

## Chapter 5

### Conclusion and Recommendation

#### Conclusion

The analysis of types of power was based on six types of social power proposed by Raven (French & Raven, 1959; Raven, 1965, as cited in Raven, 2008). This study revealed that there are only five out of six types of social power revealed in the speeches. The types of social power were reward, coercive, referent, legitimate, and informational power; while expert power were not used at all. These four types of social power gave different impact to the audience (Cummings, 2017).

The five types of power collaborated to express the protest on racial injustice. Martin Luther King Jr. used informational power to persuade people to start the changes in society in the case of racial segregation. To support his idea, he empowered people through the use of reward power by stating the goal of Civil Right Movement. In “Our God is Marching On”, the audience agreed with the statements from Martin Luther King Jr. In legitimate power, Martin Luther King Jr. tried to expose the gap between white and black people. While in referent power he recalled people or figures active and took part during the racial segregation as well as famous leader from

all around the world. Both legitimate and referent power was used as the supporting statements on the racial segregation issues discussed in his speeches. The coercive power was represented in statements which contained warning and strong reminder written in the speeches. Martin Luther King Jr. encouraged government to do something to overcome the racial segregation issues in society. Based on the types of power used, it can be seen that Martin Luther King Jr. did not show any superiority among the audience especially black people. He tried to position himself at the same group of black society as reflected from the absence of expert power in his speeches.

In the gap between white society as the “majority group” and black society as the “minority group”, it was further explored into social status and roles in society. It can be seen that white society as the “majority group” and black society as the “minority group” had different social status. White society tended to have higher class position while black society positioned as lower class society such as threat to society (Van Dijk, 1984, as cited in Van Dijk, 1991, 2008). The different social status between them affected their roles in society. White society as the “majority group” had a tendency to dominate black society as the “minority group” especially in the public discourses such as, mass media (Van Dijk, 1991, 2008).

## **Recommendation**

This study concerned with social power analysis. The social power was further explored into the types of social power and how the gap between white society as the “majority group” and black society as the “minority group” reflected in Martin Luther King Jr.’s speeches. This study revealed that there are only four out of six types of social power revealed in the speeches based on Raven theory (French & Raven, 1959; Raven, 1965, as cited in Raven, 2008). The types of social power were reward, referent, legitimate, and informational power. In the gap between white and black society, it focused on two aspects: social status and roles in society.

Further study can make some improvements to get deeper analysis or concerned on different aspect of analysis. Combination of macro and micro analysis can be done to find the relation of both aspects in discourse. The future researcher can find out how the use of language features can affect how audience perceived the information. The researcher can also apply other approaches, for instance, discourse historical approach (DHA). Discourse historical approach can applied to analyze the implicit prejudiced discourse (Wodak, 2011). The study can be investigated the historical fact behind Martin Luther King Jr.’s speeches. In addition of such a study, the

ethnicity background of the researcher may affect the result of the study. For example, if the future researcher is an Afro-American he or she will have different interpretation. Further studies can explore the other works, for instance the other speeches, articles, or letters. Different data may generate different result of the study.

## REFERENCES

- Alfayez, H. (2009). Retrieved 2013, from KSU Faculty Member Websites:  
<http://faculty.ksu.edu.sa/Alfayez.H/Pages/SCAofKing%27sspeechIhaveadream.aspx>
- Amelia, T. M., & Widyastuti. (2014). Critical Discourse Analysis of Racism in Django Unchained Movie. *Language Horizon*, 2(1), 1-8.
- Berry, D. R. (2018). Retrieved 2018, from History.com:  
<http://www.history.com/news/martin-luther-king-jr-mountaintop-moments>
- Bilal, H. A., Tariq, A., Zahra, S., Ashraf, S., & Aqsa, K. (2012, June). CDA and Power Relation. *British Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 6(1), 1-11.
- Blake, J. (2014). Retrieved 2018, from CNN:  
<http://edition.cnn.com/2014/01/19/us/king-speeches-never-heard/index.html>
- Bukhari, N. H., & Xiaoyang, W. (2013). Critical Discourse Analysis and Educational Research. *Journal of Research & Method in Education (IOSR-JRME)*, 3(1), 9-17.
- Cameron, D., & Panovic, I. (2014). *Working with Written Discourse*. Sage.
- Cook, G. (1990). *Discourse*. Oxford University Press.
- Cummings, A. (2017) *The Effects of Social Power Bases Within Varying Organizational Cultures*. (Doctoral

Dissertation). Retrieved from  
[https://academicworks.cuny.edu/gc\\_etds/2313](https://academicworks.cuny.edu/gc_etds/2313)

Dastjerdi, H. V., Latifi, M., & Mohammadi, E. (2011, January). Analysis of Power and Threat Manifestation in the Discourse of Traffic Police Officers: A CDA Perspective. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 2(1), 255-260.

Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and Power*. London: Longman Inc.

Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analysing Discourse*. New York: Routledge.

Gee, J. P. (2011). *How to do Discourse Analysis: a Toolkit*. London: Routledge.

Godfrey, M. (2016). *10 Reasons Race Relations in the U.S.A. are Better Now Than Ever*. Retrieved June 2017, from Listland: <https://www.listland.com/10-reasons-race-relations-u-s-better-point-history/>

Handgraaf, M., Dijk, E., Vermunt, R., Wilke, H., & De Dreu, C. (2008). Less power or powerless? Egocentric empathy gaps and the irony of having little versus no power in social decision making. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 95(5), 1136-1149

Hansan, J. E. (2011). *Jim Crow Laws and Racial Segregation*. Retrieved June 2017, from Social Welfare History Project: Hansan, J.E. (2011) <http://socialwelfare.library.vcu.edu/eras/civil-war-reconstruction/jim-crow-laws-andracial-segregation/>

History.com. (2017). *History.com*. Retrieved 2018, from <http://www.history.com/topics/i-have-a-dream-speech>

- History.com Editors. (2009). Retrieved 2019, from History: <https://www.history.com/topics/black-history/martin-luther-king-jr>
- Jahedi, M., Abdullah, F. S., & Mukundan, J. (2014). An Overview of Focal Approaches of Critical Discourse Analysis. *International Journal of Education & Literacy Studies*, 2(4), 28-35.
- Jumiah, A. K. (2016). Language, Power, and Ideology in High School EFL Textbooks in Saudi Arabia. Albuquerque, New Mexico.
- Kasenda, S. R., & Ariyanti, L. (2014). An Analysis of Speech Acts in Martin Luther King's "I Have a Dream" Speech.
- Lawson, S. F. (2010). *Segregation*. Retrieved June 2017, from National Humanities Center: <http://nationalhumanitiescenter.org/tserve/freedom/1865-1917/essays/segregation.htm>
- Livholts, M. (2015). Dis. In M. Livholts, & M. Tamboukou, *Discourse and Narrative Methods* (pp. 79-92). London: Sage.
- Malesky, K. (2014). Retrieved 2018, from National Public Radio: <https://www.npr.org/sections/codeswitch/2014/03/30/295931070/the-journey-from-colored-to-minorities-to-people-of-color>
- Mason, J. (2002). *Qualitative Researching* (2nd ed.). London: Sage Publication.
- McCarthy, M. (1991). *Discourse Analysis for Language Teacher*. Cambridge University Press.

- Mills, S. (2004). *Discourse*. New York: Routledge.
- Nobel Media. (2014). *Martin Luther King Jr Biography*. Retrieved 2017, from Nobel Prize: [http://www.nobelprize.org/nobel\\_prizes/peace/laureates/1964/king-bio.html](http://www.nobelprize.org/nobel_prizes/peace/laureates/1964/king-bio.html)
- OpenStax-CNX. (2013). Retrieved 2018, from Creative Commons : <http://cnx.org/content/m42857/1.3/>
- Paltridge, B. (2008). *Discourse Analysis*. New York: Continuum International Publishing Group.
- Peksen, S. (2013). An Analysis of the Power Relations between White and Black Women in the Slave Narratives . *Interaction*, 22(10), 119-128.
- Pereira, G., Prada, R., & Santos, P. A. (2016). Integrating Social Power into the Decision Making of Cognitive Agents. *Artificial Intelligence*, 1-44.
- Piantanida, M. & Garman, N. B. 1999. *The qualitative dissertation: a guide for students and faculty*. London, Sage.
- Plesset, E. (2018). Retrieved 2018, from WASHINGTON WEEK: <http://www.pbs.org/weta/washingtonweek/blog-post/5-martin-luther-king-jr%E2%80%99s-most-memorable-speeches>
- Ramirez, M. (2008). Retrieved 2018, from SEATTLE TIMES: <https://www.seattletimes.com/life/lifestyle/dr-martin-luther-kings-our-god-is-marching-on-speech-resonates-still/>

- Raven, B. H. (2008). The Bases of Power and the Power/Interaction Model of Interpersonal Influence. *Analyses of Social Issues and Public Policy*, 8(1), 1-22.
- Rbedi. (2016). *Racial Segregation: 1950s and Today*. Retrieved June 2017, from Social Rollins Edu: <http://social.rollins.edu/wpsites/thirdsight/2016/11/21/racial-segregation-1950s-and-today/>
- Saadabad, M. H., & Kasmani, M. B. (2014, May). A Critical Discourse Analysis of Summit Series: The Representation of Social Actors. *Asian Journal of Social Sciences & Humanities*, 3(2), 61-71.
- Schiffrin, D., Tannen, D., & Hamilton, H. E. (2001). *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis* (1st ed.). Malden: Blackwell Publishers.
- Siddiqui, S. (n.d.). Retrieved 2017, from Sound Vision: <https://www.soundvision.com/article/a-brief-history-of-racism-in-the-united-states>
- Sipra, M. A., & Rashid, A. (2013). Critical Discourse Analysis of Martin Luther King's Speech in Socio-Political Perspective. *Advances in Language and Literary Studies*, 27-23.
- Stewart, N. (2018, April 2). Retrieved 2018, from New York Times: <https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2018/04/02/us/king-mlk-last-sermon-annotated.html>
- The Stichting Female Journalist Network. (2016). *Women in Emerging Syrian Media*. Arnhem: Stichting Female Journalist Network.

- Vaidyanathan, R. (2016). *BBC News*. Retrieved 2017, from <http://www.bbc.com/news/world-us-canada-35255835>
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1984). *Prejudice in Discourse*. John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1991). *Racism and the Press*. London: Routledge.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1993). *Elite Discourse and Racism*. Newbury Park: Sage Publication.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1996). Discourse, Power and Access. In C. Rosa, C. Coulthard, & M. Coulthard, *Text and Practices* (p. 84). London: Routledge.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2001). Critical Discourse Analysis. In D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen, & H. E. Hamilton (Eds.), *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. Blackwell Publisher.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2002). Discourse and Racism. In D. T. Goldberg, & J. Solomos (Eds.), *A Companion to Race and Ethnic Studies* (pp. 145-159). Blackwell Publishers.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2008). *Discourse & Power*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2011). Principle of Critical Discourse. *Discourse and Society*, pp. 249-283.
- Wodak, R. (2011). Critical Discourse Analysis. In K. Hyland, & B. Paltridge, *Discourse Analysis* (pp. 38-53). New York: Continuum International Publishing Group.
- Wood, L. A., & Kroeger, R. (2000). *Doing Discourse Analysis*. London: Sage Publication, Inc.