

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

In this chapter, the writer would like to present the conclusion and suggestions concerning this study.

5.1 Conclusion

A good writing skill requires not just the ability to construct grammatical sentences but also the ability to create a meaningful text. Therefore, it is important to show the logical relations within the text using cohesive devices. Conjunction is one of the cohesive devices which is important to indicate links between sentences in order to express certain meanings in a text. Mastering conjunctions will enable the writer to construct a clear and coherent text.

In this study, the writer analyzed the frequency of the conjunctions and the appropriate use of conjunctions showing additive, adversative, causal and temporal. After figuring the frequency of conjunctions discovered in discussion texts made by Writing IV students, the writer found that the use of conjunctions was as many as 1.061 times, with the division of causal occupying the first rank with the total sum of 422 times (39,77%), followed by temporal with the total occurrences of 265 times (24,98%). While additive followed in the third place

with the total amount of 212 times (19,98%). The adversative dwelled in the last place with the total amount of 162 times (15,27%).

Referring to the first research problem, the writer found that the most frequently used conjunctions showing additive were ‘and’ (51,89%), followed by ‘besides’ (8,02%). While the conjunctions ‘and also’, ‘not only...but also’, and ‘or’ followed in the third rank (5,66%). The least frequently used conjunctions were ‘another case’ and ‘either or’ with the percentage of 0,47% each.

The writer found that the most frequently used conjunctions showing adversative were ‘but’ (46,30%), followed by ‘however’ (22,22%). Conjunction ‘although’ followed in the third rank (6,79%). The least frequently used conjunctions were ‘another point of view’, ‘considering those facts’, ‘in spite of the fact’, and ‘nevertheless’ with the percentage of 0,62% each.

The writer found that the most frequently used conjunctions showing causal were ‘because’ (36,49%), followed by ‘if’ (29,15%). While the conjunction ‘so’ followed in the third rank (18,01%). The least frequently used conjunctions were ‘for’ and ‘otherwise’ with the percentage of 0,24% each.

The writer found that the most frequently used conjunctions showing temporal were ‘when’ (30,57%), followed by ‘while’ (27,92%). The conjunction ‘after’ followed in the third rank (11,32%). The least frequently used conjunctions were ‘eventually’, ‘fifth’, ‘finally’, ‘fourth’, ‘in sum’, ‘in the end’, ‘meanwhile’, ‘since’, and ‘until’ with the percentage of 0,38% each.

Referring to the second research problem, the writer found that the number of conjunction showing additive used appropriately was as many as 124 times (58,49%). While the number of conjunction showing additive used inappropriately was 88 times (41,51%). In additive conjunctions, 'and' had the highest frequency of inappropriate use (60,23%), followed by 'besides' and 'moreover' (9,09%).

The number of conjunction showing adversative used appropriately was 92 times (56,79%). While the number of conjunction showing adversative used inappropriately was 70 times (43,21%). In adversative conjunctions, 'but' had the highest frequency of inappropriate use (43%), followed by 'however' (24%).

The number of conjunction showing causal used appropriately was 295 times (69,91%). While the number of conjunction showing causal used inappropriately was 132 times (31,28%). In causal conjunctions, 'if' had the highest frequency of inappropriate use (34,85%), followed by 'so' (25%).

The number of conjunction showing temporal used appropriately was as many as 236 times (89,06%). Meanwhile, the number of conjunction showing temporal used inappropriately was 29 times (10,94%). In temporal conjunctions, 'when' had the highest frequency of inappropriate (55,17%), followed by 'then' (20,69%).

Based on these findings, the writer found that among four types of conjunctions, the students committed more errors in using conjunction showing adversative and additive than using causal and temporal. The inappropriate use of

conjunction mostly occurred as the students literally translated their sentence from their first language into the target language. Also, some students still made errors in the spelling of some conjunctions since they did not really comprehend the conjunctions well.

In the next sub chapter, the writer presents some suggestions in the area of teaching learning and for further research.

5.2 Suggestions

In the last part of this chapter, the writer would like to propose some suggestions concerning the result of this study. The suggestions are as follows:

- a) The students should not only given the example of common conjunctions, but also introduced to the uncommon conjunctions (e.g. nevertheless, thus, otherwise) so that the students know the usage of these conjunctions and apply them appropriately in their composition later. By using various types of conjunctions, the sentences in their compositions can be more interesting.
- b) The exercises about the use of conjunctions should be given in complete texts rather than in isolated words so the students have chances to recognize the relation between sentences in context.
- c) The teachers needs to give more attention to the spelling of the conjunctions since most of the students still failed to use the conjunction appropriately (e.g. in the other hand, as the result, etc).

- d) In order to minimize the inappropriate use of conjunction, the students should be reminded not to translate word by word directly from their native language into the second language as it may trap them into unnecessary word.
- e) Due to limited time, the writer did not analyze and classify the errors in details. Therefore, it is suggested that this research is further conducted by categorizing the common errors in using conjunction.
- f) Last, it is suggested that the future study is conducted by using interview in order to check the students' understanding of conjunctions and investigating the possible cause of inappropriate uses of conjunctions in students' writing.

Finally, the writer realizes that this study is far from perfection and hopes that this thesis can be useful and give contributions to English teaching, especially in teaching conjunctions and also discussion text.

Bibliography

- Barwick, J. (1999). *Targeting Text: Information Report, Explanation, Discussion. Upper Level*. Singapore: Green Giant Press.
- Bình, T.T.H. (2014). An Error Analysis on the Use of Conjunctions in the Writing by Freshmen at Pre-Intermediate Level of English at Thang Long University. *Kỷ yếu công trình khoa học 2014 Vol 2*.
- Brown, H.D. (1980). *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching (4th ed.)*. New York: Longman.
- Cook, G. (1989). *Discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Corder, S.P. (1974). Error Analysis. In Allen, J.L.P., & Corder, S.P. (1974). *Techniques in Applied Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Corder, S.P. (1981). *Error Analysis and Interlanguage*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Denzin, N.K. (1973). *The Research Act: A Theoretical Introduction to Sociological Methods*. New Jersey: Transaction Publishers.
- Dulay, H., Burt, M., & Krashen, S. (1982). *Language Two*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Ellis, R. (1994). *The study of second language acquisition*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Free English Course. (2012). *School Uniform*. Retrieved on May 29, 2015, from <http://freeenglishcourse.info/example-of-discussion-text-school-uniform/>
- G. Brown., & G. Yule. (1983). *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Halliday, M.A.K., & Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.
- Hamed, M. (2014). English Language Teaching: Conjunctions in argumentative writing of Libyan tertiary students, *English Language Teaching, Vol 7(3)*, 108-118. doi: 10.5539/elt.v7n3p108.
- James, C. (1998). *Error in Language Learning and Use: Exploring Error Analysis*. London: Longman.

Richards, J.C. (1971). A Non-Contrastive Approach to Error Analysis. In Richards, J.C. (ed). (1971). *Error Analysis: Perspectives on Second Language Acquisition*. London: Longman.

Yeasmin, S., & Rahman, K.F. (2012). 'Triangulation Research Method as the Tool of Social Science Research. *BUP Journal*, 1(1), 154-163.