

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

5.1 Conclusion

The research tried to score the teachers' implementation of character education in classroom interaction connected to the teachers' point of view about the implementation. Based on the analysis in the chapter four, that teacher A and B performed different results in implementing the core performance values. Teacher A was scored 3 of 4 by the scoring guide with 61,11% percentage of all indicators, while teacher B was scored 4 of 4 with 88,89% percentage of all indicators.

Teacher A and B's performance in the classroom brings out similarity and differences. The similarity is that both teachers did not reveal C1 indicator in their own classroom activities. C1 indicator claims teacher to do self and/or peer-assessment to examine their own behaviour. C1 indicator says that staff encourages students to examine their own behavior in light of the core values and challenge them to make their behavior consistent with the core values (Lickona et al., 2010). The absence of self and/or peer-assessment makes teacher more difficult in assessing all of the students' behaviour in the classroom in the same manner as peer-assessment also brings a great advantage for the students. As stated by Goldfinch & Raeside (1990), peer-assessment provides a way of achieving individual marks. Then Falchikov (2005) further explains that, peer-assessment deepens students' understanding of their own learning and empowers students to become more actively engaged and self-directed in their learning processes. Therefore, peer-assessment is important to appear when assessing students' behaviour.

On the other hand, the difference between teacher A and B falls into the implementation of B1 and C2 indicators. B1 indicator claims teacher to help students develop an appreciation for and a commitment to the core values. In the implementation, teacher A did not give directions of what to do in the the group, but the students automatically understood what to do next. It was different from

teacher B, even though teacher B explained the directions, the students needed to get more explanations. Therefore, teachers are not only the main factors the unsuccessful teaching and learning session, but also the students become ones of the factors.

Then, teacher A also performed the absence of C2 indicator. The teacher did not give any feedback towards the students' performances. It was different from teacher B who almost always gave feedback for the students' performance. Spiller (2009) in his book states that, "It is widely recognised that feedback is an important part of the learning cycle,"

The absence of some indicators is probably caused by the absence of teacher's lesson plan. As stated in chapter 2 that lesson plan is needed in order to anticipate every single thing that will happen in the classroom interaction and the most important point is that lesson plan enables teacher to optimize things (Haynes, 2007, p.2). Saying again that teacher B only missed one indicator while teacher A missed three indicators. Those conditions caused 3 score for teacher A and 4 score for teacher B. Based on the analysis, teacher A did not make lesson plan for the teaching and learning activity. Some indicators missed in the teacher A's performance are probably caused by the unpreparedness of the teacher. Meanwhile, teacher B, who made her own lesson plan, only missed one indicator in the performance.

Then, concerning the teachers' perception and difficulty in implementing character education in classroom interaction, teacher B seemed more difficult in giving instructions to the students to work in group in meeting one until finally the teacher did reiteration and repetition technique (Madrid & Hughes, 2013). Meanwhile, teacher A did not look difficult in managing the class, even only when she pointed the students, they understood what to do. The different method used by the teachers was also considered as one of the causes the teacher was difficult in giving instruction since, as explained in chapter two, that jigsaw method is more complicated than debate method.

Therefore, there are two main conclusions drawn from the study. The first one is that teacher B implemented the key indicators of Character education more

comprehensively than teacher A. It was proven by the score and the percentage got by each teacher. Teacher A's percentage is 61,11% which indicates 3 score, while teacher B's percentage is 88,89% which indicates 4 score. Teacher A's lack in implementing the Character education is probably caused by the teacher's unpreparedness of the classroom activity whereby she did not prepare a lesson plan for the teaching and learning session.

Then, the second conclusion is that the teacher's difficulty in performing core performance values is not only depending on the teacher's English ability, but also it is depending on the students' English ability, the students' passionate in learning, and the method used in the teaching and learning session and one of the most important thing is the teacher's lesson plan.

5.2 Suggestion

In line with Lickona et al. (2010), this study is expected to help educators examine their current character education practices, identify short- and long-term objectives, and develop or strengthen a strategic plan for continuous improvement by scoring each item. After a school determines its baseline data, it can use the Eleven Principles Scoring Guide again later to assess progress.

Taking relation to results of the study, to implement a character education, a teacher needs to prepare lesson plan(s). In the lesson plan, a teacher can manage and prepare everything including the method used. The method can be modified to arrange proper ways to handle variety of students in the classroom.

The implementation of character education in EFL classroom interaction is likely to continue, since English has been a very crucial language to master and it is needed to be accompanied by a good manner. In Indonesia, research in this area has not been well advanced, since the issue of character education is newly coming when 2013 curriculum was implemented. Even though the Ministry of Education and Culture has stopped the 2013 curriculum, the character education does not need to be dismissed too. Nevertheless, there are still some provinces that still use 2013 curriculum, such as, West Java, Banten, Bengkulu, and some more ("79 Sekolah", 2014; "Mayoritas Sekolah", 2015").

The present analysis has provided some useful information relating to character education. However, there are still a number of important areas which deserve further investigation. These include:

- a. Further exploration of the assessment used by teacher to assess students' behaviour in Indonesia
- b. An investigation of teacher's code switching when implementing character education in EFL classroom
- c. An investigation of the effects of different method used to perform the same values
- d. The analysis on gender effects in implementing character education might also be carried out.

5.2 Concluding Remarks

This chapter has presented the conclusions and suggestions of the study based the findings and the discussion in chapter IV.

