstantial element of manner (10.11%), the circumstantial element of role (7.86%), the circumstantial element of accompaniment (4.49%), the circumstantial element of matter (4.49%), the circumstantial element of cause (3.37%), and the circumstantial element of extent (2.24%).

The speakers' intention when they delivered the speech primarily related to the terrorist attack can be seen through the material process. Almost all clauses contain the negative emotion of the speakers—however, not only the dominant process but also the lowest process in the two speeches discourse. There are differences in the lowest common types of processes. In Donald Trump's speech, only one out of six process types were not found as the first data. There is no

behavioral process in the first data. Therefore, the existential process is the lowest process typically found in the first data, which occurs once. There is no existential process in the second data in Hillary Clinton's speech. Therefore, the lowest occurrence of process types is the behavioral process that occurs once.

Furthermore, in the selected clause of Donald Trump's speech which consists of several types, the material process is the most dominant process type. Donald Trump used several pronouns in the participant, such as *evil*, *Radical Islamic Terrorism*, *brutal attack*, and *enemy*, which refers to terrorists. Several pronouns mean profoundly immoral and wicked, which refers to the terrorist attack. The semantic field of violence and chaos: *murder*, *were shot*, *were executed*, and *detonated*. Therefore, some forms of violence and destruction are described in the analysis. The dominance of material processes indicated the negative emotion and negative image of a terrorist, which can be seen through the data. As well as Donald Trump, Hillary Clinton also represented negative emotions toward terrorists through the material process. The choice of words is *killed*, *beheads*, *enslaves*, and *rapes*. The choice of words refers to the activity of terrorists. Then, Clinton uses mental processes to describe the effort that will be made to defeat terrorist attacks in her country. Through a mental process, she expressed her plans.

Furthermore, Trump uses the relational process to figure out the condition of the United States after the terrorist attack. He described the negative impact of representation. The impact that occurs in the United States and the impact that occurs in another country, such as France. The words are; *injured*, *worst mass*, *suffering*, and *the dead*. In addition, the prevailing circumstance in both speeches

in each speech discourse is the location which refers to place and time. The time refers to when the process occurs, and the place refers to where the process takes place. In conclusion, the material process is the most dominant process in both speech discourse. Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton represent the negative images of terrorists; meanwhile, other countries such as France were also suffering as the victims of the terrorist attack.

4.2. Suggestion

The researcher would like to provide several suggestions for readers, students, and researchers who will conduct the research on SFL (Systemic Functional Linguistics) and discourse analysis. Those are:

1. For linguistics students

It is suggested to linguistics students to discover about Systemic Functional Linguistics. It is interesting to know how people's intentions are beyond their words, especially in discourses of speeches. Therefore, we could find out the speaker's purpose and intention through the use of language in their speech. Although this study is based on limited to some data, the findings suggest linguists and discourses analysts enter other political discourse domains. Discourse in political aspects, can also reconstructive and manipulative. On the reason of that, political discourse analysis is needed to discover the awareness of citizens through social and political problems.

2. For other researchers

The analysis on speech discourses about 'war on terror' and terrorisme in this research is still limited to some data. However, there are many other speech

discourses that could be helpful for the next researchers, mainly about terrorism. The next researchers doing further analysis on this discourse should find out comprehensively the interpersonal and textual metanfunction. In addition, further research would be better if the next researcher would like to involve semantic theory comprehensively to analyze the nominal and verbal group.

