

## **CHAPTER V**

### **CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION**

#### **5.1 Conclusion**

From the findings that exposed in the Chapter IV, it could be seen that all of the students had already composed the process essays in an expected structure. Most of the students had already developed the process essays well. Unfortunately, not all of them were aware that a paragraph should be developed from a main idea. Some of them still wrote a paragraph which had more than a main idea. Even though they were not aware about that, but the ideas that were presented in the body paragraphs had already supported the thesis statement that they had in the introductory paragraph.

The following conclusions of the study are drawn based on the findings and the discussion presented in Chapter 4.

1. All of the students had already written the process essay as the expected structure.
2. All of the students stated the thesis statement in the introductory paragraph.
3. Almost each body paragraph that is written by the students had a main idea. Some of the students developed more than a main idea in a paragraph.
4. All of the main ideas presented in the body paragraph had already supported the thesis statement in the introductory paragraph.
5. Some students still could not differentiate the main idea and the supporting idea.

## **5.2 Suggestion**

The writer realized that the thesis is not perfect. There are many things that should be improved. That is why the writer wants to give some suggestions so that the research will be more useful for the future teaching of process essays and also

for the future researcher who wants to conduct a study of the same topic.

First, it can be said that the students have already known how to write a process essay with a good organization, but they are not aware much about the organization of the paragraph, especially the existence of the main idea. Some of them missed to write it while the others include more than one main idea in a paragraph. The lecturers of Writing III should put more attention of this. It will be better if the lecturers emphasize that a good paragraph contains a main idea.

For the future researcher, the writer hopes that this research can help as a reference, but there are some weaknesses on this research that the future researcher should be aware. The first weakness is the data used. The writer chose to use the mid-term test papers of the students as the data. But, on that test, the students did not have to write the process essay. They could choose what types of text they wanted to write between the

process and why essays. Thus, the data that were got by the writer could not cover all of the students. The writer suggests the future researcher to use the data where all of the students who take Writing III write.

Besides, the writer is also aware that an essay can be judged as a good essay if it has good organization, has good content, and has no mechanical problem. Thus, the writer hopes the future researcher can analyze all of those criteria of good writing if there is enough time.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Badger, R. and G. White. 2000. *A Process Genre Approach to Teaching Writing*. ELT Journal Volume 54/2. Oxford University Press.
- Denzin, N. K. 1970. *The Research Act in Sociology*. Chicago: Aldine.
- Denzin, N. and Y. Lincoln. 2000. *Handbook of Qualitative Research*. London: Sage Publication Inc.
- Gould, E., R. DiYanni, and W. Smith. 1989. *The Act of Writing*. New York: Random House.
- Hancock, B. 1998. *An Introduction to Qualitative Research*. Trent Focus Group.
- Hyland, K. 2004. *Genre and Second Language Writing*. Michigan: The University of Michigan Press.
- Indrawati, T. 1988. *An Analysis of the first year SMA Kr. Petra 1 (siang) Surabaya students' error in Learning English*. S1 Widya Mandala Thesis.
- Langan, J. 2001. *English Skills*. New Your, U.S.A.: McGraw-Hill
- Lester, L., and J. Resnick. *Text and Thought*. New York, U.S.A.: Longman.
- McMillan, J.H. 1992. *Educational Research: Fundamentals for the Consumer*. New York, U.S.A.: HarperCollins Publisher.

- Knapp, P. and M. Watkins. 2005. *Genre, Text, Grammar: Technologies for Teaching and Assessing Writing*. Sydney, Australia: University of New South Wales Press Ltd.
- Koeppel, M.S. 1989. *Writing: Resources for Conferencing and Collaboration*. New Jersey, U.S.A: Prentice Hall.
- Ospina, S. 2004. *Qualitative Research*. Encyclopedia of Leadership. London: SAGE Publications.
- Reid, J.M. 1993. *Teaching ESL Writing*. New Jersey, U.S.A.: Longman.
- Reid, J.M. 1999. *The Process of Composition*. New York, U.S.A.: Longman.
- Reid, J.M. and Margaret Lindstrom. 1985. *The Process of Paragraph Writing*. New Jersey, U.S.A.: Prentice Hall.
- Rodgers, T. 2012, June 18. *Language Teaching Methodology*. Retrieved from [http://www.cal.org/resources/digest/digest\\_pdfs/rodgers-methods-paper.pdf](http://www.cal.org/resources/digest/digest_pdfs/rodgers-methods-paper.pdf).
- Tribble, C. 1996. *Language Teaching: Writing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Tukan, S.L. 2011. *Writing 3*. Surabaya, Indonesia: English Education Study Program Widya Mandala Catholic University.
- Williams, V. and C.D. Blake. 1992. *Explorations: from Sentence to Paragraph*. New York, U.S.A.: HarperCollins Publishers.

Wiriyadi, R. 2011. *The Quality of the Generic Structure and Language Features of Report Genre as Encountered in the S1 English Department Students' Report Compositions*. S1 Widya Mandala Thesis.

Yarber, R.E. 1989. *Writing for College*. New York, U.S.A.: HarperCollins Publisher

Yohanna, R.S. 2011. *The Quality of the Generic Structure and Language Features of Descriptive Genre as Encountered in the S1 English Department Students' Descriptive Compositions*. S1 Widya Mandala Thesis.