

## **CHAPTER FOUR**

### **CONCLUSION**

This chapter concludes the findings in Chapter Three and puts forward my opinion and comments about them. In addition, the limitation of my study and some suggestions for future research are presented as well.

The purpose of my thesis is to find out how the self is represented positively and the other represented negatively in the macrostructure, microstructure, and superstructure analyses in a news article. In addition, this thesis also aims to see how a writer of news articles may insert his or her point of view subjectively in the writing and this persuades readers to side with them.

The primary data of my thesis is a news article taken from Cable News Network Wire (CNN) on 1 May 2017 with the title “Trump Administration Ending Michelle Obama’s Girls Education Program”. The author of this news is unknown, but the article is taken from a well-known and reliable news network. The analysis in Chapter Three shows that the writer puts his own representation towards the topic of the news. It is shown in the analysis of the macrostructure, microstructures, and superstructures of the article the writer tries to build a positive representation of Michelle Obama. On the other hand, the writer tries to represent Donald Trump negatively. In other words,

the writer considers Michelle Obama to be part of self and Donald Trump to be the other.

In the macrostructure, by using an active structure in the headline and the chosen words in the lead such as *initiative* and *signature*, I think the writer is successful in disclosing the representation of the self and other. In the headline part, the writer begins to show his position, which is on the opposite side of Donald Trump. Trump is presented as a subject who does an unpleasant thing to a program that is positive. Accordingly, Donald Trump is represented negatively. Furthermore, in the lead part the writer shows that Michelle Obama's position is on the same side as the writer. It can be seen in how the writer describes Michelle Obama's program with positive words such as *signature*, *initiative*, *championed by*. It suggests that the program is truly positive. Thus, it is clear that in the macrostructure, Michelle Obama and the program are presented positively as the self, while Donald Trump is presented as the negative other.

In the microstructure, there are three tools that are used to reveal the representation of the self and other. Those are lexicon, conjunctions, level of specificity and degree of completeness. Based on these tools, the writer represents Michelle Obama positively and Donald Trump negatively.

The first tool is lexicon. There are six data which show the positive words referring to Michelle Obama and five data which contain the negative words for Donald Trump; in other words, the numbers of both the positive and negative words are almost the same. It means it is clear that the writer represents Donald Trump negatively and Michelle Obama positively. By doing this, I think the writer tries to influence the readers' opinion on Donald Trump and Michelle Obama so that the readers will agree

with how the writer represents both people. For example, the writer puts the word *heavily promoted* for representing Michelle Obama positively. On the other hand, the words *cease immediately* are added to represent Donald Trump negatively. Moreover, in my viewpoint, the writer is successful in disclosing his representation by deliberately not using positive words to refer to Donald Trump and negative words to refer to Michelle Obama. Accordingly, the readers realize that the writer tends to support Michelle Obama more than Donald Trump.

The second tool is conjunction. There are three conjunctions in three paragraphs which represent Donald Trump negatively. Through this tool the writer makes a connection between two ideas which leads to Donald Trump's negative representation. I think by inserting conjunctions, the writer is smart and successful in making the contrast more clearly. For example, in using the conjunction *while*, the writer makes a contradictory sentence which can convince the readers that the sentence has a negative meaning referring to Trump. Consequently, Donald Trump is more negative in the readers' eyes.

The last tool is the level of specificity and degree of completeness. In this news article, mostly, all information relating to Michelle Obama is explained more specifically than the information about Donald Trump. In my opinion, it is clear that the writer takes side with Michelle Obama. He is more interested in speaking out about Michelle Obama and her program instead of about Donald Trump. Furthermore, the writer never gives specific information about Donald Trump so that the readers start to ask questions whether Trump is actually right or wrong. Besides, the writer puts all information about Michelle Obama as the main discussion in this news article so that

Michelle Obama is represented positively. Thus, I think the writer manages to convey clearly to the readers how Michelle Obama and Donald Trump are represented.

The last analysis that can show the representation of somebody is the superstructure analysis. In this analysis, all obligatory and optional functions are present and correlate with the theory. However, there is no comment function in this news article. The dominant function in this news article is verbal reaction.

In this news article, the writer does not put the comment about the issue at all. It is interesting because generally other articles have the comment function. Nevertheless, this news has not. I think the purpose of the writer does this is to reveal that the writer is truly neutral. Besides, in my opinion, the writer is really smart to convey his representation smoothly so that the readers do not think that the writer takes side with anyone. Not only that, I conclude that the writer also intends to make the readers more aware about the issue without adding personal comment at all.

The writer adds verbal reaction from people who support Michelle Obama's program at most. In my opinion, the writer chooses those verbal reactions subjectively. He selects people or politicians who give positive statements about Michelle Obama and inserts them in this news report. Because of that, Michelle Obama's representation will be clear. Besides that, the writer does not place these verbal reactions randomly. He places one positive and reliable verbal reaction cleverly at the beginning of the news article. Accordingly, the readers' mind will be much influenced by the writer's viewpoint even before they read the whole content of the news. Besides, the writer wants to show that what he has written is true and based on the fact without adding comment which is not necessarily true.

My research has three limitations. First, the author of the news article chosen is not mentioned clearly by the website; therefore, it is a little difficult to be certain whether the writer actually has a positive attitude toward Michelle Obama in general or this is only something that the news site requires that the writer should write. The next limitation is the data. I only take one news article from the website. Therefore, I cannot generalize the conclusion that CNN represents Michelle Obama positively and Donald Trump negatively. The last is about the tools. I only use three tools out of a number of tools available. Accordingly, the representation cannot be revealed completely.

Therefore, I suggest that future researchers should be able to analyze a news report with a clear author in order to ensure that the writer actually has a positive attitude towards Michelle Obama. Moreover, about the data, the researchers should look for related articles by the same author or website to strengthen the analysis more. The last suggestion is to use as many tools in the microstructure analysis as possible in order to get a better understanding of the representation.

(WORD COUNT: 1,294)