

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

5.1 Conclusions

The study is conducted to investigate the social actions that are attributed to each social actor in the text investigated, the distribution of social actions that are attributed to Obama's administration, and the kinds of actions that tend to be deactivated and abstracted. The study finds that there are 227 actions and 27 reactions that are attributed to 6 actors. The actions of Obama's administration concerning terrorism are distributed in the form of material and semiotic actions. Regarding the tendency of deactivation and abstraction, the study also reveals that there are 2 kinds of deactivation and three kinds of abstraction found in the text. The attribution of such actions to the administration suggests that Barack Obama's administration controls the discourse of terrorism, strengthens its position in the world and provides a legitimation for all of its actions in the attempt of defeating Al-Qa'ida and other violent extremists.

The main actor in the discourse is Obama's administration. Its actions as well as the reactions are represented in the discourse. The reactions that are attributed to the administration are mostly cognitive reactions; its affective reactions are objectivated. Its actions are dominated by instrumentalized material actions. The dominant use of instrumental actions suggests that the administration represents the other actors as interchangeable as objects. Its interactive actions with the allies are associated with positive qualities.

There are four references of opponent that are represented in the text: Al-Qa'ida, violent extremists, the Taliban, and the enemies. The administration put more emphasis on Al-Qa'ida and violent extremists. The main point that is trying to be delivered by the administration is that it attempts to disrupt, dismantle, and defeat Al-Qa'ida and its violent extremists with all the help that can be gained from its allies. Two main opponents—less powerful actors: Al-Qaida and violent extremists—are represented as performing more nontransactive actions rather than transactive ones. It is because the ability to transact needs a certain amount of power. In addition, most of their actions are deactivated. The deactivation suggests that their actions are backgrounded as things or as quality. These different attributions of social actions imply that the administration wants to make a clear distinction between its allies and its enemies. However, the representation of actions of other enemies suggests that the administration does not close the possibility of targeting other actors, aside from Al-Qa'ida, who endanger its position.

Regarding the tendency of objectivation and abstraction, there are two kinds of objectivation and three abstractions found in the discourse. The first objectivation is the name of the episode of social practices. The second objectivation is the affected reactions of the administration and the Americans. These objectivation are used to downgrade the priority of the actions. The first abstraction is the social practice “attack”. The representation of this practice is abstracted and not presented thoroughly. The second abstraction highlights the actions of Al-Qa'ida and the Taliban as quality. The third abstraction concerns

with the “cooperation” that is built by the administration. It highlights the positive quality of cooperation without describing what kind of cooperation that takes place. These objectivations and abstractions function as the legitimation of what the administration does: disrupting, dismantling, and defeating Al-Qa’ida or building cooperation with Pakistan to defeat violent extremists in Afghanistan.

5.2 Suggestions

The framework of recontextualization of social practice constructed by Van Leeuwen is thorough. It is not only limited to the representation of actors or action but also to the representation of time and space. A more thorough analysis of representation of social actor and actions as well as their representation of time and space may contribute to a better interpretation of certain discourse. In addition, this broader range of analysis widens the kinds of discourse that can be analyzed. It is suggested that the future study not only analyzes a piece of news or government’s official document but also different kinds of discourse. It is better not only to focus on political discourse but also on other area of discourse, such as educational discourse. There will be many interesting findings that can be gained through this kind of analysis.

Van Leeuwen’s framework of recontextualization of social practice does not limit itself to one discourse. It is suggested that the future study compares two or three kinds of discourse. The comparison will make the analysis of the recontextualization of the same social practice in different discourse clearer and

more observable. For instance, the analysis of different versions of fairy tales using the framework of recontextualization may reveal an interesting finding. Positively, this kind of analysis will broaden the area of Critical Discourse Analysis that mostly focuses on political discourse.

