

Chapter 5

Conclusion

This chapter presents summary of research findings, implication of the studies and recommendation for further study.

Summary

This research is basically intended to investigate a pragmatically verbal bi-directional classroom interaction: how students respond to their teachers' request and/or question, and how teacher may influence the way students respond to theirs. The research question is designed in reverse, in order to comply with the inductive style of the investigation.

Based on the analysis conducted towards the classroom interaction as well as the interview; it is found that the teachers' locution on students' perlocution could be analyzed from the availability and the clarity of the students' response, native language responses delivered in the classroom (in regard of an English-speaking classroom), the use of fillers, confirmation requests, rhetorical questions, and the implicatures (specifically, in form of maxim violations, floutings, and infringements). The result definitely confirms the theoretical framework of this research, which emphasizes that perlocution is indeed the bringing about of effects on the audience by means of uttering the sentence (locution), as written by Austin (cited in Levinson 1983, p. 236). In this research context, basically, a teacher reaps a response (perlocution) according to what is sown by herself

(locution), except in some cases where the unexpected response is caused by the students themselves (for example, among the less-cooperative students).

Meanwhile, the interview conducted toward both English teachers and their students also shows several interesting points that are related to the second research question. It is revealed that physical appearance and grooming, dignity, class handling, teaching method, teaching style, relationship with students, voice quality, consistency upon the pre-set rules (in this context, the full use of English in the classroom, and the willingness to support, are indeed the aspects that influence teachers' locution on students' perlocution. Those result also indirectly goes in-line with the teacher's experience, as it is known that novice teacher tend to trigger more

negative responses from the students when communicating (interacting between each other).

Implications of the Study

The result shown on this research will be beneficial especially to the teachers, as the expected reader segment, in order to help them identify what actions that may contribute either positively or negatively in building a smooth verbal interaction.

While labeling whether one particular subject teacher has already established a good or bad interaction is something vague, the researcher leaves the entire judgement to the readers themselves. Instead of labeling their performance, the readers are expected to gain some benefit by selecting what aspects or action that is suitable or useful for their own teaching experiences, then apply it afterwards.

Upon selecting and implementing some appropriate actions that are influential for their interaction, as well as reducing the negative aspect and improving the positive aspects, teachers are expected to indirectly able to communicate well with the students and correctly identify their learning needs. This research, on the other hand, also warn the teachers that even a simplest action or personal aspect may contribute in the way students cooperate with them; therefore, upon reading this research, they are also expected to do a self-review on their classroom verbal interaction been performed this far.

Recommendations for Further Study

More following researches elevating similar topic with more specific focus is really suggested, due to the fact that this research has been conducted in a broad and much general scope. Similar investigation focusing in non-verbal communication is the research gap left by this current research, waiting to be conducted by the following researches. As written in the previous chapter, the researcher also encourages further research focusing on the relationship between linguistic performance and competence, in relation to the locution and perlocution to confirm whether there is indeed a connection between them, as may be proven in the long-term research result.

Based on the data analysis, it was known that there are inconsistencies between interview and classroom action due to the limited research period and

relatively small number of participants; therefore, in order to prove the result consistency and a more valid result, future researchers are also encouraged to investigate similar topic using more research subjects with longer observation or recording sessions and in more than one institution are suggested. Things to remember, this will possibly be conducted if the researcher is able to patiently allocate more time into the research, with inevitably more budget and excessive administration effort to be completed.

REFERENCES

- Anney, Vicent N. (2014). *Ensuring the quality of the findings of qualitative research: looking at trustworthiness criteria*. Scholarlink Research Institute Journals: Journal of Emerging Trends in Educational Research and Policy Studies. Accessed on Saturday, September 5th 2015 from jeteraps.scholarlinkresearch.org
- Austin, John Langshaw. (1962). *How to do things with words*. London: Oxford University Press
- Batang, Boyet L. (2014). *Communicative competence and language learning styles of prospective teachers of English*. Researchers World
- Brown, H. Douglas. (2007). *Principles of language learning and teaching: fifth edition*. New York: Pearson-Longman
- Choyimah, Nurul. (2012). *Selected reading on pragmatics*. Malang: Brawijaya University
- Cook, Guy. (2003). *Applied linguistics*. New York: Oxford University Press

- Cummings, Louise. (1999). *Pragmatik: sebuah perspektif multidisipliner*. Translated by: Ibrahim, Abdul Syukur. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar
- Cutting, Joan. (2002). *Pragmatics and discourse*. Oxon: Routledge.
- Dresner, Eli and Herring, Susan C. (2010). *Functions of the non-verbal in CMC: Emoticons and Illocutionary force*. Communication Theory: In Press
- Erten, Selcen. *Teaching fillers and students' filler usage: a study conducted at ESOGU preparation school*. International Journal of Teaching and Education, Vol. 2 no. 3.
- Heigham, Juanita and Croker, Robert A. (2014). *Qualitative research in applied linguistics*. UK: CPI Antony Rowe, Chippenham and Eastbourne
- Kaburise, Phyllis. (2011). *Speech Act theory and communication: A univen study*. UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Karatas, Pinar and Karaman, A. Cendel. (2013). *Challenges faced by novice teachers: support, Identity, and pedagogy in the initial years of teaching*. Educational Research Association The International Journal of Research in Teacher Education. Retrieved on Saturday, September 5th 2015 from http://ijrte.eab.org.tr/media/volume4/issue2/p_karatas.pdf
- Keith, Brown. (2005). *Encyclopedia of language and linguistic, second edition, 14-volume set*. Elsevier Science

- Krefting, Laura. (1991). *Rigor in qualitative research: The assessment of trustworthiness*. Retrieved on Wednesday, September 3rd 2015 from <http://ajot.aota.org/data/Journals/AJOT/930283/214.pdf?resultClick=1>
- Kurdghelashvili, Tinatin. (2015). *Speech acts and politeness strategies in an EFL classroom in Georgia*. International Journal of Social, Behavioral, Educational, Economic and Management Engineering Vol:9, No:1, 2015
- Leech, Geoffrey. (1993). *Pragmatics principles*. Jakarta: Universitas Indonesia (UI) Press
- Levinson, Steven C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Nurmasitah, Siti. (2010). *A study of classroom interaction characteristics in a geographic class conducted in english: the case at year ten of an immersion class in SMAN 2 Semarang*. Semarang: Universitas Diponegoro
- Pishghadam, Reza and Kermanshahi, Paria N. (2011). *Speech acts of correction: the way iranian EFL learners correct their teachers*. Theory and Practice in Language Studies, Vol. 1, No. 4, pp. 342-348. Finland: Academy Publisher
- Potts, Chris. (2012). *Conversational implicatures: an Overview*. Stanford.
- Rashidi, Nasser and Rafieerad, Mashid. (2010). *Analyzing patterns of classroom interaction in EFL classroom in*

Iran. The Journal of Asia TEFL, Vol. 7, No. 3, pp. 93-120, Autumn 2010.

Sanchez, Carlos A.G and De Gonzalez, Barbara S.G. (2013). *The impact of teacher-student relationships on EFL learning*. A Columbian Journal for Teachers of English (HOW 20), October 2013.

Seedhouse, Paul. (1996). *Classroom interaction: possibilities and impossibilities*. Oxford University Press: ELT Journal Volume 50/1 January 1996.

Searle, John R. (1976). *Language in society*. Volume 5 Number 1. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Smith, Catherine A et al (2007). *Meeting the demand for TESL/TEFL teachers: An interdisciplinary approach to increasing program accessibility and effectiveness*. USA: Troy University

Thomas, J. (1995). *Meaning in interaction: An introduction to pragmatics*. London: Longman Group Limited

Wardhaugh, Ronald et al. (2015). *An introduction of sociolinguistics*. UK: Wiley Blackwell

Yule, George. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Zayed, Niveen Mohammed. (2014). *Jordanian EFL teachers' and students' practice of speech acts in the classroom*. International Journal on Studies in English Language and Literature (IJSELL) Volume. 2