

## CHAPTER V

### CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

#### 5.1 Introduction

This chapter presents two parts, namely, the conclusion which is written on the basis of the results of the research and the suggestion that might be useful and considerable for the lecturers of writing class in particular and other lecturers in general.

#### 5.2 Conclusions

Based on the main **objective of the research**, that is, to portray: (1) Teaching and Learning Activities in EFL Writing Class; (2) What aspects of writing assessed by the lecturer, and **the results of observation, questionnaire and interview**, it is concluded that:

Basically, the teaching –learning process observed indicates that it has been fulfilled the requirement of teaching academic writing such as stages of writing process done, including the process and aspects of writing and the approach & strategies used . However, there are some issues that still need improvement.

In terms of TLP, The teaching learning process started with a kind of warming up in order to get to know the students' skill of writing background. This activity was used to predict what teaching materials would be given and what level of English ability the students have. These indicates that the lecturer tried to

introduce the writing course by using invention strategy or pre-writing activity as the earliest stage of writing process. In this stage students were encouraged to explore and discover ideas through useful strategy given by lecturer.

In addition, the importance of the audience, the purpose and the form to be reached and how to make drafting, revising, editing and sharing in the process of writing **were not only** explained **but also** practiced as suggested by Brown (2001). Although each stage has been done in the limited time due to the time allocation given, he still managed to follow the process of writing.

Furthermore, the students were never influenced by the lecturer's ideas when doing writing exercises. They were even guided to think critically through **questions** related to their topics and **diagram** that can be used to identify topic sentence, major and minor supporting details as suggested by Brown (2001). Besides, the students were engaged in thinking process of writing through "*peers' discussion*" which would give **benefits** as well as **disadvantages**. The **benefits** are primarily for *creative* students which had tendency to work independently but not for students who are not creative.

The creative students tend to have wide breadth of interest and readiness to receive, absorb ideas from any angles and sources (Barron & Harrington, cited in Murray & Moore, 2006:31). One of the benefits is that the students could express their original ideas without any interference from others and have their ownership on their writing. In addition, the students would get a kind of self development and learn to shape their message.

**In contrast**, uncreative students would be demotivated and more consuming time to have readiness to work independently. This means that they wouldn't perform their writing skill optimally.

In terms of approach, the process-product approach was applied in this teaching learning process. It means that the teaching and learning activities were framed following the process of writing stages completed with the submission of the tasks given as suggested by Brown (2001).

Meanwhile, in terms of teaching methodology, it has been in line with the current approach of integrating various skills as advocated in teaching academic writing as suggested by Hillock (1995) and Roseshine and Meister (cited in Gage, 1998:474).

However, the 'free writing' given did not really make the students have freedom to choose the topic by themselves but the themes related to the students' experience entitled 'living far from parents' were determined by the lecturer. As a matter of fact, free writing itself has a meaning "writing freely" without any restriction. This restriction is contradiction with the freedom of expressing ideas in pre-writing suggested by Brown (2001).

Due to the time limitation used in explaining the theories it seemed that some students did not understand deeply what has been explained by the lecturer. It might cause them apply the elements of writing required incorrectly. In other words, some students are still not able to apply the materials given properly. Indeed, it was impossible to satisfy every student in such amount time allocation.

Furthermore, the prescribed patterns of structure of organization which are considered as standard ones should be followed by the students. This is understandable if the standard patterns were used because by using the same patterns, it would easily check the students' assignments. Besides, checking the writing assignments would be time consuming so that the lecturer tried to get the most efficient way as possible.

In terms of language wise, it is still far from being rich because some students still used the same vocabularies and sentence structure taken from the article given. This might be caused by the limitation of vocabularies they had and the lack of the sources related to the issue being written. This is not in line with Hyland (2003) and Brown (2001) suggestion of being 'good writing'.

In terms of assessment, the lecturer used score ranked from 65 to 85-up. The students who get 85-up considered as the ones who have fulfilled 85 percent the requirement of doing 'good writing' as suggested by Hyland (2003), while the students who get 75-up need to improve certain skills to do 'good writing' and the students who get 65-up have to learn all skill needed to do 'a good writing'. The scores given are used to give students feedback about their progress, their strengths and weaknesses as suggested by American Federation Teachers (1990, cited in Gage, 1998:509).

In terms of professionalism, based on the result of interview with the lecturer, it indicates that he has already understood the nature of academic writing goals given by the institution. In addition, he really had great contributions not only in TLP but also outside of class. This can be seen from the way he rechecked

the students' tasks submitted to his blogger and gave marks to the elements of writing which needed to be revised by students and sent back to them. This contribution is worth to be appreciated since he did not only teach in one writing class but 5 classes as the least number of classes to be handled in his institution.

Briefly, it can be concluded that based on the results of observation, analysis of texts produced by students, questionnaires and interview obtained, the TLP conducted has followed the process of writing required. However, the time given for running writing program is not sufficient. It can be seen from the way the lecturer managed time when conveying the teaching material and allocating time for doing assignments. In addition, there are too many students in the writing class that raises difficulty for the lecturer to monitor each of them.

Nevertheless, the lecturer was creative enough to manage the precise time given as efficient as possible. He gave students a lot of chance to express their own ideas in very limited time so that he gets his students used to work hard and appreciate every time used. In addition, it is worthy to appreciate his contribution to check the students' tasks through his blogger and the way he gave rewards and feedback has instilled his students to write better and get much progress.

### **5.3 Recommendation of the Study**

Based on the conclusion mentioned, it is recommended that the lecturer should be better apply real 'free writing' rather than 'guided writing' with particular theme given. In addition, the students need a kind of guidance in paraphrasing because some of them still used the words taken from article and had

difficulty in finding synonymous words or expression which have the same general meaning.

Furthermore, it is better if the students would be given guidance how to give comments related to the use of peer-reviewing for content by involving classmate's comments.

In terms teaching materials, the lecturer should decide which aspects of writing would be the main organizing principle for the course related to the time allocated. To solve the problem dealing with the time, the lecturer can adjust the time will be given to writing as opposed to discussion, feedback and language work.

Dealing with the lecturer's role, particularly in giving written feedback, he should give more clearly comments showing a kind of appraisal for students' strength and weaknesses. These will **not only** enable the students to write better and get self discovery towards the elements of writing needed **but also** increase the students' self efficacy and motivation.

In addition, to enable the students to self score their own practice essays, it is necessary for the lecturer to socialize the criteria of good writing and give a kind of scoring guidance with some models and practices given as suggested in practice scoring TWE essays. By giving this guidance, the lecturer will help the students to find their weak areas and let them practice writing quickly and carefully in a limited time given. In order to get more detail description about scoring guidance, the lecturer will enclose it in the appendix 2.



In addition to what have been described above, it is necessary to extend time allocation for writing class in order to get the maximum outcome.

Based on what was mentioned in section 5.2., the next research should concern more on appropriate prewriting for academic writing, teaching academic essays in limited time in order to get more accurate findings. In particular, the research can investigate strategy of monitoring the students in writing class and how to enable the students to have 'good writing' in limited time. In addition, it is suggested that the research on the whole academic writing classes (5 other classes) in entirely class meetings (1semester) should be conducted in order to get more significant results.

