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This research attempts to analyze and comprehend the role of perspective in representing and constructing the object of reality under the light of discourse analysis. The method of analysis used is a qualitative research. The object of study is the articles by Thom Woodroofe from ABC Australia with title “Quiet Diplomacy Won’t Stop the Death Penalty” and Yohanes Sulaiman from The Jakarta Globe with title “Commentary: Why Indonesia Will Ignore All ‘Bali Nine’ Protest” by using Perspectivization from Renkema’s theory.

The research reveals that either the writer’s ideological perspective from ABC Australia and The Jakarta Globe are neutral. They show their impartial viewpoint by criticizing their own government and political issue through their articles with the same approach but with different substance. The findings show that the similarity can be seen from the way the perspective is communicated by the writers being an external focalizer or observer without getting in touch with any character in their articles. Meanwhile, the differences from both of them are the subject they identified the most. In Thom Woodroofe’s article, Australia is the main subject talked about the most. Meanwhile, in Yohanes Sulaiman’s is Joko Widodo. The research also reveals that both writers’ viewpoints focus on something hidden behind the death penalty rather than to the Bali Nine’s execution.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

A. Background

A text contains missions and structures in so many patterns of discourse with various meanings for the purpose of its writer.¹ In fact, the content of it can be stained by the writer or the publisher’s point of view of judging something. Renkema has stated that even information can be presented with many different perspectives.² In brief, to figure out what is exactly inside the text and how the writer presents the story for luring the audience to catch the idea in it are important.

A writer or the publisher takes a role for framing the demonstration of reality into discourse. The writer is its creator, language is its tool, media is its medium and article is its basic form of the written discourse. Those elements can be an intervention during the process of text creation.³ Since the knowledge or discourse that it arouses sometimes biased based on the media has.⁴ In short, what is in the text is not a neutral one and the line between the fact and opinion is not tangible.

Inside the text, the discourse is constructed according to its aim and adjusted by the current issue evolves in the community. Such as argumentative and persuasive

³ Hinkel, op.cit., p. 9.
language used inside a text includes a lot of hidden ideologies that is not observable for ordinary readers. It means, the writer or the media can involve their ideology explicitly or implicitly, therefore the usage of discourse can make depiction of social group or particular occasion appear to be reasonable and acceptable when in fact the reality is prejudice and injustice. For that, further exploration inside the text is desired, especially, to uncover the way writer judges and tells the reality into discourse in order for avoiding unnecessary propaganda.

Those explanations above are the reason I put my interest to do this research especially in the text with topic about Bali Nine ringleaders’ execution in Indonesia, which attracts many attention from around the globe, mainly Australia. In fact, the issue taints the diplomacy tied between Indonesia and Australia since the defendants in the front row are also Australians. Moreover, politics affairs will also be involved considering the decision of the death penalty for drugs convict directly comes from the President of Indonesia, Joko Widodo. On the other hands, Indonesia also is in law enforcement situation especially for executing illegal drugs traffickers, and Bali Nine group is one of them. It is undeniable that people will be sought their notions about what is true or false about this particular issue. It is proven in some of the media that published the topic about it. The two of them are ABC from Australia in Thom

---


Woodroffe’s article and *The Jakarta Globe* in Yohanes Sulaiman’s article.

Furthermore, another reason steals my interest to do this analysis is the theory used. I choose to apply Renkema’s perspectivization theory, as Mr. Hilmi, M.Hum suggest to me, in order to uncover the ideological perspective, the viewpoint, and the most identified character within those two articles I mentioned earlier which consist with three approaches. In the same way, they are suitable with the objective of this research. The approaches are vision (analyzing the ideological viewpoint comes from), focalization (analyzing the viewpoint is communicated), and empathy (analyzing the character is identified the most).\(^7\) Moreover, I find this theory is rarely use in linguistics research.

**B. Focus of Study**

This research is limited in perspectivization from discourse analysis concept that is focused in the perspective inside the *ABC* or *The Jakarta Globe*’s article about Bali Nine ringleaders’ execution by revealing the vision, focalization, and empathy within each article.

**C. Research Question**

1. How is the perspective inside the *ABC* or *The Jakarta Globe*’s articles about Bali Nine ringleaders’ execution?

2. How do the vision, focalization, and empathy reveal the perspective inside the *ABC* [\(^7\) Renkema, *op.cit.*, p. 130.]


or The Jakarta Globe’s articles about Bali Nine ringleaders’ execution?

D. The Significance of Study

There are two significances of this research, theoretical and practical. Theoretically, this research is expected to contribute to linguistics students, especially in majority of perspectivization from discourse analysis concept with the aim that this research can assist to discover other ideas to develop some researches in the same field and add enough information about related topic since the theory itself is rarely used.

Practically, this research is expected to contribute in society as the development of the knowledge of language society, especially for people who want to learn further about linguistics. In addition, it is also expected as the steps in introducing linguistics to societies, mainly about perspectivization theory.

E. Research Methodology

1. The Objective of Research

The objectives of this research are:

a. To reveal the perspective inside the ABC or The Jakarta Globe’s articles about Bali Nine ringleaders’ execution.

b. To reveal the vision, focalization, and empathy in revealing the perspective inside the ABC or The Jakarta Globe’s articles about Bali Nine’s execution.
2. The Method of Research

The selecting of method in this research is adjusted to the formulation of the problem and research objectives. Thus, that qualitative methods are considered more appropriate to use since focuses on meaning in context, requires a data collection instrument that the sensitivity is underlying the meaning when gathering and interpreting data.\(^8\) In addition, this research is concern about revealing the pattern of discourse usage that is used for describing a story or information within a text by its writer.

The kind of research used in this research is descriptive research. It is because the description is applied to report the findings and result.

3. The Technique of Data Collecting and Analysis

For the aim to provide reliable data, it is necessary for making well-arranged technique for collecting the data. The technique of data collecting is done by bibliography technique, considering the corpus of this research is article. According to Subroto, it is more suitable for research in language field, especially written language such as articles, books, magazines, newspaper and etc.\(^9\) The technique consists with some steps as follows:

1. Reading the some references to determine the topic of research, the research

---


formulation, and the related theories to solve the research problem;

2. Reading the chosen articles as the research corpus from ABC and The Jakarta Globe to understand the content for analyzing;

3. Marking the reference and corpus to identify the vision, focalization and empathy elements;

4. Moving the findings to the data card to process the data analysis;

5. Analyzing and explaining the data according to the theory of perspectivization and other related discourse theories;

6. Concluding the findings to answer the research question as the problem solving.

4. The Instrument of The Research

The instrument in this research is using the data card. It means, the finding of major problem inside the data which becomes the concern of the research is written on the card. It is chosen considering the main technique of this research is reading and writing. Consequently, it will make work easier for the researcher to do the analysing.

5. The Unit Analysis

The unit analysis is the discourse in ABC’s article with title “Quiet Diplomacy Won’t Stop the Death Penalty” by Thom Woodroofe posted in March 11th 2015 and The Jakarta Globe’s article with title “Commentary: Why Indonesia Will Ignore All ‘Bali Nine’ Protests” by Yohanes Sulaiman posted in February 20th 2015.
A. Previous Studies

Previous research is included in this chapter as material review in order to clarify the distinction and the attitude of this research as a comparison with the other research formerly conducted. Even though this research is rarely done and difficult to be found, I manage to find several analyses from the former.

The first previous research I conclude here is from Samir Karmakar who conducted an analysis with title “Perspectivizing Space in Bāŋlā Discourse”. In Karmakar’s research, the concern is to conceptualize the production and comprehension of spatial perspectives as the synchronization of intentions and contentions in a linguistic discourse by investigating the acts of intending and contending in invoking and instantiating the categories. The analysis explains that perspective setting and taking in terms of intending and contending which are crucial in shaping the conceptual route for the gradual revelation of the communicative intent. Finally, the finding shows an understanding of what constitute the perspectivization process in a discourse.

The second is from International Journal in 2011 with title “Some Cognitive Insights into Perspectivization in Persian Narrative” by Maryam Sadat Fayyazi.

---

Aliel Korde Zaferanloo Kambuzia, Hossein Safi Pirloojeh. In their analysis, the concern is on the effects of perspectivization to the process of semantic representation on the scene. The research examines whether or not the two parameters meet the adequacy required both for describing and for explaining different scenes linguistically. The corpus is a body of Persian written and spoken data, gathered from narrative dialogues and everyday talks, is to be inductively examined. The finding shows that the specific perspective taken by the speaker is very much based on some further elements as animacy, dynamicity, size, and speaker. There is a (subconscious) tendency among Persian speakers towards observing the three factors operative by default, in descending order of importance, and in the form of one rule, a number of pragmatic parameters, like the ‘communicative objective’ of the speaker and his unparalleled angle of vision, may undermine or even flout the rule.

The third is from Dr. Arinpe Adejumo from Nigeria with title “Thematization and Perspectivization of Conflict in Nigeria: The example of Selected Yorùbá Literary Genres”. The concern in this analysis is on the thematization and perspectivization to analyse the conflict in Nigeria. The corpus is from literary Satires of Afolabi Olabimtan, Olaore He-who-ascends-the-throne-amidst-animosity a play; Debo Awẹ’s Olọunlúgo [God Secretly Watches All], a novel; and Duro Adeleke’s poem “Oníkàn Yií Rọra [The Garden-egg owner-should trek gently”].

---

selection of the texts for analysis in this paper covers Druckman’s structure of conflict. They are conflict of understanding, conflict of interest, and conflict of ideology. The findings show that, Yoruba literary artists’ attempts to narrate the issue of conflict management and resolution. It also revealed that the artists have identified some roots of conflicts. The representations of conflict and its management in the satirical genres show that artists are not able to present an effective way of managing conflict because their presentations lean towards their personal bias based on either their political or ethnic leanings. The communicative skill of artists shows that their choice of words rather than mediating and arbitrating conflict may end up aggravating it.

The differences from the research from those researches with mine are definitely the corpus chosen, the objective of the research, and the theory used although still under the same light of discourse analysis or linguistics scope. The exploration will be concentrated on the perspective that can be exposed by further examination of the vision, focalization, and empathy. The corpuses are the articles with same topic about the death penalty for two Australian ringleaders’ execution from Thom Woodroofe in ABC from Australia, and Yohanes Sulaiman in The Jakarta Globe, Indonesia. Afterwards, the result of each corpus will be compared in order to figure out the perspectivization from each party.
B. Concept

This part describes the explanation of the theory used for analysing the perspectivization of ABC Australia and The Jakarta Globe’s articles in framing the topic of duo Australian Bali Nine’s execution. The theory of perspectivization used is based on Renkema theory in discourse studies.

1. Discourse Analysis

“Discourse is a continuous stretch of (especially spoken) language larger than a sentence, often constituting a coherent unit such as a sermon, argument, joke, or narrative”, said Crystal.\(^{13}\) It is a complete unit of language and the highest unit in grammatical hierarchy.\(^{14}\) Moreover, it is the umbrella term of either spoken or written communication beyond the sentence.\(^{15}\) Mills stated that it has something to do with conversation and ‘holding forth’ on a subject, or giving a speech.\(^{16}\) Indeed, it has become a core concept across humanities and science, even beyond linguistics discipline itself.\(^{17}\) Briefly, discourse is the biggest element of language to communicate any mean through writing or speaking by involving the coherent unit.

Humans are engaged in discourse in a multiply of roles. Such as writing a letter to a friend or an essay for a course, picking up the phone, visiting doctor or local shop, looking up the dictionary, telling a joke, etc. Discourse actively does involve either

the speaker and the hearer or the writer and the reader for continuously producing and interpreting it. In short, the use of discourse is for describing the reality.

Text contains with mission that is framed by the language with vague passages in discourse form, either in the spoken or the written one. But in fact, it can intentionally or not be done by the speaker or the writer. However, the language used inside a text includes a lot of hidden ideologies that is not observable for ordinary readers. In other words, the goal of a text can be served explicitly or implicitly with the discourse used. For that an analysis of discourse is necessary to be done in order for avoiding the misleading or misconception of the idea. The tools to do further research in this field are discourse analysis. Since according to Schiffrin discourse analysis is a vast and ambiguous field.

Discourse analysis is an approach to the analysis of language that focuses on patterns of language across text as well as the social cultural contexts in which the texts occur. According to Stubbs, it is concerned with language in use in social contexts, and in particular interaction or dialogue. Indeed, it is about language in use. In addition, the discourse analyst should be committed to an investigation of

18 Georgakopoulou, op.cit., p. 4
what that language is used for.\textsuperscript{25} In conclusion, discourse analysis reveals the usage of language in particular situation, both spoken and written, and attempts to interpret the discourse by knowing the context in which the text involves. Means that discourse analysis studies either the text or the context.

The emerging history of discourse analysis is started in Chomskyan Generative School’s era when other school emerged in different parts of the world with opposite notion to those of Chomsky’s. All these school have belief of a good linguistic description should go beyond the sentence and highlight the fact that there are certain meanings and aspects of language that cannot be understood or embraced if its study is limited to the syntactic analysis of sentences. Consequently, in the twentieth century, the following new disciplines birth in linguistics field, such as functional grammars, cognitive linguistics, sociolinguistics, pragmatics, text linguistics, and, of course, discourse analysis. All these new disciplines are interrelated and can be difficult to distinguish one from the other sometimes, due to the fact that all of them have common denominators.\textsuperscript{26}

\section*{2. Discourse and Text}

Since the corpus of this research is to reveal what inside texts; I would like to submit the explanation of discourse and text relation in this chapter. First of all before the discussion get any deeper into the relation of discourse and text; it will be

convenience to talk about what text is, since discourse was already discussed earlier.

Text is considered as a verbal record of communicative act. According to Cook, text is a stretch of language formally interpreted without context. Meanwhile, Halliday stated that text is everything that is meaningful in particular situation. Thus opposite statements show that several linguists have different notions about what text is. But indeed text reflects as the tape record of communication pieces that what is ‘in’ it contains a cluster of sentences with particular meaning in particular situation either. It can be seen in the real life the absolute form of it such as article, magazine, and newspaper.

The highlight in this discussion is discourse and text can be said as resemblance unit or not. Let’s compare their definition to discover the relation between both of them. Text is indeed a unit larger than sentence, but to interpret it can be apart from context according to earlier explanation from Cook even though Halliday insists it that text is meaningful in particular situation which means if it is not in particular situation text still has meaning although not a full one. Still text can be analyzed without the context. In the other hands, discourse is a unit beyond sentence and in the highest level of grammatical hierarchy. In fact, to catch the certain meaning of discourse lays inside a text cannot be understood alone without embracing the context according to the history of the discourse emergence.

30 Alba-Juez, *op.cit.*, p. 7
31 Ibid., p.10.
In conclusion, a text is a unit that can be analyzed alone while discourse is unit that cannot be separated with the context, and discourse includes text since it is communication record.

3. Discourse and Perspectivization

The term ‘perspective’ is quite common used and easily understood. It refers to a position from which a person or a group view something (things, persons, or events) and communicate their views. Perspective can influence how story or information delivered to the reader. In fact, information can be presented from many different perspectives. Hühn said about representation in the story world (fictional or factual) such as the narration, characters, places, and circumstances that:

“This representation is in evitably shape — in the selection, combination, perspectivization, interpretation, evaluation of elements — by the agency producing it, ultimately the author who, however, may delegate mediation, particularly in fictional narration, to some intermediary agent or agents, typically a narrator (narrator’s voice) and, at lower level, to one or more characters (character’s perspective) located within the happenings (in verbal texts) and, according to some theorist, to the recording apparatus and/or voice-over (in film). This process of transforming and transmitting the story in the discourse, is what is meant by meditation in the broadest sense.”

It means that circumspection is necessary to absorb the true idea in information since there are many factors can lure the reader into a misconception, mainly the perspective point.

33 Renkema, op.cit., p. 126
It is called perspectivization, the concept used to grasp what is really in language and what is the effect of speaker’s choice of topics, expression or relevance marking.\textsuperscript{35} The reason this theory chosen is because the object of this research specifically is discourse. Indeed, Sanders and Redeker (1996) emphasize that there is no sentence in any discourse is free from a certain degree of perspectivization.\textsuperscript{36}

Renkema gives an illustration about how perspective works in discourse. Here the examples as follow:

a. There was a man at the bar. The door opened. A woman and child came in.
b. There was a man at the bar. The door opened. A woman and a child walked inside.
c. There was a man at the bar. He looked up when the door opened. A woman came in, followed by child.
d. A woman opened the door for the child. He walked in and saw a man sitting at the bar.

In example (a) the narrator is inside the bar. In (b) the narrator apparently is not inside the bar, otherwise the sentence would not have read “walked inside”. The narrator could be looking through a window into the bar in position from which he can see the man at the bar but not the people outside the door. While in (c) the story is told from the man’s perspective and in the other hands in (d) from that of the child.\textsuperscript{37}

According to Renkema, in discourse studies three approaches are importance. They are \textit{vision} (the ideological perspective), \textit{focalization} (the narrator’s perspective), and \textit{empathy} (the speaker’s attitude).\textsuperscript{38} Here are the further explanation of those three approaches based on Renkema’s theory of perspectivization:

\textsuperscript{35} Graummann & Kallmeyer, \textit{op.cit.}, p. 4
\textsuperscript{37} Renkema, \textit{op.cit.}, p. 127.
\textsuperscript{38} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 127.
1. Vision

In *vision*, the research is focused on the information presentation from a ideological perspective, precisely to the system of norms and values pertaining to social relations. This explains why two different newspapers reporting on the same event can produce different reports. The highlight research on vision is how an ideology affects language use.

Here are some more examples from experimental research cited in Renkema that has been done in this framework:

As a part of a refresher course, a group of journalist were asked to write a news story based on a fictitious event; a schoolteacher who was on the verge of being fired from her job at a Christian school for becoming pregnant out of wedlock. Afterwards, the journalist, who were not aware of the research goals, were given a questionnaire that asked their personal views concerning the issue. One of the questions were asked if firing the teacher was justified. By setting the investigation up in this manner, it was possible to ascertain that these personal views determined the way in which a given event was reported. Below is an example of differences in reporting. The material that the journalists were given included the transcript of a telephone conversation with the teacher. At a certain point in the conversation the teacher answered the question “Do they want to get rid of you?” as follows:

- (Answer) Yes, well I find it difficult to comment on this, yeah, well, I don’t think it is wise, with the dismissal and the atmosphere at school where everyone is turned against me.

This answer was worked into the article in different ways. Compare the following accounts.

- (Article 1) The teacher has decided to wait and see what happens: “I find it difficult to comment on this. With the dismissal and the atmosphere at school where everyone is turned against me.”

- (Article 2) The central figure in this controversy has no idea why she is being dismissed.
The first account was given by a reporter who, according to the questionnaire, was on the teacher’s side. The hesitation in (Answer) is interpreted in a positive manner as being a wait-and-see attitude. The second account was given by a journalist whose position was neutral. The teacher is, nevertheless, portrayed in a more negative fashion. In (Article 1) the teacher is hesitant whereas in (Article 2), it is stated that she really does not know why she is being fired. On the basis of the analytical model developed in this investigation, it was possible to show that even journalist who say that their position concerning a given issue is neutral also report in a subjective manner.

2. Focalization

In this approach the central idea is that the narrator could be someone other than the individual who has witnessed or is witnessing an event, according the French literary theoretician Gérard Genette the term focalization is used to describe this. This relationship can be signaled in discourse through verbs of observation (to see, to hear, to notice, etc.).

In focalization consists a subject and an object, an observer and an object of observation. The subject of the focalization is called the focalizer. The subject who is observing everything from an external viewpoint is called an external focalizer. Also for the character in the story it is called character-bound focalizers. Below are the further examples:

a) Pete gave a start when he heard the man coming up the stairs.
b) Mary felt that Pete was startled when he heard the man coming up the stairs.

In a), there is character-bound focalizer and in b) Pete is embedded in Mary’s object of focalization as a focalizer.

The point of focalization analysis is that it helps determine from which
observation point a story is being told and if there is a change of perspective has taken
a place. Also, it helps to determine how tension is built up in the story. Here is the
further elaborate version of the first example of perspectivization:

c) There was a man at the bar. He looked despondent. He was mumbling something
about “murdering his great love and his only future.” The door opened. A woman
and a little boy entered. The boy gazed at the customer at the bar. Suddenly he
felt the woman’s hand in front of his eyes. Through her fingers he could see...

From the story above the verbs of observation used, it can be deduced that at
first there is an external focalizer. A change takes place when child appears on the
scene, at which point the story continues from the child’s perspective. The tension in
this story is established by the fact that reader knows more than the woman and the
child, namely, the threat of murder.

3. Empathy

In discourse studies Susumu Kuno (1987) introduced the term empathy that is
used to describe the degree to which a speaker identifies a person or object which is
part of an event or condition that is describe in a sentence. Kuno showed, empathy is
expressed in the syntactic structure of a sentence. For examples:

a. John hit Mary.
b. John hit his wife.
c. Mary’s husband hit her.

In a., the empathy is almost equally divided. In b., the empathy is directed towards
John than Mary. An indication of this is that “John” is in the subject position; another
is that Mary is labelled as John’s wife. In b., the speaker identifies more with Mary
than with her husband. Kuno concluded that if possessive noun phrase, such as
“Mary’s husband”, is used, the empathy will be closer to the referent of the possessive
(Mary). He also stated that two conflicting empathies cannot occur in one sentence.
Here is further example from Kuno’s explanation:

d. Mary’s husband hit his wife.

In the subject position, the speaker expresses empathy with Mary according to the rule of the possessive noun phrase. In the object position, empathy is expressed for John as Mary is referred to as “his wife”.

Kuno showed that restriction exist to change the empathy. He gives another example to do a comparison.

a. Mary had quite an experience last night. She insulted an important guest.
b. Mary had quite an experience last night. An important guest was insulted by her.

The empathy in the first sentence is with Mary. In the second sentence of a., the empathy remains with Mary due to the “she” in subject position. In the other sides, a new character is introduced in the second sentence and becomes the focus of empathy as a result. It is proven that example b. is not as good as a. Kuno showed that the empathy of the speaker is evident in the sentential structure.
CHAPTER III

THE RESEARCH FINDINGS

A. Data Description

As I have mentioned earlier in the first chapter that this research focuses on the topic of Australian Bali Nine’s execution in the articles from ABC by Thom Woodroffe and The Jakarta Globe by Yohanes Sulaiman. The two articles are purposively selected. Those are as follow:

1. **Data A.1.** Article from ABC Australia, “Quiet diplomacy won’t stop the death penalty”. By Thom Woodroffe. Posted 11 Mar 2015, 11:15am.


Since this research is a qualitative one, it means that the researcher task is interpreting, classifying and describing the data in scope of perspectivization approaches. The first step in doing research based on qualitative method is collecting the data. In collecting data, firstly I determine the topic of the research and then read the related literature. Afterwards, deciding the corpus is needed. Secondly, I read every paragraph of the two articles and comprehend every word, clause, and sentence carefully. Thirdly, I give a mark for those findings are assumed contain vision, focalization, and empathy findings for then moving them to the data card. The last, I
analyze the chosen data.

In the analysis process, the amount of data should be specified. Random sampling is used to specify the data. However, in random sampling consist five techniques such as simple random sampling, simple stratified, proportional stratified sampling, cluster sampling and systemic sampling. Regarding to this research, the most appropriate one is simple random sampling by which the technique is used with the following steps like below:

1. Amount of data that are assumed consist perspectivization element needs to be analyzed according to vision, focalization, and empathy approaches.
2. Each data are written and entered into the data card based on its classification.
3. Explaining the text based on perspectivization approaches and analyzing every data.
4. The articles are separately analyzed as two data analysis. The articles are named as data A. 1. for articles from ABC and 1. 2. for articles from The Jakarta Globe.
5. The findings from those two articles will be compared to each other to reveal any similarity or dissimilarity. Moreover, it simplifies the findings to be concluded.

---

39 Walliman, Your Research Project, p. 233.
B. Data Analysis

Data A.1. (Article from ABC Australia)

“Quiet diplomacy won’t stop the death penalty” by Thom Woodroofe

Data No.1

“If mercy cannot prevail for Chan and Sukumaran, we must channel our outrage into a new campaign to end the death penalty”.

- Vision:

The ideological perspective comes from the writer’s neutral position. That is shown by the word “we” which it gives look as if he positioned himself as the part of the reader. It means that the sentence seems to be told from the writer and his reader’s ideological perspective who clearly tries to suggest a new campaign to end the death penalty. However the reader of this article is internationally published on its website. Thus, it means that the reader is general people that can be from around the globe. In short, the writer puts himself as a general people.

- Focalization:

The subject of focalization is the writer who includes the reader as the subject in the story. It means that “we” who refers to the writer and his reader is the focalizer. It means that the viewpoint communicated in this sentence is from the narrator or the writer’s perspective who involves himself as the part of the reader in the story. The tension he tries to established by the fact that he
includes himself and the reader in character “we” in order to give the notion that they are in the same perspective.

- Empathy:

In the first clause, the empathy is the subject “Mercy”. In the other hands, the remains clause is introduced a new character “we” in subject position which as the result it becomes the focus empathy. The character refers to him whose the position is equal with the reader as general people. It means that the writer identifies the character “we” the most, since it is a central subject.

Data No. 2

“It has been 50 years since anyone was executed in Australia and for the most of the time since there has been bipartisan support for the universal abortion of the death penalty across the rest of the world”.

- Vision:

The writer is in Australia’s side. However, the admirable history of supporting death penalty abolishment is framed in positive manner as an obedient attitude of the central subject “Australia” towards international agreement. It means that the ideological viewpoint in this sentence is presented from the writer positive ideological viewpoint for Australia’s past which it gives positive effect towards its image. In short, it can be said that it is from the writer’s viewpoint as an Australia.

- Focalization:

The word “it” is a character-bound focalizer since it refers to the subject in the sentence, “Australia”. The tension is built as if who is telling the story, the writer
of course, is from Australia’s side. It means the writer involves himself as Australia’s character in telling the story. Therefore, the perspective he tries to communicate is from himself as an Australian.

- Empathy:

The empathy is the subject of the sentence, “it”, which refers to the word “Australia”. Briefly, the character under the spotlight is Australia which in this sentence is identified the most by the writer.

Data No. 3

“But even though Australia’s strident opposition to the death penalty may exist on paper, it hasn’t always been the case in practice. Unless, of course, the person in the death row is an Australian citizen”.

- Vision

The position of the writer is neutral. He is not in the Australia’s side but rather in contra one, the side who against it. However, he does not do any defense for any side but reveal the facts. In fact, the Australia’s support for death penalty abolishment is portrayed in negative manner. It can be seen in the contradictory fact report from the first and the second sentence. It means that in describing the fact about Australia, the writer involves his ideology to retell the fact.

- Focalization:

The perspective is from an external focalizer in those sentences. In this case is the writer as the narrator because he is the subject who observing the fact about
Australia’s strident opposition towards death penalty from external point of view without meddling himself as a character inside the story. Briefly, the perspective in this data is from the writer as the external observant since his character does not interfere in the story.

- Empathy:

The character that the writer identifies the most is Australia according to the rule of the possessive noun phrase. Even though, the main point is Australia’s action but it becomes the object position. it is not someone who can be identified as a character, but still it is the main subject in the sentences. In brief, the empathy is with “Australia”.

Data No. 4

“Unsurprisingly, Australia was a vocal advocate against the death penalty during the middle power activist years of the Hawke and Keating governments. In 1990 then foreign minister Gareth Evans remarked that in the previous year Australia alone had made more than 400 representations on human rights issues, including the death penalty, to 68 different countries”.

- Vision:

The writer position is neutral but he does give a subject manner in telling the story. It is shown by the negative manner he describes Australia’s action in the past as an old-fashioned acts which it is emphasized by the word “Unsurprisingly”. It means that the writer delivers the information gives negative effect Australia’s past and image regardless his neutral position.
- Focalization:
The narrator himself is positioned as the external focalizer. He gives his point of view in telling the Australia’s history by observing from the outside view without meddling as a character in the story. It is represented in his style of story description. In short, he does not involve himself in the story but still he communicates his perspective within his writing style in reporting the facts so his existence looks invisible.

- Empathy:
The empathy in this data is directed towards Australia as the character that the writer identifies the most or in the highlight degree. Another indication of this, that “Australia” is in the subject position.

Data No. 5

“However, the overlapping cases of Australian man Van Tuong Nguyen in Singapore and of Bali bomber Amrozi bin Nurhasyim, who were both sentenced to death, caused Australia’s outright opposition to the death penalty to become lined with grey”.

- Vision:
The writer position is neutral, but the writer gives a subject manner in his report. It can be seen from the style of his writing that is emphasized by the word “however” in which it gives such a causation impression. So, the ideological viewpoint that represented in this data is from the writer’s style in delivering the
information. The way the writer delivers the story affects the way the information is framed. In this case, the effect of it gives a description of Australian’s inconsistency attitude.

- **Focalization:**

The focalization in this data is the writer as an external focalizer. He gives his report without mingled himself in the story as any character and it does look he gives point of view in his observation from the external view. The perspective is tried to communicate in this data is the perspective from the direct fact which then it is affected by the attitude of the writer in reporting it.

- **Empathy:**

The empathy in this story expresses with the Australian man Van Tuong Nguyen and Bali bomber Amrozi bin Nurhasyim according to the rule of the possessive noun phrase. In short, the characters in the spotlight are both of them.

Data No. 6

“In 2007 then shadow foreign minister **Robert McClelland** criticised John Howard for being "supportive of the executions of the perpetrators of the Bali bombings, Osama bin Laden and Saddam Hussein, while at the same time he continued to state that Australia opposed capital punishment”’.

- **Vision:**

The writer position is neutral. He simply writes the fact, without giving any impression to what he reports. But he does put two facts from that happened in the same time, which they are opposite to each other, to give a comparison event
for the reader to notice the difference. In short, there is no ideological viewpoint presented in this data except the perspective from the reality itself which it is structured by the way of the writer serving the information.

- **Focalization:**
The focalization in this data is the writer as the external focalizer. He tells his observation from the outside. The viewpoint he tries to communicate is the tension with the way he puts the opposite information to purposively be noticed by the reader.

- **Empathy:**
The empathy in this story is equally divided. The characters in the same degree in who are identified the most are Robert McClelland the subject and John Howard the object. In short, the characters are the most identified in this data by the writer are both of them.

Data No.7

“While Howard (who campaigned personally and passionately against Singapore’s execution of Van Nguyen in 2005) readily accepted the inconsistency, McClelland was publicly condemned by Kevin Rudd for being "insensitive in the extreme" and any claim he had to the foreign ministry in the event of a Labor victory was swiftly revoked”.

- **Vision:**
The writer position is in the neutral one but he gives personal judgement to describe his report in which it is shown in the words “who campaigned personally
and passionately against Singapore's execution of Van Nguyen in 2005”. That description is interpreted as the way the writer sees someone’s action, in this case is Howard. It represents his perspective in telling the reality even though his position is not in any character in this data. In brief, the way the writer sees an object affects the way he describes it.

- Focalization:
  There are two character-bound focalizers which they are Howard and McClelland. In the first clause before the coma, the words “who campaign personally” refer to the main subject “Howard”, in here the perspective comes from him. Meanwhile, at the same time, McClelland also be the character-bound focalizer who the writer involves himself in the story as McClelland’s character. It means that the perspective in this data comes from both of them.

- Empathy
  At first the empathy is focus with Howard as the subject. However, new characters are introduced which becomes the main focus of empathy as the result. The two characters are McClelland as the object position and Kevin Rudd as subject position who the empathy is almost equally divided for both of them. In brief, the focus of the empathy that the writer highlights the most is McClelland Kevin Rudd.
Data No. 8

“At the time Rudd was at pains to note there was not a crack of light between the Labor and Liberal parties’ policies on the death penalty, labelling them "identical" and based on "the global opposition to the death penalty". It was a sentiment he had also expressed a year earlier in criticising the execution of Saddam Hussein (departing from Mark Latham’s view as opposition leader) when he noted that "it is not possible, in our view, to be selective in the application of this policy".

- Vision:

The ideological perspective is presented from Rudd’s side. Rudd’s effort to against death penalty by labelling two opposite parties’ policies on death penalty are in the same voice is interpreted in positive manner by telling how Rudd feels as his sentiment attitude for against being selective in death penalty. In short, it can be seen that the writer is agree with Rudd’s ideological perspective therefore it affects the language use in here.

- Focalization:

The perspective in this data is from Rudd’s viewpoint due to his subject position and makes him as the focalizer. The tension builds in this data is that the reader knows more about what Rudd feels than any character in this data.

- Empathy:

The empathy is with Rudd. He is the character identified the most in this data.

Data No. 9

“Nevertheless, in stark contrast to all these statements Rudd also went on to say at the time of the McClelland affair that "no diplomatic intervention will ever be made by any
government that I lead in support of any individual terrorist’s life”.

- Vision:

The ideological perspective comes from the writer’s neutral position. However, he gives the description of Rudd’s statements as contradictory manner at that time. It gives negative portrait for Rudd image as the character in the story. It means that there is no ideology affecting the language use in here but the way the writer describes the Rudd’s contradictory action gives his character looks as inconsistent one.

- Focalization:

In this data, the perspective comes from the an external observation towards Rudd’s character. It means that the writer as the narrator is an external focalizer since he does not involve in the story as a character or himself.

- Empathy:

The empathy is equally divided with Rudd as the subject and McClelland as the object.

Data No. 10

“While the inconsistency of all these positions from both sides of politics is clear, there is no doubting McClelland’s comments were poorly and insensitively timed, and that the crimes Amrozi committed were heinous in the extreme with the blood of 88 Australians on his hands. But while both Julie Bishop and Tanya Plibersek have restated Australia's universal opposition to the death penalty as part of their delicate diplomatic offensive to secure clemency for Andrew Chan and Myuran Sukumaran (for which they should be commended), there is still a lot that we can do as a country to
ensure that nobody - Australian or otherwise - faces the monstrous barbarity that is capital punishment”.

- Vision:
The ideological perspective comes from the writer’s neutral position, even though he portrayed the contrast action between McClelland, Bishop, and Plibersek in here. It is interpreted as the writer’s intention to highlight the inconsistency of Australia’s government to end any death penalty. The way writer portrays the contrast reality gives negative effect for all of them an inconsistency.

- Focalization:
The subject of focalization in this data is the writer as the narrator. The data is told from the external viewpoint, also because he is not put himself as a character in the story. The tension he tries to build in here is established by the fact that the reader knows more about two different affairs in different time either but in the same situation and focus of problem about death penalty. Briefly, the writer is a character-bound focalizer.

- Empathy:
At first the empathy is with McClelland as the subject that the writer identifies. But, in the second sentence the new characters, Bishop and Plibersek are introduced who become the focus of empathy as the result.
Data No. 11

“Australia could, for instance, help establish a new regional coalition against the death penalty, especially to help nudge countries to follow the lead of others in moving towards abolition”.

- **Vision:**
  The writer’s position is in the Australia’s side. The Australia capability in the sentence is interpreted as optimism attitude of Australia to be the role to abolish death penalty. It means that the writer’s ideology in seeing Australia gives an positive effect for its character image in this data, thus the language used in it is structured in well illustration.

- **Focalization:**
  The subject of focalization in this data is the writer as an external focalizer who observing from the external viewpoint as the narrator without meddling in the story. It means that the perspective comes from the external point of view of the writer as narrator in telling the story. The tension he tries to build here is that to give an implicit suggestion by stating the Australia’s capability.

- **Empathy:**
  The empathy is with Australia as the most character identified in this data.

Data No. 12

“The Holy Grail would of course eventually be their inking of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and its Second Optional Protocol, but we should be under no illusions as to how long this may take”.
- **Vision:**

The ideological perspective in this data is from the writer who positioned himself as the part of the reader. It means that his position is as a common people, not from the government, and in their side either. However, the suggestion to ignore any illusion is interpreted as writer’s personal point of view as a general. In brief, this ideological perspective comes from the writer who positioned himself as a part of common citizen.

- **Focalization:**

The subject of focalization in this data is the writer as a character-bound focalizer since he involves himself to give the viewpoint as a character “we” in the story. The tension he tries to build is established by the fact that he is also the part of Australian who is not from the government but from the common citizen, thus his ideology in this data is shown as if it is for general human well-being.

- **Empathy:**

The empathy in this data is with the subject “we”, the writer and his reader, who becomes the spotlight character.

Data No. 13

“The notion that any campaign such as this could upset our relations in the region or beyond is quite simply a fallacy. The fact that Australia’s relations with our immediate region are considered to have reached a peak under the Hawke and Keating governments during the time of elevated activism on the issue underscores this point. So too does the example of the European Union - led primarily by France - which has campaigned strongly against the death penalty for a number of years, including
through introducing an annual resolution into the UN General Assembly”.

- **Vision:**

  The ideological perspective comes from the writer’s neutral position. It is clearly shown by the possessive noun “our” which illustrating the writer as the part of a citizen. That possessive noun is interpreted as the writer and the reader’s possession of something. In brief, the ideological perspective in here comes from the writer as a part of his concern as a citizen instead of his own country.

- **Focalizer:**

  The subject of focalization is the writer as a character-bound focalizer. The word “our” is represented the subject, the writer and his reader, as the narrator who gives the viewpoint of what they discuss. Since the writer is positioned himself as the part of the reader, it means that he also involves himself as a citizen character and includes the reader’s perspective either in the story. It can be proven by the words “The fact that Australia's relations with our immediate region”, he distinguish his position with Australia. In brief, the tension he tries to build is established by the fact that he and his reader are in the same perspective.

- **Empathy:**

  The empathy in here is the character “our” that their possessiveness is more identified in the story according to the rule of the possessive noun in theory.
Data No. 14

“Australia's recent experience on the UN Security Council reminded us all that we can make a significant contribution to the world and bring countries together on difficult issues when we choose to. A campaign such as this would not only be consistent with the values we hold dear, but it would also be in our national interests”.

- **Vision:**

The writer in this data is positioned himself as Australian citizen. It can be noticed his ideology viewpoint as that character is represented by the word “*us*” in these sentences. Moreover, the character has an interpretation that the writer is positioned himself as the part of the reader side. As the result, the ideological perspective in this data comes from the writer’s perspective in seeing Australia’s experience on the UN Security Council. He also describes his character as the part of general citizen, so the interest is not seen as personal interest but rather as for a world peace by using character “*we*”.

- **Focalization:**

The subject of focalization in here is the writer as a character-bound focalizer due to his involvement as a character “*us*” in the story. It means the perspective comes from him and also he includes the reader as the part of it as well. The tension he tries to build is established by the fact that the he and his reader are in the same perspective.

- **Empathy:**

At first the empathy is with Australia as the possessive of noun “experience” but
afterwards, a new character “us” is introduce as new subject and becomes the focus of empathy as the result.

Data No. 15

“The time for quiet diplomacy is over. Australia must step up and take the lead.”

- Vision:
The writer is in Australia’s side. The suggestion for Australia to take a step as the lead is interpreted as optimism attitude from the writer in the story. Briefly, the ideological perspective comes from the writer’s viewpoint as a character in Australia’s side.

- Focalization:
The subject of focalization in this data is from the writer as the external focalizer. In brief the perspective comes from the external viewpoint of the writer as the narrator in the story without being any character in the story. The tension he tries to build is the fact that his existence implicitly visible since he does not involve himself as any character in the story.

- Empathy:
The empathy is with Australia as the character identified the most and due to their subject position.
“Commentary: Why Indonesia Will Ignore All ‘Bali Nine’ Protests” By Yohanes Sulaiman

Data No. 1

“President Joko Widodo has been on the receiving end of international protests and condemnation for executing foreign nationals in January. He now plans to send 11 more convicted drug traffickers on death row, including two Australians, to the firing squad”.

- Vision:

The writer’s position is neutral. However, the character “President Joko Widodo” is portrayed as negative image. The character is stated as the ignorance attitude of him towards his controversy in executing foreign nationals drug traffickers. The ideological perspective is from the writer’s neutral position even though the way he describes the figure in this data is affected the language he used to give a negative impression towards a figure.

- Focalization:

The subject of focalization in here is the writer as an external focalizer. He as the narrator tells the story from external viewpoint without involving his existence in the story. The tension he tries to build is established by the fact that the perspective comes from him but his existence is invisible.

- Empathy:

The empathy is with the character “Presiden Joko Widodo” as the most identified in
the story.

Data No. 2

“UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon has called for Indonesia to halt executions. Australian Prime Minister Tony Abbott also pleaded for Jokowi, as the president is popularly known in Indonesia, to spare the lives of “Bali Nine” duo Andrew Chan and Myuran Sukumaran, warning that the relationship between the two countries will be harmed if Indonesia proceeds with the executions”.

- Vision

The ideological perspective in here comes from the writer’s neutral position. However, in this data the information is completely included the fact how the Australia government reacts towards the execution. It gives negative impact toward Australia’s image. In brief, that the way the writer serves the data with the whole actual reality gives a negative effect to Australia’s negative.

- Focalization:

The subject of focalization in this data is from an external focalizer. And it is the writer as the narrator in the story. The writer tells the story from the external viewpoint without meddling inside his report. The tension he tries to build is established by the fact that his existence does not involve with any character in the data, but the story is told by him as an invisible narrator.

- Empathy:

The empathy is with Ban Ki-Moon, at first. However in the next sentence, a new character is introduced and identified the most by the writer. As the result the new
character Australian Prime Minister Tony Abbott becomes the focus of empathy.

Data No. 3

“Human rights activists have been calling for Jokowi to abide by Indonesia’s obligation to grant death row convicts a genuine chance of pardons and commutations as stated in the International Convention on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR)”.

- Vision:
The ideological viewpoint in this data is from the writer neutral position. Neither positive nor negative manner are described in the story.

- Focalization:
The subject of the focalization is the writer as the external focalizer. His existence as the narrator does not involve with any character in the story, he only observes from the external side. The tension he tries to build is established by the fact that his existence does not involve with any character in the data, but the story is told by him as an invisible narrator.

- Empathy:
The empathy in here is equally divided with Human Right activist as the subject and Jokowi as the object.

Data No. 4

“For Jokowi, the calculation is clear: the political cost is too high for him to grant such pardons”.

- **Vision:**

The ideological perspective in this data comes from Jokowi’s viewpoint as the subject. It means that the writer is in the Jokowi’s side because the ideological perspective does not come from his alone but involve Jokowi’s either.

- **Focalization:**

The subject of focalization in this data is the writer as the narrator. It means he is an external focalizer. He becomes the narrator without getting involved with the main subject. He only observes from the external side. The tension he tries to build is established by the fact that the calculation comes from Jokowi but it is the opposite. It is the writer’s calculation by observing Jokowi from the outside.

- **Empathy:**

The empathy is with Jokowi as a character identified the most in this data.

Data No. 5

“As I have explained, while there is no systematic and independent survey that could show the percentage of Indonesians supporting the death penalty, Indonesia’s political elite is generally united in their support for capital punishment”.

- **Vision:**

The ideological perspective is clearly presented from the writer’s viewpoint. He is neutral. The way he describes the situation gives a negative description towards surveyor as unsystematic and dependent survey institution.
- **Focalization:**

   The subject of focalization in this data is “I”, the writer, as the focalizer. The tension he tries to build is established by the fact that in here the perspective comes from himself as the visible narrator.

- **Empathy:**

   The empathy is with the subject “I” who it is the writer as the narrator himself.

**Data No. 6**

“Following Ban’s call to halt execution, the deputy speaker of the Indonesian House of Representatives, Fadli Zon, who is from the opposition coalition, declared his support for Jokowi to ignore the UN’s call and go ahead with the executions. He stressed that there is overwhelming public support for executing drug offenders.”

- **Vision:**

   The ideological perspective comes from the writer neutral position. He does not present any ideology from any character. There is no negative manner rather than positive in reporting the story of Fadli Zon’s support declaration.

- **Focalization:**

   The subject of the focalization is the writer as an external focalizer. The writer as the narrator in the story does not involve with the character but observe them. It can be said that the perspective comes from his viewpoint on seeing the characters in the story without getting in touch with them. The tension he tries to build is established by the fact that the reader gets to know what happened earlier before
Fadli Zon declared his support.

- **Empathy:**

The empathy is with Fadli Zon as the most character identified in this data.

**Data No. 7**

“Abbott’s linking of aid to his call for Indonesia to show mercy — he pointedly referred to the A$1 billion Australia had provided after the 2004 tsunami — provoked a negative response”.

- **Vision:**

The ideological perspective represents the writer’s neutral position as the narrator who sees the affair. The additional information “— he pointedly referred to the A$1 billion Australia had provided after the 2004 tsunami —” in here is interpreted as the writer intention to inform Australia’s reaction towards his citizen in the front row of death penalty execution in Indonesia as a negative provocation.

- **Focalization:**

The subject of focalization is the writer as the external focalizer. The writer as the narrator in the story does not involve with the character but observe them. It can be said that the perspective comes from his viewpoint on seeing the characters in the story without getting in touch with them. The tension he tries to build is the fact that the reader get to know what happened after Abbot pleaded a mercy in that way.

- **Empathy:**

The empathy is clearly with Abbott due to his position as a subject and the character identified the most.
Data No. 8

“Vice-President Jusuf Kalla stated that Indonesia would carry out the executions regardless of Australia’s protests. Foreign Minister Retno L.P. Marsudi said that the death penalty was “purely a law enforcement issue.””

- **Vision:**

The ideological perspective comes from the writer’s neutral position. There is no a subject manner in describing or reporting in reporting the information.

- **Focalization:**

The subject of the focalization is the writer as the external focalizer. The writer as the narrator in the story does not involve with the character but observe them. It can be said that the perspective comes from his viewpoint on seeing the characters in the story without getting in touch with them. The tension he tries to build is the fact that his existence as the narrator looks invisible.

- **Empathy:**

The empathy is with Vice-President Jusuf Kalla as the subject position in the first sentence. However, in the second sentence is introduced a new character, Foreign Minister Retno L.P. Marsudi, who becomes the focus of empathy as the result.

Data No. 9

“The Schapelle Corby case proved that being lenient to drug smugglers was politically unpopular, as then-president Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono discovered. So Jokowi is not likely to consider halting the executions. Such a move simply does not have clear political benefits”.
- **Vision:**

The ideological perspective comes from the writer’s neutral position. The writer’s portrait of the Presidents of Indonesia’s action towards drug smuggler is interpreted as a comparison action between the former and current President of Indonesia. It shows the contradictory fact that it is purposively served by the writer. It gives such a negative effect for Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono’s figure. The writer also puts his own judgement towards what Jokowi’s thinks. It can be seen from the last sentence.

- **Focalization:**

The subject of focalization in this data is the writer as an external viewpoint. The writer as the narrator in the story does not involve with the character but observe them. It can be said that the perspective comes from his viewpoint on seeing the characters in the story without getting in touch with them. The tension he tries to build is established by the fact that the narrator put his own perspective without being any character; his existence looks very visible in expressing it since he does not involve any subject.

- **Empathy:**

The empathy is with Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono as the subject in the first sentence. However, in the second sentence is introduced a new character, Jokowi, who becomes the focus of empathy as the result.
Data No. 10

“Granting clemency to convicted drug traffickers would also provide ammunition for Jokowi’s powerful critics to hammer his administration further. Domestically, Jokowi’s popularity is suffering from his seeming indifference to the National Police’s efforts to undermine the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK).”

- **Vision:**

The ideological perspective is presented the writer’s neutral viewpoint. The reality facts are framed as Jokowi’s negative previous movements. In addition, the prediction about what kinds of benefit Jokowi gets is presented in negative manner. It can be seen from the second sentence. That information is portrayed to give negative image for Jokowi as for helping his popularity decline.

- **Focalization:**

The subject of focalization is the writer as the external focalizer. The subject of focalization in this data is the writer as an external viewpoint. The writer as the narrator in the story does not involve with the character but observe them. It can be said that the perspective comes from his viewpoint on seeing the characters in the story without getting in touch with them. The tension he tries to build is established by the fact that the narrator put his own perspective without being any character; his existence looks very visible in expressing it since he does not involve any subject.

- **Empathy:**

The empathy is with Jokowi as the character identified the most.
Data No. 11

“Foreign pressures will not do much to sway Jokowi’s opinion. Instead, it is more likely to generate a nationalist backlash.”

- **Vision:**
  The ideological perspective comes from the writer in Jokowi’s side. It means he is not neutral. The description of Jokowi in this data is interpreted as a strong leader figure.

- **Focalization:**
  The subject of the focalization is the writer as an external focalizer. The subject of focalization in this data is the writer as an external viewpoint. The writer as the narrator in the story does not involve with the character but observe them. It can be said that the perspective comes from his viewpoint on seeing the characters in the story without getting in touch with them. The tension he tries to build is established by the fact that the narrator put his own perspective without being any character, his existence looks very invisible in expressing it since he does not involve in any subject.

- **Empathy:**
  The empathy is with Jokowi as the character identified the most in this data.

Data No. 12

“Unlike Yudhoyono, who seemed to strive really hard to be liked by everyone, Jokowi has seemed not to really care about what other nations think about him. After his first foreign trips in November 2014, Jokowi remarked: “What’s the point of having many
friends but we only get the disadvantages? Many friends should bring many benefits.”

- Vision:

The writer is in Jokowi’s side. It means that the ideological perspective does not come from the writer neutral position as the narrator. The description of Jokowi’s movement is interpreted as a positive manner as being an strong leader figure.

- Focalization:

The subject of the focalization is the writer as an external focalizer. The subject of focalization in this data is the writer as an external viewpoint. The writer as the narrator in the story does not involve with the character but observe them. It can be said that the perspective comes from his viewpoint on seeing the characters in the story without getting in touch with them. The tension he tries to build is established by the fact that the narrator put his own perspective without being any character, his existence looks very invisible in expressing it since he does not involve in any subject.

- Empathy:

The empathy is with Jokowi as the character identified the most in this data.

Data No. 13

“Jokowi’s refusal to pardon drug convicts on death row could be explained by his desire to project the public image of a decisive leader. Jokowi wants to be seen as a leader who commands a country with strong rule of law.”
- **Vision:**

The writer is in neutral position. The description of Jokowi’s movement is interpreted as a negative manner as being an impure motive to refuse pardon for the execution in order to be seen as a strong leader. The negative manner of the writer in describing Jokowi gives negative effect for him in this data.

- **Focalization:**

The subject of the focalization is the writer as an external focalizer. The subject of focalization in this data is the writer as an external viewpoint. The writer as the narrator in the story does not involve with the character but observe them. It can be said that the perspective comes from his viewpoint on seeing the characters in the story without getting in touch with them. The tension he tries to build is established by the fact that the narrator put his own perspective without being any character, his existence looks very invisible in expressing it since he does not involve in any subject.

- **Empathy:**

The empathy is with Jokowi as the character identified the most in this data due to his subject position.

---

**Data No. 14**

“There are some who dissent from my argument. Jarrah Sastrawan has argued that Jokowi’s bullheaded refusal to grant clemency was not based on concern for his personal image, but rather on: “his personal conservatism and the impact of the Soeharto-era propaganda of his youth.””
- Vision:

The ideological perspective comes from the writer neutral position in reporting the information. He gives another opposite statement from Sastrawan’s perspective to make a comparison with his opinion. In here, the perspective from Sastrawan is seen to be in pro side of Jokowi’s inner motive. He describes that Jokowi’s refusal is based on his conservatism rather than personal interest.

- Focalization

The subject of focalization in this data is the writer as an external focalizer. The subject of focalization in this data is the writer as an external viewpoint. The writer as the narrator in the story does not involve with the character but observe them. It can be said that the perspective comes from his viewpoint on seeing the characters in the story without getting in touch with them. The tension he tries to build is established by the fact that the narrator put his own perspective without being any character, his existence looks very invisible in expressing it since he does not involve in any subject.

- Empathy:

The empathy is with Jokowi eventhough there is Jarah Sastrawan in the data. But Jarah Sastrawan is not identified as much as he identified Jokowi. Thus, Jokowi becomes the focus of empathy as the result.
Data No. 15

“We may disagree on Jokowi’s inner motivation. I will not speculate on that. But it is clear that regardless of his motivation, Jokowi wants to be seen as a strong leader or, rather, as father of the nation who can be firm when necessary.”

- Vision:

The ideological perspective comes from the writer’s perspective. The ideology is presented his own perspective without being in any side. Thus, he is neutral. It can be seen by his argument he explains that his point of view towards Jokowi as President figure. It is interpreted as if he is quite sure that Jokowi insists to be seen as a strong leader regardless of his motivation.

- Focalization:

The focalization subject in this data is the writer as the focalizer. He becomes the subject who observes and gets involved in the story. The object of focalization here is Jokowi. The tension he tries to build is established by the fact that he knows the situation more than the reader.

- Empathy:

The empathy is with the character “we” and “I” who refers to the writer as the subject identified the most in the data. However, the new character Jokowi is introduced who becomes the focus of empathy as the result.

C. The Findings Summarize

After a long analysis, the result is discovered. To make the explanation easier, the findings from two data analysis will be compared to each other as I have mentioned
earlier in data description.

The finding result shows in data A. 1. from ABC, that there are 10 out of 15 data contain vision from the writer’s neutral position. They are data no. 1, no. 3, no. 4, no. 5, no. 6, no. 7, no. 9, no. 10, no. 12, and no. 13. Nevertheless, the writer gives subjective manner in delivered the story in those data which the most of them portrayed as a negative image for the result. However, the ideological perspective still has 5 data which show the writer is not neutral. He puts ideological perspective from others in data no. 2, no. 8, no. 11, no. 14, and no. 6. It can be from the writer’s position in Australia’s side in data no. 2, no. 11, and no. 15, Rudd’s character as a subject in data no. 8, and the writer’s position as an Australian citizen in data no. 14. Those findings indicate that the writer is actually not in any side but agree with the notion death penalty abolishment for general. Otherwise, he shows his neutral ideological perspective by revealing some facts that affected Australia as the main subject of article in negative portrait. They are framed as a country with inconsistent manner towards death penalty abolishment. Woodroofe shows how selective Australia was by revealing the past history of Australia inconsistency with his subjective manner in the data. Also the data which shows partially ideological perspective is used to emphasize the writer’s impartial position towards his nationality.

Meanwhile, the vision in data I. 2. shows the same indicator. The most of ideological perspective is found from the writer’s neutral position. It is from 12 out of 15 data. However, he gives a subjective manner in delivered the story in those data.
Consequently, it gives a negative effect towards Jokowi’s character as for having other ulterior motives regardless his persistent to execute the foreign drug traffickers as law enforcement. Those data are from data no. 1, no. 2, no. 3, no. 5, no. 6, no. 7, no. 8, no. 9, no. 10, no. 13, no. 14, and no. 15. The rest three data are the ideological perspective found from Jokowi’s viewpoint in data no. 4, no. 11, and no. 12. These findings indicate to the writer’s neutral position as impartially narrator. The subjective manners he gives in telling the story is the evidence. He reveals some contradictory facts to show that the death penalty is an impure action to stand the justice but rather for political interest. Also, he delivers the story from Jokowi’s viewpoint is interpreted as Sulaiman’s approach to prove his impartial ideology towards Jokowi’s figure.

The findings of focalization shows that both of the articles are communicated from the narrator or in this case is the writer themselves as the external focalizer. It means that the writers deliver the story as an external observer. It is shown in data A. 1. that there is 8 out of 15 data is being communicated from the writer’s perspective as the external observer. They are data no. 1, no. 3, no. 4, no. 5, no. 6, no. 9, no. 10, no. 11, and no. 15. Meanwhile, the other remains are as a focalizer and character-bound focalizer. The focalizer can only be found in data no. 8. Also, the character-bound focalizer can be found in data no. 2, no. 7, no. 12, no. 13, and no. 14. Meanwhile, in the data I. 2. there are 13 out 15 data can be found the writer as the external focalizer and the rest as focalizer. The tension the writers try to build is established by the fact that the perspective is delivered by them without getting in touch with any character in their
They only become the narrator who observes everything from the external side and it can be by hearing, seeing, and noticing.

The empathy from data A. 1. is dominated with Australia as the most identified character. It shows in data no. 1, no. 2, no. 3, no. 4, and no. 11. The rest of the data show different empathy. This means that the main character discussed the most is Australia. Meanwhile, the empathy from data I. 2. is dominated with Jokowi as the most identified character. It shows in data no. 1, no. 4, no. 9, no. 10, no. 11, no. 12, no. 13, and no. 14. The other remains have different empathy. This means that the main character is discussed the most is Jokowi.
CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

A. Conclusions

After long and tiring analysis on the details of the data from ABC Australia by Thom Woodroffe and The Jakarta Globe by Yohanes Sulaiman about the death penalty for Bali Nine ring leaders drugs convicts, I summarize some conclusions in this chapter to sketch out the answer for the questions of the research I raised in Chapter I, in which it limits the framework of this analysis. For the answers of the questions in this research, I conclude the result of the analysis by giving some following points:

1. The perspective inside both articles has different viewpoints of story, although they have similar topic, death penalty. The article from ABC sees the topic from the way it should be applied by revealing some facts. It is proven by the subjective manner he gives in his article. His subjective manner shows his neutral position as the writer and portrays Australia’s character as a figure with an inconsistency for supporting the death penalty abolishment in which the abolishment for the death penalty is applied in selective circumstances, especially if in the front row is Australian citizen. Meanwhile in The Jakarta Globe sees the topic from the way it is used by a certain character. It is also proven by the subjective manner he gives in telling the story in his article. His
subjective manner shows his neutral position as the writer and portrays Jokowi’s character as a figure of president who does an execution for foreign drug traffickers with another ulterior motive regardless his excuse as law enforcement. His figure is described as a President of Indonesia who wants to be seen as a strong leader with his brave and persistent attitude to execute foreign nationals regardless the protest he received. Also the writer’s manner in describing this character indicates Jokowi has other inner motive for restoring his popularity decline which it caused by the previous negative affair towards him.

2. The vision from data A. 1. shows that the writer’s neutral position is dominated the ideological perspective in his article. It proves that he is not in any side, especially Australia regardless he is an Australian, but agree with the death penalty abolishment for general. Instead his subjective manner gives negative effect for Australian’s image. The focalization shows that he tells the story from the perspective as the external observation without getting in touch with any character. It means for telling the story the writer observes by hearing, seeing, and noticing. The empathy shows that the most character the writer identified the most is Australia. It means that the main subject in his article is Australia. Meanwhile the vision from data I. 2. shows that the writer’s neutral position is dominated the ideological perspective in his article. It proves that he is not in any side, especially Jokowi regardless his status as an Indonesian. Instead, his subjective manner portrays Jokowi in negative image. The focalization shows...
that he tells the story from the perspective as the external observation without getting in touch with any character. It means for telling the story the writer observes by hearing, seeing, and noticing. The empathy shows that the most character the writer identified the most is Jokowi. It means that the main subject in his article is Jokowi.

From the conclusion above, I can see the similarity that either Woodroofe or Sulaiman have same indicator elements of perspectivization. The research reveals that either the writer’s perspective from ABC Australia and The Jakarta Globe are neutral. They show their impartial viewpoint by criticizing their own government and political issue through their articles with the same approach but with different substance. The similarity can be seen from the way the perspective is communicated. Both writers are being an external focalizer or observer without getting in touch with any character. The differences from both of them are the subject they identified the most. In Thom Woodroofe’s article, Australia is the main subject talked about the most. Meanwhile, in Yohanes Sulaiman’s is Joko Widodo. The research also reveals that both writers’ viewpoints focus on something hidden behind the death penalty rather than to the Bali Nine’s execution.
B. Suggestions

During the research, I realize that the theory applied is still rigid and far from what analysis should be. It is not as exhaustive as Renkema does or concern in his theory, even though I try to fill the flaw with other supportive theories. Thus, for the next research, the analysis needs to strengthen the theory and more references to help reaching the deeper aspect so it will give wider scope to do the investigation.

In my research, the analysis is only based on Renkema’s perspectivization approach as the main theory, regardless the theory of focalization alone from Gérard Genette and empathy from Susumo Kuno.

In using all the theory, I just concern to what objective of this research is looking for. Indeed, there is also another aspect that should be analyzed is missed or shortly this research only serves the related data. In fact, it is not as simple and easy as I think it would. Actually, the research should read all of his works to discover more specific idea on how this theory should be applied to reach all the aspect needed. Thus for the next researcher when using discourse analysis, especially perspectivization’s theory, must have complete literature and read the related works in order to complete the analysis demands.
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Quiet diplomacy won't stop the death penalty

Opinion
By Thom Woodroofe

Posted 11 Mar 2015, 11:15am

Photo: If mercy cannot prevail for Chan and Sukumaran, we must channel our outrage into a new campaign to end the death penalty. (Ake Prihantari)

Australia's once outright opposition to the death penalty has become lined with grey. In light of the Bali 9 case we must renew our strident opposition to capital punishment and lead the fight against it, writes Thom Woodroofe.

It has been almost 50 years since anyone was executed in Australia and for most of the time since there has been bipartisan support for the universal abolition of the death penalty across the rest of the world.

But even though Australia's strident opposition to the death penalty may exist on paper, it hasn't always been the case in practise. Unless, of course, the person on death row is an Australian citizen.

Unsurprisingly, Australia was a vocal advocate against the death penalty during the middle power activist years of the Hawke and Keating governments. In 1990 then foreign minister Gareth Evans remarked that in the previous year Australia alone had made more than 400 representations on human rights issues, including the death
penalty, to 68 different countries.

Under the Howard government these representations about the general use of the death penalty by different countries largely continued, albeit with a lack of enthusiasm a number of officials have conceded. However, the overlapping cases of Australian man Van Tuong Nguyen in Singapore and of Bali bomber Amrozi bin Nurhasyim, who were both sentenced to death, caused Australia's outright opposition to the death penalty to become lined with grey.

In 2007 then shadow foreign minister Robert McClelland criticised John Howard for being "supportive of the executions of the perpetrators of the Bali bombings, Osama bin Laden and Saddam Hussein, while at the same time he continued to state that Australia opposed capital punishment".

While Howard (who campaigned personally and passionately against Singapore's execution of Van Nguyen in 2005) readily accepted the inconsistency, McClelland was publicly condemned by Kevin Rudd for being "insensitive in the extreme" and any claim he had to the foreign ministry in the event of a Labor victory was swiftly revoked.

At the time Rudd was at pains to note there was not a crack of light between the Labor and Liberal parties' policies on the death penalty, labelling them "identical" and based on "the global opposition to the death penalty". It was a sentiment he had also expressed a year earlier in criticising the execution of Saddam Hussein (departing from Mark Latham's view as opposition leader) when he noted that "it is not possible, in our view, to be selective in the application of this policy".

Nevertheless, in stark contrast to all these statements Rudd also went on to say at the time of the McClelland affair that "no diplomatic intervention will ever be made by any government that I lead in support of any individual terrorist's life".

While the inconsistency of all these positions from both sides of politics is clear, there is no doubting McClelland's comments were poorly and insensitively timed, and that the crimes Amrozi committed were heinous in the extreme with the blood of 88 Australians on his hands. But while both Julie Bishop and Tanya Plibersek have restated Australia's universal opposition to the death penalty as part of their delicate diplomatic offensive to secure clemency for Andrew Chan and Myuran Sukumaran (for which they should be commended), there is still a lot that we can do as a country to ensure that nobody - Australian or otherwise - faces the monstrous barbarity that is capital punishment.

McClelland's speech - which was in fact billed as an announcement of Labor policy -
contained a number of helpful starting points. Australia could, for instance, help establish a new regional coalition against the death penalty, especially to help nudge countries to follow the lead of others in moving towards abolition.

For this to be effective it needs to be nuanced and incremental - probably starting by convincing countries to reduce the number of crimes that carry the death penalty within their jurisdictions, pushing for the total removal of mandatory death sentences for certain crimes, and also encouraging greater transparency on the publication of statistics around these executions.

The Holy Grail would of course eventually be their inking of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and its Second Optional Protocol, but we should be under no illusions as to how long this may take.

The notion that any campaign such as this could upset our relations in the region or beyond is quite simply a fallacy. The fact that Australia's relations with our immediate region are considered to have reached a peak under the Hawke and Keating governments during the time of elevated activism on the issue underscores this point. So too does the example of the European Union - led primarily by France - which has campaigned strongly against the death penalty for a number of years, including through introducing an annual resolution into the UN General Assembly.

Others, including Liberal MP Phillip Ruddock have even outlined the "diplomatic co-benefits" that would come by teaming up with the Indonesians to help them secure clemency for the some 200 citizens they themselves have on death row overseas, mostly in the Middle East.

Australia's recent experience on the UN Security Council reminded us all that we can make a significant contribution to the world and bring countries together on difficult issues when we choose to. A campaign such as this would not only be consistent with the values we hold dear, but it would also be in our national interests.

If mercy cannot prevail for Chan and Sukumaran, as a country we must channel our collective outrage and grief into a new diplomatic campaign to finally free humanity from the scourge of the death penalty.

The time for quiet diplomacy is over. Australia must step up and take the lead.

Thom Woodroofe is a Rhodes Scholar at the University of Oxford and a regular commentator on Australian foreign policy.
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President Joko Widodo has been on the receiving end of international protests and condemnation for executing foreign nationals in January. He now plans to send 11 more convicted drug traffickers on death row, including two Australians, to the firing squad.

UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon has called for Indonesia to halt executions. Australian Prime Minister Tony Abbott also pleaded for Jokowi, as the president is popularly known in Indonesia, to spare the lives of “Bali Nine” duo Andrew Chan and Myuran Sukumaran, warning that the relationship between the two countries will be
harmed if Indonesia proceeds with the executions.

Could their pleas actually move Jokowi to change his mind and grant clemency to the death-row prisoners now facing execution?

It is doubtful that Jokowi will be moved. He has insisted that the death penalty is a “law enforcement” solution to a national drug “emergency.” But more than that, it is also a political issue.

Human rights activists have been calling for Jokowi to abide by Indonesia’s obligation to grant death row convicts a genuine chance of pardons and commutations as stated in the International Convention on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR).

For Jokowi, the calculation is clear: the political cost is too high for him to grant such pardons.

As I have explained, while there is no systematic and independent survey that could show the percentage of Indonesians supporting the death penalty, Indonesia’s political elite is generally united in their support for capital punishment.

Following Ban’s call to halt execution, the deputy speaker of the Indonesian House of Representatives, Fadli Zon, who is from the opposition coalition, declared his support for Jokowi to ignore the UN’s call and go ahead with the executions. He stressed that there is overwhelming public support for executing drug offenders.

Abbott’s linking of aid to his call for Indonesia to show mercy — he pointedly referred to the A$1 billion Australia had provided after the 2004 tsunami — provoked a negative response.

“Threats are not part of diplomatic language,” foreign affairs spokesman Arrmanatha Nasir said. “And from what I know, no-one responds well to threats.”

Vice-President Jusuf Kalla stated that Indonesia would carry out the executions regardless of Australia’s protests. Foreign Minister Retno L.P. Marsudi said that the death penalty was “purely a law enforcement issue.”

The Schapelle Corby case proved that being lenient to drug smugglers was politically unpopular, as then-president Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono discovered. So Jokowi is not likely to consider halting the executions. Such a move simply does not have clear political benefits.

Granting clemency to convicted drug traffickers would also provide ammunition for
Jokowi’s powerful critics to hammer his administration further. Domestically, Jokowi’s popularity is suffering from his seeming indifference to the National Police’s efforts to undermine the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK).

Foreign pressures will not do much to sway Jokowi’s opinion. Instead, it is more likely to generate a nationalist backlash.

In light of Ban’s appeal for sentence commutation, several Indonesian news media outlets, including Merdeka.com, Detik.com, Media Indonesia and Viva News, ran an opinion article by Hikmahanto Juwana, a professor of international law from the University of Indonesia (UI). He rhetorically asked where Ban was when Indonesian migrant workers were executed in Saudi Arabia.

Unlike Yudhoyono, who seemed to strive really hard to be liked by everyone, Jokowi has seemed not to really care about what other nations think about him. After his first foreign trips in November 2014, Jokowi remarked: “What’s the point of having many friends but we only get the disadvantages? Many friends should bring many benefits.”

It could probably be argued that, for Jokowi, it is less a case of “Jokowi should commute the Bali Nine’s death sentence to make Tony Abbott happy” than “what could Tony Abbott do for Jokowi so he would commute their death sentence?”

Jokowi’s refusal to pardon drug convicts on death row could be explained by his desire to project the public image of a decisive leader. Jokowi wants to be seen as a leader who commands a country with strong rule of law.

There are some who dissent from my argument. Jarrah Sastrawan has argued that Jokowi’s bullheaded refusal to grant clemency was not based on concern for his personal image, but rather on: “his personal conservatism and the impact of the Soeharto-era propaganda of his youth.”

We may disagree on Jokowi’s inner motivation. I will not speculate on that. But it is clear that regardless of his motivation, Jokowi wants to be seen as a strong leader or, rather, as father of the nation who can be firm when necessary.

Yohaness Sulaiman is a lecturer in international relations and political science at the Indonesian Defense University.
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