

CHAPTER IV

COCLUSION

4.1. Conclusion

The purpose of this study is to discuss the function of the transitivity system, based on the type of process, participant function, and circumstantial elements in the two speech discourses. The two speech discourses presented as objects of research came from a speech delivered by Barack Obama and a speech discourse from Benjamin Netanyahu. The two figures are heads of state in each of the different regions, but the content of the two speeches is the same as discussing the war against terrorism. In addition, the purpose of this study is to discuss the types of processes that most often appear or dominate in the two discourses of speeches delivered by two different heads of state about terrorism.

The total results of finding clauses in both speeches from Barack Obama and Benjamin Netanyahu were 200 clauses. Of the 200 clauses, the process type that dominates the most in these two speech discourses is the material process type with 117 clauses. Then, the difference between the two speech discourses is that for the verbal process type in Benjamin Netanyahu's discourse, one of the process types dominates with 7 clauses. A total of 47 clauses in Benjamin Netanyahu's speech. Then, the dominant participant function of these two speech discourses is also the same based on the findings on the process type. Then, for the circumstantial elements found in these two speeches, there are 71 clauses. From these two speech discourses, the findings were very different from the two speech discourses, such as circumstantial elements found in 30 clauses and accompaniment in 16 clauses. It

was the circumstantial elements that dominated Barack Obama's speech discourse out of 58 clauses. Meanwhile, in Benjamin Netanyahu's speech, the circumstantial elements that dominate the discourse of this speech are the situation location and extent of 5 clauses out of 13 clauses.

The aim of this research study is to compare the two speeches delivered by the two heads of state which differ from the aspects of language experience contained in these two speeches using ideational meaning. Apart from that, the aim of this research is to discuss the reactions of the two heads of state regarding terrorist acts based on their views which use ideational meaning or what is meant by language as experience. For this part, these two material process types of speech dominate equally and equally describe the negative impact of this terrorist act. Then, the difference between the two speech discourses for this is the type of verbal process that dominates in Benjamin Netanyahu's speech discourse, how Benjamin Netanyahu reacts to this action through the type of verbal process, namely the type of process that is related to the process of saying. So in this type of verbal process, Benjamin Netanyahu said that this action must be retaliated against by Hamas and reminded Hamas that Israel would take revenge on this action. So in these two speech discourses it can be concluded that the type of process that is most often found in these two speech discourses is process material. Apart from that, the two heads of state reacted to this act of terror as a bad act and harmed many people and the difference between these two speeches was how the two heads viewed this act as an experience in their respective languages using ideational meaning. It means that, they explained how the two heads of state described a group of terrorists from

the point of view of the two heads of state

4.2. Limitation

In this research discusses the analysis of the speeches of Barack Obama and Benjamin Netanyahu using transitivity system theory. The limitation of this research is that the data sources obtained are quite difficult for the text of Benjamin Netanyahu's speech, because the video of this speech was taken from YouTube and the text of the speech cannot be found on the official website of the Israeli government. besides that, the limitations of speech texts are difficult to find on the official website or all articles on the internet, in terms of the theory used in this study is a system of language functions based on ideational meanings, so the writer has limitations in examining parts of textual and interpersonal meanings.

4.3. Suggestion

For researchers who want to use systemic linguistic functions or transitivity systems, there are many speeches or interviews that can be analyzed using this theory and using ideational analysis like this research. However, if you want to use interpersonal or textual meaning, it would be better and different from previous research. So, the author hopes that those who want to research using this theory must understand and be interested in systemic functional linguistics. Then, hopefully this research that the author conducted can be a reference for future researchers who want to discuss transitivity systems.