

## CHAPTER V

### CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

**In chapter V, there are two parts to be discussed. They are conclusion and suggestions. Conclusion deals with the summary of research, while the suggestions deals with input or recommendation for further research.**

#### **5.1. Conclusion**

**Teaching writing as a foreign language is essential in second language learning. Achieving writing skill means so much to students concerning that writing can help the learners to strengthen the mastery of other skills (Rivers, 1968:241). However, teaching writing nowadays is not emphasized like teaching other skills. This kind of situation makes the writing lesson done in monotonous way by giving such a simple teaching technique and method. In writing class, the teachers tends to keep giving the exercises to the students, let the students work in writing by giving guidelines or sometimes just let them work by leaving them with some instruction to create the writing composition without knowing the students' ability in composing ideas into a good essay.**

**By giving semi-control writing technique, the students are expected to encourage their creativeness and pour it in their writing. The problems occurred when the students do not emphasize the purpose of writing itself. They tend to think about something deals with grammar, vocabulary, and**

others until they ignore the content of their writing itself. Moreover, the limitation of their grammar and vocabulary makes them feel reluctant to develop more ideas. As the result, it reduces the quality of their writing and reduces the teacher's intention to read and examine their works. Therefore, both the teachers and students will be easy to get bored when they have their writing class.

Having known this phenomenon, the writer suggest a prewriting technique to make the teaching and learning activity become more enjoyable, exciting and enhance the quality of writing itself. Through mind mapping, the students can develop their critical thinking by making a brief diagram of their ideas and then connect those ideas into a coherent composition. As its function is to prevent the students from imaginative block by making their writing freely and use their creativity in composing an essay. In order to enable the students to use certain vivid and appropriate words, the writer choose descriptive writing because they can make their writing alive through five senses creatively.

In conducting this research, the writer chose two classes as the experimental and control group. They were given the same treatments with different teaching techniques, mind mapping and semi-controlled writing. The subject was the eleventh grade of SMAK Stella Maris. During their treatment they firstly got pre-test to know their ability in general and then scored by ESL Composition Profile which indicated whether they had the same ability in four criteria such as content, organization, vocabulary and

language use.

Based on the statistical calculation of the data obtained after the treatments, the writer found out that there is a significant difference between their content, organization, vocabulary and the whole score in general who were taught by using Mind Mapping pre-writing technique and those who were taught by using guidelines. The finding of the post test score in each writing criteria are described as follows:

Table 5.1.

Summarizing the Analysis of the Post Test Scores

Writing Criteria	Groups	Mean (x)	to	tt	Note
<b>Content</b>	<b>Experimental</b>	<b>3.02</b>	<b>1.88</b>	<b>1.671</b>	<b>Significant</b>
	<b>Control</b>	<b>2.068</b>			
<b>Organization</b>	<b>Experimental</b>	<b>1.7</b>	<b>1.7</b>	<b>1.671</b>	<b>Significant</b>
	<b>Control</b>	<b>0.8</b>			
<b>Vocabulary</b>	<b>Experimental</b>	<b>1.96</b>	<b>11.49</b>	<b>1.671</b>	<b>Significant</b>
	<b>Control</b>	<b>0.96</b>			
<b>Language Use</b>	<b>Experimental</b>	<b>2.12</b>	<b>1.22</b>	<b>1.671</b>	<b>Insignificant</b>
	<b>Control</b>	<b>1.027</b>			
<b>Total Score</b>	<b>Experimental</b>	<b>9.16</b>	<b>15.2</b>	<b>1.671</b>	<b>Significant</b>
	<b>Control</b>	<b>4.45</b>			

Therefore, teaching the students writing by mind mapping has given the significant impacts to the students for the better learning. Mind mapping proves to give a contribution in improving students' writing in content, organization and language use criteria better than by using Semi-controlled writing. Mind mapping successfully helps the students to get more of ideas and developing them creatively and arrange those ideas in an organized structure. It also can enrich the students' vocabulary from their critical thinking. On the opposite, the statistical shows that there is no significant difference in language use criteria because mind mapping does not concern to mechanical process. In conclusion, mind mapping only works in generating, developing, and organizing the ideas especially to focus the students' ideas to the content of writing.

## 5.2. Suggestion

The writer realizes that this thesis is not perfect. There are many things that should be improved. Therefore, the writer wants to give some recommendations so that the research will be more useful for the future writing teaching.

First of all, mind mapping actually does not give a significant contribution to language use criteria. However, in fact, language use can make the writer's composition become clear and readable with a deeper knowledge about language context comprehension in a composition. So, for the next study, the writer expects that other researchers can provide the

students with other interactive writing techniques that involved the development of four criteria as listed in ESL Composition Profile. It will be better if the students are given grammar exercises needed in the descriptive writing before giving the treatments.

Second, since mind mapping is one of the pre-writing techniques that is not applied at school as often as other techniques, the writer considers that the treatment given for three meetings to the groups is not enough. Basing on the questionnaire given, the students need more time to get used in mind mapping.

Third, the pre test and post test in both experimental and control group will be better to be given in the same instruction.

Fourth, for a class which rarely gets a writing class, better if other researchers try to use mind mapping technique in group first than in individual to make them used to the new writing technique presented. More writing class presentations and examples are good to make them clear and get involved with writing and its technique.

Fifth, the writer also expects that the other researchers can teach mind mapping to students in the Elementary school since they can develop their kinesthetic learning style by drawing and coloring. Better if the other researchers teach mind mapping in order to improve the students' reading or vocabulary skill. Applying more mapping and various shapes of mapping will be advantages for the students' English achievement in Elementary school.

Sixth, games in writing class will be preferred so much in teaching

**writing to High School. Because learning in fun can create fresh mind and fast learning.**

## Bibliography

- Anonym. 2007. *Writing a Descriptive Essay*. Retrieved on January 12th, 2009 from. [http://www.essay-paper.net/descriptive\\_essay.html](http://www.essay-paper.net/descriptive_essay.html).
- Anthony, Edward in Allen and Campbell. 1972. *Teaching English as a Second Language*, Bombay: Tata Mc.Graw Hill Publishing Company Ltd.
- Arapoff, Nancy. 1967. *Writing: A Thinking Process*. TESOL Quarterly, 1 (7), 33-39.
- Barrass, Robert. 1982. *Students Must Write*. New York: Methuen and Co.
- Byrne, Dorn. 1991. *Teaching Writing Skills*. London: Longman.
- Buzan, Tony. 2007. *Buku Pintar Mind Mapping*. Jakarta: P.T. Gramedia Pustaka Utama.
- Brown, H. Douglas. 1980. *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Cooper, C. and Odell, L. (Eds.). 1978. *Research in Composing: Points of Departure*. Urbana, IL:NCTE.
- Chastain, Kenneth. 1976. *Developing Second-Language Skills: Theory to Practice*, 2nd ed. Chicago: Rand McNadly and Co.
- Clause, Barbara. 1983. *Fine Writing: From Inner to Outer World*. New York: McGraw-Hill Inc.
- Duke, Charles R. 1983. *Writing Through Sequence:A Process Approach*. London: Scott, Foresman and Company.
- Davis, Jason. 2006. *Effective Academic Writing 3*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Dagher, Joseph P. 1976. *Writing a Practical Guide*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.
- Eugene, Maria. 1982. *How I Use Songs*. English Teaching Forum, Volume XX, July.
- Flower, Linda and John R. Hayes. *A Cognitive Process Theory of Writing*. College Composition and Communication 32.4 (1981): 365-387. Rpt. in Cross-talk in Comp Theory: A Reader. Victor Villanueva. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English, 1997. 153-166.
- Frank D'Angelo. 1976. *Process and Thought in Composition*, 2nd. ed. Massachusetts: Winthrop Publishers Inc. Englewood Cliffs.
- Ford, Marjorie and Jon Ford. 1990. *Dreams and Inward Journeys: A Reader for Writers*. New York: Harper Collins Publishers, Inc.
- Goffman, E. 1956. *The presentation of self in everyday life*. NewYork: Anchor.
- Hacker, Diana. 1942. *Writing with a Voice*. NewYork: HarperCollins Co.
- Hawley, James and Charles Tilghman. 1992. *Getting Down to Specifics*. NewYork: HarperCollins Co.

- Huot, B. 1990. *Reliability, validity, and holistic scoring: What we know and what we need to know*. *College Composition and Communication*, 41 (2), 201-213.
- Jacobs, H. L., Zingraf, S. A., Wormuth, D.R., Hartfiel, V.F., and Hughey, J.B. 1981. *Testing ESL Composition: A Practical Approach*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House Publishers.
- Linggajati. 1997. *The Use of Brainstorming as a Prewriting Technique in Composing a Descriptive Writing*. S-1 Thesis. English Department. Teacher Training Faculty of Widya Mandala Catholic University Surabaya.
- Miller, Robert Keith. 1949. *Motives for Writing*. New York: The McGraw-Hill Co.
- Olson, Carol B. 1992. *Thinking Writing: Fostering Critical Thinking Through Writing*. HarperCollins: New York.
- Oluwadiya, Adewumi. 1992. *Some Prewriting Techniques for Student Writers*. English Teaching Forum.
- Paulston, Christina Bratt and Marry Newton Bruder. 1976. *Teaching English as a Second Language: Techniques and Procedures*. Cambridge: Winthrop Publishers.
- Protherough, R. 1983. *Encouraging Writing*. New York: Metheun and Co.
- Raimes, Ann. 1983. *Techniques in Teaching Writing Skills*. England: Oxford University Press.
- Reid, Joy M. 1993. *Teaching ESL Writing*. New York: Regents/Prentice Hall.
- Raimes, Ann. 1996. *Keys for writers*. New York: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Rivers, Wilga M. 1968. *Teaching Foreign-Language Skills*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- S, Joanita. 2006. *Picture as a Means of Teaching Writing in English for SMA Students*. S-1 Thesis. English Department. Teacher Training Faculty of Widya Mandala Catholic University Surabaya.
- Simon&Schuster. 2003. *Essay Writing STEP-BY STEP*. New York: Newsweek, Inc.
- Seldess, Jesse.1996-2008. *How to Write a Descriptive Essay*. Retrieved from [www.descriptive\\_essay.html](http://www.descriptive_essay.html).
- Sudarwati, M and Grace, Eudia.2005. *Look Ahead an English Course*. Jakarta: Erlangga.

**Sudiby, Bambang. 2007. *Materi Sosialisasi dan Pelatihan Kurikulum Tingkat Satuan Pendidikan (KTSP) SMA*. Jakarta: Department Pendidikan Nasional.**

**Tribble, Christopher. 1996. *Writing*. England: Oxford University Press.**

**White, Ronald V. 1981. *Approaches to Writing*. Guidelines for Writing Activities.**

**Werner, Kathleen. 1989. *Models for Clear Writing*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.**