CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter draws conclusion and recommendation. The conclusion section begins with a brief description of the background, the main findings, and conclusion. Some recomendations are proposed at the end of the chapter. The recomendations are intended for the improvement of future research for other researchers particluarly on similar topics. However, a summary of the main findings is sketched. The summary is based on the nature of the problems which were formulated in the study.

5.1 Conclusions

It is very difficult for many beginning writers to write because they have lack knowledge about writing process and few strategies and skills available to use while they are writing. This problem happen for most students of senior high school in Indonesia. They are not ready to do writing in English classroom because they are affraid of making many mistakes in grammar, vocabulary, and punctuation. Moreover, there are no strategies how to write well in writing tasks.

Regarding some problems the students have in writing at English classroom, this study was conducted. The aim of this study was to investigate the students writing strategies in senior high school in process of writing an analytical exposition text. The questions established for the purposes of the investigation were as follows:

1) Do the students write correctly the schematic structure of analytical exposition texts?
2) Do the students apply appropriate language features in their analytical exposition texts?
3) What writing strategies do the students employ in writing analytical exposition texts?

A variety of approaches were adopted to collect accurate data. The participants were invited to participate in this study. As the purposeful sampling, there were eigth volunteers took part in this study. They were assigned to write analytical exposition texts. Their written texts were used as the primary data to be analyzed. Then, a classroom observation notes were taken to get the real situation of the writing process analytical exposition texts. Continuously, some open-ended questionnairs were distributed to the participants. The responses that were given to the questionnaires were analyzed in order to get the data about the writing strategies they employed in writing.

The major findings of this study are:

a. The students wrote correctly the schematic structure of analytical exposition text. The elements of schematic structure are Thesis, Arguments, and Reiteration. It seemed that the students understood about the schematic structure of this text type. In writing Thesis, the students could state their position or their point of view toward one issue. They started with interesting background and then arose the reader's attention toward the issue.

In writing arguments, the students then gave arguments supported with evidence. They elaborated some ideas and provided some evidence to support their arguments. And finally, in writing reiteration, the students restated the issue to remind the reader about the point of view that was stated in the Thesis. The students had appropriately good control of writing the schematic structure of analytical exposition texts.

b. The students used all language features successfully. The language features of analytical exposition texts are simple present tense, human and nonhuman participants, conjunctive relations, material, relational, and mental processes. They used appropriate tense in the texts; the simple present tense. They used human and non human participants; human, place and things. They used conjunctive relations which are known as internal conjunctive relations. Moreover, the students also used material, relational, and mental processes. The texts consisted of the verbs related the process systems. The Material processes which express the notion that some entity physically does something. While Relational processes involve states of being. And the last, Mental processes are the sensing; feeling, thinking and perceiving.

c. Regarding the writing strategies, the students employed metacognitive, cognitive, rhetorical, and social/affective strategies. The students employed various micro strategies such as planning, generating, organizing, drafting, revising, evaluating and monitoring. The students also used social affective

strategies by keeping high motivation with their writing and enjoyed themselves during the process of writing. These strategies made them easy to plan, organize, draft, revise, edit, and publish their writing.

Finally, it is important to give the students understanding toward the process of writing and the strategies they employ in writing. By understanding the writing process and writing strategies, the students have a chance to develop their ability in writing. The writing is not only the product oriented but also the process itself.

5.2 Recommendations

The findings clearly demonstrate the students need to write correctly the schematic structure of analytical exposition text and also use appropriate language features in writing any kind of text types. These are useful for a better knowledge of writing to improve the student's writing ability. Besides that, the knowledge about the writing strategies is important. These strategies will help them to solve their problems during the wiriting process.

This study also has important pedagogical implications for both students and teachers. Students improve their writing ability, particularly in writing analytical exposition texts. Meanwhile, teachers may have a better understanding of genre analysis and the writing strategies for the teaching writing context.

Although the present study suggests the analysis on the schematic structure and the use of appropriate language features is beneficial for the teachers

and students, there are some important things that need further consideration for future research.

Clearly, additional research is necessary. Some approaches should be done to help the students improve their writing ability. The students of senior high school are potential enough to develop their writing ability. They need the knowledge of writing process and the writing strategies for developing their literacy understanding. The study on process approach and writing strategies are needed to do by the teachers in English classroom at school in Indonesia.

However, this present study has several limitations to reveal about the writing strategies of senior high school students in the process of writing analytical exposition text. The limitations of this study can be as follows:

1) The participants of this study were the purposeful sampling. It seemed that the participants of this study were few. The results of this study just exposed the capable student writers in the school in which the students had a better knowledge and had been familiar with writing activities at school.
2) The investigation of the writing strategies of senior high school in the process of writing analytical exposition text was interesting. However, this study was only focus on the strategies what Mu and Carrington (2007) had done. There were limited investigation questions to explore many more writing strategies the students employ.

Based on the limitation of this study, there are several recomendations for the future research.

1) The future study should involve more text tpes and more participants The more participants might show different results from the various students. Or may be, there is another research design about the writing strategies and writing process.
2) The future study should observe the process of learning writing in EFL class.
3) The future researchers can also investigate whether the students use different strategies in writing. There will be new findings about the student's writing strategies.

UNIVERSITAS PENDIDIKAN INDONESIA
PERPUSTAKAAN

References

Allen, E.D. and Valette, R.M. (1972) *Classroom Techniques: Foreign Languages and English as a Second Language*, New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc.

Alagozlu, N. (2009) *Critical Thinking and Voice in EFL Writing*, downloaded sources from the EFL Journal, Vol.8, No. 4, 2009. Accessed from internet in March, 2010.

Blanchard, K & Root, C. (2004) *Ready to Write More*, NY: Pearson Education, Inc.

Borjars, K & Burridge, K. (2001) *Introducing English Grammar*, London: Oxford University Press Inc.

Casanave, C.P. (2004) *Controversies in Second Language Writing*, USA: University of Michigan.

Cheng, F. (2008), *Scaffolding language, Scaffolding Writing: A Genre approach to teaching narrative writing.* Accessed in March, 2010, from internet: The Aian EFL Journal, Vol. 10, No. 2, 167-191, June, 2008.

Chesla, E. (2006) *Write Better Essays in just 20 minutes, 2nd Edition*, USA: Learning Express, LLC.

Ellis, R. (1997) *Second Language Acquisition*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ellis, R. (2003) Task-based language Learning and Teaching, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Emerson, L. (2007) *Writing Guidelines for Education Students*, Australia: Thomson.

Emilia, E. (2008) *Menulis Thesis dan Disertasi*. Bandung. Alfabeta and UPI Press.

Emilia, E. (2010) *Teaching Writing: Developing Critical Learners*, Bandung, Rizqi Press.

Emilia, E. (2011) *Pendekatan Genre-Based dalam Pengajaran Bahasa Inggris: Petunjuk untuk Guru,* Bandung: Rizqi Press.

Ferris, D.R. & Hedgcock, J.S. (2005*) Teaching ESL Composition*, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associations, Inc.

Fitzpatrick, M. (2005) *Engaging Writing; Paragraph and Essays*, NY: Pearson Education, Inc.

Freedman, A. And Medway, P. (1994) *Learning and teaching genre*, USA: Boyntoon/Cook Publishers, Inc.

Feez, S. & Joyce, H. (1998) *Writing Skills*, Australia: Phoenix Education Pty Ltd.

Grabe, W. & Kaplan, R.B, (1996) *Theory & Practice of Writing* , London:Wesley Longman Limited.

Gibbos, P. (2002) *Scafolding Language, Scafolding Learning*, USA: Heinmann.

Gill Philip, (2008) *Adverb Use in EFL Students Writing,* To appear in Proceedings of EURALEX XIII International lexicography congress. This preprint available http://amsacta.cib.unibo.it

Graves, D.H.(1983) *WRITING*: *Teachers & Children at Work*, London: Heinemann Educational Books.

Grififths, C. (2008) *Lessons from Good language Learning*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Goatly, A. (2000) *Critical Reading and Writing*, London: Routledge

Halliday,M.A.K. (1985) *Spoken and Written Language*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Harmer, J. (2004) *How to Teach Writing*, England: Pearson Education Limited.

Harmer, J. (2007) *The Practice of English Language Teaching*, England: Pearson Longman Limited.

Hamzah,M.S.G. (2009), *Analysis on metacognitive strategies in reading and writing among mMalaysian ESL Learners in four education institutions.* Accessed from internet in March, 2010, Europian Journal of Social Science, Vol. 11, No. 4, 676-683, 2009.

Herrero, A.H. (2007), *Journal: A tool to improve students' writing skills*, Vol.7 No.1, 1-37, 2007. Accessed from internet: http://revista.inie.ucr.ac.cr, March, 2010.

Hill, S. (2006) *Developing Early Literacy*, Autralia: Eleanor Curtain Publishing.

Hutchinson, E. (2005) *Expository Writing*, USA: Saddleback Educational Publishing.

Hyland, K. (2002) *Teaching and Researching Writing*, England: Pearson Education Limited.

Hyland, K. (2003) *Second Language Writing*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Hyland, K. (2004) Genre and Second Language Writing. USA: the University of Michigan Press.

Johns, A.M. (2002) *Genre in the Classroom*, USA: Lawren Erlbaum Associates.

Joyce, H. And Freez, S. (1998) *Writing Skills,* Australia: Phoenix Education Pty Ltd.

Kellogg, R.T. (2008), *Training Writing Skills: A cognitive developmental perspective,* Journal of writing research, 1(1), 1-26. USA: Saint Louis University.

Kroll, B. (1990) *Second Language Writing; Research insights for the classroom*, Cambrige: Cambridge University Press.

Khranke, K. (1987) *Approaches to Syllabus Design for Foreign Language Teaching,* New Jersy, USA.: Prentice Hall, Inc,

Martin J.R. and Rose, D. (2007), *Working With Discourse*, London: Continuum.

Mc Carthy, M. and Carter, R. (1994) *Language as Discourse*, England: Longman Group.

Metropolitan East Disadvantaged Schools Program (1988) *Teaching Factual Writing.* A Genre Based Approach. The report of the DSP Literacy Project Metropolitan East Region . Sidney.

Ming-Yueh Shen - *Reading-Writing Connection for EFL College Learners'*. Accessed in March, 201o, from internet: the EFL Journal, Vol. 11, issue 1, 2009.

Munday, J. (2001) *Introducing Translation Studies; Theories and Application*, USA: Reutledge.

Murray, D.M. (1982) Learning by teaching.USA: Boynton/Cook Publishers, Inc.

Nunan, D. (1989) *Designing Tasks for the Communicative Classroom,* Cambridge: Cambridg University Press.

Nunan, D. 1988. *The Learner-Centered Curriculum; A study in second language teaching*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Oshima, A. & Hogue, A. (2007) *Introducing to Academic Writing*, USA: Pearson Education , Inc.

Oshima, A. & Hogue, A. (1983) *Writing Academic English; A Writing and Sentence Structure Workbook for International Students*, USA: Addison – Wesley Publishing Company.

PecCei, J.S. (1999) *Pragmatics*, London:Routledge.

Ravelli, L.J. and Ellis, R.A., (2004), *Analysing Academic Writing*, London: Continuum.

Richard, J.C. (2001) *Curriculum Development in Language Teaching*, Cambridge: Cambridge Language Education.

Richard, J.C. and Renandya, W.A. (2002) *Methodology in Language Teaching*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Richard, J.C. (2001) *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schaefer, E. (2008), *Rater bias patterns in an EFL writing assessment.* Accessed from internet in March, 2010. Language Testing, Vol. 25, No. 4, 465-493, 2008.

Shippen, M.E. et. Al. (2006), *Using the expressive writing program to improve writing skills of high school students with learning disabilities*, Journal ofDirect Instruction, Vol. 6, No. 1, 35-47, 2006. Accessed from internet, March, 2010.

Shokrpour, N. & Fallahzadeh, M.H. *A Survey of the Students and Intern's EFL Writing Problems In Shriraz University of Medical Sciences*, downloaded sources from the EFL Journal, Volume 9, Number , 2007.

Silvia, P.J. (2007) *How to write a lot, A Practical Guide to Academic Writing*, USA: American Physicology Association.

Spear, K.(1988) *Sharing Writing; Peer Response Groups in English Classes*, USA: Heinemann Educational Books Inc.

Swales, J.M. and Feak, C.B., (2004) *Academic Writing for Graduate Students*: Second Edition, USA: Michigan University Press.

Talebinezhad, M.R. (2008) *The effect of explicit teaching of concep mapping in expository writing on EFL students' self-regulation,* Accessed in March, 2010, from nternet: The Linguistics Journal, Vol.2, Issue 1, 69-90, 2008.

Todd, L. (1987) *An Introduction to Linguistic*, England: Longman York Press.

Tompkins, G.E. (2008) *Teaching Writing; Balancing Process and Products*, New Jersey: Pearson Education, Inc.

Wenyu, L. And Young, L. (2008), *Research on EFL Writing strategy using SRP: an empirical study in DUT*, Accessed in March, 2010, from the internet: The Asian EFL Journal, Vol. 10, No. 2, 51-83, June, 2008.

Williams, J. (2005) *Teaching Writing in Second and Foreign Language Classrooms*, USA: The McGraw-Hill, Inc.

Willis, D. and Willis, J.(2007) *Doing Task-based Teaching*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ya-Ling Wu- *Language Learning Strategies Used by Students at Different Proficiency Levels*. Accessed in March, 2010, from internet: the EFL Journal, Vol. 10, No. 4, 2008.

Yule, G. (1996) *Pragmatics,* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

UNIVERSITAS PENDIDIKAN INDONESIA
PERPUSTAKAAN