

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

5.1. Summary

This study dealt with the coherence found in argumentative compositions of the English Department students of Widya Mandala Catholic University Surabaya. The subjects were the students of the English Department of Widya Mandala Catholic University Surabaya. The source of data was the argumentative compositions that the students wrote during the final examination.

The first analysis, the writer analyzed the coherence within each paragraph. It concerned with the logical connection between the topic sentences (claims) and the supporting details (proofs) (Moody, 1981:197). The supporting details in the paragraph have to be logical connected to the related supporting details. McWhorter (2008:1) also adds that the supporting details are the facts and ideas that explain or prove the topic sentence. When the topic sentences and the supporting details were related, it produced the coherence in the paragraph level.

In the second analysis, the writer analyzed the coherence in the whole composition. It dealt with the logical connection among the title, opening, thesis statement, claim, refutation, concession, and conclusion. When the title, opening, thesis statement, claim, refutation, concession, and conclusion were logical connected each other, it led to the coherence in the overall level.

5.2. Conclusion

It can be concluded then that the quality of coherence in a composition is still weak. In addition, most students still find difficulties to produce good compositions, especially in making connection between their thesis statement and topic sentences. It is also concluded that the quality of coherence in students' paragraphs is low. Many students have written more than one unrelated supporting sentences in a paragraph that it makes the incoherent paragraph.

5.3. Suggestions

Based on the findings previously presented, some suggestions for teaching writing to Indonesian students and future research are given. This section is then devoted to these suggestions.

5.3.1. For Teaching Writing to Indonesian Students

In connection with the result of the study, the writer would like to give suggestions to Writing lecturers as follows:

To help students to write good argumentative compositions, students should give good and bad argumentative compositions to be analyzed. The students are asked to identify the thesis statements and topic sentence. And then, students are asked to justify whether the thesis statement and topic sentences are related or not.

To train the students to know the coherence of each paragraph, students are given good and bad model of argumentative paragraph. And then, students are asked to determine whether the topic sentence and the supporting details are related or not.

Based on the model, students are asked to produce their own argumentative compositions. First, they are asked to produce a paragraph and then a complete composition that consists of several paragraphs.

5.3.2. For Future Research

The writer realizes that this study still has shortages and needs some improvements. Then, the writer would like to give some suggestions that will be useful for further study. In this study, the writer took the subjects only in a class. It will be better that the next study will use more than one class as the subjects to get better valid data. Since this study analyzes the argumentative composition, the writer expects that there will be another study about the other type of composition, especially in analyzing coherence.

REFERENCES

- Anker, Susan. 1998. *Real Writing with Readings*. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's.
- Anson, Chris and Schwegler, Robert A. *The Handbook for Writers and Readers Second Edition*. Retrieved May 24, 2008, from <http://www.uark.edu/campus-resources/qwrtcntr/resources/handouts/para-fcd.htm>
- Ayer, Deborah and Callaghan, Jen and Jetha, Kanimi. *The Emory Writing Center*. Retrieved May 24, 2008, from <http://www.writingcenter.emory.edu/goodwrite.html> - 6k
- Brown, Marilyn. *Focusing and organizing Compositions*. Retrieved May 24, 2008, from http://www.sdstate.edu/writingcenter/focusing_and_organizing_composit.htm
- Brunsvold, Libby. *The Scott Foreman Handbook for writers Third Edition*. Retrieved May 24, 2008, from <http://leo.stcloudstate.edu/acadwrite/thesistatement.html>
- Cobb, Charles Miguel. 1985. *Process and Pattern*. U.S.A.: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.
- Connor, Ulla and Johns, Ann M. 1990. *Coherence in Writing Research and Pedagogical Perspectives*. U.S.A.: Teachers of English to Speakers of Others Languages.
- Cooper, Allence. 1988. *Given-New: Enhancing Coherence through Cohesiveness in Written Communication Journal* 5.3, p. 353-67.
- House, Jeff. 2006. *Writing Is Dialogue*. United States of America: Christopher Gordon Publishers, Inc.
- Howard, C. Jeriel and Tracz, Richard Francis. 1976. *Writing Effective Paragraphs*. Massachussets: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.
- Indrajani, Vivi. 1990. *A Study on Expository Composition Coherence of the Fifth Semester Students of the English Department of Widya Mandala University. Unpublished S1 Widya Mandala University Thesis*. Unpublished S1 Thesis.
- Kakois, Thomas E., and John, Scally. 1978. *Writing in An Age of Technology*. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, Inc.
- Kies, Daniel. *Coherence in Writing*. Retrieved May 24, 2008, from <http://papyr.com/hypertextbooks/compl/coherent.htm>
- Kinneavy, James L. 1980. *A Theory of Discourse. The Aims of Discourse*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

- Kinslow, Carolyn. *Paragraph Coherence*. Retrieved May 24, 2008, from http://www.cameron.edu/~carolynk/par_coherence.html
- Kolb Jr., Harold H. 1980. *A Writer's Guide The Essential Points*. U.S.A.: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc.
- Marques, S. *Writing Effective Paragraph*. Retrieved May 24, 2008, from <http://www.kent.k12.wa.us/KSD/KR/WRITE/GEN/coherence.html>
- Mayberry, Katherine J. and Golden, Robert E. 1990. *For Argument's Sake A Guide To Writing Effective Arguments*. U.S.A.: Harper Collins Publishers.
- McCrimmon, James M. 1984. *Writing With A Purpose*. United States of America: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Mcwhorter, Kathleen T. *Identifying Supporting Details*. Retrieved May 24, 2008, from http://wps.ablongman.com/long_mcwhorter_ersonline_1/0,2257,70178-,00.html
- Moody, Patricia A. 1981. *Writing Today A Rhetoric and Handbook*. United States of America: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Ngadiman, Agustinus. 1997. *Javanese Cultural Thought Patterns As Manifested in Expository Discourse*. Unpublished S3 Institute of Teacher Training and education at Malang Desertation.
- Nunn, Samuel. *The Mayfield Handbook of Technical & Scientific Writing*. Retrieved May 24, 2008, from <http://www.mhhe.com/mayfieldpub/tsw/p-cohere.htm>
- O'Regan, David. *Cohesive Devices*. Retrieved May 24, 2008, from <http://portal.ku.edu.tr/~doregan/Writing/Cohesion.html>
- Ramage, John D. 2004. *Writing Arguments A Rhetoric With Readings*. United States: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Reid, Joy M. 1988. *The Process of Composition*. U.S.A.: Prentice Hall Regents.
- Smalley, Regina L., Rutten, Mary K., and Kozyrev, Joann Rischel. 2001. *Refining Composition Skills Rhetoric and Grammar*. U.S.A.: Heinle&Heinle Publishers.
- Smith, Marina. *Paragraph Unity*. Retrieved May 24, 2008, from <http://www.writingcentre.ubc.ca/workshop/tools/unity.htm>
- Sperica. 2008. Repeat Key Words and Phrases. Retrieved November 30, 2008, from <http://www.wordsintransition.com/2008/03/12/repeat-key-words-and-phrases/>

Spurgin, Sally DeWitt. 1989. *The Power To persuade*. United States of America: Prentice-Hall.

Troyka, Lynn Quitman and Nudelman, Jerrold. 1982. *Steps in Composition*. U.S.A.: Prentice-Hall.

White, Fred D. and Simone J. Billings. 2007. *The Well-Crafted Argument*. Boston (New York): Houghton Mifflin Company.