

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

This chapter contains the conclusion made based on the object of the study that has been described in details in the previous chapters as well as the researcher's recommendation towards the study-related matters and suggestion for the future research.

5.1. Conclusion

Hedging phenomena has become the parts of academic world where science with its dynamic would never have an absolute truth in its journey. Eventhough it is realized that most of the students are not even aware of this hedging phenomena, they have already used it in several parts of their life, especially in academic life. From what have been analyzed in this study, students use these pragmatic markers in their oral presentations, which are categorized both formally and functionally according to Meyer hedging classifications; shields, approximators, author's/ speaker's personal doubt and direct involvement, emotionally-charged intensifier, and compound hedges.

The study reveals that students during their oral presentation mostly use shields, which reaches 63.18% in its use. Then followed by approximators with 31.73%, emotionally-charged intensifier with 4.06%, and the last is compound hedges with do not reach 1% which is the least frequently used hedging of all in this study.

There are various ways of how the students use these hedging devices in their oral presentation. Most of them use the hedging when they show suggestion that can promote their researches or ideas on the techniques or methods being proposed, as well as reducing the authoritativeness while delivering them. They also use hedging when they state claims that something might have certain effect on others, but the presence of some of hedging devices as the pragmatic markers could make their claim more tentative so even though the statements are weakened, they sound even stronger with greater accuracy.

It is also found that students use some hedging devices while showing their opinion, providing the possible but valid answer to the questions made by audience, and offering the appropriate solutions to respond them. The existence of these kinds of hedging devices help them in implicating their level of uncertainty and show the audience that their arguments not to be considered as the definite truth, rather it is merely their personal opinion, judgement or belief, which is open to further negotiation.

Thus, in conclusion, it can be said that hedging and its use in academic discourse might imply the students pragmatic ability in communicating their ideas, especially in academic presentation in which nowadays is used by large researchers, scholars or academic community in sharing ideas and spreading the knowledge among them, even in international scale. Having this kind of pragmatic awareness might be helpful for them in delivering their work and ideas in their study and even would be a good rhetoric strategy for students in larger tasks of their life later.

5.2. Recommendation

In this study the researcher has some suggestion for the future research regarding hedging phenomena due to the researcher's limitation. Since the hedging devices are identified with both formal and functional criteria according to Meyer classification and there is no fixed instrument in considering the hedging devices for they are context-dependent phenomena, the results of this study might be subjective to certain extent. Nevertheless, the subjectivity threat can be minimized since the researcher still use the framework as the basis in analyzing the data.

Thus, the researcher suggests that the further research could fill these gaps with developing more reliable instruments for identifying the hedging phenomena. Besides, as the English Education students, the researcher recommends that this kind of pragmatic competence could be taught in the classroom so that the students could be more aware of the use of hedging in their communication.