

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND SUGGESTIONS

6.1 Conclusion

To conclude this research, there are some points:

1. The classroom speech acts during the classroom interaction should be analyzed according to Sinclair and Coulthard's discourse analysis that was developed by Nababan. There are some classroom speech acts found during the interaction in some classes in the English Department, State University of Gorontalo.

A. The Lecturers' speech acts.

- a. The lecturer performed the acts of start, elicit, directive, inform.
- b. Most of the lecturer's acts are directive and elicit, even in the class discussion in which the presenters are the students, the lecturer directed. But in such a discussion, the lecturers mostly elicited, asking some information about the topics being discussed, and directed the students to comment and question.
- c. The lecturers, in responding to the students' contribution, mostly in agreeing, or eliciting.
- d. The data shows that there is an act that is out of Sinclair and Coulthard's discourse analysis, i.e. re-elicite. It is found in the class

Reading for Instructional Design. The lecturer re-elicited the English for the Indonesian word *benua* to enable the students to have the basic vocabulary to find out the main topic of the text being read.

- e. In the very specific context that affected the lecturer's psychological condition, for example when a late student entered the class, or a student doing an irrelevant activity such as playing Facebook, the lecturer performed the acts of anger expressive that is not discussed in Sinclair and Coulthard discourse analysis. This can only be explained by applying Searle's Illocutionary Acts. in terms of Searle's illocutionary act, it is an expressive act.

B. The Students' Response to the Lecturers' Speech Acts

- a. The students responded to the lecturers' speech acts verbally, i.e. by performing speech acts. They performed the elicitation, and confirming, classroom speech acts are categorized into two according to the model of interaction, i.e. the acts performed in-class discussion in which the interaction was lecturer-students and students-students.
- b. When talking to the lecturer, the students played the role of the contributors in the sense that they responded to the lecturer's elicit or directive acts.

- c. When talking to their classmates, the students performed elicit and assertive acts. This happened in the class activities conducted in discussion form.
2. In terms of turn-taking, qualitatively, the students and the lecturers had equal portions as observed by the writer. The lecturers and the students seemed to be interactive in talking. The lecturers performed some acts such as directive, informative, elicitation. The lecturers often directed the students to talk, to ask. However, the quantitative data shows that the lecturers got more portions in talking. This is because the interaction was teacher-students interaction, not multi interaction. Therefore, there was only communication between the lecturers and the students; the lecturers performed some classroom speech acts and the students responded verbally. The students had little chance to communicate with each other. The lecturers, on the other hand, often gave long speeches. As a result, the lecturers got more portions to talk to. This indicates that the learning is still conducted in teacher-centered learning.
3. In terms of discourse analysis discussed by Rymes, there are some conclusions:
 - a. The individual agency, interactional context, and social context affect each other. The affection is in the word choice, the classroom speech acts, and the classroom interaction atmosphere.

- b. The lecturer, as the individual agency, controls the classroom interaction verbally. The way she performed the speech acts affected the students in contributing to the classroom activities. The lecturers, as the individual agency, were affected by the classroom interactional context, and so were the students. It seemed when a late student entered the room, and when a student seemed to ignore the classroom activities, the lecturer performed an illocutionary act that is categorized as expressive: anger; this is not explained by Sinclair and Coulthard.
4. In terms of the effects of the classroom to the classroom interaction, the lecturers controlled the interaction through discourse. When s/he performed an elicitation, for example, and addressed to the whole class, then there was a dialogue between the lecturers and the students. in other words, then a lecturer-students interaction happened; it was found in the classes of Reading for General Communication and Speaking for General Communication. When a lecturer addressed the speech acts, for example, elicitation, to a student then a student-lecturer interaction emerged as found in the class of English Instructional Design.
5. Regarding the lecturers involving students talking, there are some methods applied by the lecturers to involve the students to talk. First, by performing elicitation. In doing the elicitation the lecturer asked some questions to the students and the students replied to them.

Second, by directing the students to talk. Third, by uttering the so-called Designedly Incomplete Utterances to be continued by the students. All of these strategies were successful.

6. In terms of the students' learning, the classroom discourse affected the students' learning. From Bloom's taxonomy point of view, lecturers the speech acts performed by the lecturers reflected the level of the students' cognitive ability. As discussed in chapter II, Bloom proposed a taxonomy of the students' cognitive ability level, i.e. remembering (C1), understanding (C2), applying (C3), analyzing ((C4), evaluating (C5), and creating (C6). The data analysis shows that the speech acts in the classroom interaction are in line with Bloom's taxonomy. The data analysis of the classroom discourse shows that language use in the classroom affects the learning process.

6.2 Pedagogical Implications

There are some pedagogical implications of this research. First, that is of concern with the classroom speech acts. The lecturer/teacher, as the class activities manager, should create a classroom atmosphere in which the students can construct their thought and express it freely. In this sense, Walsh (2002) says that the teacher's role was to facilitate the students in discussing through discourse. The teacher was the facilitator of the discussion to scaffold the student-centered learning in which every student is

free to think and express the idea. In this class, the teacher's role was to build the students' capability to talk by creating a positive interaction. Positive interaction here means the atmosphere the situation in which the students are active to think and to talk. This can be done by doing, first, designing utterances that can encourage the students to think as proposed by Rhymes discussed in chapter II. Therefore, instead of asking technical questions such as in the class English Instructional Design, the lecturer was to ask a question that trigger the students to think of the essence of every step in the Lesson Plan. This would trigger a discussion among the students that leads them to think critically.

Secondly, teachers/lecturers of language, especially that of English should build the classroom interaction to increase the students' linguistic competence and communicative competence. Linguistic competence, as Chomsky said (1972) is the knowledge of the language system. This knowledge is practiced in communication in real interaction. In real communication, the students call the language knowledge stored in their minds to construct the meaning and express it (Thomas 1995).

Third, to involve the students to talk actively, the teacher/lecturers create an atmosphere that enables the students to talk. This can be obtained by creating an interaction in which the students get more chances to talk. This is obtained well by involving the students in discussion. For this purpose, should manage the interaction, s/he should facilitate the students' discussion and

should not play the role as the information source such as answering all the students' questions by himself/herself. S/he had to involve the class to answer a student's question by directing them to try to find the answer by uttering, "Anybody can answer this question?" This is more effective than saying, "Any question?" or "Any comment" after a long lecture. The quantitative data of the talk portion shows us that in the class of Pengantar Pendidikan students' portions of talk are bigger than in the other class. It is because this class is conducted in class discussion.

The paragraph above is to say that like teacher-student interaction, the student-student interaction is also a very important aspect of the learning process. This can increase the outcome of language learning as explained by Walsh (2006) that through interacting with others are learning to understand. Communicative competence, as can be concluded from Bonvillain (2003) is the competence of practicing language knowledge properly. Properly here, according to the researcher's interpretation, means contextual.

Fourth, Still based on the quantity data of the talking portion, the teacher/lecturer should facilitate the interactional space in the sense that students must be given adequate chance to participate in the classroom discourse, to contribute to the classroom conversation, and to receive feedback on their contribution (Walsh, 2006). To contribute here means to perform illocutionary acts such as declaring, informing, affirming, asserting, accepting, rejecting, etc. This is in line with Peng's research findings (2020)

that teacher plays important role in building the students' willingness to communicate. The teacher should create the discourse to affect the interaction in which the learners can increase their critical thinking ability and communicative competence. In the interaction, they can communicate their ideas.

Fifth, during the classroom interaction, the participants, especially the teacher/lecturer should avoid the inappropriate expression of anger. This kind of expression will be a threat to the interaction. In this condition, the students can barely participate in the activities; they cannot express their ideas freely since every utterance of them will be responded negatively by the lecturer as shown by the data found in the class Reading for General Communication.

The last, the teacher/lecturer should optimize the classroom discourse to produce interaction that is conducive to learning (Walsh, 2006). The classroom interaction should be learning-oriented. To obtain the optimal discourse, the teacher/lecturer should optimize the speech act. For instance, as shown by the data analysis, the lecturer re-elicited the same questions when the students did not answer well. The lecturer performed the same illocutionary act in different locutions.

The lecturers should perform the speech acts that trigger the students' cognitive ability. The speech acts should be able to facilitate the students to develop their theoretical and practical knowledge. Furthermore, they must be able to provide the students' critical thinking ability. In other words, in terms of

Krashen's input hypothesis, the lecturers' speech acts must be the input to train the students to have critical thinking ability.

6.3 Suggestions

1. As found in this research that from a discourse and classroom interaction point of view, the learning activities were still in teacher-oriented learning. The lecturers still dominated the class. It is suggested that the students are given more opportunities to express themselves by giving them more opportunities to talk.
2. The lecturer should conduct a positive interaction through classroom discourse. This can be done by producing positive locution when performing a classroom speech act. The lecturer's locutions when expressing anger, i.e. the choice of the word, linguistic form, caused the communication gap between the lecturer and the students. The writer suggests that it is better to perform that directive act, i.e. warning that the students would not do the same mistake, or the lecturer elicits the students the reason for coming late. It will increase the students' communicative competence.

3. It is suggested that the lecturers of the English Department conduct the classroom discourse to build the classroom interaction that can affect the process of learning
4. It is suggested that the lecturers perform the speech acts to enable the students to think critically. The data analysis showed that the lecturers performed the speech acts that triggered the student to apply conceptual knowledge (C3) and analyze a phenomenon (C4) in Bloom's taxonomy. This can be done by asking starting from the remembering ability (C1) and understanding ability (2). Then the lecturer may continue to C3 and C4). The C1 and C2 are the steps of preparing the students to the higher ability.
5. Hopefully, this research will provoke the other researchers to do some further research on the classroom discourse to have a more complete picture of how discourse in the classroom interaction plays role in the learning process.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Anderson, L. W. (2001). *A Taxonomy for Learning, Teaching, and Assessing: A Revision of Bloom's Taxonomy of Educational Objectives*. New York: Longman.
- Austin, J. L. (1975). *How to do Things with Words*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Barbieri, F. (2013). Involvement in University Classroom: Register Variation and Interactivity. *Applied Linguistics*, 1-24.
- Blauw, R. D. (2008). High quality interaction in the classroom: a focus for professional learning. *L1 Educational Studies in Language and Literature* 8, 107-126.
- Brown, G., & Yule, G. (1983). *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cazden, C. B. (2001). *Classroom Discourse: The Language of Teaching and Learning*. Portsmouth: Heinemann.
- Chomsky, N. (1972). *Language and Mind*. San Diego: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Publisher.
- Christie, F. (2002). *Classroom Discourse Analysis: A Functional Perspective*. London: Continuum.
- Christie, F. (2002). *Classroom Discourse Analysis: A Functional Perspective*. London: Continuum.
- Denzin, N. K. (2018). *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research*. Los Angeles: Sage.
- Dijk, T. A. (1993). Principles of critical discourse analysis. *Discourse and Society* vol. 4(2), 249-.
- Donald, S. (2020). Learner Initiatives in the EFL Classroom: a Public/Private Phenomenon. *ELT Journal, Volume 74, Issue 2*, , 136–145.

- Evans, T. P. (1970). Flinders System of Interaction Analysis and Science Teacher Effectiveness. *Forty-Third Annual Meeting* (pp. 1-22). Minnesotas: National Assosiation for Research in Science Teacing.
- Fatsah, H. (2008). *Critical Discourse Analysisn on English Communication in the Classroom*. Gorontalo: Gorontalo State University.
- Gebhard, J. G. (2000). *Teaching English as a Foreign Language: A Teacher Self-development and Methodology Guide*. Michigan: The University of Michigan.
- Gee, J. p. (2005). *AN Introduction to Discourse Analysis: Theory and Method*. London: Routledge.
- Geis, M. L. (1995). *Speech acts and conversational interaction*. Cambridge: Cambridge university press.
- Gillian Brown & George Yule. (1983). *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Grundy, P. (2000). *Doing Pragmatics*. New York: Arnold.
- Gündzù, M. (2014). Analyzing languag classrooms through classroom interaction. *International Journal of Huan Science*, 1149-1166.
- Hasanuddin Fatsah. (2008). *Critical Discourse Analysis on English Communication in the Classroom*. Gorontalo: Gorontalo State University.
- Hasanuddin Fatsah. (2008). *Critical Discourse Analysis on English Communication in the Classroom*. Gorontalo: Gorontalo State University.
- Hasanuddin Fatsah. Adriansyah A. Katili, Iman Safiana, Nurwahidah Pido, Dahlia Husain. (2008). *Critical Discourse Analysis on English Communication in the Classroom*. Gorontalo: Gorontalo State University.
- Hidayat. (2009). EFL learners' Communication Obstacles. *Electronic Journal of Social Sciences*, 84-100.

- Hymes, D. (1972). Models of the Interaction of Language and Social Life. In J. J. Hymes, *Directions in Sociolinguistics: Ethnography of Communication* (pp. 35-71). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.
- Hymes, D. (2001). *Foundation in Sociolinguistics, an Ethnographic Approach*. New York: Routledge.
- Hymes, D. (2001). *Foundation in Sociolinguistics: an Ethnographic Approach*. New York: Routledge.
- Hymes, D. (2004). *Ethnography, Linguistics, Narrative Inequality: Toward an Understanding of Voice*. London: Taylor and Francis Ltd.
- Jooneghani, N. S. (July, 2012). Classroom Interaction: Betting A Utopia . *INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL of ACADEMIC RESEARCH Vol. 4. No. 4. , 32-38*.
- Katili, A. A. (2007). *Relevance in arthur miller's drama "death of a salesman": a of based on sperber's and wilson's theory of relevance*. Malang: State University of Malang.
- Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition*. California: Pergamon Press, Inc.
- Kristiina Kumpulainen & David Ray, e. (2002). *Classroom interaction and social learning*. London: Routledge Falmer.
- Kumaravadively, B. (1994). Intake factord and intake processes in adult language learning. *Applied Language Learnings*, 33-71.
- Lerner, G. H. (2004). *Conversation Analysis*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Lincoln, Egon G. Guba & Yvonna S. (1981). *Effective Evaluation*. San Fransisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Locke, T. (2004). *Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Cromwell Press.
- Luisa Molinari, Consuelo Mameli and Augusto Gnisci. (2013). A sequential analysis of classroom discourse in Italian primary schools: The many

- faces of the IRF pattern. *British Journal of Educational Psychology* 83, 2012.
- Luzio, A. d. (2013). Presenting john j. gumperz. In e. a. Susan L Erdmans, *Language and interaction: discussion with john j. gumperz* (pp. 1-6). Philadelphia: John Menjamin B.V.
- Maloch, B. (2002, January/ February/March). Scaffolding Student Talk: One Teacher's Role in Literature Discussion Groups. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 94-112.
- Mayoar, R. M. (2014). Corrective feedback episodes in oral interaction: A comparison of a CLIL and an EFL classroom. *IJES*, vol. 14 (1), , pp. 1-20.
- McCarthy, M. (1991). *Discourse analysis for language teacher*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- McCarthy, M. (1991). *Discourse analysis for language teachers*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Mulyana. (2005). *Kajian Wacana: Teori, Metode, dan Aplikasi Prinsip-prinsip Analisis Wacana*. Yogyakarta: Tiara Wacana.
- Nababan, S. U. (1992). *Psikolinguistik: Suatu Pengantar*. Jakarta: PT Gramedia Putaka Utama.
- Nasser Rashidi & Mashid Rafleerd . (2010). Analyzing patterns of classroom interaction in EFL classroom in iran. *The Journal of Asia TEFL VI 7 no 3*, 93-120.
- Numa Markee, e. (2015). *The handbook of classroom discourse*. Malden: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Park, Y. (2014). The roles of third-turn repeats in two L2 classroom interactional context. *Applied Linguistics*, 145-167.
- Peng, J.-E. (2020). Teacher interaction strategies and situated willingness to communicate . *ELT Journal, Volume 74*, 307-317.

- Petra Armistany, Zamzani. (2019). The Functions of Illocutionary Acts Used by the Teachers in the Classroom Interaction. *Lingua Vol. 14, No. 1*, 187-196.
- Phillip J. Glenn, Curtis D. LeBaron, Jenny Mandelbaum. (2003). *Studies in language and social interaction*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Rahman, A. Q. (2005). *A Pragmatic Study of Indonesian Speakers' Use of Turn-Taking Mechanism in English Conversation* . Makassar: Hasanuddin University.
- Rymes, B. (2008). *Classroom Discourse Analysis: A Tool for Critical Reflection*. Cresskill, NJ: : Hampton Press.
- Searle, J. R. (1985). *Speech Acts*. (A. P. Martinich, Ed.) New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Shui-fong Lam, Y.-k. L.-k. (2009). Classroom discourse analysis and educational outcomes in the era of education reform. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 617-641.
- Sima Sadeghi, Saeed Kitabi, Mansoor Tavakoli, & Mosleem Sadeghi,. (2012). Application of critical discourse analysis (CCDA) in analyzing classroom interaction. *English Language Teaching vol.5*, 166-172.
- Stubbs, M. (1987). *Discourse Analysis: The Sociolinguistic Analysis of Natural Language*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Thibault, P. J. (2003). Contextualization and social meaning-making practices. In e. a. SusanL Erdmans, *Language and interaction: discusion with john gumperz* (pp. 41-62). Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing .B.V.
- Thomas, A. M. (1987). *Classroom Interaction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Thomas, J. (1995). *Meaning in Interaction*. London: Longman.
- Thomas, J. (1995). *Meaning in Interaction: an Introduction to Pragmatics*. London: Longman.

- Tsohatzidis, S. L. (2007). *John Searle's Philosophy of Language: Force, Meaning, and Mind*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Turner, J. H. (1988). *A theory of social interaction*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Walsh, S. (2006). *Investigating classroom discourse*. New York: Routledge.
- Wendi Wampler, e. a. (2012). Reflective discourse techniques: from in-class discussion to out-of-classroom problem solving. *Physics Education Research Conference* (pp. 414-417). Oregon: American Institute of Physics.
- Yu, W. (2009). An Analysis of collegeeEnglish classroom discourse. *Asian Social Science*, 152-159.
- Yule, G. B. (1983). *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Zhang, Y. (2008). Classroom Discourse and Student Learning. *Asian Social Science*, 80-83.
- Ziafar, P. M. (86:2013). Effective factors in interactions within Japanese EFL classrooms. *The Clearing House*, 74–79.