

victim about to make her journey to death, as his first sentences in excerpt 5. He explains it well. But Asanuma still denies it with a fact she can use to defend herself, that is by throwing a question in order to resist all Mouri's explanations. There is a fact where the whiskey is brought by the victim when Mouri and Asanuma have a drink together. Hence, she chooses 'challenge' to disagree. She asks the question that is asking the fact about whiskey which is brought by the victim. When they have a drink, there is someone who brings the whiskey. But, in the fact, it is a doll used by her to create an illusion that the victim is alive. Hence, she wants to bring the fact that the victim is alive at that time. By that question, it can break Mouri's claim stating that the victim is already dead.

All in all, the 3 excerpts of the 'challenge' type shown above can represent all the data that contain this type, challenge. The villains tend to use it because they want to ask the way or the tricks can be done as the interlocutor proposes, when actually they have a perfect alibi, as shown in excerpt 3. The other reason is to ask where the proof of the accusation is, as shown in excerpt 4. Since a proof is indeed important key to accuse and arrest a villain, so the villains would like to keep defending their self until the proof is found. The next reason is to ask a neglected fact that can resist or broke the interlocutor's claims as in excerpt 5. The villains will always try to find the neglected fact that they still have to be asked. They will expect that the detective will not be able to answer it.

existence of the witnesses, as he only informs a fact which can prove that he is innocent. As in the characteristics of 'counterclaim' that the speaker provides an alternative claim and/or reason for why she/he disagrees, which invites negotiation of the previous claim by opening up the topic of discussion rather than closing it down. Saneto chooses to give a reason and opens up the discussion about the witnesses he talks about. Therefore, Mouri begins to talk over one of the witnesses, Conan, and what actually happens between Saneto and the witnesses.

For Saneto's counterclaim number 2 and 3, they are similar in form that there is a preface in the beginning of the sentence. They are "Alright, even if what you said was true" and "You can say that". They are used to be prefaces before he starts his argument, and can be considered as partial agreement. He seems to agree at the first time, but then he continues his actual argument by saying "but" as the conjunction. He agrees at the first time only to indicate his indirectness when saying disagreement, then he says "but, I have an alibi" in number 2 that opens up the discussion again. Since he brings up his alibi, Mouri must explain how the crime is done when the culprit has an alibi. For number 3, he continues by saying "but you can't do anything in 3 minutes". At the first time, he agrees and admits that there is a time which is for 3 minutes the children do not see him. But he, then, delivers his disagreement that neither he nor other persons can do anything in 3 minutes, especially to kill someone. He impliedly states that he has no time to kill the victim.

brakes. It also makes Kurumatani appears to be unable to plan or do anything about the accident.

Excerpt 13

Kudo Shinichi: The person who killed Tatsuya-san is you, his manager, Tarehara Mari-san!

*Terahara Mari :**That's nonsense. Since when Tatsuya collapsed in this room, I was on the phone that's outside of this room.***

Kudo Shinichi: You were able to poison him even without being in that room as long as you made him sing this song. [Eps.42/P.19]

Teramahari directly disagrees by using ‘contradiction’ when she is accused as the culprit of the case. There is a word “nonsense” to contradict Mouri’s accusation. Then, her utterance is followed by ‘counterclaim’. She presents a reason why she contradicts or disagrees and saying that Mouri’s utterances are nonsense, that is she has an alibi when the crime happens. When Tatsuya, the victim, collapses due to poison, she is not in the room with the victim. She is outside of the room and is on the phone. She wants to prove that she can do nothing to him. Hence, she states that Mouri’s accusation is nonsense.

It can be concluded that the villains tend to use this type of disagreeing strategies that is counterclaim to give a reasonable disagreement. They present the reason after disagreeing and deny the interlocutor’s previous claim in order to strengthen their disagreement. They want to prove that they are innocent, have an alibi, or can do nothing to the victim.

Excerpt 24 is from an interesting episode. It is about a female villain named Hatsuha Toba who murders 4 persons, and one of them is her half-blood sister, Moyona. She also attacks her own boss who is a director. She makes her murderer scene into her planning. She makes Moyona to appear as the culprit who attacks other victims, and she makes herself as the culprit who attacks Moyona. It is in order to make her attack appear to be a self-defense against Moyona. But Mouri knows that she is the true culprit, and he knows all her tricks. As in his first utterance in the excerpt 24, he states that Hatsuha stabs Moyona. Hatsuha directly disagrees by giving 'challenge' to ask about another fact that is about the wound of the director, since actually his wound is matching with a tool held by Moyona, not held by Hatsuha. As her next utterance which is 'counterclaim', she states that the tool is a chisel. Her 'counterclaim' strengthens her 'challenge'. It implies that the one who attacks the director and the other victim is Moyona, because the tool of the murder is a chisel that held by Moyona herself. By giving her 'challenge' and 'counterclaim', she wants to deny that she can kill Moyona intentionally as Mouri claimed, and makes Moyona appear to be the real culprit.

Therefore, 'counterclaim' in this type used to make the 'challenge' cannot be answered easily by the interlocutor. It will make the interlocutor's accusation appears to be wrong, if he/she cannot answer it. The counterclaim used to propose a fact that supports the challenge, such as in Hatsuha's disagreements. She wants to ask about the director's wound. Then, she proposes a reason that the wound is by a chisel.

evidence about the delivery person Prof. Agasa talks about. He shows his 'contradiction' by saying a negated utterance of Prof. Agasa. There is "no" in his utterance to represent his 'contradiction' about the existence of the delivery person. He wants to make Prof. Agasa appears to be wrong in seeing the delivery person. He continues his disagreement by stating 'counterclaim'. He explains a reason and a fact through it. He explains that there are other persons who have the same hair style as him, and the delivery person can be one of his fans. It implies that he cannot be the culprit if it is due to the hair style, since other people have the same hair as him. It also implies that it is not a strong evidence to accuse Satan as that delivery person. He does not stop there. He continues his disagreement again by stating 'challenge'. He asks if he is the culprit then how he will reapply his makeup. In the story, Satan always uses unique makeup that makes him different from other people. Satan uses it as an alibi. If he is the culprit, he will be recognized by other people if he walks out of his room to kill the victim in his room. If he erases his makeup, he cannot reapply it since there is no mirror in his room, and his manager just buys it after the murder happens. Therefore, he uses that fact to ask how he can reapply his makeup in that state. He wants to show that he cannot be the culprit due to his makeup.

4.1.2 The Similarities and the Differences of Male and Female Villains in Applying Disagreeing Strategies

As mentioned in the background of the study, it is worth to analyze the differences between male and female villains, since many studies had analyzed the differences between men and women, yet there is a different result. This study is

Excerpt 26

Mouri Kogoro: Yeah, but if he had woken up in the dark, he wouldn't have noticed that he was in someone else's room. That's how he got Yoshimura-san to jump from the window, and die in the process.

Ueda Jouji : Please, wait a minute! When Yoshimura fell, I was right there with you Mouri-san.[Eps.232/P.3]

Ueda Jouji is a male villain. His counterclaim is an example of clarification. When Mouri gives deduction about the trick Ueda uses to kill the victim, Ueda tries to deny by saying a clarification. He states “wait a minute”, and clarifies that he is with Mouri when the victim falls. It implies that he cannot murder the victim because he is not in the victim's place. He wants Mouri to recall that he is with him. He clarifies it in a case that Mouri forgets if he is with him. He disagrees impliedly by ‘counterclaim’ through clarification.

Excerpt 27

Mouri Kogoro : Earlier, it was you who suggested Yuuka-san would have a spare key. But you didn't ask Yuuka-san when you couldn't get the door open.

Katsugi Kensuke: That's because I was in a bit of a panic and hurrying.[Eps.512/P.6]

Katsugi Kensuke, a male villain, utters his ‘counterclaim’ by stating a reason. He proposes a reason of his actions which is being pointed out by Mouri as a strange action. Mouri thought that Katsugi intentionally does not want to get the door open by spare key. Katsugi disagree about it impliedly by stating his reason why he does not ask for the spare key. There is a word “because” in his utterance to indicate that he wants to propose his reason why he does the thing Mouri talks about.

disagreement by stating 'counterclaim'. He explained a fact that he is the one who buys the newspaper to support his sentence that Hiroko does not come to Fukushima. It implies that Hiroko does not buy the newspaper, and she does not go to Fukushima. It strengthens his 'contradiction'.

Thus, 'contradiction followed by counterclaim' can be considered as a direct disagreement. It is due to the position of 'contradiction' that is placed in the beginning of the sentence. It makes the speaker appear to disagree directly and explicitly without mitigating his disagreement. Even though, there is 'counterclaim' that is from indirect disagreement, but 'counterclaim' used next for presenting the reason for why the speaker disagreed. It strengthens the contradiction. The directness or indirectness of the type is shown in the beginning of the sentence or in the first disagreement, as the examples shown above. The second disagreement uttered next is for supporting the first disagreement.

Meanwhile, 'counterclaim followed by contradiction' can be considered as indirect disagreement. 'Counterclaim' is uttered first, and then continued by 'contradiction'. Since 'counterclaim' is placed in the beginning of the disagreement, the disagreement seems to be mitigated. The speaker uses this type to propose a reason or a fact. It impliedly shows the disagreement. The speaker does not state disagreement explicitly or directly. Especially, the 'counterclaim' appears with a preface. It can indicate the politeness shown by the speaker; because the preface can be a partial agreement used by the speaker before stating his/her real statement. 'Contradiction', then, is used to express that the speaker disagree after proposing

contradiction followed by counterclaim. (Behnam and Nirooman, 2011:208). The taxonomy is completed with 5 types of disagreeing strategies.

This present study finds new types of disagreeing strategies beside those 5 types. They are 6 new types from male villains and 4 new types from female villains. Those types do not exist in the taxonomy of Muntigl and Turnbull (1998), and can be considered as the new results from this study. They are the combination of the 5 types in the taxonomy. They are (1) counterclaim followed by contradiction, (2) irrelevancy claim followed by counterclaim, (3) contradiction followed by challenge, (4) counterclaim followed by challenge, (5) challenge followed by counterclaim, and (6) contradiction + counterclaim followed by challenge. The 2 types which are not found in female villains' utterances are irrelevancy claim from the taxonomy, and contradiction + counterclaim followed by challenge from the new result of this present study.

As the title suggests, both of male and female villains do use various types of disagreeing strategies. They always try to defend themselves by disagreeing with all claims uttered by the interlocutor. The Muntigl and Turnbull taxonomy do not catch up the villains' disagreements. They like to use 2 types combined in one. Because of that, the new types appear in this present study. As explained beforehand, the new types are from the combination of the 2 types, such as counterclaim which is followed by challenge. Those two types are from the taxonomy, and combined into one type by male and female villains, and then become a new type of disagreeing strategy. They want to make strong disagreement which can be denied easily by the

interlocutor, since they really do not want their crime to be uncovered. Suryanto stated in Destiyani's study (2011:4) that villains have different characteristics and thought than other people. They tend to be brave, expert in manipulating, and have more power. They are also weak in controlling emotion (Destiyani, 2011). In this study, the villains are brave to always state their disagreements. It is proven by the new types which occur in this study. They are in danger situations which push them to state strong disagreement in order to keep their crime. If they state a weak disagreement which can be denied, their crime can be revealed by the detective. Therefore, they state a strong disagreement by combining 2 types of disagreeing strategies.

The researchers of the previous studies about disagreeing strategies typically used 5 types of the taxonomy to analyze the data. Behnam and Niroomand (2011), Sofwan and Suwignyo (2011), Fahaarani and Molkizadeh (2013), Bavarsad *et al.* (2015), Heidari *et al.* (2015), Nourozi (2015), and Sadrameli and Haghverdi (2016) found all the 5 types in their study. They did not find new types as found in this present study. The results of those previous studies only show the existences of the 5 types of disagreeing strategies. Hence, the 6 new types can be considered as the new result that can enrich the previous taxonomy.

The next point which needs to be discussed is from the findings of the second research question. The second finding has a relation with the study about gender, since it explains about the similarity and the difference between male and female villains in applying disagreeing strategies. As mentioned in the background of the

study, there is a different result shown by previous studies in the case of gender. The result from the study by Kozcogh (2012) shows that female participants favored more direct strategies such as contradiction than male participants did. It is confirmed by the study from Faharani and Molkizadeh (2013). Their study showed no highly statistical differences between using politeness strategies in disagreement and gender. The result shows that male and female participants of the study used all kinds of strategies nearly the same.

The findings of this present study show different result. As in the finding of the second research question about the differences between male and female villains in applying disagreements, it shows that male villains tend to use direct disagreements such as contradiction, contradiction followed by challenge, and contradiction followed by counterclaim. Female villains tend to use indirect disagreements such as counterclaim, counterclaim followed by challenge, and counterclaim followed by contradiction. They favor using counterclaim as the first disagreements. In order to get the differences of male and female in choosing disagreeing strategies, the comparison of each percentage from each type of male and female villains and the classification of direct and indirect disagreements is made and presented. It can be seen in figure 4.4. There are 8 direct disagreements and 3 indirect disagreements. Male villains favor 6 direct disagreements of 8 direct disagreements. Female villains favor all 3 indirect disagreements.

Referring to figure 4.3, the differences of male and female villains can be seen clearly. It refutes Kozcogh (2012) and Faharani and Molkizadeh (2013) results. While

Kozcogh (2012) stated that female participants in his study favored more direct disagreeing strategies such as contradiction, in this present study, the ones who favor more direct strategies such as contradiction are the male villains with the percentage 21.4%. Meanwhile female villains' percentage only reach a half of male villains' that is 10.4%. Female villains favor for using counterclaim. It indicates that female villains is more polite in choosing disagreeing strategies, since by counterclaim, disagreeing strategies can be mitigated by using partial agreement or positive markers.

The results of this present study strengthen the results from some recent studies which are conducted by Bavarsad *et al.* (2015), Aisyah (2015), and Heidari *et al.* (2015). They show that women tended to be indirect, polite and cautious in expressing disagreements. Female participants in their study favored more counterclaim than male participants did. In the result of Bavarsad *et al.* (2015), the percentage of counterclaim from their female participants is 14.22%, and male participants' is 12.22%. Female participants have the higher percentage. Aisyah's (2015) study shows the same result. Female students in her study tended to use counterclaim more frequently than male did. Male students used contradiction strategy more often than female. Heidari *et al.* (2015) presents some situations using DCT in his study, and in most of the situations, female students used more counterclaim as well. In one of the situations that is disagreement to the professor, female students' counterclaim reaches 46%. Meanwhile, female students' counterclaim reaches only 18%. This present study has the same result as these 3

previous studies. Male villains have the higher percentage in contradiction as in the study of Aisyah (2016) indicating that they favor contradiction more than female villains do. Female villains favor counterclaim as well as women in the previous studies by Bavarsad *et al.* (2015) and Heidari *et al.* (2015).

Thus, this present study adds new results in the taxonomy of disagreeing strategies and in the field of gender. It is in the same side with the previous studies which have a result that women are more polite in choosing disagreement, since they favor counterclaim than men. It is as Holmes (1992) stated that women are more linguistically polite than men, and as cited in Rohmah (2011) that women speech could be considered as being indirect. Counterclaim is the type which indicates indirectness in disagreement. This study strengthens the result of previous studies which stated that women are more indirect in expressing disagreement.