#### **CHAPTER 5**

### CONCLUSION, LIMITATIONS, AND SUGGESTION

The following chapter provides the conclusion of this study, the limitations of the study, and also the suggestion for the improvement of the next research.

### 5.1 Conclusion

This research was conducted to investigate teacher's implementation of approaches to teaching writing and its portrayal on students' written texts. The analysis shows that the way that the teacher's approaches to teaching writing are generally portrayed on the students' written texts.

According to what has been analyzed and discussed in the previous chapter, there are three main conclusion of the study. First, based on the phases of teaching learning activities in the three classes observed, the teacher's teaching of writing is relevant to the characteristics of two approaches, i.e. product approach and genre approach. Characteristics of product approach (mimic model text, individual, one-draft, and focused on end product) can be traced from classroom activities in one class considered low by the teacher. On the other hand, characteristics of genre approach (emphasis on reader expectations and product, more than one draft, individual and collaborative) can be traced from classroom activities in two other classes considered mid and high by the teacher.

Second, basically, the teacher shows good understanding about the nature of writing. She is aware of the necessity of teaching writing appropriately as it will lead to the quality of the students' writing skill. However, different from what the data from observation have shown, the teacher claims to implement only genre approach in her teaching of writing. Somehow, there are some points in the phases of teaching, especially in BKOF and Modeling, which are not implemented appropriately due to her lack of information about this approach.

Third, in the classroom activities indicating product approach, though the texts show some grasp of their respective schematic structures, they are reasonably underdeveloped texts, suggesting too many similar sentences found in the samples of students' texts with the model text given by the teacher. This phenomenon seems to happen because the students tend to imitate the model text as the teacher tells them to do so. In the classroom activities indicating genre approach, on the other hand, the schematic structures of the texts suggest that the students generally understand the demands of the generic form of the genre to achieve its purpose. Somehow, the inappropriateness in the implementation of the approach leads to the less optimum students' written texts. Some mistakes found in the students' written texts have something to do with grammar and certain expressions which should have been discussed in BKOF phase of the approach (see Chapter 2 Section 2.2.3.2). Besides, the content of the students' texts are not improved optimally as the teacher just ask them to produce simple texts though the reason for it is the limited time allocation or doctrine.

# **5.2 Limitations of the Study**

There are some limitations in this study. The first limitation has something to do with the participant and the length of data used in this study. A complete analysis of the implementation of certain approaches to teaching writing should involve an analysis of teacher(s) who teach(es) all classes in the same grade. However, in the interest of space and time, this study only focused on one English teacher and three classes of grade eight. As a consequence, it would lead to incomplete analysis of the teaching of writing and the students' written texts. The second limitation is concerned with the fact that it was only the writer alone who observed, conducted the interview, and analyzed the text. Therefore, there would also be a bias in interpreting the data which involved personal prejudice.

However, some attempts had been made to minimize these limitations. Among of these attempts is the use of multiple sources of evidence through multiple data collection techniques, which allowed for a triangulation of different sources of information. Another attempt is the use of Functional Grammar as the tool to analyze the students' written texts. In this case, Halliday assumes that a discourse analysis that is not based on grammar is not analysis at all, but simply a running commentary on a text (1994: xvi-xvii). Halliday further argues that "the

Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia | repository.upi.edu | perpustakaan.upi.edu

most direct move in the analysis of a text is to give its structural interpretation, ... all the structural analyses could be reinterpreted in terms of the features selected" (1994: xvii).

## **5.3 Suggestions For The Next Study**

Based on the findings of this study, which may not be generalized to other settings, it is recommended that appropriate workshop or training about approaches to teaching writing should be conducted more intensively to provide English teachers with a proper understanding of the background and practical guidance on the application of the approaches in their classes which will lead to the improvement of their students' writing skill. Thus, no matter which approach to teaching writing that the teacher uses, as long as it suits the students' needs, it should be implemented appropriately so that the portrayal of the approach in the students' written texts will be optimum.

Moreover, regarding the limitations of the study above, it is suggested to investigate at least two teachers teaching in different classes but the same grade and all students from that grade for a better and complete result. Besides, it is suggested to ask for any input from other persons who analyze a similar study or the persons who master the theory that informs the study as a single person's opinion or interpretation will always involve subjectivity.