

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

This chapter is the closing section that contains conclusions and suggestions related to this research. The conclusion contains a summary of the results of the data analysis that has been described in the previous chapter, and answers the research questions. Meanwhile, suggestions are given that are expected to be useful for related parties as well as a reference for further researchers. Thus, this chapter is expected to provide an overview of the research results as a whole.

5.1 Conclusion

Based on the research question number one, the researcher found 185 clauses that contained nine sub-categories of engagement in three opinion articles. There are *Monogloss* in 56 clauses (30.27%) and *Heterogloss: Deny* in 27 clauses (14.59%), *Counter* in 31 clauses (16.76%), *Concur* in 8 clauses (4.32%), *Pronounce* in 4 clauses (2.16%), *Endorse* in 4 clauses (2.16%), *Entertain* in 41 clauses (22.16%), *Acknowledge* in 13 (7.03%), and *Distance* in 1 clause (0.54%). The most frequent number of sub-categories found in the three opinion articles is *Monogloss*. However, *Heterogloss* type dominates with 129 clauses from a total of eight sub-categories when viewed from the type.

Furthermore, there are different functions of each engagement sub-category used by the writers of the articles to answer the second research question include *monogloss* to present a single point of view, *deny* to express denial, *counter* to present two different statements, *concur* to express the author's agreement explicitly, *pronounce* to emphasize the authorial, *endorse* to present a valid proposition, *entertain* to explicitly entertain the reader, *acknowledge* to present the implicit existence of another point of view, and *distance* to present a scare quote. Article one uses *monogloss*, *deny*, *counter*, *concur*, *pronounce*, and *entertain*. Eight sub-categories are used in article two, including *monogloss*, *deny*, *counter*, *concur*, *endorse*, *entertain*, *acknowledge*, and *distance*. Meanwhile, article three only uses *monogloss*, *deny*, *counter*, *endorse*, and *entertain*.

Therefore, the writers in the three opinion articles have different writing styles. The author in the first article expressed more of his statement using *monogloss* because his profession as a teacher is directly related to the topic discussed in his article. The author's experience also influences it in dealing with the problem of students' cellphone use in the classroom. While the authors in articles two and three are non-educators who use more external sources or voices such as *acknowledge* to strengthen their statements and *entertain* to make dialogical space. So, there are differences among these authors in using the sub-categories of engagement and their functions.

5.2 Suggestion

This research has limitations in that it only uses three opinion articles from the same homepage. The researcher limited the number of data sources to achieve the time limit that has been determined to conduct this research. In addition, the three articles discuss the same issue or topic regarding students' cell phone usage in class. The articles talk about whether cellphones are a barrier or a tool when learning in the classroom. However, the authors of the three articles have different professions that influence their writing. So, the researcher only took three opinion articles that were used to examine the sub-categories of engagement and their functions.

The researcher considers it necessary to provide some suggestions that can be taken into consideration by certain parties and further researchers. Readers are also expected to gain knowledge about engagement after reading this study. Therefore, the researcher suggests that further researchers conduct research about engagement on different topics or media of articles, various backgrounds of writers of articles, other genres (news, advertisement, or other texts on social media), or select certain sub-categories of engagement to get deeper research. These suggestions are expected to contribute to the development of studies in the field of systemic functional linguistics, especially engagement as one of the domains in appraisal theory.