CHAPTER V
CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

This chapter presents the conclusions of the research and the suggestions for the further research with the same or similar topic.

5.1 Conclusions

As stated in the first chapter, this study is intended to answer two purposes of the research: (1) to analyze the communicativeness of the tasks during the speaking assessment by using seven checklists of communicative tasks proposed by Nunan (1989), and (2) to analyze the appropriateness of the scoring criteria used by the English teacher during the speaking assessment.

In terms of the first research question, based on the results of the classroom observations and interview, the tasks conducted during the speaking assessment did not measure the students' communicative speaking skill. There were some limitations found in line with the use of the tasks. The teacher had conducted various activities to deliver the language learning communicatively, such as through songs and games. The teacher helped the students' understanding with the use of the simple language and gestures during the activities. She also provided examples to make the learning process clearer. The teacher also emphasized the students' participation as shown when she involved the students in the discussions. She usually invited the students to answer questions from exercises. Thus, she was not too dominant. However, regarding to the goals and rationale, teacher's perspective towards the language learning goals was not clear. The use of the target language was limited during the classroom activities. The interaction between the teacher and the students was mostly in Indonesian. Besides, the statement of the purpose was not stated clearly so that the students did not have any preparation for the learning process. It was proved by some students who forgot to bring their books or homework. Moreover, it was also not clear whether the learning objectives were obtained by all of the students or not since there was no review given towards the students' strengths and weaknesses.

Usually, the time was over while the teacher was busy in assisting each student in finishing his or her exercises. As a consequence, the students asked the teacher to close the classroom activities without concluding the learning materials.

Furthermore, considering the language instructions, the teacher sometimes did not explain orally what the students needed to do in the given exercises. The teacher tended to distribute a piece of paper or ask the students to open their workbook and ask them to do the certain exercises without giving more explanations. Thus, the students were noisy and kept asking the teacher while she was assessing the other students.

In line with the classroom implementation, it was noted that the students were active if only they had games or songs. When they were asked to do written exercises, they tended to be noisy. The students tended to make a noise, such as talking each other or playing inside the classroom when they had finished the written exercises and when they had their turn in the speaking assessment. There were no additional activities so that the teacher seemed to let the students busy with themselves. It was also obtained that the students would use the target language only if the teacher asked them. Therefore, the language-learning atmosphere in these classes did not represent the atmosphere of the English class should be.

Moreover, in accordance with the grade of the tasks, there was a task which could not really explore the students' speaking skill. In this case, the teacher would assess the students' ability in using the expressions of telling the prepositions of place. The students were named one by one and asked to sing the song while gesturing each preposition of place. In other words, the activities seemed to be inappropriate with the skill expected.

Afterwards, considering the teacher's roles, her control in managing the classroom atmosphere was not fully maximized. First, the teacher was too busy in assisting students in finishing their exercises. The teacher did not prepare an extra activity for the students who had done their works so that they tended to make a noise. Second, there were two students who did not want to join the speaking assessment. The teacher did not ask them why they did not want to join the

learning activities. She let the two students do what they wanted to do. Finally, the teacher did not provide sufficient feedback related to students mistakes during the assessment process. The feedback was not given for all students and sometimes it was given in Indonesian.

Lastly, in line with the assessment, the teacher did not bring any scoring criteria whenever she had speaking assessment. She also did not inform the students about the speaking assessment. The speaking assessments tended to be conducted coincidentally since the teacher wanted to know her students' readiness.

In terms of the scoring criteria, it was found that from the four speaking scoring criteria categories proposed by Brown (2001) and Heaton (1989), the teacher only involved two categories, namely accuracy and fluency. In addition, the teacher divided accuracy into three categories, namely grammar, pronunciation, and vocabulary. The teacher did not consider the importance of comprehension and task. She considered more on the importance of students' confidence. She thought that elementary students were lack of self-confidence, especially when they were asked to speak English. Thus, she assessed the students' speaking skill from three categories, namely students' accuracy, students' fluency, and students' confidence. Moreover, in line with the students' score, there was no difference for each rating. The teacher made the same criteria for the students who got A- to A, B to B+, C+ to B-, and <C+. Thus, the bias score might happen since it was quite difficult to differentiate who would get A- and who would get A, for example. In short, the speaking scoring criteria constructed by the teacher was not appropriate to assess the students' speaking skill since it could not cover all the categories of speaking skill assessment.

5.2 Suggestions

5.2.1 Pedagogical Implication

This research shows the analysis of the communicativeness of the tasks and the appropriateness of the scoring criteria used by the English teacher during the speaking assessment. Based on the results, the tasks used

for the speaking assessment were not communicative enough for measuring the students' speaking skill. The tasks could not explore the students' speaking skill maximally. Moreover, the scoring criteria were also not constructed well. There are two missing categories, such as students' comprehension and tasks. The criteria for each category are not defined clearly. It could make the other teachers confused. Thus, it is suggested for the teacher to learn more about elementary students' characteristics. The teacher needs to know her students' need in oral skill development. Knowing the range of the students' ability is also important in designing the tasks and constructing the scoring criteria. In short, in order to truly measure the students' speaking skill, the teacher is required to design compatible speaking assessment instruments.

5.2.2 Further Research Directions

Since this research investigated the communicativeness of the tasks during the speaking assessment involving the appropriateness of the scoring criteria, the further research is suggested to investigate the speaking tasks in a more detailed focus, such as speaking tasks' design for elementary students so that the researchers could focus on the tasks specifically designed for children. In addition, the further researcher can conduct a research which implements a teacher training to promote the language proficiency level of teachers of young learners. It helps the teachers to improve their teaching professionalism.