

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, LIMITATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study has analyzed how Indonesians and Americans bilingual/multilingual changed their request strategies when they speak Indonesian and English. This chapter presents the conclusion, implications, limitations of the study, and recommendations about this present study. This section summarized the result based on the discussion from the previous chapters with some recommendations for future researchers.

5.1. Conclusions

This study has come up with two major conclusions. First is that, according to DCT and observations, Indonesians, in making request strategy considering power and relation, tended to be more direct and used bold on record strategies in making a request in Indonesian, while they tended to use conventional and non-conventional indirect strategies when they made a request in English. The directness which they were using while they made a request in Indonesian is due to their environments and cultural background in which the use of directness in making a request is not seen as impoliteness or rudeness and it is seen as closeness and intimacy. On the other hand, almost all American participants tended to be more indirect when they made a request in English and they chose to change it to direct request strategies when they made a request in Indonesian. DCT and observations results have supported this study to determine that Indonesian participants in this study mostly used direct request strategy except to someone who had more power than them, while in terms of making requests in English, Indonesian participants tended to be more polite by using indirect request strategy with some external and internal modifiers. The same result was also found in American participants in which they tended to be more direct when they used Indonesian. It is also revealed that this conclusion may contradict other studies and theories that claimed that Indonesians value indirectness while Americans value directness. In fact, according to this study, in terms of making a request, Americans

and Indonesians seem to exchange the value. The use of request strategies may vary depending on what they were comfortable to use.

Second conclusion is that almost all participants experienced several cultural difficulties such as food problems, how to use the language properly, how people interact with each other, and how to do things in the target language environment. In terms of strategy that they were using in gaining intercultural knowledge, four of American participants and four of Indonesian participants used cognitive strategy where they observed how people do things in the target language environment in order to avoid misunderstanding and all participants agreed that imitating the way society interacted with each other was the key for them to bind themselves with others, meanwhile the other American and Indonesian participant used social strategy where they preferred to ask people about how they used the language properly or when they were confused. This could also mean that most people from different cultural backgrounds tended to imitate what the target language environment expected them to be rather than transferring their native language value into the target language value. Society, of course, has a big role in shaping the way they use the language within society. It would also be better if social and cognitive approaches are combined to gain better understanding towards intercultural knowledge.

In addition, a positive attitude towards the target language and culture also influenced their motivation in having an intercultural knowledge so that they were able to conduct the same values as the native speakers. This study implicitly revealed that all participants in this study had a positive attitude towards the target language they were learning and the result was the ability to gain intercultural knowledge and apply it to the target language environment since learning the language itself is not enough to interact with people, especially the native speaker of the target language. All participants have experienced living in the target language environment, some of them worked in the target language environment and other studied in the target language environment. Living in the target language environment has helped them to have a positive attitude towards the target language culture and that attitude has given good

impact in gaining intercultural and pragmatic competence so that all participants were able to do and say things like native speakers of the target language.

Finally, it can be concluded that all participants had successfully achieved the target language values in terms of making a request although it contradicts other findings and theory about the directness of Americans and indirectness of Indonesian. In addition, having an experience living in the target language country could give a positive attitude towards the target language itself and it could increase the target language learners' intercultural and pragmatic knowledge by using a social-cognitive approach. As a result, the target language users could interact with the target language native speakers using not only proper grammar, but also proper norms and values.

The researcher has learned that learning a language is not only about learning the pattern of the grammar, but also about how language is used as the researcher has experienced transferring L1 values to L2 use and it has created a big misunderstanding between the researcher and her students. So, having intercultural competence is a must in the language learning process and it can be gained using a social-cognitive approach. The researcher also has learned that being 'too friendly' can be seen annoying for some people who do not have the same definition of friendliness especially when the addressee do not have the same culture as the speakers, so as an Indonesian native speaker, it is a must to rethink the questions that are going to be asked to other people from other cultures.

5.2. Implications

This study had been conducted in analyzing the way Indonesians and Americans multilingual/bilingual request strategies in both languages. According to the findings, it can be seen that intercultural knowledge takes part in the way of participants making a request in both Indonesian and English. Being fluent in speaking another language means nothing when they do not know how to use it and understand the value and manners in the target language since it will create misunderstanding and miscommunication. In order to avoid misunderstanding and miscommunication, people who intensively communicate with people from different cultural backgrounds

need to have cultural or intercultural knowledge. Everyone in this world may react differently towards one particular occurrence, one may find one reaction is rude and impolite while others find it normal. This is a common issue in intercultural communication.

So, in accordance with that, the researcher agrees that having an intercultural knowledge is very important in intercultural communication in order to avoid misunderstanding and miscommunication due to the differences of norms, values, and beliefs. Misunderstanding could happen not only because of language barriers but also because of their values in using language even though the speaker of the target language has mastered the language and grammar. It is suggested to all target language learners to also learn the target language values, behavior, and norms in order to avoid misunderstanding and conflict in the future interaction. Building a positive attitude towards the target language, enhancing intercultural and pragmatic competence, and tolerating and respecting other cultures also shape our better communication with other people from different cultures.

5.3. Limitations of Study and Recommendation

This study has extended several findings regarding Indonesians and Americans bilingual/multilingual request strategies by using DCT, observation, and interviews. However, there are a number of limitations in this current study that should be considered since the results were based on a small group of participants and the participants' background were still varied. This study only involved five Indonesian and five Americans, so that the sample size is very small. However, it does not affect the research since the researcher focuses on digging deep the information from participants using triangulation data. The weakness of DCT also should be considered since the DCT results have limited authenticity compared to real-life situations and the observations were also conducted in the small and limited environment and situation. However, it does not affect the research since DCT result was also supported by observation results. In the observations, the researcher also only assessed each participant's type of request with different power and social distance and did not

include all power and distance for all participants. It would be fascinating if the future researchers could involve all power and distance for all participants. This study also would suggest future researchers to consider exploring more about request strategies changing in large numbers of participants since this study had limited participants and the result cannot be applied to all Indonesian and American-English multilinguals and probably could explore more on how it changes when they make invitations, refusal, apologies, etc and also dig deep more into intercultural pragmatics. The future researchers also could include age, gender, and specific cultural background to make it deeper since this study did not include age, gender, and specific cultural background since the researcher only includes power and social relation without looking at age, gender, or specific cultural background. This study also did not include relation of imposition in designing DCT situations. This study did not include the cost or expenditure, value of goods, service and goods, and time-consuming cost since this study only focused on designing DCT using power and distance only. So, the future researcher could include imposition in designing DCT so that DCT could get richer and deeper information.

The difficulties in including those factors are finding more participants who fluently speak both Indonesian and English even though the researcher had easy access to the participants, so that the researcher did not include gender, age, and specific cultural background due to the limited number of participants. Another difficulties also include time and funding where it took such a long time to conduct observations for each participant since the researcher naturally waited for the request strategy to appear although the location where observations were conducted was easy to access and no funding received by the researcher and that made the researcher sometime experienced difficulties in conducting an observation and interview. However, the researcher believes that this study will give abundant benefits for multiculturalism in Indonesia and The United States of America, especially in cross-cultural communication, English teaching, and BIPA teaching program, so that the teacher could include intercultural pragmatics knowledge in their teaching process. This study also suggests that people who are learning a language have to also learn the target language culture and how they

used the language instead of transferring their native language values to the target language use.