

MINISTRY OF EDUCATION AND TRAINING
UNIVERSITY OF DANANG

HUỲNH THỊ NGUYỆT

**AN INVESTIGATION INTO
EXPRESSIONS OF ASKING FOR
AND GIVING CLARIFICATION
IN ENGLISH AND VIETNAMESE**

Field : The English Language

Code : 60.22.15

**M.A. THESIS IN THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE
(A SUMMARY)**

Danang, 2011

The study has been completed at
the College of Foreign Languages, University of Danang

Supervisor: Assoc. Prof. Dr. Trương Viên.

Examiner 1:

Examiner 2:

The thesis will be orally defended at the Examining Committee

Time:

Venue: University of Danang

The origin of the thesis is accessible for the purpose of reference at:

- The College of Foreign Languages Library, University of Danang
- Information Resources Centre, University of Danang

Chapter 1
INTRODUCTION

1.1. RATIONALE

Asking for and giving someone's clarification is believed to be of vital importance because it helps communicators establish and maintain a good relationship. An appropriate question for and giving clarification may rescue a broken link between people and provide wonderful power for the conversation to survive, as follow:

(1) Jane: *Excuse me?* Can I ask you something?

John: I said shoot!

Jane: Would you spell that out for me?

John: It's S-H-O-O-T "S-h-o-o-t"

Jane: *What does that mean?*

John: It means to go ahead. [72, p.48]

This research paper – *An investigation into expressions of asking for and giving clarification in English and Vietnamese* – is just an attempt to consider problematical aspects of asking for and giving clarification with respect to syntactic and pragmatic features.

1.2. AIMS AND OBJECTIVES

The study is to find the possible similarities and differences in the syntactic and pragmatic features of asking for and giving clarification between two languages. I fully understand that clarification is a complex speech act, even for native speakers but I hope that the study will reveal many interesting things to serve better communication as well as the teaching and learning process with clarification in English and Vietnamese.

1.3. THE SCOPE OF THE STUDY

The research is concerned with contrastive analysis the syntactic and pragmatic features expressions of asking for and giving clarification in English and Vietnamese. It focuses mainly on exchanges: one question for clarification and one answer to clarify through the analysis of the data collected from dictionaries, conversations, books, modern short stories, novels...in both English and Vietnamese.

1.4. RESEARCH QUESTIONS

1. What are syntactic features of asking for and giving clarification in English and Vietnamese?

2. What are pragmatic features of asking for and giving clarification in English and Vietnamese?

3. What are the similarities and differences in the syntactic and pragmatic features of asking for and giving clarification between the two languages?

- The ways of asking for and giving clarifications in English and Vietnamese carry the wide range of meanings syntactically and pragmatically.

- There are similarities and differences in the ways of asking for and giving clarifications in English and Vietnamese.

1.5. ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY

1) **Chapter 1:** Introduction

2) **Chapter 2:** Literature Review and Theoretical Background

3) **Chapter 3:** Method and Procedure of the study.

4) **Chapter 4:** Findings and Discussions.

5) **Chapter 5:** Conclusions and Implications.

Chapter 2

LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL

BACKGROUND

2.1. REVIEW OF PREVIOUS STUDIES

Austin [24] made an interesting point that in saying something, one is actually doing something. This view is considered a breakthrough in linguistics since it points out that many everyday language declarative sentences are not intended to make true or false statement, as is firmly asserted by logical positivists.

Yule [81] mentions speech acts with locutionary act that is the basic act of utterance and illocutionary act, the act performed via the communicative force of an utterance and perlocutionary act, in which the hearer will recognize its effects depending on the circumstances.

In Vietnamese studies, Nguyễn Đức Dân [7], with several theoretical bases about pragmatics, mentions speech acts. Nguyễn Thiện Giáp [10] introduces some notions about pragmatics. Nguyễn Quang [9] introduces some ways of common expression in daily conversations both in English and Vietnamese. Hoàng Lưu Bảo [40] presents the syntactic and pragmatic features of sympathy expressions in English and Vietnamese. Đỗ Thị Kim Liên [3], in her book with several theoretical bases about pragmatics, mentions speech acts. Nguyễn Thị Tố Nga [65] describes and analyzes the syntactic and pragmatic features of directives in English and Vietnamese. Lê Thị Băng Tâm [58] presents the semantic and pragmatic features of negative comments in the two languages.

For the studies presented above, we can see that some authors just did the research into speech acts and pragmatic features in general or even in some particular aspects but nothing relating to

expressing clarifications. So, in this thesis, we will try to deal with another aspect: AGC expressions in English and Vietnamese under the field of syntactic and pragmatic features.

2.2. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

2.2.1. Definition of Clarification

According to Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary "*Clarify is to become or make something clearer or easier to understand*" [67, p.203]

The Merriam-Webster's online dictionary: "*Clarify is to make understandable (clarify a subject) or to become clear*"

From these definitions, asking for clarification is regarded as an act of asking for clarify: the meaning which speaker wants to say, speaker's action which explicates in the text, and provide the answer to clarify meaning or action which speaker says or makes.

For example:

(6) A: Peter kowtowed again.

B: *What does "kowtow" mean?* [126]

In this example, (A) produces utterances containing an act of clarification with (B)

2.2.2. Frequency of the Phenomenon of Asking for and Giving Clarification

AGC are frequent in our daily life, particularly when the topic is various: about something, about somebody...

In this thesis, I decide to study asking for clarification with Yes-No questions and question-words, giving clarification with expressing a clarification and an explanation.

2.2.3 Syntactic Theory

2.2.3.1. Syntactic Aspect and Feature of Utterance

Syntax is the study of how words combined to form sentences and the rules, which govern the formation of sentences. It is more involved the internal organization of a sentence.

Syntactic structure is the arrangement of words and morphemes into larger units (phrase, clause and sentences). Languages may be compared for differences in syntactic structure.

Syntactic aspect of an utterance involves words and expressions, the syntactic structures of the utterance and the prosody in the representation of an utterance to indicate it as having the illocutionary force of some kinds or having some meaning.

2.2.3.2. Classification of AGCEs According to the Basic Structure

According to Quirk and Greenbaum [69, p.190], one of approaches to distinguish types of speech acts can be made on the basic of structure: declarative, interrogative, imperative and exclamative or with different communicative functions: statements, questions, commands/requests.

According to Diệp Quang Ban, sentences are also classified into declarative, interrogative, imperative and exclamative based on communication purpose [1, p.224-239]

Interrogative Sentence

Questions can be divided into three major classes according the types of answer they expect: Yes-No question, Wh-questions, Alternative questions and some other questions such as: tag questions, declarative questions, exclamatory questions, rhetorical questions, hypothetical questions.....

Exclamatory sentence

They are usually begin with a phrase using *how* or *what*, but they do not reverse the order of the subject and the auxiliary verb in

English or use such words as *làm sao, biết bao, sao, ôi, chao ôi, ghê, quá, vô cùng*, and so on in Vietnamese.

2.2.3.3. Types of Questions for Clarification

There are many ways of understand what questions are based on several definitions of linguists. Nevertheless, in the study a *question* is considered as any sentence that invites a reply.

Some studies by linguists have been conducted on questions. Among these researchers, some have used different criteria to classify types of questions.

Basing on the viewpoint of McArthur, as well as Quirk and Sidney Greenbaum, the data of the research were analyzed.

2.2.4. Speech Act

Asking for clarification and giving clarification is a speech act. In order to accomplish their aims in communication, people are said to perform intended actions while talking. In this section, the works by Austin and Searle, two pioneers in the field, are first briefly reviewed in order to provide theoretical frameworks.

a) Austin's classification

The notion of speech acts dates back to the British language philosopher_ Austin [24]. A speech act is a unit of speaking and performs different functions in communication. In his book "*How to do things with words*", Austin refined five classes of illocutionary of verbs.

(i) *Verdictives*, (ii) *Exercitives*, (iii) *Commissives*, (iv) *Behabitives and*, (v) *Expositives*

b) Searle's classification

Searle [71], based on Austin's work, put forward the important notion of indirect speech acts. According to Searle [71] direct speech

act enjoy a transparent relationship between form and function. And there are five basic types the classification of speech acts:

- (i) *Declaratives*, (ii) *Representatives*, (iii) *Directives*, (iv) *Commissives* and (v) *Expressives*.

A similar way of classifying speech acts is made by G. Yule [81] as in the table below:

Table 2.1. The Five General Functions of Speech Acts

Speech types	Direction of fit	S = speaker; X = situation
Declaration	Worlds change the world	S causes X
Representatives	Make words fit the world	S believes X
Expressives	Make words fit the world	S feels X
Directives	Make words fit the world	S wants X
Commissives	Make words fit the world	S intends X

2.2.5. Politeness Theory

2.2.5.1. Face-saving

According Brown and Levinson [26] to their analysis, politeness involves us showing an awareness of other people’s face wants. They consider that all competent member of a society have (and know each other to have) “face”, the public self image that every member wants to claim for himself. There are two aspects to this self image: positive face and negative face.

2.2.5.2. Face Threatening Acts (FTAs)

Brown and Levinson [26] divide FTAs into four groups:

- (a) Acts threatening the hearer’s negative face.
- (b) Acts threatening the hearer’s positive face.
- (c) Acts threatening the speaker’s negative face.
- (d) Acts threatening the speaker’s positive

2.2.5.3. Positive and Negative Politeness

There are two kinds of redressive actions: positive politeness and negative politeness.

- Positive politeness is oriented toward the positive face of H. Positive politeness minimizes the threatening action by reassuring the H that he or she is valued by the S, that somehow the S wants what the H wants, or that they are members of the same in-group.

- Negative politeness is oriented mainly toward H’s negative face. If the act to be accomplished is more threatening, S selects this strategy, redressing the threat to basic claims that tertiary and self-determination directly, for example by apologizing or being indirect and formal.

2.2.5.4. Politeness for Doing FTA

Brown and Levinson [26] state that the more serious the particular FTA is, on the S’s assessment, the more he will tend to choose the higher-numbered strategy. The assessment of the seriousness of the FTA involves the following factors:

- the “social distance” (D) of the S and the H
- the relative “power” (P) of the S and the H
- the absolute ranking (R) of imposition in the particular culture.

2.2.6. Felicity Conditions

The felicity conditions of an illocutionary act are conditions as expected or appropriate circumstances for the performance of a speech act to be recognized as intended.

Austin [24] and Searle [71] said following conditions:

- *General condition*
- *Preparatory condition*

- *Propositional condition*
- *Sincerity condition*
- *Essential condition*

2.2.7. Direct and Indirect Speech Act

Searle [71] based on Austin's work, puts forward the important notion of indirect speech acts. According to Searle, direct speech acts enjoy a transparent relationship between forms and functions. Indirect speech acts, on the other hand, display no such relationship, and therefore, their illocutionary, indirect speech acts consist of two acts, a primary illocutionary act and a secondary one where the primary act operates through and in force of the second one. Peccei [68, p.56] stated "speech acts can be classified as direct or indirect. In a direct speech act there is a direct relationship between its linguistic structures and the work it is doing. In indirect speech acts the speech act is performed indirectly through the performance of another speech act."

According to Jean Thomas [45], there are things which all human beings find impossible to express. This could be because certain concepts are beyond our understanding. Therefore, they may use intonation or body language to convey their idea. However, they are not included in this thesis.

According to Tannen [74], there are two benefits of indirectness: defensiveness and rapport. Defensiveness refers to a speaker's preference not to go on record with an idea in order to be able to disclaim, rescind, or modify it if it does not meet a positive response. And the benefit of rapport in indirectness is to allocate power to one individual in the conversation.

According to Yule [81], indirect acts are generally associated with greater politeness in English than direct acts.

2.2.8. Conversational Theory

2.2.8.1. Conversational Acts

Conversational act is the act of causing an effect in another by virtue of the meaning of words. In order for a speech act to qualify as a conversational act a person has to be affected by what is said.

2.2.8.2. Conversational Structure

a. Turn

According to Stenstrom (1984) [72], 'turn is everything a current speaker says before the next speaker takes over.'

b. Adjacency Pair

A pair made up of two turns made by two different speakers is referred to as an adjacency pair. This kind of pair always consists of a first part and a second part. The utterance of the first part immediately creates an expectation of the second utterance in the same pair.

c. Sequence

A sequence is made up of more than one turn. Sometimes a sequence is actually a pair, at other times it is made up of three or four turns. There are some cases in which one pair occurring inside another. Schegloff (1974) [70], *A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation*, Language 50/4] calls it an insertion sequence.

Jefferson (1972) [46], proposed another kind of sequence called side sequence which she considers to be different from Schegloff's.

2.2.8.3. Conversational Principle

A conversation is successful or not depending on the approach of each speaker to the interaction. The way in which people try to make conversations work is sometimes called the *cooperative principle*: “*Make your conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage in which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged.*” [81, p.35].

2.2.8.4. Conversation Implicature

Grice [34, p.20-40] presented an approach which was called conversational implicature – how hearers manage to work out the complete message when speaker mean more than what they say.

Chapter 3

METHOD AND PROCEDURE

3.1. AIMS AND OBJECTIVES

3.1.1 Aims

This study is aimed at finding the similarities and differences in English and Vietnamese in terms of syntactic and pragmatic features.

The findings of the research are expected to improve the ability to use expressions of asking for and giving clarification effectively; particularly, in the teaching and learning of English and Vietnamese as a foreign language.

3.1.2 Objectives

- Finding out the syntactic and pragmatic features of asking for and giving clarification in English and Vietnamese.

- Analyzing and contrasting the features mentioned above to find out the similarities and differences of the two languages in this field.

- Offering some implications in the teaching and learning English as a foreign language in Vietnamese.

- Suggesting some types of activities in practicing using clarification.

3.2. METHODOLOGY

3.2.1. Research Design

Descriptive method is supposed to be the main method for the contrastive analysis. Besides, the study also uses qualitative and quantitative approaches as supporting methods which make analyzing data become more reliable.

3.2.2. Selection of the Samples

This thesis includes the data collection and corpus building, data sorting and finally data analysis. Data needed of the study will be taken from conversations in English and Vietnamese short stories and novels. Besides, we also take samples from magazines, internet, textbooks and course books for conversation practice as well.

3.2.3. Data Collection

The data are mainly taken from famous short stories by well known authors in both languages.

3.2.4. Description of the Samples

The study collected 300 samples in English and 300 ones in Vietnamese.

3.2.5. Data Analysis

The data collected were statistically, quantitatively and qualitatively analyzed.

3.2.6. Reliability and Validity

Reliability and validity are the two most important criteria to guarantee the quality of the data collection procedures. Reliability

provides information on the extent to which the data collection procedure elicits accurate data; and validity provides information on the extent to which the procedure really measures what it is supposed to measure.

Chapter 4

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

4.1. SYNTACTIC FEATURES OF AGCES IN ENGLISH AND VIETNAMESE

4.1.1. Syntactic Features of Asking for Clarification in English and Vietnamese

4.1.1.1. In English

- a. *WH-questions*
- b. *Yes-No questions*
- c. *Alternative questions (OR questions)*
- d. *Declarative questions*
- e. *Negative Interrogative questions*
- f. *Exclamatives*
- h. *Tag questions*
- i. *Gaps*
- j. *Conventional forms*

4.1.1.2. In Vietnamese

- a. *WH-questions*
- b. *Yes-No questions*
- c. *Alternative questions (OR questions)*
- d. *Declarative questions*
- e. *Negative Interrogative questions*
- f. *Exclamatives*
- h. *Tag questions*

- i. *Gaps*
- j. *Conventional forms*

4.1.1.3. The Frequency of English and Vietnamese Asking for Clarification

Table 4.1. Number and Frequency of Syntactic Features of AGC Expressions in English and Vietnamese

Structural form	In English		In Vietnamese	
	Number	Frequency	Number	Frequency
INTERROGATION	300	100%	300	100%
WH-questions	124	41,33	106	35,33
Yes-No questions	105	35	115	38,33
Alternative questions	12	4,0	15	5,0
Declarative questions (rising tone)	37	12,33	41	13,67
Negative Interrogative questions	1	0,33	3	1,0
Exclamatives	3	1,0	2	0,66
Tag questions	0	0	1	0,33
Gaps	10	3,33	5	1,68
Conventional forms	8	2,67	12	4,0
TOTAL	300	100%	300	100%

4.1.2. Syntactic Features of Giving Clarification

4.1.2.1. In English

4.1.2.2. In Vietnamese

4.1.3. Similarities and Differences in Syntactic Features

4.1.3.1. Similarities

English and Vietnamese people often use Interrogations with nine types of questions as: WH-questions, Yes-No questions, Alternative questions, Declarative questions, Negative Interrogative questions, Exclamatives, Tag questions, Gaps and Conventional forms are used both in direct and indirect ways.

(114) “Good morning, darling. I need somebody to scrub my back.”

He looked at her and mumbled something.

“What did you say?”

“You don’t need to take a shower. You’re soaked to the skin already.”

“I’ve been running. You should come along.”

“If I tried to go at your pace, I’d have a heart attack on Norr Mälarstrand.”

“Nonsense. Come on, time to get up.” [73, p319]

(118) Phan Thanh vội vã cầu hoà:

– Thôi thôi. Chẳng ai nói đùa cả. Quốc Dũng, cô em gái của bạn đâu?

Quốc Dũng xoa hai tay đứng dậy:

– Xin chờ một chút Đợi cho bóng bạn vừa khuất sau cánh rèm, Tuấn Kha lập tức quay sang Phan Thanh, gậy sừ.

– **Thế này là thế nào? Tao chẳng hiểu gì cả?**

Phan Thanh mỉm cười khoái chí khi đã làm cho bạn bực mình:

– Đời thường có những sự Trùng hợp thật bất ngờ. Suýt tí nữa là cậu đã hại mình rồi. [105]

Regarding to exclamatives, either in English and Vietnamese are less used. The percentage is 1% in English and 0,66% in Vietnamese. Both English and Vietnamese sometimes use exclamative structure to express asking for clarification. Using the structures, the speakers tend to ask for clarification through showing their feelings or attitudes toward the preceding utterances. The intonation is therefore quite substantial in fulfilling this function.

(119) He went up to the mantelpiece, and contemplating his face in the mirror said: ‘Your friend The Buccaneer has made a fool of himself; he will have to pay for it!’

She looked at him scornfully, and answered: **‘I don’t know what are you talking about!’** (Tôi không hiểu anh đang nói gì đấy?)

‘You soon will. A mere trifle, quite beneath your contempt - four hundred pounds.’ [49, p.181]

(120) Và y tiếp. Nếu anh đã nghèo qua vài lần thì ít ra anh cũng phải biết rằng cái nghèo chẳng có ích cho ai. Nó làm tiêu mòn sức lực, héo hắt tâm hồn. Nó khiến người ta thành bủn xỉn, nhỏ nhen, ích kỉ, sát bờ đất. Nó tạo nên thành những con người nô lệ.

San lại cười hờ cả lợi, kêu lên:

Thế thì có trời mới hiểu anh muốn nói gì! Giàu thì anh chê là truy lạc. Nghèo thì anh chê là ích kỉ, nhỏ nhen, nô lệ. Vậy thì ý anh thế nào? [5, p.16]

4.1.3.2. Differences

In spite of some similarities mentioned above, the two languages have a few differences in syntactic features of Asking for and Giving Clarification.

Firstly, through the table 4.1 we can see that among the seven types of question, Wh-question takes the top place with 39,66% in English but Yes-No question is at the top range with 38,33% in Vietnamese. Declarative question is more used in English than in Vietnamese. Vietnamese people sometimes use Interrogation questions with **“Ý anh là sao?”**, **“Có nghĩa là gì?”**, **“Ý cô là?”** in asking for clarification expressions with the percentage of. Where as these structural forms are not used in English.

- In regard to question tags, we can see clearly that English native speakers do not use this question in expressing clarification and In Vietnamese used less with 0,33 %.

- Some structural questions in AGCEs in English do not have the equivalent ones in Vietnamese such as in Wh-questions and Negative Interrogative questions. To form a Negative Interrogative question, English people always put the auxiliary negation at the beginning of the question. However, in Vietnamese there are not auxiliaries so Negative Interrogative questions are usually formed by placing the negators as “*không, chẳng...*” after the subject and before the predicate in the combination with such particles “*sao, à, ư, a, à, hả, hử, chứ, chẳng,....*ect at the end of the question when transferring from English into Vietnamese.

In English:

AUX + NOT + S + V + O/C/A?

(121) – 'You've got to realize,' he said, ' that I don't want you to do it if you don't want to. I'm perfectly willing to go through with it if it means anything to you.'

'Doesn't it mean anything to you? We could get along.'

'Of course it does. But I don't want anybody but you. I don't want anyone else. And I know it's perfectly simple.'

'Yes, you know it's perfectly simple.' [43, p.43]

In Vietnamese:

S + KHÔNG + V + C/A + TTT?

(122) – Vẫn biết rõ cô, lẽ ra tôi không nên trong chờ cô thành thật, hoặc trọng danh dự hoặc song phẳng mới phải. Nhưng rõ đại thay tôi đã tin cô.

- *Tôi không hiểu anh định nói gì?*

- Tôi nghĩ là cô hiểu. Dù sao đi nữa, trông cô rõ ra người phạm lỗi. Lúc này, tôi đang phóng ngựa qua phố Cây Trường Xuân, chợt có

người chào tôi từ sau một hàng rào. Còn ai khác niềm nở với tôi như vậy, ngoài bà Asli Uylkz! Tất nhiên, tôi dừng lại nói chuyện với bà.

- Thật ư?

- Phải, chúng tôi đã có một cuộc nói chuyện rất thú vị.

[2, p.377]

4.2. PRAGMATIC FEATURES OF AGC EXPRESSIONS IN ENGLISH AND VIETNAMESE

4.2.1. Direct and Indirect AGC Expressions

4.2.1.1 Direct AGC Expressions

Direct AGC expressions are those in which the speaker expresses the illocutionary force of asking for clarification explicitly. In direct AGC expressions, the Sp uses common verbs to ask for someone’s clarification in English data such as “*mean*” or “*say*” in: *What do you mean....?*”; “*How do you mean....?*”; and so on. Direct asking for clarification mostly appears in the form of questions.

4.2.1.2. Indirect AGC Expressions

a. *Using in-group identity markers*

b. *Giving deference*

c. *Clarifying acoustic understanding*

d. *Making a reference*

e. *Making pragmatic impact*

f. *Confirmation of a hypothesis*

g. *Using Severity*

h. *Using repetition (or reformulation)*

i. *Confirmation request*

j. *By shocking*

k. *Using non-verbal actions*

4.2.2. Similarities and Differences in Pragmatic Features

As it mentioned above, we can see that both westerners and Vietnamese tend to use more directness than indirectness in AGC. The study has confirmed that with the following analysis in the table below.

Table 4.2. Relative Frequency of Directness and Indirectness in English and Vietnamese AGCEs – 300 Examples for Each

Ways of AGC	English		Vietnamese	
	Number	Frequency	Number	Frequency
Using Directness	198	65,0%	212	70,67%
Using Indirectness	102	35,0%	88	29,33%
Using in-group identity markers	19	6,33%	14	4,67%
Giving deference	3	1,0%	8	2,67%
Clarifying acoustic understanding	15	5,0%	15	5,0%
Making a reference	8	2,67%	6	2,0%
Making pragmatic impact	3	1,0%	1	0,33%
Confirmation of a hypothesis	9	3,0%	4	1,33%
Using severity	3	1,0%	2	0,67%
Using repetition	28	9,33%	16	5,33%
Confirmation request	4	1,33%	2	0,67%
By shocking	6	2,0%	9	3,0%
Using non-verbal action	4	1,33%	11	3,67%
Total	300	100%	300	100%

4.2.2. Similarities and Differences in Pragmatic Features between AGC in English and Vietnamese

4.2.2.1. Similarities

The statistics in the table above show that all the direct and indirect strategies are used in the both English and Vietnamese cultures. In which, direct strategy take the most and highest percentage with 65,0% in English and 70,67 % in Vietnamese in the total samples taken. It means that in literary, it is sometimes easier for the H because firstly, thanks to the Sp’s directness the H can “give the point” easily and the Sp does not need much time to beat

around the bush which may costly and risky. In both English and Vietnamese are using “*clarifying acoustic understanding*”, occupies 5,0%.

Using short questions including interrogative pronouns to clarify the previous part is very popular in both English and Vietnamese. For example:

(192) A: Did you talk to Peter?

B: *You what?* [126]

(194) - Thằng cha kia còn dốt hơn nó nhiều lắm, phải không mày?

- *Thằng nào?*

- Thằng ấy...

- À, Trần Đức Chinh phải không?. [102, p.227]

4.2.2.2. Differences

Firstly, among 300 samples of AGC in English and the same number in Vietnamese, there are 198 using directness in English and 212 in Vietnamese. It proves that Vietnamese people tend to use directness more than English people.

Secondly, both Vietnamese and English people used great deal of sub-strategies of Indirectness but these ones are used in different ways and with different frequency. The using repetition in English occupies 9,33% while in Vietnamese they do 5,33%. The using in-group identity markers are used with 4,67% in Vietnamese but with the higher percentage in English with 6,33%. On the contrary, using nonverbal action occupies 1,33% in English and 3,66% in Vietnamese.

Thirdly, AGCEs by shocking with stressed and high intonation, in which the utterance of the first speaker is completely repeated by the second one, is more popular in English than in Vietnamese.

(196) A: Joe was in an accident.

B: *What?*

A: It's true. A truck ran into Joe's new car. [126]

In the example (196), when the Sp announces the serious information about Joe's accident, the H responds by a short question "What?" with stressed and high intonation to emphasize his feeling.

Fourthly, regarding the result of the statistics in the table 4.3, we see that the number of making pragmatic impact in Vietnamese (0,33%) is a little fewer than that in English (1,0%). It is perhaps that a language can not separate from the society in which the language is used and the people from different countries have different ways of speaking. In English, using repetition takes of 9,33% while it is only 5,33% in Vietnamese. We find that the form of short questions for repetition strategy such as "*What?, Eh?, Pardon?...*" in English more than in Vietnamese. Using in-group identity markers in English is much more than that in Vietnamese. In English, It takes of 6,33% but it takes of 4,67% in Vietnamese. Probably, it is because the purpose of using AGCEs in communication of English people is more various than that of the Vietnamese.

Chapter 5

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

5.1. A SUMMARY OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE STUDY

As it was stated in the four previous chapters, the thesis involves in descriptive and contrastive study of syntactic and pragmatic features of AGCEs in English and Vietnamese.

In order to carry out the study effectively, we have read numerous theoretical materials related to speech acts and other issues

concerning into the research. After that, we set the outline to specify the steps of the study.

In addition, we also have read a lot of books, stories and novels in English and Vietnamese to choose the supporting points of view which the study follows. Beside, we also choose a lot of samples from internet, textbooks and course books for conversation practice.

After, we described, analyzed and made a contrastive analysis to clarify the similarities and differences between English and Vietnamese in the ways of performing AGCEs.

5.2. SUMMARY OF THE FINDINGS

The ways of AGC are realized in various ways. In our study AGCEs reveal the following facts:

1. The syntactic features of AGC are realized in English and Vietnamese. They involved declaratives and interrogation. In which, there are many sub-types of Interrogation forms such as: WH-questions, Yes-No questions, Alternative questions, Exclamatives, Tags questions, Gaps questions and conventional forms.

2. AGC expressions can be expressed in different ways. It depends on the relationship between the Sp and the H, the relationship among the Sp, the H and the one commented in the AGC that directness, indirectness and politeness are used.

3. The data collection and analysis reveals that Vietnamese people tend to use more directness than indirectness in their AGC though both of the groups are in favor of direct AGC expressions.

4. There are a lot of similarities of AGC expressions between English and Vietnamese in the syntactic and pragmatic features. Through the analysis we can see that people use quite a few strategies to ask for and giving clarification in daily conversations.

5. The choice of directness and indirectness depends on a lot of factors and linguists have been appreciated by the author in that directness and indirectness are closely interacted and interlinked with politeness in AGC.

5.3. IMPLICATIONS OF THE STUDY

5.3.1 Implications for Learners

For successful communication, learners should know the frequency of using clarification in conversation.

Vietnamese learners of English should understand about AGCEs in any forms and with whatever implicature they mean. What similarities and differences are there in the ways English and Vietnamese people ask for and giving someone's clarification?

Learners could recognize the importance of using AGCEs in communication so that can confidently ask to have sufficient information before giving their final opinion.

5.3.2 Implications for Teachers

Teachers should create more opportunities for learners to practice conversation by encouraging them to ask for and give clarification.

Teachers of English should raise learners' awareness of asking for and giving clarification by giving their similarities and differences so that learners can be more confident in communication.

Teachers should help learners to know the frequency of asking for and giving clarification in communication in order that they could not feel their face to be threatened when others violate the maxims by using asking for and giving clarification.

The description analysis of syntactic and pragmatic features of AGCEs, the contrastive study of in the two languages will be of

practical use to teachers and learners of English and those who are interested in translating or interpreting utterances in the field.

5.4. LIMITATIONS

- Firstly, due to the limit of relevant materials relating to AGCEs in both English and Vietnamese, the limit of researcher's ability and time budget, the study may not have been thoroughly discussed as it should be.

- Secondly, AGC can be expressed by several different strategies involving directness, indirectness and politeness and other factors such as tones, facial expressions and body language.

- Thirdly, as for the similarities and differences between English and Vietnamese in the ways of performing AGC.

5.5. SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

- A study of AGCEs on facial expressions and body language.

- Pragmatic and culture aspects of asking for and giving clarification in English and Vietnamese.