

CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSION

Having analyzed all the August 1997 to May 1998 editions of the Jakarta Post, we can see that sportswriters (writers of the sport section of a newspaper) have been having great efforts in making the sport section's language always interesting to the readers. One of the efforts is their use of lively, playful, and metaphoric words selected particularly for the sake of the readers. Yet, the most obvious and interesting phenomenon of the efforts is their use of a large variety of verbs in their description of winning and losing. From the August 1997 to May 1998 editions, the sportswriters used 40 verbs of winning and 20 verbs of losing with such a different frequency of use – some are used very frequently, some are rarely.

Of all these verbs, we can see that most of them are transitive (an object must follow the verbs), only a few are intransitive. The number of transitive verbs is 29 – about 74 % of all the verbs describing winning. 10 verbs that are followed by nouns indicating winning as in the verb phrases “nail a win, score a victory, etc.” are not analyzed for the verbs alone do not have anything to do with the description of winning. Meanwhile, of all the verbs describing losing, most of the are in the form of passive voice, and only a few are in active voice. Two verbs that are followed by noun indicating losing as in “suffered a defeat” and “slumped to a defeat” are not analyzed for the same reason as the verbs describing winning.

After analyzing the verbs, we can conclude that there are three factors that underlie the sportswriters' choice of the verbs for their description of winning and losing; the contexts of the verbs, the similarity of meaning between the verbs, and the existence of a shared feature among the verbs (i.e. the implications of winning and losing). The first, the context of the verbs, means that the sportswriters do not randomly take any verbs of winning or losing to be put into sentences describing winning or losing. Instead, in choosing which verbs to fit into sentences describing winning and losing, they seem to be governed by certain contexts – e.g. verb 'A' is used in sentence X under the context of a, b, and c. the contexts may deal with the facts of the playing teams and the actual situation of the match.

There are five contexts that underlie the use of verbs describing winning. They are:

1. goal spread
2. the winning of a team over weaker or having-equal-power opposing team
3. place of the match
4. prestige of the match, and
5. rivalry between the playing teams

These five contexts do not underlie the use of each of the verbs of winning simultaneously, but a combination of some of them (e.g. the verb 'thrash' in a particular sentence is underlied by context no. 1, 3, and 4). This in turn make it

possible for the verbs to be divided into five groups, each of which underlied by the same contexts.

There are also five contexts that underlie the use of the verbs in sentences describing losing. They are:

1. goal spread
2. the defeat from weaker or less favored teams
3. prestige of the match
4. the losing/defeat at home ground
5. the losing/defeat by a rival team

As in the verbs of winning, these contexts do not underlie the use of each of the verbs of losing simultaneously, instead a combination of some of them.

The second factor is the similarity of meaning between the verbs. This factor is valid only to some of the verbs, not to all of them (i.e. twelve verbs describing winning and five verbs describing losing). They characterized by direct description of wining and losing. They are all similar in the sense that 'to win' is the same with 'to overcome in a battle or contest, to win victory over, to subdue, to overpower, to defeat, to be victorious, etc.', and that 'to lose' is similar with 'to be overcome in a battle or contest, to be overwhelmed, to undergo loss, to be overcome or vanquished, and so on'. This feature (direct descriptions of winning and losing) is shared by all the twelve verbs describing winning and five verbs describing losing and make it

possible for the verbs to be grouped together into the semantic field of winning and losing and be used in the descriptions of winning and losing.

The last is the existence of a shared feature among the verbs – that is the implications of winning and losing. By this notion, it means that all the verbs describing winning are used to describe winning because they have some implications of winning in their very nature of meanings, and that all the verbs describing losing are used to describe losing because they have in their nature of meanings some implications of losing. The implications of winning are such that the winning team dazes or stupefies, makes helpless, lowers the pride or dignity of, butchers or kills, or hurt the feelings of its opponent (by causing it to be foolish or contemptible). Meanwhile, the implications of losing are such that the losing team is prevented from gaining success, brought to nothing, put to an end, shocked deeply, made humble or lowly in mind, or discarded as worthless.

The last two factors make it possible for all the verbs describing winning and losing to be grouped together into the semantic field of winning and losing respectively, and to be used by sportswriters in their descriptions of winning and losing.

We can also conclude that all the verbs describing winning and losing actually do not come from the semantic field of winning and losing only. They could come from other fields or domains. Some of the verbs describing winning, for example, come from the fields of destruction (crush, demolish, eliminate, hammer, etc.) and

killing (slaughter, nip, outgun, etc.). Some of the verbs describing losing also could come from the field of destruction – it's just that the verbs are changed into passive voice. This transfer of verbs from one field to another is possible for some parts of the verb meanings can be used to symbolize or describe winning and losing which in turn influence the sportswriters to use them in their descriptions of winning and losing.