

CHAPTER V
CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

In this chapter the writer would like to make a conclusion about the results of this study which were discussed in the previous chapter. Besides, she would like to give some suggestions concerning this study.

5.1 Conclusion

Both native speakers and non-native speakers as teachers of second language should realize that the appropriate condition for the students to gain second language success is by providing them with comprehensible input since receiving such input means understanding the messages. It means that teachers should make the messages in the target language as the 'input' simple, clear, and understandable (in $i+1$ condition) and also make the students 'open' to meet such input (have low affective filter). Teachers also have to prepare the best strategies to deliver input in the required condition by trying to control the input not to become too easy or too difficult for the students.

Krashen (1987 : 21) in his Input Hypothesis says that if communication in which the acquirers focus on meaning is successful, the input is understood. He also posits four characteristics for optimal input for second language acquisition. Actually, there are some possible sources of comprehensible input, for instance reading, vocabulary, and simple codes. The second language teachers and second language classroom have important roles to provide the appropriate condition for second language success, too. Teachers should help the students to get language success by making input in the target language comprehensible, and the classroom should meet all the requirements of being the 'supplier' of comprehensible input. The use of the appropriate teaching strategy such as can also affect the providence of

comprehensible input in the classroom.

In order to find out the kinds of input provided by the natives and non-natives and their strategies to make the input comprehensible, the writer applies the participant observation method of qualitative research to observe four subjects under the study : two native speaker subjects (NS-1 and NS-2) who are teachers at English First Surabaya, and two non-native speaker subjects (NNS-1 and NNS-2) who are teachers at Friendship Surabaya. In addition, the students in the situation being studied were categorized into level 6 or intermediate level of competence. She used two research instruments to investigate such condition : she herself as participant observer and the equipments of tape recorder and field notes. She applied three procedures of collecting data which were completely done after four months. Then the data were described into descriptive and reflexive data which would be analyzed during and after the data collection.

As the results of the study, the writer found out that both native speakers and non-native speakers presented visual, verbal, aural, and written input in the classroom. To make such input comprehensible, they used various strategies. By analyzing the students' responses during the presentation of each input, she found out that there were strategies that really worked well to make and keep input in $i+1$ condition. In other words, there were strategies that failed to make input comprehensible. However, there were input that were already in the $i+1$ condition but there were others that were not in that condition ($i+0$ or $i+2$). The strategies that worked are strategies that can make the $i+0$ and $i+2$ input become $i+1$ input and vice versa. When the input are in the $i+1$ condition, the students gave positive responses to the teachers and when the input are in $i+0$ or $i+2$ condition, the students gave negative responses to the teachers during the presentation of input. But this measurement can only be applied to the students with the same level of competence (intermediate level, etc.). Furthermore, the writer

found that native speakers provided more comprehensible input in the forms of visual input or by using visual aids as the helping tools. And the non-native speakers provided more comprehensible input in the forms of written input since their explanation were mostly translated once again into the students' first language (Indonesian).

5.2 Suggestion

This study has shown that presenting comprehensible input in the classroom is not an easy way to do. It needs a set of strategies that should be considered important by every second language teacher, native speaker or non-native speaker. Knowing about this, the writer would like to suggest the following ways to help teachers and teacher candidates to present comprehensible input in the classroom :

1. Teachers should check how much the students have already known about the coming input. Having known about it means having known about the students' level of competency that refers more to the students' i level.
2. Teachers should send input at the $i+1$ level (level above the students' level of competency) by controlling the input not to become too easy or too difficult for the students.
3. Teachers should not only present the already interesting input but should also try to make the uninteresting input as interesting as possible. This can be best done by using visual aids such as the teachers' gestures and mimics, real objects and their replicas, pictures and drawings, charts and diagrams, slides, film strips, video films, etc.
4. Teachers should control how successful the students comprehend the input. This can be best done by giving tasks concerning the input, asking the students to carry out commands and instructions concerning the input, or checking the students' understanding towards such input spontaneously.

Finally, the writer realizes that this study only investigated the kinds of input and the strategies to make the input comprehensible in general forms. So she expects that there would be another studies done by the other S1 graduated students of English Department that could show the impact of such strategies in the students' performance. She believes that such studies could prove stronglier about the importance of comprehensible input in the second language acquisition process.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Brown, H. Douglas. 1987. Principles of Language Learning and Teaching. New Jersey : Prentice Hall, Inc.
- Chaudron, Chaig. 1988. Second Language Classrooms. New York : Cambridge University Press.
- Ellis, Rod. 1988. Classroom Second Language Development. London : Prentice Hall International (UK) Ltd.
- Krashen, Stephen D. 1985. The Input Hypothesis : Issues and Implication. New York : Longmann Inc.
- Krashen, Stephen D. 1987. Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition. London : Prentice Hall International Ltd.
- Krashen, Stephen D. and Tracy D. Terrel. 1988. The Natural Approach. London : Prentice Hall International Ltd.
- Krashen, Stephen D. 1989. Language Acquisition and Language Education. London : Prentice Hall International Ltd.
- Longmann Dictionary of Contemporary English. 1989. London : Longmann Group UK Limited.
- Marton, Waldemar. 1988. Methods in English Language Teaching. London : Prentice Hall International (UK) Ltd.
- Miles, Matthew B. and A. Michael Huberman. 1992. Analisis Data Kualitatif. Jakarta : UI Press.
- Millan, James H. Mac. 1992. Educational Research. New York : Harper Collins Publishers.
- Seliger, Herbert. 1988. Psycholinguistic Issues in Second Language Acquisition. In Leslie M. Beebe (ed.). Issues in Second Language Acquisition : Multiple Perspective. Boston : Heinle and Heinle Publishers.
- Shoemaker, Connie L. and F. Floyd Shoemaker. 1991. Interactive Techniques for the ESL Classroom. Boston : Heinle and Heinle Publishers.
- Scarcella, Robin C. and Rebecca L. Oxford. 1992. The Tapestry of Language Learning. Boston : Heinle and Heinle Publishers.