CHAPTER V
CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

The previous chapter has presented the analysis and discussion of pre-service teachers' ability in writing a Discussion text regarding its schematic structure and linguistic features followed by their difficulties supported by the interview data. This chapter presents the conclusions derived from the previous chapter in answering the research questions in this study and also provides some suggestions for related parties and future researchers who are interested in the field of investigating pre-service teachers' writing.

5.1 Conclusions

The focus of this study is to find out pre-service teachers' ability and difficulties in writing Discussion texts. It aimed at investigating how the Discussion texts were developed by six pre-service teachers from one state university in Bandung, Indonesia, categorized as low, middle, and high achievers, in terms of schematic structure and linguistic features and revealing the difficulties encountered by them in writing such texts. Additionally, a qualitative case study involving text analysis and interviews was applied to answer the research questions.

Regarding the pre-service teachers' ability, this study found out that 2 pre-service teachers (PST 3 and PST 4) had applied appropriate schematic structure of a Discussion text. The writing consists of four essential elements including *Preview of Issue, Arguments for, Arguments against*, and *Recommendation* or *Evaluation* as suggested by Feez & Joyce (2002), Unsworth (2000), and Macken-Horarik (2002). Meanwhile, 2 other pre-service teachers (PST 2 and PST 5) did not present a complete structure of a Discussion text since they missed any *Recommendation* or *Evaluation* stage and the rest 2 pre-service teachers (PST 1 and PST 6) did not apply any appropriate schematic structure of the text. These

various results indicate their unstable knowledge about the schematic structure of Discussion text.

In regard to the linguistic features, the findings show that 5 texts contain various linguistic features of a Discussion text as summarized by Emilia (2011). It is found that the texts focus on one certain topic, use mental verbs, use connective words, contain technical terms, provide evidence or experts' arguments, use evaluative language, contain passive sentence, and use simple present tenses throughout the texts. Meanwhile, another 1 text (which is categorized as low achiever's text) contains more linguistic features of a Descriptive text since it involves one specific participant, mostly implements attributive relational processes, uses a lot of linking verbs, and contains a lot of adjectives to describe the topic (Derewianka, as cited in Emilia, 2011, p. 83).

Experientially, most of the texts have contained various types of processes. Those include material processes, relational processes, verbal processes, and mental processes. Besides that, existential processes also occasionally exist. In this study, most of the texts are dominated by relational processes then followed by material processes. Relational processes help describe features and characteristics, introduce technical terms, provide definitions, and relate cause and effect (Derewianka, 2011) and material processes help build aspects of the field or build information on the issue (Emilia, 2014, p. 178).

In the light of textual metafunction, most of the texts present various types of Theme. Those include topical unmarked Theme, topical marked Theme, textual Theme, interpersonal Theme, and multiple Theme to create coherent and cohesive texts. Additionally, various types of Thematic progressions were also employed by the pre-service teachers even though these are still rarely used. Those include reiteration patterns, zigzag patterns, and multiple Theme patterns. However, this study found out that there are only 2 pre-service teachers (PST 1 and PST 3) presented the multiple Theme patterns, which completely constitutes macro-Theme, hyper-Theme, and macro-New.

Besides the ability, there were also several difficulties encountered by the pre-service teachers. It is found that the pre-service teachers appeared to experience difficulties especially in terms of text organization, grammatical structure, generating ideas, and creating appropriate citation.

Overall, the findings lead to a final conclusion that the pre-service teachers still need some improvements and guidance to write a Discussion text especially in terms of its schematic structure and linguistic features, not only for those who belong to low and middle achiever categories, but also for those who belong to high achiever category in order to enrich their content knowledge to fulfil the professional competence required by the Ministry of Education in Indonesia as stated in Indonesian Law No. 14 2005, article 10, paragraph 1.

5.2 Suggestions

The following suggestions are offered for lecturers in the university and further researchers regarding SFL analysis of pre-service teachers' texts as possible ways to improve this study based on the findings, discussion, and conclusions of the research results.

Firstly, for lecturers, particularly in the lecturing of writing genre-based texts, explicit teaching is suggested to implement based on the pre-service teachers' levels of achievement. In addition, it is also suggested to provide corrective feedback by applying SFL analysis in assessing pre-service teachers' texts in order to reveal their language ability and difficulties in writing each particular text. It will lead to a better recognition on which part to be improved regarding their language capacity to fulfil the requirements of having sufficient content knowledge before they come to a real teaching practice.

Secondly, for further research, investigating another text type made by a larger number of pre-service teachers using SFL framework shall be conducted. Adding other strands of meaning, in this case interpersonal metafunction, is also

suggested to obtain more detail information, which can be realized through Mood system analysis.