

## CHAPTER V

### CONCLUSION

This chapter concludes the result and analysis regarding with the questions of the research which include the structural organization and the types of legitimation strategies within Barack Obama's Presidential Address on Combating ISIS and Terrorism as well as the use of legitimation strategies within the structural organization of the speech.

#### 5.1 Conclusion

Based on the result of the research of Barack Obama's presidential address on combating ISIS and terrorism, it can be concluded that:

1. Barack Obama's presidential address generally modifies the use of normative structure of political speech as proposed by Porksen (2013). The speech is divided into six segments which covers all seven structures in Porksen's theory of normative structure. The structure of Barack Obama's speech includes: (1) *Personal introduction of central theme*; (2) *Situation-based explanation of main thesis*; (3) *Presentation of main thesis*; (4) *Conclusion*; (5) *Comparative view on parallel and contrastive cases to integrate thesis in the course of political events*; and (6) *Appeal to audience*. On the other hand, one last normative structure, which is *presentation of counter position and*

*their refutation*, is used as a realization of *presentation of main thesis* (segment 5). Modification of structure can be seen from the flip that happens between segment (2) and segment (3) in which *situation-based explanation of main thesis* precedes *presentation of main thesis*; and also between segment (4) and (5), in which *conclusion* precedes *comparative view on parallel and contrastive cases to integrate thesis in the course of political events*.

2. Barack Obama's presidential address on combating ISIS and terrorism significantly evokes the emotions of the audience; rationalizes the actions/proposal/strategy; and emphasizes the benefits of the actions/proposal/strategy against ISIS. This can be concluded from the fact that more than a half of the legitimization strategies are Appeal to Emotions (27 occurrences, 51.9%); more than a third are Rationality (15 occurrences, 34%); and more than a tenth are Altruism (8 occurrences, 13.5%). On the other hand, the address does not significantly emphasize future consequences and voice of others. This is according to the fact that there are only 2 occurrences of Hypothetical Future (3.8%) and a single occurrence of Voice of Expertise (1.9%).
3. Segments in the structural organization of Barack Obama's presidential address seem to be typical with particular strategy of legitimization. For example, *situation-based explanation of main thesis* is typical with Appeal to Emotion (with 18 out of 29 occurrences in

this segment alone) in which emotions and fear is very well emphasized in the background problem. Furthermore, *presentation of main thesis* is typical with Rationality (with 5 out of 14 occurrences) though Appeal to Emotions and Altruism is moderately used (5 and 4 occurrences respectively). This shows that the heart of the proposal is very well presented in rational, procedural and cooperative manner to guarantee success. Additionally, *conclusion* is typical with Rationality that it only employs rationality to conclude the proposal by emphasizing its rational quality. Finally, *comparative view on parallel and contrastive cases to integrate thesis in the course of political events* seems to moderately use several strategies of legitimation. It uses few of Appeal to Emotion, Rationality and Altruism to slightly remind audience of the emotional, rational and beneficial features of the counterterrorism proposal.

## 5.2 Recommendation

This study of Barack Obama's Presidential Address on Combating ISIS and Terrorism has been limited only in Critical Discourse Studies, specifically regarding with legitimation strategies in terrorism issue. In this way, opportunity is wide open to study Barack Obama's Presidential address from different perspectives and fields of study. For example, it has not yet been studied how Obama persuades audience and congress to accept his proposal with in the perspective of persuasive strategies. Furthermore, pragmatics study can also be a way to study the language use within this presidential address in political context,

and to view this presidential address as a form of social action. In short, it is hoped that other researchers would be able to widen the scope of study of Barack Obama's presidential address.

