

CHAPTER FOUR

CONCLUSION

In this chapter, I will present some concluding points that are based on the findings of my analysis in Chapter Three. As mentioned in the previous chapter, my thesis analysis is based on van Dijk's theory and I only analyze the micro level, which consists of the macrostructure, the microstructure, and the superstructure analyses.

The macrostructure analysis constitutes an analysis which discusses the main topic of the text globally. This analysis aims to know the topic that is defined for discourse as a whole. As mentioned in the previous chapter, the type of Pipes' text the Muslims are Coming! The Muslims are Coming! is an argumentative text and it consists of three main parts, which are the thesis statement, the arguments, and the restatement of position. This traditional organization of argumentative text makes it easier for me to understand the whole text. This is due to the fact that the global topic of the text can be found in the thesis statement and the restatement of position. By only seeing the thesis statement and the restatement of position, I can clearly know the general ideas that

Pipes wants to put forward, which in the text is about the threats of Islam or Muslim.

In the text, Pipes shows that the threats of Islam or Muslims are divided into two parts: jihad and Muslim immigrants. By saying this, Pipes obviously wants to represent Islam or Muslims as something negative. Personally, I totally disagree with Pipes' opinion. In this context, Pipes refers to jihad as a type of terrorism. In my opinion, jihad is not the same as terrorism. It constitutes the right things based on the Islamic law that Muslims have to do. However, in the text, Pipes has a perception that jihad is terrorism. Some terrorists claim that their actions are based on jihad and it may be the reason why Pipes has such a perception. In fact, jihad is not like what Pipes thinks about.

Moreover, Pipes also mentions that Muslim immigrants are the threats for the Western countries. In this context, Pipes is very explicit in representing Muslim immigrants as something negative. By showing the bad side of Muslim immigrants, Pipes clearly wants to discriminate Islam. Again, I totally disagree with Pipes' opinion. I think, Pipes only shows the negative side of Muslim immigrants. He does not show their positive side. I think the reason why Pipes does not give the positive side of Muslim immigrants is that he really intends to discriminate Islam. He wants to show the readers the bad side of Muslim immigrants without showing the positive side of Muslim immigrants in order to let the readers assume that Islam or Muslims are bad.

In the microstructure analysis, I only discuss the lexicon that occurs in the text as it is the most dominant feature showing the negative representation of Islam. However, in van Dijk's theory, there are other features that can be used in

the microstructure analysis besides the lexicon. I do not use the other features because of the limitation of my thesis analysis. Thus, these other features can be used for further researches. Those who are interested in continuing this research can use the other features to analyze this text.

In van Dijk's theory, lexicon is concerned with the selection of positive words for "us" and negative words for "them." In this part, I only focus on the selection words for "them" as this idea dominates the text. Moreover, I can hardly find the positive words for "us." For this reason, I can infer that Pipes deliberately gives the negative words for Muslims exclusively in order to make Muslims marginalized. In this context, by showing the negative words dominantly, the readers will understand easily that Islam or Muslims are bad.

In the text, lexicon used is of various parts of speech – adjectives, verbs, nouns, and adverbs: which contain the negative meaning. These four parts of speech are used more or less in the same portion. By giving the same portion of the four parts of speech in the text, I think Pipes use all the resources that there are in the language to show all bad sides of Islam or Muslims. This obviously makes the impression that Pipes seriously intends to discredit Islam or Muslims.

Furthermore, in analyzing the lexicon, firstly, I use the dictionary meaning to know the literal meaning of the words. Secondly, I also relate the dictionary meaning to the contextual meaning. I conclude that the contextual meaning is more important than the literal meaning as in a text analysis the word meaning is not stable.

In relation to finding out the contextual meaning and sometimes to know the intention of the writer, I have to understand the background of some facts in order

to result in the clearer and more accurate meaning. By searching the background of some facts, my analysis can be considered an intertextuality. With the help of other texts, I can understand the writer's intention more clearly.

In the superstructure analysis, all information of the text is arranged into a scheme. As mentioned in the previous part, the text The Muslims are Coming! The Muslims are Coming! is an argumentative text. Thus, the scheme of this text is arranged from thesis statement, the arguments, and the restatement of position. The superstructure analysis can also be defined as an organization of the ideas which form a scheme in the text. From this scheme, I can know all detailed information that occurs in the text. In this way, it is easier for me to track the ideas. I do not need to read the whole text when I have to focus on a certain point. Thus, it obviously helps me in analyzing the data.

(956 words)