

CHAPTER V CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

Conclusion

I would like to take some conclusions about the result of this skripsi, these are as follow :

- a. Based on the analysis on the students ability in composing recount text, the total score of the students of SMP Negeri 4 Gorontalo was 201 or 29.73 %, therefore I can conclude that the students ability in composing recount text had categorized poor.
- b. The percentage of the students writing ability in vocabulary aspects is 54.7 %, it is caused students' limited vocabulary. The percentage of the students writing ability in form aspects is 59.52 %, it is caused students confused to manage or put their idea. The percentage of the students ability in grammar aspects is 57.14 %, it is caused students make mistakes on grammar. And the percentage of the students ability in mechanic aspects is 67.85 %, it is caused some of students' do not master punctuation and capitalization especially using capital letter.

Suggestion

Based on the conclusion above, I would like to gave some suggestion, such as :

- a. The English teachers should give the students more exercise of writing ability based generic structure and the teacher give more explain how to use mechanic, vocabulary and grammar in writing recount text.

- b. The English teachers should be able to find and develop on the class, so the students will be more interest in learning English especially in writing.
- c. The students should be learn more about generic structure, how to use mechanic, vocabulary, grammar in writing recount text.
- d. For the further researcher to find out the factors which cause students' ability in writing recount text is poor.

REFERENCES

Andersen, Mark and K. Andersen. 1997. *Text Types in English*. South Yarra : Macmillan Education PTY LTD

Arikunto, Suharsimi. 1998. *Prosedur Penelitian*. Jakarta : Rineka Cipta

Danial, Haris. 2011. *The Influence Of Concept Mapping Strategy Toward Writing Recount Text*. Gorontalo State Univercity

Diknas. 2005. *Materi Pelatihan Terintegrasi Pembelajaran Teks Rrecount*. Jakarta : Diknas

Gerot, Linda and Peter Wignell. 1994. *Making Sense Of Funcinal Grammar*. Sydney: Gerd Stabler

Gie, The Liang. (2002). *Terampil Mengarang*. Yogyakarta. ANDI

Greenville, Kate. 2001. *Writing From Start To Finish*. Griffin Press: South Australia

Haris, D. 1969. *Language Testing English as a Second Language*. New York: McGraw-Hill

Heaton, J.B 1989. *Writing English Language Test*. New York : Longham

Hornby, AS. 1995. *The Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English*. Oxford Univercity Press

Hyland, Ken. *Teaching and Researching Writing*. Britain: Pearson Education

Igirisa, Suwarni. 2010. *Developing The Students' Ability in Writing Recount Text By Using Journal Events*. Gorontalo State Univercity

Lamusu, E. Yolanda. 2009. *A Descriptive Study On The Students Ability In Composing Recount Text*. Gorontalo State Univercity

Raimes, Ann. 1983. *Technique In Teaching Writing*. England :Oxford Univercity

Soemarto & Soemardjo. 1994. *English Structure In Context 1* : Direktorat Jendral Pendidikan

Spivey, L. Becky. 2001. *What is writing Process ?*

Sukarni, Semi. 2006. *Teaching Recount Text to Junior High School*. Universitas Muhammdiyah Purwarejo

Tarigan, Henry Guntur Prof. Dr. 1984. *Menulis sebagai Suatu Keterampilan*. Angkasa Bandung. Bandung

Tim Penyusun. 2008. *Detik – detik Ujian Nasional Bahasa Inggris untuk SMP/MTs*. PT. Intan Pariwara.

<http://duniabaca.com/pengertian-menulis-menurut-para-ahli.html>

APPENDIX I

The Scoring Rubric of Recount Text

Aspect	Score	Explanation
Vocabulary	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use vocabulary an idiom rarely (if at all) distinguishable from that of educated native speaker
	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Occasionally uses inappropriate term or rarely on circumlocation, expression of ideas hardly impaired
	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Uses wrong or inappropriate words fairly frequently, expression of ideas maybe limited because of inadequate vocabulary
	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limited vocabulary and frequent errors clearly hinder expression of ideas
	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Vocabulary so limited and so frequently misused that the reader must often rely on own interpretation
	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Vocabulary limitation so extreme as to make comprehension
Form	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Highly organized, clear progression of ideas well like educated native speakers
	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Material well organized, links could occasionally be clear but communication not impaired
	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some lack of organization re-reading required for clarification of ideas
	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Little or not attempt at connectivity though reader can deduce some organization
	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Individual ideas maybe clear but very difficult to deduce connection between them
	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Individual ideas maybe clear but very difficult to deduce connection between them

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of organization so severe that communication is seriously impaired
Grammar	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Few (if any) no noticeable errors of grammars of word order
	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some errors of grammar or word order which do not however, interfere with comprehension
	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some errors of grammars or word order fairly frequent occasional re-reading necessary or full comprehension
	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Errors of grammars or word order frequent, efforts of interpretation sometimes required on readers part
	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Errors of grammar or word order very frequent, reader often has to rely on own interpretation
	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Errors of grammar or word order as severe as to make comprehension virtually impossible
Mechanic	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Few (if any) noticeable lapses in punctuation or spelling
	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Occasional lapses in punctuation or spelling, which do not. However, interfere with comprehension
	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Errors in punctuation or spelling fairly frequent, occasionally re-reading necessary for full comprehension
	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Frequent errors in spelling or punctuation, lead sometimes to obscurity, sometimes required on readres part
	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Errors in spelling or punctuation so frequent that reader must often rely on own
	1	

		<p>interpretation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Errors in spelling or punctuation so serve as to make comprehension virtually impossible
--	--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

APPENDIX II

INSTRUMENT

Make a recount text based your experienced. The recount text make in two least paragraph

- Orientation
- Events
- Re-orientation

APPENDIX III

QUESTIONS :

1. Apakah kamu menyukai pembelajaran menulis dalam bahasa Inggris? Berikan alasannya
2. Apakah menulis dalam bahasa Inggris itu mudah? Berikan alasannya
3. Apakah yang anda ketahui tentang recount text ?
4. Apakah dalam membuat recount text, anda mengalami suatu kendala ?
5. Bagaimana guru anda dalam memberikan materi recount text ?
6. Apakah anda senang dengan metode pengajaran yang dilakukan oleh guru anda ?

APPENDIX IV**Name of Students**

1. Alditya Ahaliki
2. Asti Amalia Ashari
3. Fandi Mamonto
4. Febriyanto Polii
5. Fidya Ningsih asilia
6. Fitriyanti M. Yasin
7. Ismail Katili
8. Liliyanti Pautina
9. Mahyudin Mohammad
10. Maria Liando
11. Meylan Abbas
12. Meylan Adzunu
13. Moh. Gufran Katili
14. Moh. Rizal Ibrahim
15. Mohammad Taufik Datu
16. Noviyanti Tahir
17. Nurain Y. Poha
18. Rahmad S. Daud
19. Rinaldy Tou
20. Riski Ahmad
21. Selvi Kasim
22. Sintia Fidelya ombaile
23. Sri Cindrawaty Bunai
24. Syahrul Abdul
25. Tiara Ismail
26. Windawati Abas

APPENDIX V

No.	Name of Students	Score of Vocabulary	Percentage	Category
1.	Alditya Ahaliki	1	16.6	Poor
2.	Asti Amalia Ashari	2	33.3	Poor
3.	Fandi Mamonto	1	16.6	Poor
4.	Febriyanto Polii	4	66.6	Good
5.	Fidya Ningsih asilia	3	50	Average
6.	Fitriyanti M. Yasin	1	16.6	Poor
7.	Ismail Katili	3	50	Average
8.	Liliyanti Pautina	2	33,3	Poor
9.	Mahyudin Mohammad	2	33.3	Poor
10.	Maria Liando	1	16.6	Poor
11.	Meylan Abbas	1	16.6	Poor
12.	Meylan Adzunu	3	50	Average
13.	Moh. Gufran Katili	1	16.6	Poor
14.	Moh. Rizal Ibrahim	1	16.6	Poor
15.	Mohammad Taufik Datu	2	33.3	Poor
16.	Noviyanti Tahir	1	16.6	Poor
17.	Nurain Y. Poha	5	83.3	Excellent
18.	Rahmad S. Daud	1	16.6	Poor
19.	Rinaldy Tou	1	16.6	Poor
20.	Riski Ahmad	1	16.6	Poor
21.	Selvi Kasim	1	16,6	Poor
22.	Sintia Fidelya ombaile	3	50	Average
23.	Sri Cindrawaty Bunai	2	33.3	Poor
24.	Syahrul Abdul	1	16.6	Poor
25.	Tiara Ismail	1	16.6	Poor
26.	Windawati Abas	1	16.6	Poor

APPENDIX VI

No.	Name of Students	Score of Form	Percentage	Category
1.	Alditya Ahaliki	2	33,3	Poor
2.	Asti Amalia Ashari	2	33,3	Poor
3.	Fandi Mamonto	1	16.6	Poor
4.	Febriyanto Polii	3	50	Average
5.	Fidya Ningsih asilia	3	50	Average
6.	Fitriyanti M. Yasin	1	16.6	Poor
7.	Ismail Katili	3	50	Average
8.	Liliyanti Pautina	2	33.3	Poor
9.	Mahyudin Mohammad	1	16.6	Poor
10.	Maria Liando	2	33.3	Poor
11.	Meylan Abbas	1	16.6	Poor
12.	Meylan Adzunu	4	66.6	Good
13.	Moh. Gufran Katili	1	16.6	Poor
14.	Moh. Rizal Ibrahim	1	16.6	Poor
15.	Mohammad Taufik Datu	2	33.3	Poor
16.	Noviyanti Tahir	1	16.6	Poor
17.	Nurain Y. Poha	4	66.6	Good
18.	Rahmad S. Daud	1	16.6	Poor
19.	Rinaldy Tou	2	33.3	Poor
20.	Riski Ahmad	1	16.6	Poor
21.	Selvi Kasim	2	33.3	Poor
22.	Sintia Fidelya ombaile	5	83.3	Excellent
23.	Sri Cindrawaty Bunai	2	33.3	Poor
24.	Syahrul Abdul	1	16.6	Poor
25.	Tiara Ismail	1	16.6	Poor
26.	Windawati Abas	1	16.6	Poor

APPENDIX VII

No.	Name of Students	Score of Grammar	Percentage	Category
1.	Alditya Ahaliki	2	33.3	Poor
2.	Asti Amalia Ashari	2	33.3	Poor
3.	Fandi Mamonto	1	16.6	Poor
4.	Febriyanto Polii	4	66.6	Good
5.	Fidya Ningsih asilia	2	33.3	Poor
6.	Fitriyanti M. Yasin	1	16.6	Poor
7.	Ismail Katili	4	66.6	Good
8.	Liliyanti Pautina	2	33.3	Poor
9.	Mahyudin Mohammad	2	33.3	Poor
10.	Maria Liando	1	16.6	Poor
11.	Meylan Abbas	1	16.6	Poor
12.	Meylan Adzunu	4	66.6	Good
13.	Moh. Gufran Katili	1	16.6	Poor
14.	Moh. Rizal Ibrahim	1	16.6	Poor
15.	Mohammad Taufik Datu	1	16.6	Poor
16.	Noviyanti Tahir	1	16.6	Poor
17.	Nurain Y. Poha	5	83.3	Excellent
18.	Rahmad S. Daud	1	16.6	Poor
19.	Rinaldy Tou	2	33.3	Poor
20.	Riski Ahmad	1	16.6	Poor
21.	Selvi Kasim	1	16.6	Poor
22.	Sintia Fidelya ombaile	3	50	Average
23.	Sri Cindrawaty Bunai	2	33.3	Poor
24.	Syahrul Abdul	1	16.6	Poor
25.	Tiara Ismail	1	16.6	Poor
26.	Windawati Abas	1	16.6	Poor

APPENDIX VIII

No.	Name of Students	Score of Mechanic	Percentage	Category
1.	Alditya Ahaliki	2	33.3	Poor
2.	Asti Amalia Ashari	2	33.3	Poor
3.	Fandi Mamonto	1	16.6	Poor
4.	Febriyanto Polii	4	66.6	Good
5.	Fidya Ningsih asilia	3	50	Average
6.	Fitriyanti M. Yasin	2	33.3	Poor
7.	Ismail Katili	2	33.3	Poor
8.	Liliyanti Pautina	3	50	Average
9.	Mahyudin Mohammad	2	33.3	Poor
10.	Maria Liando	2	33.3	Poor
11.	Meylan Abbas	2	33.3	Poor
12.	Meylan Adzunu	3	50	Average
13.	Moh. Gufran Katili	2	33.3	Poor
14.	Moh. Rizal Ibrahim	1	16.6	Poor
15.	Mohammad Taufik Datu	2	33.3	Poor
16.	Noviyanti Tahir	1	16.6	Poor
17.	Nurain Y. Poha	5	83.3	Excellent
18.	Rahmad S. Daud	2	33.3	Poor
19.	Rinaldy Tou	3	50	Average
20.	Riski Ahmad	2	33.3	Poor
21.	Selvi Kasim	2	23.3	Poor
22.	Sintia Fidelya ombaile	3	50	Average
23.	Sri Cindrawaty Bunai	2	33.3	Poor
24.	Syahrul Abdul	2	33.3	Poor
25.	Tiara Ismail	1	16.6	Poor
26.	Windawati Abas	1	16.6	Poor

APPENDIX IX

Sample	Aspects				Total	%	Category
	Vocab	Form	Grammar	Mechanc			
1.	1	2	2	2	7	33.33	Poor
2.	2	2	2	2	8	38.09	Poor
3.	1	1	1	1	4	19.04	Poor
4.	4	3	4	4	15	71.42	Good
5.	3	3	2	3	11	52.38	Average
6.	1	1	1	2	5	23.80	Poor
7.	3	3	4	2	12	57.14	Average
8.	2	2	2	3	9	42.85	Poor
9.	2	1	2	2	7	33.33	Poor
10.	1	2	1	2	6	28.57	Poor
11.	1	1	1	2	5	23.80	Poor
12.	3	4	4	3	14	66.66	Good
13.	1	1	1	2	5	23.80	Poor
14.	1	1	1	1	4	19.04	Poor
15.	2	2	1	2	7	33.33	Poor
16.	1	1	1	1	4	19.04	Poor
17.	5	4	5	5	19	90.47	Excellent
18.	1	1	1	2	5	23.80	Poor
19.	1	2	2	3	8	38.09	Poor
20.	1	1	1	2	5	23.80	Poor
21.	1	2	1	2	6	28.57	Poor
22.	3	5	3	3	14	66.66	Good
23.	2	2	2	2	8	38.09	Poor
24.	1	1	1	2	5	23.80	Poor
25.	1	1	1	1	4	19.04	Poor
26.	1	1	1	1	4	19.04	Poor
T O T A L					201	29.73	Poor