

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The aims of this last chapter are to discuss the conclusions which are based on the findings that have been presented in Chapter Four. The conclusions will address the three research questions which have been formulated in Chapter One. Lastly, this chapter provides recommendations for further study for those who are interested in similar issue.

5.1. Conclusions

This study investigates how students perform their skills in writing a literary response text. It is intended to examine students' skills in organizing the writing and in choosing the linguistic features that are appropriate for the text. It also attempts to capture the teaching and learning activities that facilitate students' skills in writing literary response, and students' and lecturer's perception on writing literary responses. Based on data presentation and analysis as discussed in Chapter Four, several conclusions from the findings are drawn as follows.

Related to the first research question, through the analysis of teaching and learning activity in the class, it was found that class activities which facilitate students' skills in writing literary responses are BKOF (which include reading activity, explanation of theory of reading, class discussion, encouraging students to use adjective and textual evidence appropriately, explaining guiding questions), modeling text and independent construction. At BKOF stage, the lecturer has

effectively invited the students to recognize more on the content of literature learning as the beginning phase of teaching cycles. The lecturer also gave the students a model for writing their responses. She also invited the students to examine the organization of a model text by deconstructing the model text. This is appropriate with the concept of teaching genre in literature classroom as has been discussed in Chapter Two. That is the lecturer should execute modeling phase (explaining schematic structure and linguistic features) in inviting students to write literary responses. In spite of that, the lecturer did not explain the linguistic features that should be followed by the students. This makes the students' performance, as indicated in findings from documentation, is less successful in writing literary responses. Consequently, these findings lead to the hypothesis that the teaching and learning activities in the class have not been optimally used by the teachers for promoting students' skills in writing literary responses. In this case, the lecturer has not taught the text type explicitly in literature classroom. Hence, it is better for the lecturer to induce explicit teaching of genre in subject learning like literature, as suggested by the experts (Butt et al, 2000; Derewiaka, 2000; Gibbons, 2009), so that students' performance in writing literary response will be enhanced.

Related to the schematic structure and the linguistic feature of students' texts, through the analysis explained in Chapter Four, it was found that the schematic structure of the students' texts comprise all the stages of literary response text which includes introduction, expansion stage, and reaffirmation. It indicates that the students had a good control in employing the schematic structure

of literary response text. However, as indicated in Chapter IV, in introduction stage the students fail to develop context and background information about general themes of the literary work as suggested by Gibbons (2009), Feez & Joyce (2004), Christie in Coutoure (1986). According to these experts, introduction stage should present the summary of narrative work such as author, setting, or characters. Meanwhile, dealing with the use of linguistic features, the students especially mid and low achiever tend to use temporal finite past tense instead of present tense and use minimal connectives which can promote the cohesiveness of the text. These findings reveal that the students are to some extents not really successful in realizing the appropriate linguistic features of literary response texts. At this point, it can be concluded that the students' skills in writing literary responses are not well developed in literature classroom of this research setting. This leads to the assumption that, as recommended above, the teaching and learning activity in literature classroom of the setting has not yet explicitly and optimally been used for inviting students to write by following the concept of genre which unify the teaching of the literature and the language.

Through the interviews, regarding with the difficulty in writing, the mid achiever student perceives that finding vocabulary that best suited to the response is quite difficult. The low achiever student states that the problem in reading literary texts makes him difficult to write the response. In addition, it is difficult for him to write the closing part or the reaffirmation stage. On the other hand, the high achiever does not find any significant problem in writing literary responses. In this case, it is better for the lecturer to give intensive activities which help them

find appropriate vocabularies related to the topic of the field. This can be done by giving semantic map, wallpapering, or progressive brainstorm, word bank, interviewing expert, excursions, picture dictation or barrier crossword (Derewianka, 2000; Gibbons, 2009). In terms of their knowledge of the text types, the analysis indicates that the students are not familiar enough with the literary response genre. They have not known well about the purpose of the texts, the schematic structures and the linguistic features of the text. It indicates that the teaching and learning activity in the class has not yet implemented teaching cycle of writing explicitly and optimally in the class. These findings also imply that students' ability in writing literary responses, to some extent, has not yet well developed.

5.2. Recommendations

Based on the conclusions above, the researcher wants to give several recommendations. Those recommendations are:

First, since the students in this study are not really successful in writing literary responses, it is better for the students to familiarize them selves with the skills of writing literary responses as suggested by experts (Feez and Joyce, 2000; Gibbons, 2009). They should learn that in order to be successful writer, they should recognize the purpose of literary response texts, its schematic structure and its linguistic features. Also, they must understand how to apply it in their writing practice.

Second, in order to guide the students to be successful writer, it is better for the teachers, from now on, to make an optimal effort in inviting students to

write literary responses. To do this, the teachers should familiarize themselves with the teaching of writing by using genre based approach specifically the teaching of genre in literature classroom. It means that the lecturer, as suggested by Christie in Couture (1986), Mohan (1986), Butt et.al (2000), Hammond (2001), Johns (2003), and Gibbons (2009), should be aware that literature demands a specific thinking skill and hence require a particular language use. Therefore, it is better for the lecturer who teaches literature to encourage the students to write in literary response rather than academic essay which is more argumentative.

Finally, further research about the language learning, especially writing, in diverse subject learning, i.e. science, history, mathematics, should be promoted in all levels of education so that a rich insight about the practice of language learning, particularly in Indonesian EFL context can be obtained. The finding of this kind of research will be very beneficial for teachers to modify their teaching and become their rationale for bridging language learning and content learning.