

CHAPTER IV CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

4.1. Conclusion

This study discusses the distribution of transitivity systems that may occur in speech discourses declared by two important state figures, and there are George W. Bush and Scott Morrison. Then, this study also discusses the comparison of the two speeches, which means what process dominates from the two speeches. It is also, how do process types, participant function, and circumstantial deliver image terrorist from the two discourses. The data from this study are in the form of two video speeches that discuss the 'war on terror'. This data was taken because both of them have similarities in discussing the war against terrorists after a group of terrorists attacked their territory.

The finding of this research showed that there are 160 clauses analyzed in this research. There are 86 occurrences for the material process, 31 occurrences for the mental process, 21 occurrences for the relational process, one occurrence for the behavioral process, 17 occurrences for the verbal process, and four occurrences for the existential process. The numbers of the participant functions are related to the numbers of the process types. Then seeing for the circumstantial elements, there are 109 occurrences: three occurrences for the extent, 63 occurrences for the location, seven occurrences for the manner, seven occurrences for the cause, 15 occurrences for the accompaniment, 11 occurrences for the role, and one occurrence for the angle.

In both discourses have process material as the most dominant type of process, which represents an appeal that oriented on the action, the activity, and the real action to combat terrorists. However, there are differences in the least common types of processes. In George W. Bush's speech, only four out of six process types were found as the first data. There are no behavioral processes and existential processes in this data. So that the lowest process is found in the verbal process, four times occur. In Scott Morrison's discourse, as the second data, it is found that behavioral processes are the least common processes.

In the selected clause of George W. Bush's speech, which consists of several process types, the dominant one is the material process. George W. Bush, as the speaker, uses several pronouns in the participant such as *evil, enemies, these acts of mass murder, the very worst of human nature*, which refers to terrorists. Material processes related to terrorists belong to the semantic field of violence and chaos: *came under attack, were ended, can shake, and shattered*. Thus, the analysis shows the material process mostly shows violence and destruction. The data shows that the dominance of material processes signifies a negative representation of terrorists. Meanwhile, Bush uses relational processes to show America as a victim of atrocities committed by terrorists. Directly proportional to George W. Bush, Scott Morrison also mostly uses material processes in describing the image of terrorists in his speeches. Not only on the material process, but Scott also uses verbal processes to describe the image of terrorists in his speech. He chose the words such as *religious extremism, evil thieves and evil, violent extremist Islam, radical violent extremist Islam, religious extremism, greatest*

threat, radical, dangerous ideology that leads to terrorists, which shows strong emotional connotation and negative image of terrorists. Furthermore, Scott uses mental processes to portray Australia as a victim. In addition, the circumstantial elements used in both speech discourses show more of the place and time, where and when the incident occurred. To sum up, in both speech discourses, the material process is the most dominant process than others. As a result, both George W. Bush and Scott Morrison portray negative images of terrorists, while America and Australia are represented positively and victims of terrorist acts.

4.2. Suggestion

Researchers formulate several suggestions for students, as well as readers and subsequent researchers who will carry out research related to SFL (systemic functional linguistics) and transitivity analysis as follows:

1. For linguistics students

Researchers suggest studying SFL more in-depth. Thus, it is interesting to learn because it can interpret discourses, especially discourses of speeches of important state figures in the language. There can be a purpose and how they describe something through the speech they deliver.

2. For other researchers

Hopefully, the next researcher can be more creative and critical. Also, it would be better for further research involving interpersonal and textual metafunctions. Hence the study of the analysis can complete.