

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

5.1 Conclusions

Based on the previous findings, the following conclusions are presented.

1. This study found that classroom interaction mainly involved four speech functions: statements, questions, commands, and offers; with minor clauses as supporting elements. Statements were the most dominant, accounting for 43.71% of the teacher's utterances and 83.84% of the students' utterances, indicating that interaction focused on exchanging information. The teacher showed a dominant role through the use of questions (38.36%) and commands (11.64%), while students rarely initiated interaction, with only 4.55% questions and 1.52% commands, and mostly produced brief responses (minor clauses: 9.60% compared to the teacher's 3.77%). Overall, these findings suggest that classroom interaction remains largely teacher-centered, with the teacher controlling and directing communication.
2. Speech functions in the classroom were realized through three main mood types: declarative, interrogative, and imperative. While each mood has a typical function, such as declarative for statements, interrogative for questions, and imperative for commands, the findings show flexibility, as speech functions do not always align with their typical moods. Offers, in particular, appeared across different moods depending on the speaker's intention. This indicates that mood is used strategically, especially by the teacher, to manage interaction and support the learning process.

5.2 Suggestions

The following suggestions are presented to improve classroom interaction and guide future research.

1. For teachers and students, it is necessary to reconsider how speech functions are used in classroom interaction, as the dominance of statements and teacher-controlled questions limits meaningful participation. Teachers need to reduce control by encouraging students to initiate interaction through offers, questions, and commands, rather than only responding. Without this shift, interaction remains procedural and teacher-centered, preventing students from actively managing communication and negotiating meaning.
2. For future researchers, it is important to move beyond simply identifying the frequency of speech functions and examine more critically how speech functions and mood are not always congruent, as shown in this study. The mismatch between grammatical mood and communicative function suggests that classroom interaction cannot be fully understood through form-based analysis alone. Therefore, future studies should investigate how this incongruence operates in different classroom contexts and how it influences student participation, interactional control, and learning outcomes. Without addressing this issue, research on classroom discourse risks oversimplifying interaction and overlooking how meaning is actually constructed in practice.