

CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSION

In this chapter I would like to give my personal opinions and comments on the findings about the representation of Indonesia's judiciary, which have been described previously in Chapter Four. The findings will be drawn from three aspects in the micro-level analysis, such as macrostructure, microstructure, and superstructure.

Based on the findings in the macrostructure, the global topic of the news article, which is drawn in the headline and lead, talks about the negativity of Indonesia's judiciary on blasphemy case. First, the headline is ““Rot at the Core’: Blasphemy Verdict in Indonesia Dismays Legal Experts”. As a headline summarizes the events into a brief phrase, the writer is seen to give a clear representation of the judiciary, especially through the use of an idiom *be rotten to the core* and the word *dismay*, both of which carry a negative connotation.

The same thing goes with the lead, which again provides more negative description about Indonesia's judiciary. This is specifically the result of the use of the words *notoriously* and *capricious*, both of which also carry a negative connotation.

In this part I can say that the writer takes a brave strategy to show which party that he sides on, by giving a negative portrayal of Indonesia's judiciary in the headline and lead, which aim to attract the reader's attention at first sight. The headline and lead may cause various reactions from the readers, who probably side Indonesia's judiciary and disagree with the negative representation given by the writer.

Through the macrostructure, I believe the writer tries to deliver the global topic in a clear way, which also gives a hint about the complete information that will be discussed in the article. Besides, by giving a clear representation in the headline and lead, it can be easier for the readers to get the writer's perception towards the event, whether he supports or opposes it. In this case, it is clearly seen that the writer is not in favour of the event.

Furthermore, in the microstructure, there are three linguistic elements which have been analysed, such as syntax, semantics, and stylistics by using four tools in order to show the representation of Indonesia's judiciary. The first tool is lexicon, which consists of ten specific words that denote a negative connotation and add negative description to Indonesia's judiciary. In spite of using sophisticated political terms, the writer chooses the ten words which are commonly used in daily life. I think by using common words, which are more familiar for the readers, the information in the article can be better understood by the readers in general. Moreover, as these ten common words are used to describe the negativity of Indonesia's judiciary, I think the writer wants to make sure that the information is delivered effectively to the readers.

In sentence syntax, the active sentence construction can be found in the headline and six sentences. These sentences describe the negative actions done by the actors, which are related to Indonesia's judiciary. Since the sentences contain negative description, I think the reason why the writer makes the sentences in active construction is to put emphasis on the actor, which will be seen more prominent in the involvement of the action. Thus, the readers can see in an obvious way that the parties which are related to Indonesia's judiciary have done negative things.

The third tool used is level of description and degree of completeness. Here, I find two general topics that describe the negativity of Indonesia's judiciary: three paragraphs which consist of the details about the reason for unfair judgement and another three paragraphs of the details about the effect of unfair judgement. Both of the two topics are described in detail by the writer. In my opinion, the writer does it in order to highlight the bad ruling system in Indonesia's judiciary by providing complete and detailed information about the negativity. Thus, the reader can see the flaws in Indonesia's judiciary.

The last tool is implication. Here, I find five data of implication that can be drawn from eight paragraphs. All the data of implication point out the negativity of Indonesia's judiciary, for instance the political scenario that lies behind the blasphemy case. The writer provides this implicit information in order to show his thoughts or ideology of the events in a safe way. As the writer cannot explicitly show his ideology in the article due to his duty to provide objective information, then he shows it in an implicit way. However, this implicit information cannot be acquired by only reading the article as it does not lie on the surface structure of the

text. Therefore, I think the readers also need to think critically and have sufficient knowledge to unveil the implicit information.

Based on the findings in microstructure through the use of four tools, such as lexicon, sentence syntax, level of description and degree of completeness, and implication, it can also be seen that only the findings in lexicon are stated explicitly in the text. Meanwhile, the findings in the other three tools are stated implicitly. Thus, the writer dominantly uses the tools which only show implicit findings as a strategy to cover up his perception and inclination, so that people can only see them after doing a thorough analysis of the text.

In the superstructure, all of the paragraphs in the news article are classified into five categories. The result shows that out of thirty-one paragraphs in total, there are nineteen paragraphs of consequences, ten paragraphs of backgrounds, five paragraphs of main events, and one paragraph of comment. Therefore, the highest occurrence is consequences (verbal reaction), in which the writer puts opinions or comments on the event from other people. In my opinion, the reason why the writer puts more consequences category than the others is to show that the event has attracted a lot of concerns and opinions from many people around the world.

Besides, I believe the use of verbal reactions shows the writer's brilliant strategy. In the news article, the writer provides several opinions which come from influential and reliable people, such as legal experts. The comments which come from experts dominantly show oppositions on the judges' ruling and concern on Indonesia's judiciary. From this explanation, it can be seen that the writer is not in favour of the event. In addition, the writer also tries to ensure the readers that the

information about the negative judiciary is credible as it is provided with a lot of testimonies from influential and reliable sources, like experts.

On top of that, the use of verbal reactions also functions to neutralize the findings in the macrostructure and microstructure which clearly show the writer's opposition towards Indonesia's judiciary. By stating the opinions and comments from reliable people in the superstructure, the writer tries to balance the findings in the macrostructure and microstructure which are drawn from his viewpoint in the text, so that the findings showing the negativity of Indonesia's judiciary do not come only from his perception, but also from other people.

As suggestions for future researchers who would like to take Critical Discourse Analysis of a news article as their research, they had better have at least two related news articles for the data to be analysed. Therefore, the aspect of the analysis can be more various and wider, for instance it can focus on the comparison between the articles in three aspects, such as macro-level, micro-level, and meso-level analyses. In this way, the analysis can be more thorough and comprehensive.

(Word: 1,250)