

THE IMPLEMENTATION OF DISCLAIM IN ELT ARTICLES TO PROPOSE THE WRITERS' ARGUMENTATION

Agung Budi Kurniawan, Warsono, Djoko Sutopo and Sri Wuli Fitriati

Corresponding Author, STKIP PGRI Pacitan, Indonesia1

Graduate School, Universitas Negeri Semarang, Indonesia2

agungbudi430@yahoo.co.id

Abstract

The concept of disclaim has negative representation in linguistic study and language application. In fact, it cannot be avoided that communication in written paper could involve both positive and negative statement. The concept of this research was to identify the negative statement implementation in disclaim in three ELT articles that were published in journals. The instrument involves the concept of Interpersonal meaning in qualitative design. Researchers found that it was useful and necessary for writers to propose their argumentation to deny something in their ELT articles. Naturally, the writers' argumentation could be positive or negative. The disclaim implementations were needed by the writers to deny concept, value, negative stereotype, quality, academic identity, and scientific claim. The other interesting thing is that disclaim was also needed to propose the objective view point or argumentation. It was also found that the most appropriate technique of presenting the disclaim statement was a hedge to avoid strong disclaim. It was concluded that not all disclaim statements had negative purpose, effect, and the whole implementations. The context of use needs to be involved to understand it.

Keywords: Disclaim, ELT, Articles, Interpersonal, Meaning

INTRODUCTION

Disclaim or denial is one of the Interpersonal meaning implementations that represents the decision to refuse something. Denial or negation is the dialogic perspective as a resource for rejection, and it is not as a simple logical or acceptance or refusal (Martin & White, 2005, p. 118) . It means disclaim or negation does not always contain negative meaning or sense. It depends on the context of use. It teaches us to be critical by looking at an object or phenomenon from the deep side. The mastery of the Interpersonal meaning skill could make us understand the whole phenomena whether explicit or implicit.

In this research, researchers revealed the implementation of the disclaim in the written text based on the Interpersonal meaning concept. The written text could contain both explicit and implicit meaning including the denial. The denial in the text book was not so simple as presenting or proposing the writers' view point. It is a complicated application. Gulliver & Thurrell (2016) studied the denial of racism in the Canada English textbook that revealed the sensitive value. In this study finding, it also found that the denial needs serious strategy for certain situation and application. It was not a simple action of refusing something. The communication sense needs to be considered.

The study of denial to propose argumentation was based on the use of lexical in a text. The lexical of denial such as “no, did not, never” represented the denial Interpersonal meaning (Martin & White, 2005). The use of the lexical that contain denial could be applied in the format of conjunction as the cohesive device (Bahaziq, 2016). It connected the information in a text including denial expression or statement. In this case, the identification of the denial was not only about literal, but also the explicit meaning. On the other hand, Çakır (2016) found the lexical of “clearly, probably, apparently” in the research abstract influenced the appropriate meaning transfer. The lexical of denial such as “probably” hold important rule as the “hedge” to propose the denial statement. In this research, it was also found some expression of denial that was carried out through hedge.

The study of lexical use to identify Interpersonal meaning including denial requires high and deep analysis system. Öztürk & Köse (2016) found that Turkish writers overused most of the lexical bundles in presenting their meaning based on their background of the native speaker. Then, Theodore (2013) identified the lexical error in building the Interpersonal meaning in a discourse. In addition, Ağçam (2015) explored the comparison of the lexical and grammatical application and influence to the Interpersonal meaning. It could be concluded that the lexical has serious rule in the Interpersonal meaning implication including the denial or negation. Even, the frequency of use takes the deep influence. When a writers used a denial lexical e.g. “never” for over-used, it will decrease the text credibility. The lexical application was not about just taken

for granted. The strategy must consider many aspects.

One of the strategies that could be recommended for the Interpersonal meaning strategy including the denial is the rule of cohesive device for discourse construction. Cüneyt Demir (2017) found the importance of the rule of cohesive in the collocation lexical. Hu & Li (2015) investigated the frequency of use of “and, but, because, so, however, therefore” that gave high impact to the meaning construction in a text. The construction of denial meaning was also influenced by the frequency and strategy of use of the potential lexical. It also means that the use of Interpersonal meaning of denial requires plan that it should avoid using it through accident. The wrong application could mislead the readers for the meaning and information interpretation.

The study of Interpersonal meaning based on the lexical use on the social practice is as valuable as the written text. It was as the comparison and supporting view point. Khojasteh & Kafipour (2012) found that the use of modal auxiliaries in the Malaysian English textbook did not represent the natural use in English. The modal auxiliaries were potential to be applied for the denial Interpersonal meaning. It could give effect to the social practice for the practitioners who applied the text book. Križan (2016) found the various attitudinal categories in the British advertisement including manifestation, categorization, and social effect. They realize us that the study of Interpersonal meaning including denial could be applied whether in the written, spoken, or social practice text.

Based on the background and the literature review, this research proposed one research question which is “how is the implementation of the denial disclaim to propose writers’ argumentation in the English language teaching articles?”. The objective of this study is “to reveal the technique and communication implementation of the denial disclaim in order to propose writers’ argumentation in the English language teaching articles”. The finding and analysis of the research problem and objective were proposed through a stratified and scientific work schema.

METHODOLOGY

The design of this research is qualitative. In fact, a few of numeric calculation was also applied as the assistance in the process. The qualitative design actually cannot be separated with the quantitative totally (Mack, Woodson, MacQueen, Guest, & Namey, 2005). The object was three articles in the English language teaching or ELT field study that were published in journals. They were chosen by using purposive sampling technique. The instrument was lexical list and concept of denial (Martin & White, 2005). The technique of collecting data was selecting the lexical and the context of use. The technique of analyzing data was combination perspective (Dey, 2005, p. 68). It means the analysis combined more than one angle of perspectives.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The findings and discussion were presented and separated object by object. In line with the method, it comprised three objects or articles. It was considered to propose the clear material. It was also impossible to present the holistic analysis because every

finding represented its own application and implication.

Findings and Discussion of the Object 1

The finding and analysis of disclaim in the article or object 1 was to propose the writers’ argumentation. Every finding has its implementation. The description could be viewed below.

The implementation of disclaim as the first finding was the denial of the specific application of the old concept in order to propose the new concept. It was a technique to argue a concept implicitly. The statement in the article explained that the traditional account or writing study may not apply when the definite articles were embedded by the lexical bundles. It was a direct denial to the effectiveness of the old concept. Then, it was continued by giving the recommendation of lexical bundles application, meanwhile the lexical bundles was the research article main topic. Lexical application frequency was one of the main concerns in the successful Interpersonal meaning construction (Hu & Li, 2015). The positive value implementation was that it avoids presenting the conflict successfully. In the previous side, the writers still admitted the scientific value of the old concept, and then, it explained its weaknesses. The further explanation as the indirect promotion to the article concept could give humble impression.

On the other hand, the implementation of disclaim was to deny the general view point or stereotype. The writers explained the general view point about the unimportant position of articles in writing that was compared with other linguistic material and rule. The writers then explained their

disagreement with the general view point. The implementation was that disclaim was carried out by giving the comprehensive explanation and proposing the promise of benefit. They argued that the potential benefit of their argumentation would be applicable for the linguistic study and practice. In order to show the high level of disclaim, the previous studies was reviewed and presented. It brought two antithesis groups. The first was the previous studies whose the stereotype, and the second was the previous studies whose similar concept with the authors' view point. In this case, the authors tend to give larger review to the previous studies whose similar concept with their argumentation. The lexical use in the proper context could make the speakers to be more confident (Ağçam, 2015). The personal or subjective technique was also applied to maximize the result and build opinion. The proposition was actually high risk because it denied the stereotype directly. It was predicted that the research had passed the high level of process so that the authors were confident to deny it directly.

The application of previous studies was found to deny a schema of work of a concept. There are two schemas of work for the lexical bundles study. The first was the field research based on the empiric data. It means the study must be practiced in the language study especially English language teaching. The second work schema was the pedagogical study in which it reviewed the concept. In this case, the authors agreed with the first work schema of field research rather than pedagogical study. The use of previous studies implemented the strong basis of denial so that it proposed serious argumentation. One important notice that it

needs to reminded that the use of lexical in the Interpersonal meaning construction must not over-used (Öztürk & Köse, 2016). The positioning of the previous studies was also important that it should be placed directly after the authors' argumentation. The previous studies application also proposed the message that the denial was objective.

In addition, the authors also denied the contribution of the previous studies in order to argue that their concept was original indirectly. The previous studies were still reviewed in the positive sense and side, but the authors or writes did not admit their contribution to the related study. It was very unique strategy because the denial was not related with the negative result, but with the study field. They were denied because their study scope was not similar with the authors' field of the article. It did not decrease the value of the previous studies, but it still respected them. In this case, the use of personal pronoun for the denial and declaration could be vital (Liping, 2017). They also still admitted the prospect of the previous studies for the other research in the similar field. The implementation of the technique was a hedge of written communication.

The quality of the object contribution was presented in the negotiable sense in order to argue that the lack of the research object was still in tolerance boarder and it did not give significant negative impact. It explained that the low of article mastery did not reflect the students' grammar knowledge. Meanwhile, the grammar was not the focus of the research. It builds the argumentation that we should differentiate the scope of every study. The Interpersonal meaning needs to consider the positive identity impression (Ye, 2010),

so that the readers or interlocutor still would give respect. The implementation was the implicit technique to avoid the unnecessary critique. The authors would like to keep the readers still focused on the research and article topic rather than connecting it with unrelated study field.

Findings and Discussion of the Object 2

The findings and its implementation were found in the various performances in the article or object 2. All of them represented the authors' personal perspective and attitude in the written text. The findings and analysis could be viewed deeply below.

In the first place, the denial expression was applied as a hedge to force argumentation. It was the high level technique of application. The use of modal of "may or may not" indicated that there was no other choice rather than what had been proposed by the authors. The use of discourse markers has similar rule in written or spoken text (Shakarami, Hajhashemi, & Caltabiano, 2016), that the writers need to be careful to apply them including in proposing a concept or idea. It had implicit message that the material cannot be bargained anymore. It represented the information that it was the best choice. It could be categorized as a high level of application because it served two places as the soft approach. The placement of the foreign language and peripheral gave objective impression that anyone who was in the authors' position would take the similar action. It gave strong basis of the personal argumentation. It was also a safe method for the authors from getting the hard critique.

The denial of the specific and special identity was the implementation of effort to build

positive opinion that a field study was universal. In this finding, the authors tried to refuse the specific identity of the research object as the additional value for the research. The Interpersonal meaning needs to consider the positive identity impression (Ye, 2010). It implied the message that the special identity of Chinese students was not a tolerance for giving second opinion rather than the empiric research results. They would like to place the research as professional as possible without giving high attention to the intervening variable. The problem related with the subject status was defined as a general phenomena. It means to declare that the Chinese English quality had been similar with the International English practitioners.

The next denial was purposed to refuse the scientific claim. The implementation was the message that the claim was a universal phenomena. So, it cannot be categorized as a scientific statement even formulation. The criteria of "patchwriting" was described directly to belong to any language including Chinese and English. It was also an indirect critique for practitioners to be careful in claiming a phenomena as a scientific formula because it needs novelty. The other implementation was to propose an indirect standard of formulating the scientific claim. The authors refused the comparison of patchwriting in Chinese and English. The personal attitude was carried out through objective idealism. The other implementation was that the authors tried to be fair with their attitude and ideas. One of the solutions to refuse the scientific claim softly was the application of appropriate reference and conjunction such as studied by Bahaziq (2016) that both of them could be explored to reveal the positive value in the communication.

The denial statement could be implemented as the strategy to show humble. The authors denied that their research was perfect or excellent. On the opposite side, they admitted that it still needs improvement. The attitude indicated to build the impression of humble to the authors. They admitted that they were not able to recruit the commerce major students at the university. Actually, it was also a strategy to save their credibility for further or next happening because antithesis would still be possible present. The humble performance could gain the readers' sympathy. In practice, the readers' sympathy could be the entry point to get the higher attention. The argumentation would be easier to be accepted by readers who had given the sympathy for the first sight. The use of soft lexical could be applied as the alternative technique to show humble in which Çakır (2016) proposed the use of stance adverb of "clearly, probably, apparently" in the pedagogic implication.

The last denial of object 2 was the denial of the work system efficiency in a research. The authors criticized the allocation and utilization of time in a previous study. They categorized it as insufficient too. The implementation was to increase their research by decreasing the previous study. It blamed the factor of time to make the previous study become unsuccessful. On the other hand, the authors implicitly informed that they did not follow the similar schema of working. If it was viewed in detail, the authors would just present the personal standard. It lacks the basis of the previous studies. It implied information that the research article applied the better work schema. It was in line with a previous study that lexical application frequency was one of key points in the

successful Interpersonal meaning (Hu & Li, 2015). Actually, the action to decrease the previous study needs to be evaluated based on the scientific ethics.

The Findings and Discussion of the Object 3

The object 3 contains some implication of disclaim as the method of proposing writers' argumentation. The denial statements were presented comprehensively in the object 3 so that it could be recognized rapidly. The explanation of the finding could be viewed below.

The writers denied the study development and contribution of the previous studies to the research field. It has two main implications. Literally, it proposed negative justification to the previous studies. It decreased the previous study contribution to the field study. It did not give respect to the study development in order to increase the research article good impression. On the other hand, in the deep view point, it has positive values. The authors would like to remind that the development area was still minimum. It was compatible with a previous study that the appropriate use of lexical or modal in an English textbook should be accordance with the natural of language (Kafipour, Mahmoudi, & Khojasteh, 2018). The finding needs further innovation. The critique to the previous studies was placed as the entry point for the development action. In this case, it cannot be denied that the authors still tried to promote their research. They implied the meaning that their research offered the solution of the development problem.

The second disclaim implementation to propose argumentation was that it denied the perfectness of the research object in order to propose the objective view point. The authors admitted that their object was not excellent as the best choice. In fact, they also gave the reasons and background of the choice for the object. It was an effort to place the view point in the objective in order to argue that the idealism should be settle with the reality. It implied the message that there were no single factor to determine the quantity and quality of the research object. The finding was also compatible with Križan (2016) who found various types of attitude in the social interaction in the British advertisement. Sometimes, the idealism must be adapted with the field condition that the context of use and readers or interlocutors must be considered. The argumentation building in this case was to take the readers' tolerance if the object was justified as imperfect.

The last implementation of denial of the object 3 was to describe the lack of the research process by arguing the time restriction as the cause. The soft denial was the effort to communicate the cause of the lack of the process. It also proposed the implicit meaning that the authors actually could give better result, but it was limited by the restriction of time. It was a logic explanation for the reason of the lack. In this finding, the authors did not have purpose to get the readers' tolerance, but they tried to give empiric and logic explanation based on the objective situation. The logic explanation could be proposed by using the appropriate discourse markers that was successfully conducted by (Shakarami et al., 2016). The argumentation could be understood easily

because it lacks of over personal view point. The explanation was given directly.

CONCLUSIONS

The disclaim statement or expression to argue an idea or fact had some implementations. The disclaim statement does not always contain negative meaning and purpose. The application of disclaim statement needs deep consideration especially for the impact of the statement. The speakers or writers must understand that disclaim is fragile to decrease object, process, result, or participant. It was recommended to consider the effect first before stating the disclaim statement although for the positive purpose. The disclaim statement could be applied as a strategy to give implicit attitude and meaning in communication. In addition, the disclaim expression should consider the aspect of social value because every language could have different ethic rule for the use of negative linguistic expression. The knowledge and skill of communication holds important rule to control the application of negative linguistic statement.

REFERENCES

- Ağçam, R. (2015). Author Stance in Academic Writing: A Corpus-Based Study on Epistemic Verbs. *The Journal of Teaching English for Specific and Academic Purposes*, 3(1), 9–20.
- Bahaziq, A. (2016). Cohesive Devices in Written Discourse: A Discourse Analysis of a Student's Essay Writing. *English Language Teaching*, 9(7), 112–119.
<https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v9n7p112>
- Çakır, H. (2016). Native and Non - Native Writers' Use of Stance Adverbs in

- English Research Article Abstracts. *Open Journal of Modern Linguistics*, 6, 85–96.
<https://doi.org/10.4236/ojml.2016.62008>
- Cüneyt Demir. (2017). Lexical collocations in English: a comparative study of native and non-native scholars of English. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 13(1), 75–87.
- Dey, I. (2005). *Qualitative Data Analysis: A User-Friendly Guide for Social Scientists*. New York: Taylor & Francis.
- Gulliver, T., & Thurrell, K. (2016). Denials of Racism in Canadian English Language Textbooks. *TESL Canada Journal*, 33(10), 42–61.
<https://doi.org/10.18806/tesl.v33i0.1244>
- Hu, C., & Li, Y. (2015). Discourse Connectives in L1 and L2 Argumentative Writing. *Higher Education Studies*, 5(4), 30–41.
<https://doi.org/10.5539/hes.v5n4p30>
- Kafipour, R., Mahmoudi, E., & Khojasteh, L. (2018). The Effect of Task-Based Language Teaching on Analytic Writing in EFL Classrooms. *Cogent Education*, 5, 1–16.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2018.1496627>
- Khojasteh, L., & Kafipour, R. (2012). Are Modal Auxiliaries in Malaysian English Language Textbooks in Line with Their Usage in Real Language? *English Language Teaching*, 5(2), 68–77. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v5n2p68>
- Križan, A. (2016). The Social Aspect of the Discourse-Semantic Appraisal Model in British Advertisements: The Category of Attitude. *Jezikoslovlje*, 17(3), 643–665.
- Liping, C. (2017). Analyzing Interpersonal Metafunction through Personal Pronouns in Song Ci Jiang Cheng Zi. Ji Meng. *Studies in English Language Teaching*, 5(1), 71–76.
<https://doi.org/10.22158/selt.v5n1p71>
- Mack, N., Woodsong, C., MacQueen, K. M., Guest, G., & Namey, E. (2005). *Qualitative Research Methods: A Data Collector's Field Guide*. Research Triangle Park, North Carolina: Family Health International.
- Martin, J. R., & White, P. R. R. (2005). *The Language of Evaluation Appraisal in English*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Öztürk, Y., & Köse, G. D. (2016). Turkish and Native English Academic Writers' Use of Lexical Bundles. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 12(1), 149–165.
- Shakarami, A., Hajhashemi, K., & Caltabiano, N. (2016). Digital Discourse Markers in an ESL Learning Setting: The Case of Socialisation Forums. *International Journal of Instruction*, 9(2), 167–182.
<https://doi.org/10.12973/iji.2016.9212a>
- Theodore, I. (2013). An Appraisal of Students' Errors in English Compositions: Implications for the Open and Distance Learning Classroom. *International Journal of English and Literature*, 4(10), 516–522.
<https://doi.org/10.5897/IJEL2013.0455>
- Ye, R. (2010). The Interpersonal Metafunction Analysis of Barack Obama's Victory Speech. *English Language Teaching*, 3(2), 146–151. Retrieved from www.ccsenet.org/elt