CHAPTER V

In this chapter, the writer will conclude all the analyses that have been analyzed in the previous chapters. Moreover, the writer will give suggestion related to the study.

5.1. Conclusion

This study is the result on the study of Bernard Shaw's Pygmalion which talks about the reader-responses toward the drama. There are several responses and some of them are similar but also different. At the end, not every similar responses given have a same meaning and not every different responses given a different meaning. This answers the new approach, theoretical paradigm by Davis & Womack (2002, 51)

The research shows that there are varieties of responses to textual understanding toward *Pygmalion* in terms of plot, character and setting. In analyzing the climax of the drama, the writer found that 5 of 19 respondents thought that the climax was in positive situation but 14 of 19 participants gave responses that the real climax was in negative situation. The accurate participants who can identify that the climax was when the Eliza knew that she became the bet between Dr. Higgins and Colonel Pickering was only 6 respondents. This finding is also based on Roberts and E. Jacobs (1989) that

there is only always one climax in the story. Other respondents got mistaken the climax because it was so tricky and can be mistaken by when Dr. Higgins was bored with anything. However, when Dr. Higgins was bored, there was no turning point but continued with another conflict which Eliza knew about the bet. Here, the writer found that the turning point was after Eliza knew the bet, she did not believe Higgins and Pickering anymore and chose to leave them.

When the participants were invited to respond to the character of Mr. Higgins, there were a lot of responses about the negative traits rather than the positive traits. Based on the interview conducted, those respondents who gave responses about negative traits said that started from Act 1 in Convey Garden when Dr. Higgins met Eliza, he already showed the rudeness of himself toward others. In addition, beside made responses about negative traits, those 19 respondents also added the positive traits of Dr. Higgins which showed that Dr. Higgins really had a complex personality that made him became the main lead in this Pygmalion Play

In answering the question related to the setting, the respondents predominantly gave responses straight to the point but some of the respondents still missed other aspects of setting. There were also 3 respondents who did not give any responses about the setting in the drama but they gave the explanation of setting itself. The writer did an interview to them but they gave a surprising response that they actually understood the question but they run out

of time to answer. However, other 16 respondents gave a clear response but the only one who was able to answer all aspects of setting was only respondent L.

In term of responding to the social aspect of the drama, most participants had similar responses that people tend to look down others from 'weak' social status. In addition, the participants also stated the gender became the problem in the drama. The reason of that patriarchy was also not different since it was also common to have that point in Indonesia's culture.

From the responses, the writer concludes that the responses commonly produce the same readings because the respondents were culturally and socially live in Indonesia which also give impact to the responses given. However, there are also some different reading but some of them sometimes were not valid and justifiable enough.

To sum up, the various responses to *Pygmalion* commonly produced the similar interpretations because the respondents culturally and socially live in Indonesia which also gave impact to the responses given. However, there are also some of the interpretations seem not valid and justifiable enough.

5.2. Suggestion

The writer suggests that the students better read many dramas and watch them to get some new understanding of human life. A reader will get many benefits and insights about life. In addition, reader-response is a good thing to

be studied. The writer has found that is was interesting to know the responses from other and how the readers thinking.

Since the writer used the theoretical paradigm by Davis & Womack (2002), she only elaborates the responses into the three principles. Hence, the writer would like to suggest that other researchers to research more about reader-response and the reader cognitive thinking deeper than this study. Moreover, it would be better for other researchers to dig deeper other paradigms that have different principles and theories.

Hopefully, by discussing the study, the writes hopes that this study can be beneficial to the readers. Therefore, it still needs further studies for completing the analysis of reader-response. The writer kindly welcomes some suggestions and critics from the readers so that the writer can make a better research.

References

Atmadja, L. K. (2013). *The Real hero in bernard shaw's arms and The Man* (Undergraduate Program, Widya Mandala Catholic University Surabaya).

Abrams, M. H. (1958). *The mirror and the lamp: Romantic theory and the critical tradition* (Vol. 360). New York: Oxford University Press.

Barnet, S., Burto, W.,& Cain, William E. (2007). *Literature for Composition*

Barnett, M. L. (2008). *Constructivism*. The Oxford Handbook of International Security

Beach, Richard. (1993). *A Teacher's Introduction to Reader-Response Theories*.

Bennet, Robert A., & Evans, Verda. (1964). *Types of Literature.* Boston: Gin and Company.

Bloome, D. (1985). "*Reading as A Social Process." Language Arts, 62(2), 134-142*

Davis, T.F., & Womack, K. (2002). *Formalist Criticism and Reader-Response Theory.* Macmillan International Higher Education.

Dervin, D. (1975) *Bernard Shaw: A Psychological Study.* Bucknell University Press

Enciso, P., & Edmiston, B. (1997). Drama and response to literature: Reading the story, re-reading "the Truth.". *Reader response in elementary classrooms: Quest and discovery*, 69-94.

Foster, E.M. (1972). *The Aspect of The Novel.* London: Edward Arnold Publishers

Fowler, R. M. (2001). *Let the reader understand: Reader-response criticism and the Gospel of Mark*. A&C Black.

Freyd, M. (1924). *Introverts and Extroverts.* Psychological review, 31(1), 74.

Gravina, I. (2003). *Eliza doolittle's personality changes in Bernard Shaw's pygmalion* (Undergraduate Program, Widya Mandala Catholic University Surabaya).

Heikkinen, H. (2004). *Serious Playfullness - Drama Education for Teacher.* Vantaa: Dark Oy

https://fs.blog/2018/05/pygmalion-effect/ retrieved on January 6, 2019 18:56

Jarmo, S. (2009). *Drama education in English teaching: A study of drama activities in English language schoolbooks*.

Kennedy, X.J. (1979). *Literature: An Introduction to Fiction, Poetry, and Drama.* Boston: Little Brown Company.

Marshall, C., & Cretchen, Rossman B., (1989). *Designing Qualitative Research.* Newburry Park: Sage Publisher, Inc.

Neuendorf, K.A. (2002). *The Content Analysis Guidebook*. California: Sage Publications, Inc.

Notes, Cliff. (1962). *Pygmalion Notes.* Lincoln: Bethany Station

Potter, Jones L. (1967). *Elements of Literature*. New York: The Odyssey Press, Inc.

Robert, Edgar V & Henry E. Jacobs. (1989). *Literature: An Introduction to Reading and Writing*. Englewood Cliff's New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc.

Rosenthal, R. & Jacobson, L. (1992). *Pygmalion in The Classroom: teacher expectation and pupils' intellectual development.* New York: Irvington

Scholes R., Carl, Klaus H., & Silverman, M. (1978). *Elements of Literature: Essay, Fiction, Poetry, Drama, Film.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Shaw, Bernard. (1957). *Pygmalion.* Longman Green and Co

Susan R. Horton. (1981). *The Reader in the Dickens World (Style and Response)*. Palgrave Macmillan UK

Teeuw, A. (1987) *Sastra dan Ilmu Sastra*, Jakarta, Pustaka Jaya