CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

5.1. Conclusion

Considering the findings and the discussion in the previous chapter, the writer described three conclusions. Firstly, students' interpersonal moves done in the oral interaction were dominated by responses to teachers' questions and commands. Meanwhile, the oral interaction lacked of students' initiation and follow-up and that roles were dominated by the teacher. That fact indicates that the teacher didn't get opportunities to the students and students still lack of awareness to initiate or to give feedback on others' participations. Secondly, the students' interpersonal functions done in the classroom oral interaction reflects that the students' main purpose to participate the classroom oral interaction is to response to the teacher.

The last conclusion, students' experiential functions reflected by the process types were mostly represented by intensive identifying relational clauses. It was due to the interaction was a discussion dominated by questions and answer activity. Those dominant clauses were only constructed only with identifier and lacked of verbal groups. Those identifiers were English expressions used to ask for apology and express gratitude. Thus, they can't be categorized as clause. It seemed that students' participation in EFL classroom oral interaction is still at the word level, not clause level. However, verbal clauses as the most demanded clauses to occur were absent from students' utterances. To conclude, the oral

interaction occurred in the learning process showed that the goal or the demand had not been reached or fulfilled.

Furthermore, the contrasts of the students' language in doing the interpersonal functions and the experiential functions were revealed in the findings. The findings show that English was the most used language by students. Meanwhile Indonesian as their L1 was still preferred to use in the exchange out of the context of the discussion. It is an indication that the students did not feel comfortable enough to use the target language in the EFL classroom oral interaction. In fact, the students are demanded to use those expressions purposefully and meaningfully in the real life context of situation, while the classroom is the closest and more possible context to use and develop their English as a foreign language.

5.2. Recommendation

The writer hopes that she can contribute to the people, especially the English education area, through the study and its findings. Concerning the significance and the findings of the study, the writer recommends that:

5.2.1. For further research, the method of the study should be critically reviewed in order to develop the further research on the students' participation in EFL classroom oral interaction. The writer recommends those who are willing to conduct further research on the same field to give more variations in the research concerning students' participation in EFL classroom oral interaction, such as by selecting different situation and different level of

EFL class. The more various the research on this area, the richer the information gained which is helpful for EFL teachers in improving their students participation by using the target language.

5.2.2. The findings and the discussion of this study can be used as reflection of the teaching-learning process in EFL class of junior high school. Since this study shows some facts concerning a phenomenon in EFL classroom oral interaction, the writer recommends that teacher will have the findings of this study as a consideration in planning the lesson or teaching strategies in improving students' participation in EFL classroom oral interaction by using the target language.

REFERENCES

Bellack, Arno A. et al. "Overview of the Classroom Discourse," *The Language of the Classroom*. New York: Columbia University, 1966.

Brown, H.D. Principles of Language Learning and Teaching. New York: Pearson Education, 2000.

Christie, Frances. "The Language of Classroom Interaction and Learning," *Researching Language in Schools and Communities: Functional Linguistic Perspectives*. London: Cassel, 2000, p.184-203.

Christie, Frances. *Classroom Discourse Analysis: A Functional Perspective*. New York: Continuum, 2002.

Eggins, Suzane. *An Introduction to Systemic Functional Linguistics*. Continuum London: International Publishing Group, 2004.

Fairclough, Norman. *Discourse and Social* Change. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1992.

Frymer, Ann Bainbridge. "Students' Classroom Communication Effectiveness," *Communication Quarterly*. Routledge, 2005.

González, Gabriela Ayala et al. "Don't Tell My Father": Important Lessons Learned Through EFL Classroom Small Talk, *Profile*. Columbia: 2011.

Hall, Joan Kelly. "Classroom Interaction and Language Learning," *Ilha do Desterro*. University of Georgia, 2003.

Halliday, M.A.K. and Christian Matthiessen. *Introduction to Functional Grammar*. London: Oxford University Press, 2004.

Haratyan, Farzaneh. "Halliday's SFL and Social Meaning," *2nd International Conference on Humanities, Historical and Social Sciences.* Singapore: University Malaya, 2011.

Juniarti, Refty Royan. 2010. *The Contribution of the Quality of the Teacher's Questioning to Students' Ability to Speak English: A Discourse Analysis*

Knop, Constance K. Increasing Use of the Target Language in Classroom Interaction, (n.d.), 1985.

Tuan, Luu Trong and Nguyen Thi Kim Nhu. "Theoretical Review on Oral Interaction in EFL Classrooms," *Studies in Literature and Language*, 2010.

Wells, Gordon and Rebeca Mejía Arauz. "Dialogue in the Classroom," *The Journal of the Learning Sciences*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2006.

Young, Richard F. *Language and Interaction an Advanced Resource Book*. New York: Routledge, 2008.