CHAPTER V CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

5.1 Conclusions

After analyzing the data, conclusions can be drawn such as the following:

- 1 There are three types of ambiguous meaning are found in headlines of the daily The Jakarta Post. They are structural, lexical, and referential.
- 2 Lexical is the dominant type of ambiguous meaning used are found in headlines of the daily The Jakarta Post.
- Ambiguous meaning must be interpreted based on context situation because it leads the readers to know the real meaning of the sentences and get more understanding about the ambiguous meaning.

5.2 Suggestions

Having seen the result of the study, the writer would like to offer the following suggestions:

- It is advisable for the readers to understand the ambiguous meaning as well as they can comprehend the headlines of newspaper.
- Language in newspaper is greatly influenced by the mission or voice of the Politician, so it is suggested for the writer to propose balance information to certain social issue.

 It is suggested that based on the findings of the study, the readers would pay attention to the context of situation to understand the meaning of the sentences in newspaper.



REFERENCES

Aitchison, Jean 1978. Linguistics. New York: David Mckay Corporation.

Ary, D. 1979. Introduction to Research in Education. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Bach, K. 1994. Conversational Implicature, Mind and Language. Accessed on 15st May 2007.

Cairns, G. 1999. Multiple meaning of Sentences. London: Brightly.

Chierchia, M. and Ginet, T. 1992. Learning Ambiguity. Washington: Moughton.

Dinneen, S.J. 1967. General linguistics. New York: Washington

Dole, N. 2001. Semantic Ambiguity. Accessed on 3 March 2005.

Ellis, M. 1993. An Introduction to General Linguistics. Oxford: Oxford University.

Emery, M, Edwin, E, & Nancy L. R. 2000. The Press and America. Boston: Allynand Bacon.

Folkerts, J & Dwight L. 2002. Voices of a Nation. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Garce, S. 2006. How Newspaper are Made. Accessed on 10 June 1999.

Halliday, M.A.K. 1999. Function of Language. London: Edward Arnold.

Halliday, M.A.K, and Hasan, R. 1999. Cohesion in English. London: Longman.

Haugen, Y. 2005. A Day at the Daily News. London: Longman.

Rusche, H. 2002. Ambiguity. Accessed on 4th July 2006.

Hartman, R.RK. 1972. Semantic Theory. New York: Harper and Row Publishers.

Henchard, Z. 2001. Language Ambiguity A Curse and A Blessing. Accessed on 1st August 2005

Hornby, E. 2001. Learner's Dictionary. London: Longman.

Jacob, S. M. 2002. Discovering the News. Accessed on 30 September 2002.

Katz, J.J. 1972. Semantic Theory. New York: Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Kempson, R. M. 1980. Semantic Theory. New York: Cambridge University Press Kriedler, C. 1998. Introducing English Semantic. New York: Roudledge

Leech, G. 1981. Semantik, Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.

Lyons, J. 1977. Semantics. Vol. 1 Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

-----. 1995. Webster's Dictionary. Longman. London.

Martin, J.R., 1992. English Text: System and Structure. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

McCrimmon, J.M. 1984. Writing With a Purpose. Boston: Moughton Mifflin.

Miller, M. 1985. Hot Off the Press! A Day at the Daily News. London: Longman.

Miller, G. 2001. Ambiguous Words. IMP Magazine. March 22,2001.

Palmer, J. 1983. Semantic. New York: Longman.

Richard, Jack et.al. 1985. Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics.

London: Longman group.

Rusche, H. 2002. Ambiguity. Washington: English Department of Emory University.

Yeild, M. 2002. The Yellow Journalism. New York: Princeton University.



