CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

The elaboration of findings and discussion has been presented in the previous chapter. This chapter presents the conclusion for the whole study including findings based on the research problem stated before. This chapter is divided into two main sections, conclusion and recommendation for further research in the future related to the topic.

5.1 Conclusion

This study has focused on the teacher talk and interaction in the classroom. It aims at defining the type of teacher talk, finding the students’ perception towards their teacher talk, and determining the characteristic of classroom interaction. This study is significant to two main types of expectation. Theoretically, it is expected that study will give a contribution to a wider literature related to teacher talk and classroom interaction study. Practically, the study is hoped to give evaluation to teacher’s way of talk and interacting with the students in the classroom. This study employs some instruments to collect the data, including observation sheet, videotaping, and questionnaires for students. The study was making use of Flanders’ Interaction Analysis Categories (FIAC) and finally resulted in the following conclusion.

In finding the answer for the first question corresponded with the type of teacher talk, the study used observation sheet that had been developed according to teacher talk categories built by Flanders (1970). The result showed that teacher in the classroom influenced students more indirectly rather than directly. The sub categories in indirect influence were highly used by teacher. The sub categories in the indirect influence are accepting feelings, praising or encouraging students, accepting or using students’ ideas or answers, and asking questions. Teacher was more likely to ask questions in the teaching and learning process. Teacher relied hard on asking question as it could be seen from the finding that asking questions was the most dominant
categories among other categories. Asking questions reached the amount of 43.97% among all categories. The indirect influence itself was in total percentage of 70.20% far greater than the direct influence that merely reached the total of 29.80%.

Students’ perception was in line with the result of observation sheet towards the type of teacher talk. In the questionnaire, more students strongly agreed with the statements correlated to sub categories in teacher’s indirect influence. Most of the students strongly agreed that their teacher often praised or encouraged them to participate in the classroom, clarified and improved their ideas as well as did numerous asking-answering activities with them. More students also agreed that their teacher listened and responded to their complaint or feeling of pleasure towards the lesson or anything. Most students perceived that their teacher hardly lectured them all the time so that they did not have chance to speak up their ideas. Teacher was also viewed to give directions or critics although students’ perception on both of the categories was not as remarkable as indirect influence categories.

Meanwhile, the type of teacher talk was consistent with the finding of classroom interaction characteristics. Upon videotaping, transcribing, and coding the transcription, it was found that the characteristic of classroom interaction was content cross. Content cross was defined by the more use of asking questions and lecturing categories appeared in the matrix. It was exactly in line with the finding of teacher talk type that was dominated by asking questions. However, the content cross type leaned more toward the indirect influence since asking questions behavior was more often found in the talk of teacher. On the other hand, the least dominant characteristic is teacher control. It meant that teacher hardly took control of her students that possibly made students less confident with themselves.

In summary, teacher indirectly influenced the students in the classroom and most of students perceived the same way towards teacher’s indirect influence. The classroom interaction was in content cross characteristic which was in line with the findings of Nugroho (2009) and Nurmasithah (2010). It could be inferred that teacher spent much time to ask questions and lecture the students about the content in the learning material.
5.2 Recommendation

Based on the findings or the study and the limitation of it, there are some recommendations for further research and teacher in regards to classroom interaction. Firstly, this study is limited to one classroom and teacher, thus it is recommended for further research to make a wider research on English as foreign language classroom interaction in more than one classrooms and teacher so that researcher could gain more information and comparison.

Secondly, this study focuses on the type of teacher talk, so that it is recommended that further research will search for the correlation and comparison of teacher talk type (indirect and direct influence) with the achievement of students. Therefore, broader information will be achieved.

Finally, it is suggested that teacher pay more attention on type of questions to be given to the students so that students could pay more attention to teaching and learning process and therefore give positive impact on students’ outcomes.

In spite of having limitations and weaknesses, it is still hoped that this study can be a contribution to the related topic so that in the future it could give advantage to research corresponded with teacher talk and classroom interaction type. It is also hoped that the findings of this study could be an evaluation for teacher in the classroom and a broader provision for teacher to-be.