CHAPTER V
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This final chapter is divided into two subheadings which consecutively present the following two aspects; conclusions and recommendations.

5.1 Conclusion

As stated before, this study attempts to discover how Indonesian English Education students use cohesive devices in maintaining the quality of their writings. The data obtained and presented in the previous section indicate that the current research finding confirms the conclusion resulted in some previous studies (Kargozari and Ghaemy, 2012; Tsavera, 2010; Hessamy and Hamedi, 2013; Bae, 2001; Ahmed, 2008; Guthrie. 2008). On the other hand, the data suggest several findings that need to be verified by supports from future studies. Below are the conclusions of this study that can be drawn by what has been described and discussed in the previous chapters.

In responding to the only research question in this study, how the students maintain their quality of writing through the use of cohesive devices; first, the analysis and finding show that the students frequently used reiteration, followed by reference, conjunction, collocation, substitution, and ellipsis. Then, it is also discovered that the application of cohesive devices in their writings generally has two main functions, which are to remind the readers of the point under discussion and to show the position of the author within the text by clarifying and affirming semantic relationship between clauses.

In attaining the devices in the texts, however, particular cases such as misuse, overuse, and underuse are identified in the use of reference, conjunction, and reiteration. After being observed, some are considered as problem while some are not.

In terms of reference device use, student U & S tend to use exophoric reference above average, while student H & D tend to avoid it as how it is

visualized by zero occurrences of this type of reference in some texts. This finding implies that student H & D try to maintain their text's objectivity by not using first-person-pronoun such as 'I', 'you', and 'we' that signify the use of exophoric reference.

Meanwhile, the occurrences of repetition reiteration used by student D in text 1, 2, and 3 are far below average – about 69 times per text. By contrast, the occurrences of synonymy reiteration in two out of three texts written by this student are above average (about 4 times per text). In other words, this data indicate that the writer tries to maintain the quality of writing by avoiding the use of the same words which might lead the reader to be bored in reading the text. On the contrary, repetition is relied heavily by the students H in maintaining the cohesiveness of two out of three texts. The occurrences of this type of reiteration are up to 95 times in the text 2H and 180 times in text 3H. It becomes apparent that this sub-type of reiteration, in this case, is overused. However, even though the use of repetition by this student is remarkable, the analysis demonstrates that the student did not neglect the other subtypes of reiteration and other types of cohesive devices.

In terms of conjunction use, the data show that student S used almost each conjunctive device type frequently above average. However, the final score achieved by this student is the lowest among the others involved in this research. This may be caused by some misuses found within the application of conjunctive devices. Besides, the data also show that the additive conjunction is the most dominant conjunctive devices in the writings, followed by temporal, causal, and adversative. It implies that all of the students typically maintain the connectedness of their ideas in their writings by using additive conjunction.

As a final point, the way students employ cohesive devices is slightly different; high achiever students tend to use more various types of cohesive devices than the low ones, which is regarded as the most apparent effort to maintain the quality of the writings in terms of rhetorical matters (organization, cohesion, unity). Besides, as shown in the appendix 3 & 4, the use of cohesive

devices by the students is correlated with the scores achieved, in which evaluated based on criterion such as; content, organization, accuracy, and vocabulary.

5.2 Recommendation

Based on the results of this research, some recommendations are necessary to be made, especially for teachers and academicians as well as those who are interested in doing research on cohesion in the future.

To begin with, what is found in this study suggests that teachers should teach or familiarize the students with the use of type of cohesive devices that is rarely used by the students, so the use of cohesive devices in their writings could vary. At the same time, the students should increase their capability in using vocabulary and structure which could help them construct their arguments in various ways.

For future researchers on this field, this study suggests that they conduct cohesion study that focuses on particular device(s) and compare the use of particular cohesive devices in different genres or conduct cohesion study on spoken discourse as there are only few studies which focus on this field.