

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION and SUGGESTION

This is the last chapter of this thesis that consists of two parts. The first is the conclusion of the previous chapters. The second is the suggestions for the next researchers on the field of discourse especially in the teachers talk and also some suggestions that might be useful for the teachers in general. Hopefully this research will also be useful for those who are conducting some research on teacher-talk and student-talk and dealing with teaching English as a foreign language in Indonesia.

5.1 Conclusion

From the data on the previous chapter, the writer found out that teacher A liked to Elicit (40.8%) to stimulate students' answers. She often switches her language into Indonesian if there was nobody could answer her questions, but the rest she tried to use English in communicating with her students using the simple words. She also liked to do inform (26.3%) to give explanation to her students then she asked questions to evaluate students' understanding. Teacher A often did starter before beginning to say something. In brief, there were two way communications between teacher A and her students and it made the situation in the classroom was alive.

The other teacher, teacher B, liked to inform (50.9%) during the classroom and she often did elicit (28.9%). On the other hand, teacher A used Indonesia almost all the time especially when she explained grammar. To her, using Indonesian in explaining grammar was more effective than using English because students could easily understand what she explained.

In giving response, teacher B liked to do accept (70.5%) because she liked to give exercises to her students and she answered it together. On the vice versa, teacher A liked to give comment of what the students' said. She often did interview and did some jokes with her students to melt the situation.

Flanders (1970), in his research, divided student talk into three categories, they are students' expected response, students' initiated response, and all talk/no talk/confusion. The functions of students talk which mostly appeared in the classroom was students' expected response because they just answered teachers' questions and the answer could be predicted. The percentages were: (57.3%) for student talk in teacher A's class and (57.4%) for student talk in teacher B's class.

From all the data analysis above the writer found out that teachers spoke a lot than the students did, (78.5%) for teacher talk and (21.5%) for student talk. It means that the purpose of the new curriculum in Indonesia (Curriculum Competency Based) was not reached. Actually the purpose of the curriculum is to encourage students to speak English a lot in the classroom and the function of the teacher is only for the facilitator. But, in fact students spoke a little and if they spoke, it was only answering the teachers' questions.

It is good for the English teacher to give explanation to their students, but if they talk too much they will bring several effects on the students' English ability later. First, students are too lazy to try to speak English because they think that their teachers (English teacher) will speak more than they do. Second, students are able to write in grammatically correct, but nothing in speaking. Third, students will be afraid of speaking because they lack of vocabularies and grammar.

From this, the writer draws a conclusion that both teachers spoke a lot during the classroom that produced several effects for the students in the future and also the purpose of the Competence Based Curriculum was not reached as the Government wants.

5.2 Suggestion

This study was done in a formal English classroom in which all the teachers were Indonesian and English was taught as a foreign language. Therefore, the writer would like to suggest to the next researchers who deal with teacher talk and student talk in English classroom based on the Competence Based Curriculum to conduct the research in longer period of time and also observe the teachers' pronunciation because the English teachers in Indonesia themselves have problem in pronouncing the English word.

The writer also would like to give suggestions to the English teachers especially the teacher training students who read this study.

1. The English teachers should use English all the time to encourage students to speak English. Their function is only as a facilitator to guide them to learn English, not giving explanation all the time.
2. The teacher should take less directive role. The implication is that the students will take the initiative to come to the teacher.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ardinugroho, Firman. 2007. *Teacher Talk of Two English Teachers at SMA Kristen Petra 2 Surabaya*. Surabaya: Unpublished Thesis of Widya Mandala Catholic University.
- Cook, Guy. 1989. *Discourse*. Oxford University Press.
- 2003. *Standar Kompetensi 2004*. Jakarta: Balitbang Diknas.
- Flanders. 1970. *Analyzing Teaching Behavior*. Introduction Research Education. (Second Edition).
- Hudson, R.A, 1988. *Sociolinguistics*, Cambridge University Press.
- 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*. Oxford University Press.
- Nababan, P.W.J. 1984. *Sociolinguistik (Suatu Pengantar)*. Jakarta: PT. Gramedia.
- Ngadiman, Agustinus. 1994. *A Case Study of Two Reading Comprehension Teachers at The English Department of Widya Mandala Catholic University Surabaya*. Fakultas Keguruan dan Ilmu Pendidikan Universitas Katolik Widya Mandala Surabaya.
- Nugraheni W.P, Rosalina. 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.
- Sinclair, J. McH and D.Brazil. 1982. *Teacher Talk*. Oxford University Press.
- Tsui Bik-May, Amy. 1985. *Analyzing Input and Interaction in Second Language Classroom*. RELC Journal Vol. 16. No. 1, June.