Chapter 5: Conclusion

The purpose of this chapter is to provide general conclusion about the results of the study. Moreover, from the analysis, this chapter also presents the recommendation for English department in terms of lecturers, students, and further researchers.

Conclusion

Based on the students' creative writing, it can be seen that from 8 students, the participants mostly used figurative language in their creative writing. The participants are mostly used figurative language in their creative writing in order to describe the situation and to describe the writers' feelings.

According to Abrams theory of figure of speech I found there are 23 data of figurative language, whereas the non-figurative language I only found 6 data of non-figurative languages. It can be concluded that, English department students which is dominated by the left hemisphere (Juliandini, 2013) they have sufficient creativity to produce the figurative language which is the language in the right hemisphere. Surprisingly, this research is in contrast to Juliandini, (2013) who stated that English department students have insufficient creativity to produce figurative language, in fact the English department students have sufficient creativity to produce figurative language because from the analysis English students mostly used figurative language in creative writing.

However, it can be shown from 8 students, there are 6 students who can produce the figurative language. From the analysis, it can be drawn that English department students are tend to produce figurative language in creative writing. It means that, the data shows the students of English department are tend to produce the literary language in creative writing.

Recommendation

From the analysis, this study addresses some recommendation that might be taken as consideration for some aspects.

1. For lecturer, in teaching and learning process it is essential for the lecturer to teach creative writing because students not only taught academic writing but also they need creative writing in order to improve their creative language. Moreover, it is necessary if creative writing can be integrated with the syllabus of writing subject.

2. For students, since the finding have described about students language in creative writing thus, this study can be essential for the students to understand their language characteristic in order to help them in enriching their ability in writing particularly in creative writing in building up their creative thinking and their language whether they tend to produce the figurative language or non-figurative language. It is better if the students could consider their ability in language.

3. For further researcher, the suggestion addresses for further researcher that researchers can use componential analysis theory in order to analyze the meaning. To understand whether figurative language or non- figurative language, the context in which it occurs also needs to be examined closely. It is because figures of speech cannot be understood literary. To find the meaning, needs some understandings and steps. Researchers can also conduct research on creative writing, because see that object of the study particularly in linguistic mostly used are novels, poem, or movie script and other literary work. So, the readers can understand the figurative language and non-figurative language, not only in a literary work but also in any kind of writing; creative writing. Furthermore the readers also can be used this study as a new reference in linguistic study and to create other research in linguistic particularly creative writing as an object of study.

4. For English department, since in English Department has 3 major subjects namely English Language Teaching, Literature and Linguistics so that it is better to integrated creative writing among the three majors. For instance, in Literature major particularly in poem subject, English department students not only to ask to create a poem but also they need to understand their poem deeply linguistically. See that English department students have different characteristics, some students are tend to produce figurative language meanwhile the others are tend to produce non-figurative language.

References

Abrams, M.H. (1999). *A Glossary of Literary Terms (Seventh Edition).* The United States of America: Heinle & Heinle

Ahmad, J. (2012). *Stylistic Features of Scientific English: A Study of Scientific Research Articles.* Saudi Arabia: English Language and Literature Studies, Jeddah Community College

Alexander, L. et al. (1992). *Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English.* London: Longman.

Aribowo, L. (2008). *Memetakan kemampuan berbahasa pada otak manusia.* Departemen Sastra Indonesia: Fakultas Ilmu Budaya, Universitas Airlangga

Beebe, L. M, Takahashi, T. (1989). *"Do you have a bag?": Social status and patterned variation in second language acquisition discourse and pragmatics.* Clevedon, UK: Multilingual

Bowdle, B. F, Gentner, D. (2005). *The career of metaphor. Psychological review*, *112*, 193–216. doi:10.1037/0033-295X.112.1.193.

Brown, H. D. (2007). *Prinsip pembelajaran dan pengajaran bahasa.* Jakarta, Indonesia: Pearson Education

Chaer, A. (2009). *Psikolinguistik: Kajian Teoretik.* Jakarta: Rineka Cipta

Corbin, J. & Strauss, A. (2008). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory (3rd ed.).* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Creswell. (2009). *Research design qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches.* London: London Sage Publication

Crystal, D. (1992). *The Cambridge encyclopedia of language.* New York: Cambridge University Press

Crystal, D. (1991). *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetic*. Cambridge: Basil Blackwell Ltd.

De Beaugrande. (1993). *Closing the gap between linguistics and literary study: Discourse analysis and literary theory.* New York: Longman Group UK Limited

Djajasudarma, T, F. (2010). *Metode linguistic: Ancangan metode penelitian dan kajian (edisi ke3).* Bandung: PT. Refika Aditama

Ellis, R. (2008). *The study of second language acquisition (2nd ed).* Oxford: Oxford.

Greene, H. A,& Petty, W. T. (1991). *Developing language skill in the elementary school.* Needham Heights: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.

Jackson, H. (1996). *Words and Their Meaning*. New York: Addison Wesley Longman Inc.

Juliandini, P. (2013). *The Analysis of Hemisphere's Role of English Students in Producing Figurative Language*. Skripsi. Gorontalo: Letters and Culture Faculty, Universitas Negeri Gorontalo

Keraf, G. (2010). *Diksi dan Gaya Bahasa*. Jakarta: PT. Gramedia Pustaka Utama.

Kesuma, T.M. (2007). *Pengantar (Metode) Penelitian Bahasa*. Yogyakarta: Carasvatibooks.

Leech, G. (1976). *Semantics.* Harmondsworth: Penguin Ltd.

Lenneberg. E, H. (1967). *Biological foundations of human language*. New York: John wiley and sons, inc.

Liton. (2009). *Ordinary language and literary language* available on http://universeofenglish.blogspot.com/2009/02/ordinary-language-and-literary-language.html

Lyons, J. R. (2002). *Language and linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lyons, J. R. (1977). *Semantics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lyons, J.R. (1984). *Language and linguistics.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Morley, D. (2007). *Introduction to Creative Writing*. Cambridge University: Cambridge University Press, New York

MOZAIK*:* Jurnal Ilmu Humaniora, Vol. 3, No.1 *Januari - Juni 2008: 1 – 82*

Nida, E. A. (1975). *Componential Analysis of Meaning*. Belgium: Mouton.

Oxford Advanced Learners Dicitonary 8th Edition

Poedjosoedarmo, Soepomo. (2001). *Filsafat Bahasa*. Surakarta: Muhammadiyah
University Press.

Prakaimas in Bernard, (1981). *Unit 2 The Language of Creative Writing* available on
http://english.chass.ncsu.edu/creativewriting/

Qualitative Research Journal, Vol. 9, no. 2, 2009

Rapley, T. (2007). *Doing conversation, discourse and document analysis*. London:
Sage.

Reyes, A. (2012). *Linguistic-based Patterns for Figurative Language Processing:
The Case of Humor Recognition and Irony Detection.* Thesis.
Departamento de Sistemas Inform´aticos y Computaci´on, Universitat
Polit`ecnica de Val`encia

Richards, J. C, Schmidt, R. (2002). *Longman dictionary of language teaching and
applied linguistics (3rd ed)*. London: Pearson educated limited.

Theory and Practice in Language Studies, Vol. 2, No. 8, pp. 1762-1766, August 2012
© 2012 ACADEMY PUBLISHER Manufactured in Finland.
doi:10.4304/tpls.2.8.1762-1766

Wehebrink, K. (2013). *Laterality in metaphor processing: A unique role of the right
hemisphere?*. Thesis. Netherlands: Cognitive Psychology and
Ergonomics University of Twente