# CHARTER

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

### CHAPTER V

# CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

This chapter is presented to give the conclusion of what have been discussed before and give some suggestions for further studies.

#### 5.1 CONCLUSION

There are some words in language that cannot be interpreted at all unless the physical context, especially the physical context of the speaker, is known. These are words such as here, there, this, that, now, then, yesterday, as well as most pronouns, such as I, you, him, her, them.

It is generally believed that perception of and orientation in space are determinant factors in human action and interaction. As such, speech heavily depends on knowledge of the context: Where and When a sentence is uttered, and by Whom. These three dimensions are traditionally seen as the so-called deictic center of all linguistic events, without which no linguistic expression can be properly interpreted.

Deixis usually refers to linguistic components of a discourse that gain their specific meaning from the discourse situation. The word deixis comes from the Greek word deixikos which means "to indicate". Deixis can be defined as reference by means of an expression whose interpretation is relative to the linguistic or extra linguistic context of the utterance, such as who is speaking, to whom, what status the interaction participants have, what relation they have, the

time or place of speaking, the gestures of the speaker, or the current location in the discourse. In linguistic theory, deixis are a class of verbal signs whose reference depends on the speech situation in which they are used and their meaning is occasion-specific.

As mentioned in the previous chapter, this research was carried out to answer three research questions. Concerning the first research question, what deixis were used by English native speakers and students at Self-Access Center, the writer found that English native speakers and students used the three kinds of deixis, person deixis, place deixis, and time deixis.

For person deixis, the deixis I(207) was used most of the time. Followed by you as subject (170), they (96), my (68), we (58), it as subject (32), me (48), them (47), he (43), your (31), you as object (30), their (31), it as object (28), she (17), his (15), him (12), our (12), her (9) us (6).

In this person deixis, endophora/anaphora was used by native speakers with the total number of 811 or 93 %. Meanwhile, exophora was less used by native speakers with the total number of 3 or 0.3 %. Students also used endophora/anaphora with the total number of 144 or 95 %. Meanwhile, exophora was used twice or 1.3 % by the students. Endophora/cataphora was not used by either the native speakers or the students.

The kinds of place deixis used by native speakers were *here* which belonged to proximal with the total number of 32 or 3.6 %; and *there* which belonged to distal with the total number of 7 or 0.8 %. Meanwhile, students used proximal place deixis with the total number of 3 or 1.9 %.

Among the three kinds of deixis, time deixis was less used by both the native speakers and students. The native speakers used time deixis that belonged to at the time of utterance and before the time of utterance with the total number for each time deixis 7 or 0.8 %. Meanwhile, for the time deixis after the time of utterance, the native speakers used it twice or 0.2 % and the students used only before the time of utterance with the total number of 2 or 1.3 %.

The second research question was whether those deixis were used correctly. The writer found that most of the three deixis were used correctly although there were still some deixis that were not used correctly either by the native speakers or the non-native speakers.

For example: I have a friend from America and usually they don't want to come to Indonesia. Actually, the student should have used he or she instead of they to refer to the word a friend.

# Another example:

And then five years later my sister wants to come here. She said God has spoken to come here. This sentence spoken by the native speaker showed that person deixis 'she' which referred to 'my sister' was used correctly.

Concerning the third research question, why such deixis were used by the English native speakers and the students the way they were. Since deixis is a reference that refers to the surrounding situation, the writer concluded that those deixis were used as reference. For example: When did you come to Indonesia? This question was asked by a particular student. Person deixis 'you' in that sentence referred to the native speaker.

The writer found that deixis was mostly used in speech. Therefore, in speaking, the speaker must use deixis (person, place, and time deixis) correctly, accurately, and fluently, otherwise people who listen to him/her will be confused.

When we have known about the definition of deixis, we may think that deixis is a simple matter. However, after having analyzed the deixis in the conversation, the writer found that the deixis matter was not as simple as the writer had thought.

# **5.2 SUGGESTIONS**

In line with the study above, the writer would like to give some suggestions related to this study.

Since deixis always occurs in the teaching learning process, it would be better if deixis is taught to non-native speakers especially English learners or those who study English as their foreign language. For teaching, deixis is used to explain ambiguities. For example:

- 1) That clown is the finest I've ever seen.
- 2) They are fine actors. That clown is the finest I've ever seen.

It can be said that sentence 1) is confusing because it is not mentioned before which clown. However, in sentence 2) 'that clown' becomes clear, that is, the clown who belongs to one of the fine actors.

Deixis can also be applied in translation. In translating, students should know what specific person a deixis refers to. Therefore, deixis is important in translation. Otherwise, students will be confused in referring to certain deixis.

Since deixis is related to cohesion and coherence, it would be better if the discussion about deixis is conducted through pragmatics and discourse analysis. In addition, cohesion needs to be stressed, especially about the distribution of exophora, endhopora, anaphora and cataphora.

REFERENCES



# REFERENCES

- Barnart, Clarence L. and Robert K. Barnart. 1982. The World Book Dictionary. Chicago: Doubleday Company.
- Barwise, Jon and Perry, John (1983). Situations and Attitudes. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Beaugrande, Robert. 1980. Text, Discourse and Process. United States of America: Longman Group.
- Berelson, Bernhard. 1952. Content Analysis in Communication Research. New York: Hafner.
- Blicq, Ron S. 1981. Technically-Write. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Brown, Gillian and George Yule. 1984. **Discourse Analysis**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bruner, Jerome S. 1985. Actual Minds. Possible World. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Buhler, K. 1934. Sprachtheotae. Die Darstellungsfunktion der Sprache,.
  Fischer, Jena (translation by D. F. Goodwin, Theory of Language. The
  Representational Function of Language. Benjamins, Amsterdam, 1990.)
- Cobb, Charles Miguel. 1985. Process and Pattern: Controlled Composition Practice for ESL Sudents. California, Wadsworth, Inc.
- Coffey, Margaret Pogemiller. 1987. Communication Through Writing. Prentice Hall, Inc., New Jersey.
- Cook, Guy. 1992. Discourse. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Corbett, Edward P. J. 1971. Classical Rhetoric for the Modern Student. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Cowan, Elizabeth. 1983. Writing Brief Edition. Texas: Scott and Foresman Company.
- Cruse, D. Alan. 2000. Meaning in Language. An Introduction to Semantics and Pragmatics. New York: Oxford University Press.

- Crystal, David. 1997. A dictionary of Linguistics Words and Phonetics Vocal. Fourth Edition. Massachusetts, USA: Blackwell Publishers.
- Denzin, Norman K. and Yvonna S. Lincoln. 1998. Collecting and Interpreting Qualitative Materials. California: International Educational and Professional Publisher.
- Foucault, M. 1973. The Order of Things: An Archaeology of The Human Sciences. New York: Vintage.
- Glatthorn, Allan A. 1981. The English Book A Complete Course. Chicago: Science Research Associates.
- Graesser, Arthur C.; Singer, Murray; & Trabasso, Tom. 1994. Constructing Inferences during Narrative Text Comprehension. **Psychological Review** 101, pp. 371-395.
- Grundy, Peter. 2000. Doing Pragmatics. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Halliday, M. A. k. and Ruqaiya Hasan. 1976. Cohesion in English. United Kingdom: Longman Group.
- Hatch, Evelyn. 1997. Discourse and Language Education. United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
- Holsti, Ole R. 1969. Content Analysis for the Social Sciences and Humanities. Don Mills: Addison Wesley.
- Inman, Billie Andrew and Ruth Gardner. 1979. Aspects of Composition. Second Edition. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Jakobson, Roman. 1971. Selected Writings II.
- Jespersen, Otto. 1949. Language: its Nature, Development and Origin. London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd.
- John Hardaway and Francine Hardaway. 1977. Writing Through Reading. Massachusetts: Winthrop publishers.
- Krippendorff, Klaus. 1981. Content Analysis An Introduction to Its Methodology. California: Sage Publications.
- Lannon, John M. 1992. The writing Process: A Consica Retoric. Harper Collins Publisher Inc.

- Levinson, Stephen C. 1984. Pragmatics. Britain: Cambridge University Press.
- Lefcowitz, Allan B. 1976. The Writer's Handbook. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. 1985. Naturalistic Inquiry. Baverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Merriam Webster's Collegiate Dictionary. 1996. Dallas, Texas: Zane Publishing Inc.
- More, Robert Hamilton. 1966. Effective Writing. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Purwo, Bambang Kaswanti. 1984. **Deiksis Dalam Bahasa Indonesia**. **Jakarta**: Balai Pustaka.
- Rankema, Jan. 1993. Discourse Studies. An Introduction Textbook. Philadelphia: John Benjamin Publishing Company.
- Richards, Jack C., John Platt, Heidi Platt. 1997. Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics. England: Longman
- Richards, Jack C. and Richard Schmidt. 2002. Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics. Third Edition. London: Longman Pearson Education.
- Sacks, H. 1992. Lectures on Conversation. Blackwell.
- Schank, Roger C. 1990. Tell Me a Story: A New Look at Real and Artificial Memory. New York: Praeger.
- Sylvan Barnet and Marcia Stubbs. 1983. **Practical Guide to Writing**. Canada: Little, Brown and company limited.
- TOEFL. Fourth Edition. Test of Written English Guide. USA: Educational Testing Service.
- Wahab, Abdul. 1990. Butir-Butir Linguistik. Surabaya: Airlangga University Press.
- Walters, Larry. 1983. A Theoretical Model for Teaching Students to write. English Teaching Forum. vol. XXI no. 3
- Warriner, John C. 1980. Advanced Writing. Brace Joavanovich, Inc.

Winkler, Anthony C. and Jo Ray McCuen. 1988. Rhetoric Made Plain. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Yule, George. 1997. Pragmatics. New York: Oxford University Press.

Yule, George. 1996. The Study of Language. Britain: Cambridge University Press.

http://www.ling.gu.se/~biljana/st1-97/pragmalect2.html

http://rspas.anu.edu.au/linguistics/Conferences/EastNusantara/DeixisQuest.html

http://pluto.fss.buffalo.edu/classes/psy/segal/2472000/IA93-10P.htm

http://www.cs.buffalo.edu/pub/WWW/faculty/rapaport/graesser.rev.forhtml/

http://www.sil.org/linguistics/GlossaryOfLinguistic Terms/WhatIsDeixis.htm

http://www.sscnet.ucla.edu/comm/steen/cogweb/Abstracts/Deixis 95.html

http://www.comp.lancs.ac.uk/computing/users/spb/D.html. 10/24/03

http://www.indiana.edu/~hlw/Meaning/deixis.html. 10/24/03

http://www.linguistlist.org/issues/14/14-1281.html.

http://ichc.ucsd.edu/MCA/Mail/xmcamail.1998 06.dir/0058.html