

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

5.1 Conclusion

The study concluded that all representational categories from Van Leeuwen's framework were used except for Identification. There were 167 representations occurred in the 10 texts. Australian was included more frequently (44.9%) rather than Indonesian (28.1%). On the other hand, for exclusion category, the result shows that Indonesian was excluded more frequently with 27 representations (16.2%) and Australian was excluded with 18 representations (10.8%). Ninety three representations out of one hundred and sixty seven representations represented Australian, and the rest of the representations which was seventy four representations represented Indonesian.

The dominant sub category of inclusion for Australian was assimilation. It made Australian as a group of people who has similar thought, idea and values. Assimilation has two sub categories which are Collectivization and Aggregation. Aggregation is representing people with a group of people using statistic data. Collectivization is representing people by assimilating individuals into a group of people. Aggregation category was used to serve reliable and factual information because it presented with statistic data. Collectivization category was used to represent Australian as a group of people with positive images. In short, Assimilation category was used to serve reliable and factual information by

portraying Australian as a group of people who has positive images such as brave, respectable and environmentally friendly.

On the other hand, the dominant sub category inclusion to represent Indonesian was personalization. Personalization was used to give a personal authority to individual. Contrast with Australian which had a positive image as a group of people, Indonesian was portrayed with positive images as personal and active actors. Personalization was used on these texts to humanize Indonesian.

Both Indonesian and Australian were excluded. The exclusion category in these texts was used to avoid redundancy and to lead people's focus to the highlight issue which was drawn by the writers. Australian and Indonesian were given the role by the writers. On this category, Indonesian was activated more often to show that Indonesian active on the activity which included Australian. Australian was passivated more frequently. From the 10 texts, it showed that Australian acted as facilitator and provider to the event or program to support Indonesian.

5.2 Limitations and Suggestions

This study, indeed, has some limitations that can take into account in the future research. First, this study only focused on the text facebook of *Australia Embassy, Jakarta – Indonesia*. For future research, first, it might be better to analyze the pictures, because Van Leeuwen's framework could also be used to analyze symbols or used for semiotic study. Second, this study limited the amount of the texts; facebook text is quiet short, the future research could use more than

10 texts. Third, the future research could find different corpus to develop the study of representation of social actors.

After analysing the data and find the result, this study found that the Critical Discourse Analysis tool by Van Leeuwen is considered important to help students practicing their critical reading skill. By using this analysis tool, it does not only focus on language grammatically but also how language use in society. It will be beneficial for students and teachers to use this analysis tool in classroom, especially for reading skill, such as in Media Discourse subject and English for Journalism subject which is one of the activities is analysing the text from media, either printed, electronic or online media.