CHAPTER FIVE
SUMMARY OF RESULTS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSION

5.1 Findings

5.1.1 The researcher has come out with the following findings:

1. Discourse is abused to control people's minds, beliefs and actions in the interest of dominant groups and against the interest or will of others.

2. Lexical items are used effectively to emphasize and de-emphasize political attitudes, manipulate public opinion, manufacture consent or legitimate political power.

3. Media discourse highlights power struggle between the dictatorial governments and oppressed masses and in the service of the powerful elite and state.

4. The discourse is abused in many different ways, such as: subject position in terms of the agent or the doer of an action; it is found that action is attributed to unknown.

5. The analysis of the political speeches of the two presidents have demonstrated that the meanings which people convey by writer or speaker actually do not correspond to what they claim to be saying. As well as the values, ideas and beliefs they communicate, there is
new meanings which on the surface are implicit to readers or listeners but are fully controlled by efficient writers or speakers.

6. Politicians abuse the discourse to control people's minds, beliefs and actions to save their own agenda. It seems clear in the use of words which are carefully selected to meet their destinations in terms of controlling people's minds, beliefs and actions.

7. Sentences have been put in the form of passivitization to shape the hidden ideology by attributing anything to unknown or generalization without identifying who or what.

8. Inclusive we, one of the distancing device, is used successfully in speaking on behave of the speaker himself or herself as well as the addressees themselves. Therefore, it is regarded as a means of practicing power and achieving hidden ideology.

9. 'I', which refers to the exertion of power, is used to control people in terms of being obedient. Therefore, it is regarded as a means of practicing power and achieving hidden ideology.

10. In human interaction language is the best indication of how power is exercised through content, interpersonal relationships and subject positions. Therefore, language is used to transmit particular ideas, beliefs and values of the ideological world.
11. Language specifies the relationships between the participants of a social interaction, and shapes particular subject positions that people enact.

12. Power relations can be identified only by developing ourselves as critical readers or listeners through which we can acquire an awareness of the weight that linguistic expressions obtain from certain ideologies.

13. The political elites do not adjust their political discourses which lead to actions processes of individual actors who are regarded as part and parcel from group actions and social reaction processes.

14. Causative groups have more or less power and they are able to control the acts and minds of members of other groups. This ability presupposes a power base of privileged access to scarce social resources, such as force, money, status, fame, knowledge, information, "culture," or indeed various forms of public discourse and communication of the vast literature on power as stated by (Lukes 1986; Wrong 1979).

15. The coercive power of the military and violent men is based on force; the causative groups have power because of their money, whereas the more or less persuasive power of effective groups is based on knowledge, information or authority.
16. In the enactment or exercise of group power is control not only over content, but over the structures of text and talk which seem clearly in giving orders by ruling class.

17. There is a verbal aggression from the causative groups and effective groups; this seems obviously in their selection of words, terms, slogans and expressions.

18. Briefly, virtually all levels and structures of context, text, and talk are more or less controlled by powerful speakers, and such power is abused at the expense of other participants.

5.2 Recommendations.

5.2.1 The researcher has come out with the following recommendations:

1. The meaning should be illustrated as it was intended, and this requires not only the knowledge of grammar but also the knowledge of the world.

2. The sentence should be understood by the Intended audience according to the context in which a sentence is said. This kind of knowledge is needed for the interpretation of the real meaning that the writer or speaker sets out to convey.

3. Language use, discourse, shouldn't be just a matter of performing tasks, it should be a matter of expressing and constituting and
reproducing social identities and social relations, including relations of power.

4. Power is seldom absolute; causative groups shouldn't be more or less controlled other groups and shouldn't be controlled them in specific situations or social domains.

5. Effective groups shouldn't be less resist, accept, condone, comply with, or legitimate such power.

6. Power shouldn't always be exercised in obviously abusive acts of causative group members and shouldn't be enacted in the myriad of taken-for-granted actions of everyday life.

7. All members of a powerful group shouldn't always be more powerful than all members of effective groups: power is only defined here for groups as a whole.

8. In terms of text and context, members of powerful groups shouldn't be decided on the possible discourse genres or speech acts of an occasion.

9. The public use of specific words shouldn't be banned as subversive in a dictatorship and discursive challenges to culturally dominant groups (e.g. white, western males) by their multicultural opponents shouldn't be ridiculed in the media as "politically correct".
10. Action and interaction dimensions of discourse shouldn't be controlled by prescribing or proscribing specific speech acts.

5.3 Conclusion.

Scholars stated that Power is another concept which is central for CDA as it often analyses the language use of those in power who are responsible for the existence of inequalities. They said that CDA researchers are interested in the way discourse (re)produces social domination, that is, the power abuse of one group over others, and how dominated groups may discursively resist such abuse. Power is central for understanding the dynamics and specifics of control of action in modern societies, but power remains mostly invisible. Power does not necessarily derive from language, but language can be used to challenge power, to subvert it, to alter distributions of power in the short and the long term. Language provides a finely articulated vehicle for differences in power in hierarchical social structures. Most critical discourse analysts would thus endorse Habermas (1967: 259) claim, "language is also a medium of domination and social force. It serves to legitimate relations of organized power. In so far as the legitimizations of power relations ... are not articulated...language is also ideological". In the enactment or exercise of group power is control not only over content, but over the structures of text and talk. Relating text and context, thus, they already viewed that members of powerful groups may decide on the possible discourse genre(s) or speech act of an occasion argument.

The researcher has seen that there is unequal power relation between the dictatorial governments and oppressed masses in terms of accessing to the
power. He said that media discourse has been abused to control people's minds, beliefs and actions. Accordingly, he stated that lexical items have been used effectively to emphasize or de-emphasize people's attitude…. He claimed that the elites have been practiced power explicitly and implicitly to save their own agenda. The text should be understood by the intended audience according to the context in which a text is said. This kind of knowledge is needed for the interpretation of the real meaning that the writer or speaker sets out to convey.

Ultimately, I hope that all governments all over the world to have equal power relation with all. People should be enabling to access to the power. Media discourse shouldn't be abused by elites. Power shouldn't be exerted negatively. The political elites should adjust their political discourses. The political speeches which people convey by writer or speaker actually should be corresponded to what they claim to be saying. As well as the values, ideas and beliefs they communicate, there are new meanings which on the surface are implicit to readers or listeners shouldn't be fully controlled by efficient writers or speakers.
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