

## CHAPTER V

### CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Chapter four has displayed and discussed the data analyses from the classroom observation, questionnaires, semi-structured interview and analysis of students' descriptive essays regarding their writing process. This chapter concludes the study by proposing the contribution or consolidation of the reported study to the previous studies in writing process (section 5.1) and some recommendations are provided in order to give information as well as guidance to conduct further research concerning the same field or issue (section 5.2).

#### 5.1. Conclusions

This study investigates students' writing process, which is conscious and unconscious activities conducted at the pre-writing stage, writing/drafting stage and post-writing stage as realized in students' descriptive texts. As discussed in chapter four, findings of the study suggested that the participants of the study, which were the high-achiever, middle-achiever, and low-achiever students, underwent complex, non-linear, recursive process of writing, in which planning, monitoring, revising/editing, reviewing, conferencing, sharing and publishing might occur repeatedly at any stages of writing process. These findings were relevant with the findings of previous studies (e.g. Emig, 1971; Britton, et al. 1975; Murray, 1980; Graves, 1983; Bailey, 2003; Walsh, 2004; Lindemann, 1982, Proet and Gill, 1986, Friedlander, 1990; Richards, 1992, Benton, *et al.*, 1993, Emilia, 1998; 2008; 2010; 2014; Grabe & Kaplan, 1996; Angelova, 1999, Gibson, 2002, Ronk, 2003, Tompkins, 2008 and many others) as mentioned in Chapter Two of the study.

However, different activities had also been conducted by the participants of the study at the pre writing, writing and post writing stage. Firstly, the high and middle achiever students conducted similar activities at the pre-writing stage, such

as; brainstorming, making an outline or written guideline, free writing and discussing their writing with peers, which were in accordance with the findings of previous studies (e.g. Emig, 1971; Britton, et al. 1975; Murray, 1980; Graves, 1983; Richards, 1992; Bailey, 2003; Walsh, 2004; Emilia, 1998; 2008; 2010; 2014). On the other hand, the low achiever students did not make any written guideline or discussion with their friends. The only activity that they did was brainstorming ideas for their writing.

Secondly, at the writing/drafting stage, the high-achiever and middle achiever students performed the following activities; monitoring the composition process, re-writing the composition, revising the content, grammar, dictions and organization of the essay, and conferencing or sharing ideas with other writers. These findings are in line with conceptions proposed by process theorists (e.g. Emig, 1971; Britton, et al. 1975; Murray, 1980; Graves, 1983; Richards, 1992; Bailey, 2003; Walsh, 2004; Emilia, 1998; and many others). In contrast, the low-achiever students demonstrated different activities from the high and middle achiever students in the writing/drafting stage such as writing a draft in *bahasa Indonesia*, translating, and fast writing. Some of these findings are in conjunction with the conception proposed by some theorists (e.g. Emig, 1971; Britton, et al. 1975; Murray, 1980; Graves, 1983; Richards, 1992; Bailey, 2003; Walsh, 2004; Emilia, 1998; and many others), but the act of translating is considered to be not in the circle of many writing process theories. Therefore, teachers or educators need to pay more attention towards the low achiever students and adjust their teaching approach so that the low achiever would also be well facilitated in the context of teaching and learning EFL writing.

Lastly, at the post-writing stage, the high and middle achiever students had also conducted different activities that were different from the low-achiever students. The findings showed that the high and middle achiever students performed the following activities: sharing or publishing their writing to other writers, presenting their writing, revising their essay's grammaticality, dictions, and organization, adding new ideas, deleting unnecessary information. These

findings were in line with the findings of previous studies (e.g. Murray, 1980; Lindemann, 1982; Proet and Gill, 1986; Richards, 1992; Emilia, 1998; Ronk, 2003; Tompkins, 2008). On the other hand, the low-achiever students only performed an act of evaluating their essay by making minor changes regarding their essays' grammaticality and choice of words.

Furthermore, based on the analysis of students descriptive text using systemic functional grammar, it was found that the high and middle achiever students' descriptive texts were in line with the schematic structure, organization, purpose, and linguistic features of a descriptive type of writing, while the low achiever students' descriptive texts showed inconfirmity with the schematic structure, organization, purpose, and linguistic features as proposed by some experts (e.g Derewianka, 1990; Eggins, 1994; Gerrot and Wignell, 1998; Butt, et al, 2000; Emilia, 2010; 2014). Thus, in line with the data gained from the observation, questionnaire, and interview (see section 4.2, 4.3 and 4.4) the activities conducted by the high and middle achiever students, which were outlining, text planning, brainstorming, revising, sharing, conferencing and publishing, at the pre writing stage, writing / drafting stage, and post writing stage were regarded to give beneficial and positive impacts towards their descriptive texts (final draft), as their writing were, to some extent, in accordance with the schematic structure, organization, purpose and linguistic features of a descriptive text. On the other hand, In line with the data gained from the questionnaire, observation and interview (see section 4.2, 4.3 and 4.4) the activities conducted by the low achiever students, which were brainstorming, monitoring and translating, at the pre writing stage, writing / drafting stage, and post writing stage, did not, to some extent, provide significant contribution towards their descriptive texts (final drafts), as their writing were missing some important features in regards to the schematic structure, organization, purpose and linguistic features of a descriptive text.

## **5.2 Recommendations**

In accordance with the topic under discussion, which focuses on students' writing process in descriptive writing, the following recommendations are put forward in order to provide valuable information in regards to the study of writing process, especially in context of the teaching and learning of English as a foreign language.

Firstly, with regard to students' writing process, it has been mentioned that in general the low-achiever students conducted different writing process compared to the middle and high-achiever students. In regards to this finding, teachers or lecturers should provide alternative technique or strategy in teaching writing, especially in EFL context, spesifically towards students with low English proficiency.

Secondly, by comprehending the nature of students' writing process, a teacher or lecturer are able to examine the difficulties, the benefits and the complexity level of it. Accordingly, the teacher, lecturer or even curriculum developers are able to comprise a curriculum and syllabus that basically focus on the nature of students' writing process.

Lastly, in regards to the complexity of writing process, educational institution should provide a special writing program both for students and practitioners in order to help students with their writing problems and tasks.

