

Chapter V:

Conclusion and Suggestion

This final chapter, referring to the research findings discussed in the previous chapter, wraps up the study. Furthermore, some suggestions are provided.

5.1 Conclusion

Based on the data findings and analysis, this study draws several key conclusions regarding the linguistic manipulation of power and persuasion in George Orwell's *Animal Farm*. The overarching evidence demonstrates that the path to absolute authoritarian hegemony relies heavily on continuous communicative distortions that systematically reconstruct a population's social cognition, historical memory, and behavioral compliance.

The core characteristics of this manipulation operate through three distinct sequential tracks of control that gradually erode the autonomy of the subordinate class. The emotional track is identified by the strategic weaponization of psychological states such as fear, trauma, and guilt. This mechanism is primarily carried out through recurring existential threats of the human oppressor's return and the orchestration of violent public show trials, which shock the animals into immediate emotional surrender. Following this, the ideological track functions by re-engineering shared laws, values, and common-sense norms. By gatekeeping literacy, the ruling elite successfully twist the farm's original foundational principles to normalize elite material privileges, such as consuming milk or sleeping in beds, reframing these luxuries as an exhausting, sacrificial burden borne purely for the public good. Finally, the rhetorical track manifests as micro-level conversational distortions in which complex sociopolitical concepts are systematically reduced to oversimplified binary groupthink chants, unvouchered statistical abstractions are manufactured to obscure material starvation, and structural paradoxes are

generated to force the population to doubt their own memories and lived experiences.

These linguistic strategies do not exist in isolation but are structurally dependent on broader social and historical contexts of dominance. The continuous alteration of the farm's legal boundaries under the pretext of ongoing existential crises directly reflects a permanent state of exception, demonstrating how governing authorities have historically suspended constitutional frameworks to expand executive power. Furthermore, the implementation of mandatory public assemblies, military processions, and repetitive singing functions as an orchestrated social ritual designed to generate collective effervescence. This pageantry effectively drains the working class's short-term attention span and erases their independent historical records. Ultimately, the official metrics and fabricated production percentages read by the regime function as a hyperreal simulation, in which state-sanctioned textual data completely replaces and overwhelms the physical reality of material deprivation.

Consequently, the systematic distortion of language unmasks the dark underlying moral, political, and ideological value system embedded within corrupt power structures. Politically and ideologically, a stark division is exposed between the values of the elite ruling class and those of the working masses. The elite pig characters operate on a value system of absolute elitism and hierarchy, encapsulated in their final rewritten law that 'some animals are more equal than others.' Conversely, the subordinate masses operate on a value system of egalitarianism, collective labor, and blind obedience, anchored in their repetitive slogan of 'four legs good, two legs bad' and Boxer's own maxims of loyalty. Politically, the narrative exposes the complete subversion of democracy, where language is stripped of its honest, communicative intent and transformed entirely into a vehicle for political deception and cognitive coercion. Ideologically, the ruling class utilizes its intellectual monopoly to weave arbitrary class rules into a normalized cultural consensus, tricking the working class into actively participating in its own ongoing subordination.

Most crucially, the study reveals that linguistic manipulation functions as a structural shield to justify raw economic theft and labor extraction. By masking severe inequality behind an abstract vocabulary of collective sacrifice and revolutionary duty, the elite securely isolate themselves in material luxury while ensuring the continuous exploitation of working-class labor.

5.2 Suggestions

Based on the scope, findings, and critical boundaries of this study, several avenues are suggested for future academic research in the field of critical discourse and literary analysis. Scholars are strongly encouraged to continue delving into the rich mechanics of linguistic manipulation, as it remains a relatively rare yet vital focus within discourse studies. In particular, future researchers are encouraged to sustain analytical attention on *Animal Farm*, or to expand their focus to George Orwell's broader literary corpus, such as *1984* or his socio-political essays. Despite the extensive volume of existing historical and literary commentary surrounding Orwell's work, his unique allegorical mastery continues to provide an unmatched, highly sophisticated laboratory for examining how power, text, and social cognition interact.

Furthermore, from an educational standpoint, this study offers critical insights for curriculum development within the English Language Education Study Program. First, it is vital that English education students develop a keen awareness of linguistic manipulation, as identifying the hidden power structures within text is a cornerstone of advanced language literacy. Second, *Animal Farm* remains a highly relevant, indispensable title for university literature classes; its multi-layered allegory serves as a powerful instrument for cross-disciplinary studies connecting language, rhetoric, and political history. Finally, it is suggested that the specific mechanics of linguistic manipulation be formally introduced into the Discourse Analysis syllabus, providing students with a practical, rule-governed framework to diagnose how language can be weaponized to alter social cognition.

Additionally, a significant conceptual limitation of the current study provides a compelling direction for subsequent scholarship. Because this research was anchored in a narrative depicting the rise of a totalitarian state, the analysis was structurally predisposed to uncover only the negative, coercive, and destructive dimensions of language control. However, linguistic manipulation itself is a complex communicative tool that is not inherently malicious, and there is a profound academic need to explore its potential positive or protective dimensions.

Future studies could investigate how linguistic manipulation can be deployed for constructive social purposes, such as an authority figure using strategic framing and emotional appeals to unite a fractured community during a crisis, or an orator using simplified rhetoric to make complex, life-saving institutional information accessible to an uneducated public. Therefore, subsequent researchers are encouraged to apply this framework to alternative literary texts, historical speeches, or contemporary public discourses in which the speaker's underlying motivation is geared toward societal protection, social cohesion, or emancipatory progress rather than systemic exploitation. This shift in focus will provide a more balanced, multi-dimensional understanding of human communication and the ethical boundaries of persuasion.

REFERENCES

- Agamben, G. (2005). *State of Exception*. University of Chicago Press.
- Althusser, L. (1970). *On the Reproduction of Capitalism: Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses*. Verso.
- Anggela, U. M., Ardiansyah, E. A., & Wardoyo, C. (2025). Psychological effects of language manipulation in George Orwell's Animal Farm: A critical discourse analysis Approach. *IDEAS: Journal on English Language Teaching and Learning, Linguistics and Literature*, 12(2), 2141–2156. <https://doi.org/10.24256/ideas.v12i2.5754>
- Arendt, H. (1985). *The origins of totalitarianism* (pp. 267–302). Harcourt Brace. (Original work published 1951)
- Aristotle. (2007). *On rhetoric: A theory of civic discourse* (G. A. Kennedy, Trans.). Oxford University Press.
- Asya, A. (2013). Linguistic manipulation: Definition and types. *International Journal of Cognitive Research in science, engineering and education*, 1.
- Baudrillard, J. (1994). *Simulacra and simulation*. The University of Michigan Press.
- Benjamin, W. (1935). *The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction*. Penguin Books.
- Bourdieu, P. (1991). *Language and Symbolic Power*. Polity Press.
- Chilton, P. A. (2004). *Analysing political discourse: Theory and practice*. Routledge.
- Cialdini, R. B. (2007). *Influence: The Psychology of Persuasion*. Collins.
- Cole, N. L. (2024, August 13). *What Is Cultural Hegemony?* ThoughtCo. <https://www.thoughtco.com/cultural-hegemony-3026121>
- Derrida, J. (1993). *Aporias* (T. Dutoit, Trans.). Stanford University Press.
- Durkheim, E. (1912). *Elementary Forms of the Religious Life*. Oxford University Press. <https://www.gutenberg.org/files/41360/41360-h/41360-h.htm>
- Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and power*. Longman.

- Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical Discourse Analysis: the Critical Study of language*. Routledge.
- Foucault, M. (1969). *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. Routledge.
- Foucault, M. (1975). *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Pantheon Books.
- Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other writings, 1972-1977* (pp. 78–108). Pantheon Books.
- Gee, J. P. (2014). *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis*. Routledge.
<https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315819679>
- Goffman, E. (1959). *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. Anchor Books.
- Goffman, E. (1993). *The nature of deference and demeanor*. Irvington.
- Gramsci, A., Bellamy, R., & Cox, V. (1994). *Antonio Gramsci: pre-prison writings*. Cambridge University Press.
- Gramsci's Theory of Hegemony and Its Impact on Marxist Theory* • PolSci Institute. (2024, March 12). Political Science Institute.
<https://polsci.institute/political-theory/gramsci-hegemony-marxist-theory-impact/>
- Habermas, J. (1981). *The Theory of Communicative action*. Beacon Press.
- Khursheed, S., Asif, M., & Abbas, N. (2024). *Linguistic Manipulation as a Tool for Ideological and Hegemonic Manipulation in Animal Farm*.
- Lakoff, G. (2014). *Don't think of an elephant! The all new: know your values and frame the debate*. Chelsea Green Publishing.
- Marcuse, H. (1964). *One Dimensional Man*. Sphere Books.
- Marx, K. (1867). *Capital* (Vol. 1). Verlag von Otto Meisner.
- Merzah, S. K. (2024). *Linguistic Manipulation in Orwell's Animal Farm: A Pragma-Stylistic Perspective – AWEJ*. Arab World English Journal.
<https://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awej/vol15no2.8>
- Orwell, G. (1945). *Animal Farm*. Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, Corp.
<https://www.arvindguptatoys.com/arvindgupta/orwellanimalfarm.pdf>
- Orwell, G. (1946). *Politics and the English Language* (Vol. 13). Penguin.
 (Original work published 1946)

- Reisigl, M., & Wodak, R. (2015). The discourse-historical approach. *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (pp. 63–94). Sage.
- Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech acts: an Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge University Press.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2006). Discourse and Manipulation. *Discourse & Society*, 17 (3).
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2008). *Discourse and Power*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Wodak, R., & Reisigl, M. (2009). The discourse-historical approach. *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (pp. 63–94). Sage.