

## **CHAPTER FIVE**

### **CONCLUSION, DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATION**

This chapter presents a summary of the study, a summary and discussions of the findings, and recommendations for further research.

#### **5.1 SUMMARY OF THE STUDY**

##### **5.1.1 Objectives of the Study**

The study aimed to investigate the effectiveness of different techniques: the Chomskian technique of applied syntactic knowledge, and the conventional technique in comparison in terms of improving Thai students comprehension and production of subject-verb agreement used in present simple yes/no questions and negatives; to examine the common errors made by Thai students in this tense, and to find the patterns of relationship of the language comprehension and production of subject-verb agreement used in this tense.

##### **5.1.2 Subjects, Materials, and Procedure**

The subjects of this study were 70 M. 1/1 and M.1/2 students of Samutsakornburana School. They were divided into two main groups: the control group and the experimental group. 33 M.1/2 students were the control group and 37 M. 1/1 students were in the experimental group.

The pretest, posttest and delayed posttest were comprised of a comprehension test and the production test that were used to measure the two groups' comprehension and production of subject-verb agreement used in the present simple yes/no question and negative.

After both groups took the pretest, each of them was taught by a different technique, the control group with the conventional technique, and the experimental group with the Chomskian technique. An hour later, each group took the posttest, and two

weeks later the delayed posttest was administered with each group. Later on, the scores from the three tests were calculated by SPSS version 15 to produce to the findings.

## **5.2 SUMMARY OF THE FINDINGS**

The results of the study can be summarised as follows:

5.2.1 In the pretest, the scores of the control group and the experimental group are more or less the same, but in the posttest, each group's score is different significantly from the pretest scores. Nonetheless, the posttest score of the experimental group is higher than that of the control group's. Then in the delayed posttest, the results show that the posttest score of the control group is higher than their delayed posttest score whereas the posttest score and the delayed posttest score of the experimental group are more or less the same.

5.2.2 Analysis of errors revealed that in the pretest, posttest, and delayed posttest, the control group made 'mismatch of do and does,' 15%, 30% and 28% respectively, and made 'doubling errors' 38%, 12 %, and 19% respectively while the experimental group made 'mismatch of do and does,' 11%, 3% and 6% respectively, and made 'doubling errors' 36%, 9 %, and 10% respectively.

5.2.3 In present simple yes/no questions, for both the control group and the experimental group, each of their comprehension scores is higher than their production score on the pretest, and then on the posttest and the delayed posttest their comprehension scores and production scores are more or less the same. In present simple negative, for the control group, their comprehension score is higher than their production score on the pretest, and then on the posttest and the delayed posttest their comprehension scores are more or less the same as their production scores whereas, for the experimental group, their comprehension and production scores on the pretest are more or less the same, and then on the posttest their production score is higher than the comprehension score, and on the delayed posttest their comprehension scores are more or less the same as their production scores.

## 5.3 DISCUSSION

The following discussion is drawn from the findings in the previous chapter.

### 5.3.1 The Effectiveness of the Chomskian Teaching Technique

Since this study aimed to develop Thai students' comprehension and production of subject-verb agreement used in the present simple yes/no question and negative, recalling the results from 4.1 in chapter four, it is found that the Chomskian teaching technique is effective in that it helps the experimental group subjects develop the comprehension and production scores on posttest significantly when being compared to those scores from the pretest and significantly when being compared with those scores of control group subjects who were taught by the conventional technique.

Furthermore, when retesting subjects of the experimental group and the control group two weeks after the posttest in order to test for the prolong effects of the two different teaching techniques, on average, comprehension and production scores of the experimental group on the delayed posttest and the posttest are more or less the same whereas on the delayed posttest, the control group subjects' comprehension and production scores regress to those on the pretest.

Moreover, the effectiveness of the Chomskian teaching technique can be investigated in term of the reduction of the common errors found in present simple yes/no questions and negatives. Even if conventional technique helps to reduce 'doubling errors' as the Chomskian teaching technique does, it causes a double of 'mismatch of do and does' while the Chomskian teaching technique can be helped to reduce this type of error. Thus, the conventional technique that reveals to the control group subjects 'do-insertion' and the deletion of morpheme '-s' affects the reduction of mismatch of do and does' and the increasing of 'doubling errors' whereas the Chomskian teaching technique that exposes the experimental group subjects to 'do-insertion' and 'I-to C movement,' moving morpheme '-s' to 'do,' helps the subjects to reduce 'mismatch of do and does' and 'doubling errors' in a smaller amount on the posttest and the delayed posttest than they

made on the pretest and than the control group subjects on the posttest and the delayed posttest made.

Therefore, it can be summarised that the Chomskian teaching technique has the effect of developing Thai students' comprehension and production of subject-verb agreement used in present simple yes/no questions and negatives, and in reducing the common errors made by Thai students in present simple yes/no question and negative.

### 5.3.2 The Common Errors

According to Table 8, on the pretest the control group and the experimental group made 'doubling error' most frequently while they 'mismatched of do and does' less than a half as much as 'doubling errors.' It is obvious that both groups always stranded the morpheme '-s,' at the main verbs leading to expressing the tense and/or agreement on the 'fronted' auxiliary: 'do/does' and again on the main verb, and this type of error is called 'doubling error,' which O' Grady (as cited in Hattori, 2003, p. 1) defined. Moreover, the results from the pretest of the study seem to be contrary to Matawan Supanakorn (2005) in that the subjects of the two groups did not 'mismatch [of] do and does' most frequently as the subjects of her study did. Nevertheless, on the posttest and delayed posttest this type of error became the most frequent error made by *the control group* while 'doubling errors' were reduced distinctly. Comparing with the experimental group, the Chomskian teaching technique clearly helped to reduce 'doubling errors', and even if 'mismatch of do and does' was not gotten rid of, it was reduced to a diminutive level.

Taking the view of *Interlanguage* to explain the occurrence of the errors found in this present study, at the third stage of yes/no question formation and the second stage of negative formation, the second language learners are able to use 'do-insertion,' but 'do' is still not varied for person, number and tense (Lightbown & Spada, 1999, 2000). Thus, this error occurred in these stages in 'mismatch of do and does.' In the fourth stage, they can make 'doubling errors' by continuing marking tense, number and

person on the auxiliaries and the verbs for some time (Lightbown & Spada, 1999).

Consequently, according to the developmental sequences of yes/no question and negative formations, it sounds reasonable that the subjects make ‘doubling errors,’ (the errors occurring in stage four) more than they ‘mismatch [of] do and does,’ the error in stage two and three. On the other hand, this study can be used to support that the second learners pass through developmental sequences as the first language learners do, and more interestingly, the first language of the learners influences the acquisition of present simple yes/no questions and negatives in that the first language has an effect on developmental sequences of second language learners for negatives and questions. As Lightbown and Spada (1999) pointed out the learners might linger longer in such a stage. In this present study, it can be pointed out that since they still make ‘doubling errors’ for some time, they may still stay on the fourth stage, and since they ‘mismatch do and does’ they may not pass through the third stage of yes/no question formation and the second stage of negative formation. On the contrary, it is possible that the subjects may slip back in to those previous stages. It is as Lightbown and Spada (1999) described; although the learners passed through the last stage of the developmental sequences, they may slip back into previous stages. As a result, the subjects in this study made those kinds of error.

### **5.3.3 Patterns of Language Acquisition**

The results from 4.3 provide the answer to the question about relationships between language comprehension and language production of subject-verb agreement used in the present simple yes/no question and negative.

Starting by present simple yes/no question, for the control group who was taught by the conventional technique, referring to the results from Table 10 showed on the pretest, *comprehension precedes production*, and on the posttest and the delayed posttest, *comprehension equates to production*. Similarly, for the experimental group from Table 11 shows the same patterns of relationship: *comprehension precedes production* on the pretest, *comprehension equates to production* on the posttest and the

delayed posttest.

Furthermore, for the acquisition of subject-verb agreement used in the present simple negative, the results from Table 12 illustrate that the control group's *comprehension precedes production* on the pretest, and *comprehension equates to production* on the posttest and the delayed posttest. Comparing the experimental group, the results from Table 13 show quite different patterns in that *comprehension equates to production* on the pretest while *production precedes comprehension* on the posttest. After the experimental group was assigned study by the Chomskian teaching technique, it seems that their production developed faster than comprehension. Nevertheless, their *production* was shifted and *equates to comprehension* on the delayed posttest.

Due to constantly changing and interacting of linguistic and cognitive abilities during the pretest, posttest, and delayed posttest, varied patterns of the relationship between comprehension and production of subject-verb agreement used in present simple yes/no questions and negatives were found in this study. There are three patterns: *comprehension precedes production*, *production precedes comprehension*, and *comprehension equates to production*. Consequently, it can be concluded that results discovered in this study are accordant with Bloom's view of a variable and constantly changing relationship between comprehension and production in language development in 1974, according to the context and the interaction of growing linguistic and cognitive abilities of the children.

## 5.4 CONCLUSIONS

The following conclusions can be drawn from the previous discussion.

5.4.1 The findings provide researchers and educators with insight into the effective use of the Chomskian technique as a means to improve Thai students' comprehension and production in the present simple yes/no question and negative, and reduce the common errors made by Thai students in present simple yes/no question and negative. Hence, the technique could be used by English teachers for teaching Thai

students in the present simple. It is preferable to use it as a complement conventional technique in order to facilitate the students' comprehension and production in the greatest degree. Furthermore, the findings prove that Chomskian theory can be applied to the second language learners.

5.4.2 The findings provide distinct evidence about the controversial issue in the language acquisition of whether comprehension precedes production or production precedes comprehension; the relationship between comprehension and production is varied and constantly change during a course of development as Bloom pointed out. Consequently, by testing or quizzing if it appears that the students' comprehension and production are significantly different, English teachers should consider the differences and gaps between those when teaching as suggested by Brown (1994).

## **5.5 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH**

The following recommendations made for further research are based on the findings and conclusions of this study.

5.5.1 Since the Chomskian teaching technique is successful in helping the subjects improve comprehension and production of subject-verb agreement used in present simple yes/no question and negative, researchers should conduct studies in using the Chomskian teaching technique with the past simple yes/no question and negative.

5.5.2 A study could be done with subjects who are students of a different grade and face difficulty in subject-verb agreement used in the present simple yes/no question and negative.

5.5.3 The subjects in the study should be divided according the level of proficiency: high, mid and low because the level of proficiency might affect the subjects' scores on comprehension and production tests; thereby, the patterns of relationship between comprehension and production can be investigated more explicitly.

5.5.4 A longitudinal study would be more appropriate to help to examine the patterns of relationship of language acquisition of the tense better because according to Bloom's view in 1974, during the course of development, the patterns of relationship constantly change and vary.