

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

This chapter presents conclusion of the research findings and discussions in the previous chapter. In addition, some suggestions for the betterment for further research in line with the analysis of teachers' questions in general using SFL theory as theoretical framework will be provided.

5.1 Conclusion

From the analysis of teachers' questions elucidated in chapter IV, some important points are generated. In general, the findings show the teachers' questions provide appropriate Topical and Textual Theme which generally promote positive contribution toward the construction of students' understanding of the content and language feature of hortatory exposition text. Yet, the teachers' questions did not present Interpersonal Theme and Thematic Progression pattern which are in line with the language features and organization of hortatory exposition text.

The teachers' Topical and Textual themes appear to be mobilized by the genre being taught, for example, the teachers mostly picked *What*, *Why*, and *How* as Topical Themes in their questions. *What*, *Why*, *How*-initialled questions are questions whose answers can give contribution to the making of the content of hortatory exposition text. Meanwhile, the chosen Textual themes are conjunctions such as *First/ Firstly*, *Second/ Secondly*, *Third/ Thirdly*, and *Finally* which characterize language feature of genres that concerns on argumentation (Knapp & Watkins, 2005, p. 188), among others is hortatory exposition text (Emilia, 2011, p. 113).

Dissimilar to Topical and Textual Themes, the teachers' Interpersonal Themes did not provide examples of words or phrases that appear to be helpful for students in construing their comprehension of the text under discussion. It is suggested the teachers would provide more examples of Interpersonal theme through exemplification. It is because the use of interpersonal themes, particularly Mood Adjunct through phrases like *'I think'*, *'In my opinion'* and *'I believe'*, enable writers to present their opinions, belief, and position in hortatory exposition text.

Another thing that can be drawn from the findings is related to thematic progression of teachers' questions. The analysis discloses reiteration pattern occurs frequently. Zig-zag pattern comes as the second dominant type and Multiple progression pattern is the least dominant one. This condition differs from the Thematic Progression patterns usually dominantly employed in exposition text which are Zig-zag pattern (Crompton, 2004) and Multiple progression pattern (Emilia, 2014, p. 243).

5.2 Recommendation

There are some recommendations suggested to the teachers as participants of this study according to the findings gained related to the issue of teachers' questions, especially in terms of the chosen Themes, including Topical, Interpersonal, and Textual, and how the chosen Topical Themes relate to Rheme and developed throughout the whole lesson through the use of Thematic Progression

pattern. Other recommendations are addressed to further researchers who are interested in conducting studies in the area of Theme system analysis of teachers' questions.

The first recommendation for the teachers concerns on the variety of constituents of Themes. It is acknowledged that both of the participants, when they taught a hortatory exposition text, did not provide a variety of Mood Adjuncts and transitional signals that represent Interpersonal and Textual Themes. This fact, to some extent, may influence students when they wrote a hortatory exposition text. Students may use Interpersonal and Textual Themes which are only elicited by the teachers that make their text redundant as they use the same word or phrases repeatedly and it is not a characteristic of a good text (Emilia, 2011, p. 23).

Accordingly, it is imperative that teachers use and give questions to students that evoke answers which contain Interpersonal and Textual Themes when delivering the lesson for instance by using phrases such as *'What do you think of..?'* or *'what is your opinion about...?'* which are intended to make the students generate the answers started with phrases of Mood Adjuncts like *'I think...'* or *'In my opinion...'* which represent Interpersonal themes that orient the listeners the angle from which the content should be seen (Thompson, 2004, p. 165). In this case, the content which is going to be revealed is based on the speakers' point of view. Also, the appearance of such Interpersonal themes is helpful to establish the content of the hortatory exposition text which represents the writer's beliefs.

Second recommendation is addressed to the teachers in regard to Thematic Progression pattern. Thematic Progression can demonstrate relationships between clauses and how clauses link with each other to form cohesive texts in speaking and writing (Schleppergrell, 2004, p. 66). In a hortatory exposition text, the Thematic Progression is dominated by Zig-zag and Multiple progression patterns (Crompton, 2004; Emilia, 2014). The teachers should arrange their questions in Zig-zag or Multiple progression patterns more than in Reiteration one that will give example for students on how a hortatory exposition text is structured.

Similar results in regard to the realization of Themes and Thematic progression patterns performed by both experienced and novice teachers are rather disappointing. Experienced teacher is expected to pose better questions as he could learn a lot during his years of teaching experience than the novice teacher could. However, the number of years of teaching experience does not necessarily guarantee expertise (Berliner, 2001). So, this study also suggest policy makers in Education department to give in-service teacher professional development in forms of workshops, seminars or trainings that that focus on the formulation and conceptualization of questions, how they present the questions orally, how they promote students' responses, and how they process students' responses (Mauigoa-tekene, 2006) especially in teaching texts. Good questions will activate students' minds to think broadly, deeply and critically to construct knowledge. When students have lot of knowledge they will have a lot to say in their text.

In short, the recommendation for the teacher is that the teachers could make use of potential meanings through questions for both oral and written communication by considering the text being taught. The questions could serve as input which is then involved in students thinking process and finally internalized as their knowledge. The input should be noticed by students since it is not available for processing unless learners actually notice it (Nation, 1996; Saville-troike, 2006, p. 74). The degree of noticing or awareness can be influenced through the frequency of encounter with

items being learned (Schmidt, 1990, in Saville & Troike, 2006). So, it is undeniable that the input should be exposed for many times. The more input is seen and listened, the more English is acquired, noticed, or learnt (Harmer, 2007, p. 266).

Regarding suggestion for further researchers, as mentioned earlier in the first chapter of this study in section 1.4, this study only covers the theme and thematic progression analysis of teachers' question and only use the transcriptions as the main data make that make the interpretation of the result little bit restricted. The result cannot say firmly the influence of the chosen Themes and Thematic Progression patterns on students' writing.

Additionally, the result cannot disclose the reasons that trigger the teachers to utilize such Themes and Thematic Progression patterns in their questions. Therefore, it is suggestive for next researchers to conduct this study using mixed method approach to make stronger claim that Themes and Thematic Progression patterns in teachers' questions influence on students understanding the genre being learned. Also, the researcher can include interview to figure out teacher's reason for providing such Themes and Thematic Progression patterns in their questions. Thus, when the study generates convincing and information-rich result, the suggestions provided will be more accurate and effective to solve the problems.

Another suggestion for researchers is regarding the function served by teachers' questions as means of facilitating students' engagement in learning. A framework to analyze students' engagement is proposed by Suherdi (2018) called as SMSLEFA which stands for Synergistic Multilayered Students' Learning Engagement Framework of Analysis. This framework is developed based on SFL principles which are combined with frameworks of classroom discourse analysis and cognitive, affective, and psychomotor domain taxonomies. This framework enables researchers to figure out comprehensive information of how the language used in the classroom realizes learning interaction, learning behavior, and learning text.