

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

This chapter provides the conclusion of the study derived from the findings and discussion and offers some recommendations which may give some inputs for future studies with theme related to the analysis of students' writings by using systemic functional linguistics.

5.1 Conclusion

As stated in Chapter I, the focus of the study is analyzing students' analytical exposition writing in order to reveal to what extent their writings fulfill the schematic structure and linguistic features (in terms of Transitivity system) of analytical exposition text criteria. The students are divided to three levels of achievements, which are: low, middle and high achiever students. Moreover, the study was conducted in a qualitative design with a case study approach in one public school in Cimahi.

The findings show that the schematic structure of all texts fulfill the criteria of analytical exposition text. All the texts have all elements of analytical exposition structure namely thesis, arguments, reiteration. Moreover, in terms of linguistic features, all the texts use generalization of participant, simple present tense, connectives and impersonal voice. Experientially, all the texts also dominantly use relational, material and mental processes which are the characteristics of analytical exposition text. Moreover, all the texts also use circumstances to strengthen the stance being upheld.

However, the fulfillment is still inadequate to some extent. It is identified from some incomplete fulfillments which will be elaborated in detail conclusion of the study below.

First, regarding the fulfillment of schematic structure of analytical exposition text. The findings of the study show that low achiever texts fulfill the schematic structure criteria of analytical exposition text to the extent of announcing the issue although not including the writer's stance and present factual information as arguments to motivate the thesis in a form of paragraph. Meanwhile, the middle achiever texts complete the same criteria to the low achiever texts. However, they are better with two additional criteria of present background information though not very relevant and specific to the issue and present thesis reiteration and conclude the issue being upheld. The last is high achiever texts which fulfill the criteria to the same extent attained by low achiever texts. High achiever texts also have two criteria that are similar to the middle achiever texts which are present thesis reiteration and conclusion of the issue.

Second, in terms of general linguistic features, the low achiever texts attain the general linguistic features of analytical exposition text by using generalized participants, several connectives, impersonal voice and nominalizations (although poor). Meanwhile, the middle achiever texts are better to some extent that it uses better nominalizations as participant. In the high achiever texts, the linguistic features fulfillment is far better to the extent of using (1) participants in a form of noun phrase, (2) complex clauses intensively and (3) technical terms relevant to the issue. Therefore, in the aspect of general linguistics features, high-achiever texts are better than the low- and middle-achiever texts.

Third, experientially, the low achiever texts fulfill the linguistic features criteria of analytical exposition to the extent of employing mostly material, mental and relational processes. In participant roles employment, low achiever texts are inconsistent in which the role of participant mostly go to *children* and rarely assign *computer* as the issue being focused. However, low achiever texts employ circumstances properly in helping each element of the text to fulfill the purpose.

Moreover, the middle achiever texts fulfill the linguistic features criteria by employing mostly material and relational processes. The use of participant roles in middle achiever texts is also appropriate that even *science* is not assigned mostly as active participant, it sometimes occurs as passive participant and in circumstances.

Meanwhile, the high achiever texts fulfill the linguistic features of analytical exposition text to the extent they employ mostly relational and material processes. There are also frequent occurrences of behavioral processes but those are actually in form of noun clause which is the focus of the issue being upheld – *studying*. The participant roles (Actor, Carrier, Possessor and Senser) assigned to *students* and *studying*. The circumstances employed in the texts are properly enrich and clarify the message being conveyed.

In summary, all texts fulfill the criteria of analytical exposition text in terms of schematic structure and linguistic features. However, the fulfillment of the criteria is still inadequate to some extent. It may results in unsuccessful completion of analytical exposition text social purpose. The failure in social purpose completion may emerge from three causes which are different levels of students' achievements, inaccurate application of genre-based approach teaching and the limitation of data collection process which only obtained the first draft of students' writing.

5.2 Recommendation

Based on the study, there are some recommendation for teachers and researchers who are interested in developing studies related to students' writings analysis. The suggestions are derived from the limitation of this study.

First, for teachers, it is highly recommended that in genre-based approach learning, students should have been writing various text types instead of only

learning the text types theoretically. Moreover, teachers are recommended to conduct all the stages in genre-based approach in order to assure students' understanding in writing a particular text type. It is because the process of writing will improve students' English skill.

Moreover, the analysis of text they produce will give us an exposure on students' actual performance namely the strength, weaknesses and achievements. In addition, the analysis of student also has to be done specifically both on the schematic structure, linguistic features and the meaning they are trying to convey.

Second, for future researchers, the study only focuses on the analysis of schematic structure, general linguistic features and Transitivity system of students' analytical expositions. Thus, it is recommended for further studies the analysis will also involve the logical meaning or conjunction system analysis to complete the ideational metafunction analysis. Moreover, it would be even better to analyze all the metafunction to attain complete depiction of meaning within students' writing.

Third, further studies are recommended to improve in the variety of data by adding more drafts (not only diagnostic) of students' texts to attain more elaboration. For example, researchers may collect students' writing based on the cycle of genre-based approach. So, researchers may compare and identify differences or progress of students' writing ability.

Fourth, further studies may also involve the implementation of a particular teaching technique or approach in order to gain information of how particular teaching technique and approach may affect students' writings.