CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

This chapter consists of two parts. The first is the summary, which discusses all the main points in the previous chapters. The second is the suggestions for future researchers on the field of Classroom Discourse. Hopefully this research will also be useful for those who are conducting some research on teachers' talk and dealing with teaching English as a foreign language in Indonesia.

5.1 Summary and Conclusion

The writer used a handy cam and a tape recorder to record the whole conversations between the teachers and students in the real class situation. Then the writer transcribed the data and analyzed them based on the theories of teacher talk.

After analyzing the data based on Flanders (1970) as quoted by Tsui Bik – May (1985: 12-14), the writer found out eight categories of teacher-initiate: 1.) Elicit, 2.) Direct, 3.) Nominate, 4.) Inform, 5.) Recapitulate, 6.) Frame, 7.) Check, and 8.) Starter, and four categories of teacher-response: 1.) Evaluate, 2.) Accept, 3.) Comment, and 4.) Clue. But, from all the categories above, there were only three categories that very dominant occurred. The categories are Elicit, Inform and Starter.

This study found out that sometimes, in the classroom, students did not give response to the teachers' statements or questions. That is why the teachers

stimulate the students to answer or give responses by doing Elicit, Direct, Nominate, Inform, Recapitulate, Frame, Check, Starter, Evaluate, Accept, Comment, and Clue.

From all the data analysis above, the writer found out that the first teacher, teacher A, liked to give information (I = 29.5 % of total initiation) to the students during the lesson. He gave some example first before he asked a question to the students. He also liked to give a starter (S = 17.6 % of total initiation) to give some information about what will be asked so that the students did not have a great difficulty to answer, before he asked a question. He preferred to ask factual questions (FQ = 45.5 % of total elicitation / 18.9 % of total initiation), than the other questions. He did that in order to train the students to see the fact around them to answer or to react to something.

The second teacher, teacher B, also liked to give information (I = 21.7 % of total initiation) to the students during the lesson. She sometimes gave some example first before she asked a question to the students and rarely gave a starter before asking a question to the students. She liked to ask opining questions (OQ = 28.8 % of total elicitation / 12.5 % of total initiation) to see the students' opinion about something and to ask factual questions (FQ = 26.9 % of total elicitation / 11.7 % of total initiation) to see the students' understanding toward the fact around them.

In giving response, both teachers were rarely giving responses to the students' answers and questions. They rarely gave responses when the questions were answered correctly and the questions were quite difficult according to the

teacher. They also gave responses when the students did a great job, for example helped the teacher to do something and gave a great answer to the teachers' questions.

From this, the writer draws a conclusion that both teachers liked to ask factual questions (FQ) to the students to see their understanding. The difference was only teacher B also liked to ask opining questions (OQ) to the students in order to draw the students to answer based on their opinion. In teaching learning process, both teachers rarely gave response to the students answer. They kept explaining all the time. In teaching learning process, both teachers also used Indonesian in explaining. The difference was teacher A used Indonesian all the time during the lesson. Teacher B only used Indonesian when she realized that the students did not get what she meant.

5.2 Suggestion

This study was done in a formal English classroom in which all the teachers are Indonesians, and English is taught as a foreign language. Therefore, the writer would like to suggest to the next researchers who deal with teacher talk in teaching English as foreign language to conduct the research in longer period of time and take the data from many classes and not only from a few classes. Also, the researchers can compare the teacher talk between a native speaker teacher and a non-native speaker teacher in a formal classroom. The last but not least, the researchers can observe the teacher from other part of Indonesia and not only from

East Java as both teachers observed because people in other part of Indonesia have

different dialect and different ways to speak.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Boey, Lim Kiat. 1980. *Bilingual Education*. Singapore: Singapore University Press for SEAMEO Regional Language Center.

Cook, Guy. 1989. *Discourse*. London: Oxford University Press.

Flanders, N.A. 1970. *Analyzing Teaching Behavior*. Reading, Mass. : Addison – Wesley.

Holmes, Janet. 1986. Classroom Interaction and Second Language Learner. *Guide Lines*. 8 (2): 19 -30. New York

Indrawan, Yuli. 2005. *Wimakid's Teachers' Talk*. Surabaya: Unpublished Thesis of Widya Mandala Catholic University.

Krashen, Stephen D. 1985. *The Input Hypothesis: Issues and Implications*. New York: Longman Inc.

Malamah, Ann and Thomas. 1987. *Classroom Interaction.* London: Oxford University Press.

Nababan, P.W.J. 1984. *Sosiolinguistik (Suatu Pengantar)*. Jakarta: P.T. Gramedia.

Wulan Purnami, Rosalina Nugraheni. 2004. *Female and Male Teachers' Strategy in Questioning The Students of The English Department of Widya Mandala Catholic University Surabaya*. Malang: Unpublished Thesis of Graduate Program of State University of Malang.

Ngadiman, Agustinus. 1994. *A Case Study of Two Reading Comprehension Teachers at The English Department of Widya Mandala Catholic University Surabaya*. Surabaya: Fakultas Keguruan dan Ilmu Pendidikan Universitas Katolik Widya Mandala Surabaya.

Sari, Carolin Diana. 2006. *Teacher Talk and Student Talk in English Classes at Wima Kids.* Surabaya: Unpublished Thesis of Widya Mandala Catholic University.

Sinclair, J.McH. and D. Brazil. 1982. *Teacher Talk*. London: Oxford University Press.

Tsui Bik-May, Amy. 1985. *Analyzing Input and Interaction in Second Language Classroom*. RELC Journal Vol. 16. No. 1, June.