CHAPTER V
CONCLUSION

This chapter consists of three parts: 1) the major findings and the significance, 2) Implication of the study, and 3) the recommendations for further study. The major findings that presented in this chapter are based on qualitative data on types of disagreement strategy conducted by EFL learners. The findings of this study will bring some implication to the English teaching and learning in general. Further investigations are fully recommended due to the limitation and weaknesses of this study.

5.1. Major Findings and Their significance

To summarize the findings, I had shown that the lecturer’s types of disagreements ranged from Mitigated Disagreement (indirect) to Strong Disagreement (direct) and he also performed both discursive pattern of politeness namely deductive and inductive pattern. Sometimes he employed a more indirect means to express his disagreement. On the other hand, I also had illustrated the students’ type of expressing disagreement ranged from “strong-yet-mitigated” to “mitigated” and correlate with contextual variables he/she possessed.

In this classroom setting, for the lecturer, institutional power did not correlate greatly with degree of directness expressed in his disagreement strategy. Whether the students’ disagreement types, it became the fact that strategies of disagreement they performed were greatly influence by the contextual variables of politeness. As has been shown in the course of discussion, the act of expressing politeness is influenced by age. It was found that when talking to an interlocutor of different age, a speaker would indicate different preferences at using strategies. To an interlocutor of the same age, a speaker was inclined to show more
direct strategies of disagreement. To the extent that the degree of influence becomes a matter of concern, age proves to be more powerful than gender in determining the deliverance of politeness. Respondents’ awareness of the need to speak politely to an older interlocutor, for instance, is more obvious than that of their concern about gender differences. Their awareness of the need to fully attend to an interlocutor’s seniority was evident in the use of strategies of disagreement.

The contextual variables namely institutional power and social distance had also influenced greatly of the speakers in expressing disagreements. The respondents put awareness to his/ her interlocutor status in power and social distance. The less power and social distance between the members of communication transaction, the more direct the utterance of disagreement would be. We can see that the power relation between Students and lecturer ranged from equal to high and the data also showed that the social distance relation between the SS and L ranged from close to intermediate.

The students also performed deductive discourse pattern in their disagreement strategy. It was counter to what Scollon and Scollon statement that person in lower social position normally expected to use the inductive one (a more indirect discursive strategy) rather than deductive pattern.

5.2. Implication of the study

This present study has direct application to the EFL Classroom mostly in Indonesian. It is due to intricacies of language use as it correlates with several contextual and cultural variables. Furthermore, in the case of disagreement, “EFL students would benefit from being exposed to different means of expressing disagreement within a language system” (Kakava,
1995). Not only that, the students can also jump to the linguistic, textual and paralinguistic means of expressing disagreement.

5.3. Recommendation for Further Study

This present study is a case study of strategy types used by the students and lecturer in expressing disagreement. Within its big limitations, this study has many weaknesses related to limited time to investigate and analyze deeper. Therefore, the further investigation is needed in the same or different cites and setting, and background in order to bring the better result. The additional studies may provide useful insights to confirm or disconfirm the result of this study.