

## CHAPTER V

### CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

This chapter discusses the conclusion of the whole study and suggestion from the writer.

#### **5.1. Conclusion**

This study aimed at investigating the explicitness and coherence of chain of reasoning between *Research Problem, Findings, Conclusions* made by UNJ English Department students. Chain of reasoning was a form of consistency to the idea or the main purpose of the research which was applied to every chapter in *skripsi*. As McMillan (2010) stated that a chain of reasoning connects all relevant aspects of the study, from the research questions to the review literature, methodology, results, and conclusion.

In order to see the explicitness of the research problems and findings, the writer observed whether the key words of the problems restated or exist in the finding. The writer did the same thing to see the explicitness of the findings and the conclusion. The writer checked the existence of the keywords of findings in the conclusion. On the other hand, to see the coherence between research problem and findings, the writer uses the criteria and function of both. Criteria here were, for the problem, the research problem needs to cover all parts of the *skripsi*. In this case, it could be seen from the interconnection between the formulated problem (research

question) and the title. The research problem also needs to fit the criteria of a good research question suggested by expert. The criteria were: significant, clear, concise, specific, feasible, and reasonable. For the findings, the criteria used come from its function as the basis to answer the research question. The data were analyzed regarding to the question “Could the findings be used to answer the problem?”. The last, to reveal the coherence between findings and the conclusion, the writer checked to the conclusion whether it has met the criteria. Criteria used here were, the conclusion includes a brief summary of the whole research, the conclusion should be based on the findings, it also needs to give a statement that was solve or answer the research problem.

From the analysis of explicitness and coherence between research problem and findings it was found that:

1. *50% Chain of reasoning of research problem and findings* were explicit and coherent
2. *9% Chain of reasoning of research problem and findings* were explicit but incoherent
3. *19% Chain of reasoning of research problem and findings* were implicit but coherent
4. *15% Chain of reasoning of research problem and findings* were implicit and incoherent
5. *7% Chain of reasoning of research problem and findings* were non-existent and incoherent

In addition, from the analysis of explicitness and coherence findings and conclusion it was also found that:

1. 55% *Chain of reasoning Chain of reasoning research findings and conclusion* were explicit and coherent
2. 20% *Chain of reasoning Chain of reasoning research findings and conclusion* were explicit but incoherent
3. 4% *Chain of reasoning Chain of reasoning research findings and conclusion* were implicit but coherent
4. 12% *Chain of reasoning Chain of reasoning research findings and conclusion* were implicit and incoherent
5. 9% *Chain of reasoning Chain of reasoning research findings and conclusion* were non-existent and incoherent

These findings indicated that the chain of reasoning in ED UNJ students' *skripsi* was still lack of coherence and explicitness. This was unfortunate considering the role of the *skripsi* as the research that was collage product was very important in filling the gap of knowledge. Furthermore, these findings showed that the background of the students in conducting a research has shifted from finding new thing or knowledge to only completing the administrative matter to finish their study in collage.

## 5.2. Suggestion

Based on the findings, the writer suggested the students especially those who conduct *skripsi* to give more attention to the explicitness and coherence. Coherence was the heart of a good writing. With it, a complex discussion in the *skripsi* would be easily understood by readers. On the contrary how simple the *skripsi* was, it would be hard to understand if the coherence was neglected. The explicitness was also important. It helped both the researcher and the reader. For the researcher, they would not lose or forget to present their findings if the subsections were explicitly labeled with the words that the problem asked. On the other hand, the reader would easily read and encountered the findings since they were presented in the explicit way.

The last, the writer expected there was a further study related to the quality of the ED UNJ students' *skripsi*. The writer also hoped that this piece of thing could be useful to other researchers who work in the same field.