

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

This chapter is intended to give the conclusion, summary and some suggestions related to this study.

5.1 Summary

This study was carried out to see the students' mastery on writing coherent compositions. In conducting this study, first of all, the writer asked 21 students of Writing IV class as the sample to write compositions consisting of 5 paragraphs. Then, the writer analyzed only the content paragraphs of the compositions to see how coherent the subjects' supporting sentences are related to the topic sentence of each paragraph, how coherent the topic sentences are related to the thesis statement and to see how appropriately the transitional words/phrases are used in each paragraph of the compositions.

After analysing the data through identifying topic sentence in each paragraph and every sentences in each paragraph, the writer found that only 30% of the whole paragraphs were coherently written and 70% of them were incoherently written. There are different factors causing these non-coherent paragraphs. 38% of the non-coherent paragraphs are caused by the presence of two main ideas,

16% of are caused by the irrelevant relationship between the sentences in the paragraph. 6% are caused by disorderly mixed sentences and 5% of the paragraphs have incomplete paragraphs development and 5% have missing transitional sentences.

From the analysis of the transitional words/phrases used, it was found that 57% of the paragraphs use the transitional words/phrases excellently, 21% use them well, 11% use the transitional words/phrases fairly and the rest 11% of the paragraphs use the transitional words/phrases poorly. It was also found that the frequently used transitional words/phrases between the paragraphs are: "the first reason" (40%) for the first content paragraphs, "the second reason (50%) for the second content paragraphs, and "the last reason" (30%) for the third content paragraphs. The frequently used transitional words/phrases within the paragraphs are: "and" (64% of the addition transitional words/phrases), "but" (78% of the contrast transitional words/phrases).

5.2 Conclusion

Based on these findings it can be concluded that most of the students under study found difficulties in writing their compositions coherently. First, instead of writing one main idea in one paragraph, most of them

wrote more than one main idea in one paragraph. Secondly, they wrote one or two sentences not related to the topic sentence. Thirdly, their ideas were not expressed in a clear order. The sentences which should be interrelated or should discuss the same thing were put separately.

Looking at the results of the data analysis, one can conclude tentatively that the writing teachers fail in carrying out the teaching learning process. However, if we reconsider that the students had never known about writing coherence and its use before they entered the university and teaching of writing at the English Department each semester lasts only 2x100 minutes per week, the data analysis results do show that the students under study have gained a lot of knowledge and skills in writing coherently in English. From that point of view, it might be justified to say that the writing teachers of this Department have not failed after all.

5.3 Suggestions

Based on the findings discussed so far, the following suggestions are given to the writing lecturers especially those who teach at the English Department of Widya Mandala University.

First, since the main difficulties is about providing relevant supporting sentences to develop a topic sentence, it is necessary for the teachers to train

the students in separating irrelevant sentences from the relevant ones. The exercise might be asking the students to select the relevant sentences for the given topic sentences. For improving the students' ability in writing one main idea, the teacher might give some sentences and train the students to classify some similar sentences in a paragraph which might discuss a certain main idea and classify some others which discuss different main idea.

Second, students should be encouraged to be self correctors. They are trained to be critical so that they will be able to select the relevant sentences and group them. For this purpose, the students should also be encouraged to do some peer corrections, so that they will be more aware to find their own errors.

Third, in this study the kinds of expository writing written is about cause and effect. It is hoped that there will be a replication study using the others technique of expository writing for example: comparison contrast, definition, etc.

Fourth, it is also suggested that in further researches, this kind of study will be conducted to see the other kinds of writing, such as: narrative or descriptive writing.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Arapoff, Nancy. Writing a Thinking Process. English Teaching Forum, vol VIII, May-June, no.3.
- Ary, Donald, et al. 1979. Introduction to Research in Education. Second Edition. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Carney, Thomas F., 1972. Content Analysis, A Technique for Systematic Inference from Communications. Canada: University of Manitoba Press.
- Beardsley, Monroe C., 1975. Thinking Straight. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall. Inc.
- Beardsley, Monroe C., 1950. Practical Logic. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall. Inc.
- Brooks, Cleanth and Robert Penn Warren, 1979. Modern Rhetoric. New York: Harcourt Brace J. Inc.
- Brown, Clarence A. and Robert Zoelner, 1968. The Strategy of Composition, a Rhetoric with Readings. New York: The Ronald Press Co.
- Dagher, Joseph P., 1976. Writing: A Practical Guide. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.
- D'Angelo, Frank J., 1980. Process and Thought in Composition. Winthrop: Cambridge University.
- Djunaedi, Yuliana, 1989. The Correlation Between the SMA Students' Cohesive Devices Achievement and their

Reading Comprehension Achievement. Unpublished S1 WM University Thesis.

Erlinawati, Widia, 1993. An Analysis of Coherence Devices on the Argumentative Writing of the Sixth Semester Students of the English Department of Widya Mandala University. Unpublished S1 WM University Thesis.

Guin, Dorothy M. and Daniel Marder, 1987. Spectrum of Rhetoric. Boston: Little, Brown and Co.

Guth, Hans P., 1975. Words and Ideas, A Handbook for College Writing. Belmont: Wadsworth Publishing Company, Inc.

Halliday, M.A.K. and Ruqaiya Hasan, 1980. Cohesion in English. London: Longman

Hardaway, John and Francine Hardaway, 1977. Writing through Reading. Massachusetts: Winthrop Publishers.

Henze, Geraldine, 1990, From Murk to Masterpiece: Style for Business. Tokyo: Toppan Co., Ltd.

Kho, Ming Fung, 1993. The Achievement Orders of Cohesive Devices Encountered in the Free Composition of the S1 Students of the English Department of Widya Mandala University. Unpublished S1 WM University Thesis.

Lado, Robert, 1964. Language Teaching a Scientific Approach. New York: McGraw Hill Inc.

Khornomo, Lelly E., Some Most Frequent Errors in Using Cohesive Devices Encountered in the Compositions of the Third Semester Students of the English Department of Widya Mandala, Unpublished S1 WM University Thesis.

Mc. Mahan, Elizabeth and Susan Day, 1984, The Writer's Rhetoric Handbook, New York: McGraw Hill Inc.

Moody, Patricia A., 1981. Writing Today. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Reid, Joy M. and Margaret Lindstorm 1985. The Process of Paragraph Writing. Englewood Cliff: Prentice Hall Regents.

Sullivan, Kathleen E., 1976. Paragraph Practice. New York: Mac millan Publishing Co., Inc.

Susiani, Wida, Recognition of Coherence Devices within a Paragraph as a Means of Helpping the Fifth and Sixth Semester English Department Students of Widya Mandala University. Unpublished S1 WM University Thesis.

Swatan, P.Y. Fenny, 1991. The Effects of Using Cohesive Devices on the SMA Students' Reading Comprehension Achievement. Unpublished S1 WM University Thesis.

Taylor, Ann, 1991. Shaping the Short Essay. New York: Harper Collins Publishers, Inc.

Teopilus, Susana, The Correlation between the Logic Achievement and the Writing Achievement of the

Students of the English Department of Widya Mandala University along with its Manifestation in their Composition. Unpublished S1 WM University Thesis.

Trimmer, Joseph F. and Nancy L. Sommers, 1984. Writing with a Purpose. 8th edition. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.

Vivian, Charles H. and Bernetta M. Jackson, 1961. English Composition. New York: Barnes and Noble Books.

Wrinkler, Anthony C. and Jo Ray Mc Cuen, 1988, Rhetoric and Handbook. USA: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Publisher.

