

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS

5.1. Conclusions

The study is conducted to observe the representation of social actors that are embedded in news discourse regarding 2011 War in Libya on online USA Today and The Tripoli Post, based on the classification of van Leeuwen's (2008, p.73) Social Action Network. The study finds that there are nine actors involved on six articles used from both media, including President Obama, NATO, US Administration (White House), US Military (Department of Defense), Civilians, Rebels, Pro-government Libyans, Gaddafi, Other Allies, Nations, Coalitions and Journalists. Based on that recognition, the last four main actors including President Obama, NATO, US Administration (White House), US Military (Department of Defense), are referred to '**US Alliances**'. Social actions are defined as a set of actions and reactions attributed to those social actors involved in the war news reports, which can be further transformed into de-activated, de-agentialized, over-determinated forms for re-contextualizing the discourse.

USA Today presents total of 288 actions, 39 reactions and 187 transformations, while, Tripoli Post attributes 262 actions, 18 reactions and 112 transformations. Approximately 60% of those social actions are assigned to US Alliances and highly distributed in the form of material and semiotic actions. The dominating instrumentalized material actions lead them interchange the other actors as the object or goal affected by their material purpose, such as 'strike', 'attack' and 'hit'. The instrumentalization also projects humanized actions as objects that are passive in responses. Their interactive actions are also objectivized in positive qualities, such as 'responsibility to protect' and 'address to the nation'. In addition, they are stated to make 'lifesaving effort' to maintain their positive quality action and affirmed with the assumed urgency to 'help' Libyans get off Gaddafi's grasp and achieve liberty in democracy. They trigger

‘democratic aspirations spreading across Middle East’ and ‘Hits Libyan Ships to Protect the Rebel Held Port’. The statements thus legalize them to freely ‘bomb’ and wage war in Libya.

By means of semioticization, the mostly heard voices are theirs. It is a result of high number of occurrence of nontransactive quotations and renditions relying to their arguments through influence, comments, instructed, said, push back against, told, urged, and saying. USA Today presents more nontransactive semiotic actions, whereas Tripoli Post shows a balanced proportion between transactive and nontransactive actions.

Regarding the reactions, both USA Today and Tripoli Post mostly attribute them with cognitive reactions, including ‘decisive’, ‘make sure’ and ‘predicted’, leading them to be assumed as rational, react in a logical and reasonable way.

Supporting to that, the study reveals that deactivation and de-agentialization are the most frequent transformations applied to subtilize their discourse over the war. USA Today and Tripoli Post attempt to objectivize ‘hit’ and ‘attack’ into ‘friendly-fire’ and let it be attributed to a thing; ‘NATO’s warplanes’, ‘British Jet’. Thus, objectivation may also trigger a deagentialization. When their actions are deagentialized, responsibility of the agent is disguised as in ‘the attacks struck’. In addition, when the reactions are objectivated, they distance the emotions, not represented as activated feelings and directly representing how the US Alliance feels such as the affective reaction of the US Alliance, as in ‘interests’. Interestingly, ‘interests’ is combined with the material ‘serves’, illustrating their dominance and control over the event and the other social actors.

It, thus, sharpens the biased portrayal of both media, not only by the imbalance amount of actions and reactions but also by the attempts of transformation made by the media to represent US Alliances in a particular way. Tripoli Post, however, presents a more balanced proportion in presenting actions and reactions of the US Alliances compared to the other social actors’ actions and reactions.

5.2. Suggestions

Assigning a critical discourse analysis based on van Leeuwen's (2008) framework on recontextualization of social practice is not limited to social action analysis, as a set of time, location, presentation style of an actor, tool and material resources to perform a practice may also invite an in-depth investigation. Those wide ranges of analysis may contribute to break down discourses, so that the process of perceiving something through discourses will be more impartial, avoiding bias, judgment or justification. In addition, selected discourses may vary from discourses of economic, sociocultural conditions to educational discourses, such as rules at school, source books used at school, and so forth. Those further analyses may support to a critical consideration of a system in our country based on the massive use of a particular discourse.

Van Leeuwen's framework on recontextualization of social practice can also be combined with his Visual Grammar Analysis, as recently mass media discourses often completes their illustration on a particular topic with images. A CDA, through the combination of recontextualization and visual grammar, will dismantle discourse with visual communication in a more adequate understanding and valid intrepretation.