CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

5.1 Conclusions

The function of a language as an interpersonal means that language is used to enable one to participate in communicative acts with another, to take on roles and to express and understand feelings, attitudes, judgements and to exchange their experience each other. This interpersonal function pours out through the elements that participated in the interaction.

Based on the findings as presented in previous chapter, conclusions are drawn as the following.

(1) Linguistically, speech functions in classroom are coded into the form of Moods: declarative, elliptical declarative, interrogative, imperative, and modulated interrogative, both in unmarked and marked structures. The moods used in giving response to types of speech function are declarative mood and elliptical declarative mood.

(2) At lexicogrammar level the four speech functions in initiating are coded as follows: statement coded by declarative mood, question coded by interrogative mood and modulated interrogative mood, offer coded by declarative mood, and command coded by imperative mood.

(3) In the proportion of speech functions used by teacher and students are: calling & response to calling, greeting & response to greeting, exclamation

& response to exclamation, statement & acknowledge statement, question & response statement to question, offer & acknowledge offer, and command & response offer to command. The dominant speech functions used by them are statement and questions. The most dominant types of speech function used by teacher is question (27.91%), while the most dominant type of speech function used by student is statement (46.21%). This happens because both of teacher and students seek and need information and knowledge. Both of teacher and students play an important role in interaction in classroom. In giving response to the speech functions used by teacher in classroom, teacher gave response to greeting, question, and command. There were not response to calling and exclamation because teacher did not use calling and exclamation in giving response to the speech functions used by students in classroom, students gave response to greeting and question. There were no response to calling, exclamation, and command. Because students did not use calling, exclamation, and command.

5.2 Suggestions

In line with the findings, suggestions are staged as follows

(1) It is suggested that all elements of classroom (teacher and students) should know the interpersonal coding in order to avoid misunderstanding with one another in classroom interaction.

(2) All elements of classroom are suggested to use speech functions well, because using speech functions enable speakers and listeners to express their needs and messages and to give information clearly.

(3) It is worthy to suggesting to other researchers related with speech functions to do further studies from the perspectives or theories of other linguistic field.

REFERENCES

Argyle, M. 1988. *Bodily Communication*. In Robinson, H. A. 1994. *The Ethnography of Empowerment. The Transformative Power of Classroom Interaction*. The Palmer Press. Washington, D.C. London.

Berry, M. 1981. *Systemic Linguistics and Discourse Analysis*. Prentice-Hall. New York

Bloom, D and Stephanie Power Carter. 2005. *Discourse Analysis and The Study of Classroom Language and Literacy Events. A Micro Ethnographic Perspective*. New Jersey. London.

Bloor, T. & M. Bloor. 1995. *The Functional Analysis of English*. A Hallidayan Approach. Oxford University Press. London.

Bogdan, R.C & S. K. Biklen. 1992. *Qualitative Research for Education. An Introduction to Theory and Methods*. The 2nd Edition. Boston.

Cegale, D.J. 1981. *An elaboration of the Meaning of Interaction Involvement*. New York: Moughton.

Coulthard, M. 1998. *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis*. The 4th Impression. London.

Dalrymple, M; Ronald M. K; John. T. Maxwell. 1995. *Formal Issues in Lexical – Functional Grammar*. Stanford. California.

Denzin, N. K. 1978. *The Research Act*. In Sibarani, B. 2004. *Qualitative Research in Linguistics and Language Teaching*. Medan: Graduate Program State University of Medan (unpublished).

Eggins, S. 2004. *An Introduction to Systemic Functional Linguistics*. Continuum. New York. London.

Freire, P. 1970. The Pedagogy of the Oppressed. In Robinson, H. A. 1994. *The Ethnography of Empowerment. The Transformative Power of Classroom Interaction*. The Palmer Press. Washington, D.C. London.

Gagnon, G. W & Michelle Collay. 2001. *Designing for Learning*. New York: Academic Press.

Gee, J. P. 1999. *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis: Theory and Method.* London.

Green, K & Jill Le Bihan. 1996. *Critical Theory and Practice: A Course Book. Routhledge.* New York.

Halliday, M.A.K. 1985. *Introduction to Functional Grammar.* London.

Halliday, M.A.K. 1994. *Functional Grammar.* Oxford University Press. London.

Hornby. As. 2000. *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary.* Oxford University Press. London.

Lamy, M.N and Regina Hanpel. 2007. *Online Communication in Language Learning and Teaching.* Palgrave Macmillan. New York.

Lock, G. 2002. *Fuctional English Grammar.* University Chicago Press.Chicago.

Martin, J.R. 1992. *System and Structure.* Philadelpia. Amsterdam.

Meyers, C. 2002. *Some Basic Rules for Consistently Encouraging Student Interaction.*

Perangin-angin, S. 2006. *Speech functions of men and women in Business Transaction in the Traditional Markets.* Unpublished Master of Humaniora Thesis. English Applied Linguistics Study Program. Medan: Post Graduate School, State University of Medan.

Patterson, M.L. 1983. Non Verbal Behavior. In Robinson, H. A. 1994. *The Ethnography of Empowerment. The Transformative Power of Classroom Interaction.* The Palmer Press. Washington, D.C. London.

Purba, L. 2008. *Interpersonal Meanings: Speech Functions in Court Room Texts.* Unpublished Master of Humaniora Thesis. English Applied Linguistics Study Program. Medan: Post Graduate School, State University of Medan.

Robinson, H. A. 1994. *The Ethnography of Empowerment. The Transformative Power of Classroom Interaction.* Washington, D.C. London

Saragih, A. 2004. *Discourse Analysis. A Systemic Functional Approaches to the Analysis of Texts.* Faculty of Language and Arts. The State University of Medan.

Saragih, A. 2004. *Bahasa Dalam Konteks Sosial*. Faculty of Language and Arts. The State University of Medan.

Schleppegrell, M.J. 2004. The Language of Schooling. A functional Linguistics Perspective. University of California, Davis. London.

Searle, J. R. 1980. *Speech Function*. An Essay in the Philosophy of Language . London. Cambridge.

Sembiring, Y. 2007. *Speech Functions in Slogan of Television Advertisement*. Unpublished Master of Humaniora Thesis. English Applied Linguistics Study Program. Medan: Post Graduate School, State University of Medan.

Thompson, G. 1996. *Introducing Functional Grammar*. London.

Thompson, G. 2003. *Communication and Language*. London.

Wetherell, M. 2001. *Discourse Theory and Practice*. London.

Yule, George. 1985. *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge University. London

http://www.high beam.com/doc/1088.classroom interaction.html. Accessed on January 15th, 2010

http://apply.oxford journals.org/cgi/pdf-extract/5/2/156. Accessed on January 16th, 2010

http://www.bookrags.com/essay.2004/11/10/10654781. Accessed on January 16th, 2010

http://www.encyclopedia.com/doc/1088-classroom interaction.html