CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS
Completing this thesis, the writer would like to present the conclusion along with some suggestions that may be useful for English lecturers at the Economics faculty.

5.1 Conclusion

Being interested in material evaluation, the writer took Evaluating English Teaching Materials as the topic of her study. As there is no one who has evaluated English teaching materials for the Economics Faculty, the writer decided to conduct a study on Evaluating English Teaching Materials for the Students of the Economics Faculty of Widya Mandala University Surabaya.

This study has two research problems, they are:
1. What are the needs of the students taking English course in the Economics Faculty?
2. Is there a match between the learning aspects offered by the material and the student's learning needs?
In conducting this study, the writer used two research designs. First, the writer used survey to collect the data on the students' needs. Second, since this study is concerned with the analysis of the content of documented materials and deals with no statistical matters, content analysis is used.

In collecting the data of students' needs, the writer firstly made the questionnaire. Then the writer gave a try out to 15 students of the academic year 1998/1999. The result shows that the questionnaire was good enough. The questionnaires were then given to the 80 students of academic year 1998/1999 that served as the subjects.

In evaluating the teaching material, the writer followed the stages of material evaluation proposes by Hutchison and Waters(1987), they are defining criteria, subjective analysis, objective analysis, and matching. Defining criteria is the criteria based on which the materials will be evaluated. Subjective analysis refers to the criteria of the English teaching materials expected by the respondents. Objective analysis refers to the evaluation of the material. Matching is the process of matching the subjective and objective
analyses in order to find the degree of compatibility of the material.

First, the writer divided the criteria based on the criteria suggested by Hutchinson and Waters (1987: 99-104). They include AUDIENCE, AIMS, CONTENT, and METHODOLOGY. As one of the objectives of this study is to identify the needs of the students whose academic year is 1998/1999 of the Economics Faculty, the writer certainly analyzed both target situation and learning needs. However, since Hutchinson and Waters only include the learning needs, the writer added one point that is TARGET SITUATION. Second, she stated the results of the questionnaire in percentages and used them as a basis for subjective analysis. Third, the writer analyzed the existing English teaching materials and used the results as the basis for objective analysis. Fourth, she matched the subjective analysis against the objective analysis. Fifth, the writer gave points to the degree of matching between the two analysis. At last, she judged whether the teaching materials meet the students' needs or not.

After conducting all the steps above, the writer found that only one aspect got a score of 3, two aspects got a score of 2, nine aspects got a score of
1, and three aspects got a score of 0. From the finding, the writer concluded that the teaching material partly meet the students' needs as 60% of the aspects being evaluated got a score of 1.

5.2 Suggestions

Concerning the finding that the teaching material partly match the students' needs, the writer would like to give some suggestions.

In ESP courses, what is valued by language learners about language learning is often at odds with institutional values. Hence there is a situation in which the aims and objectives of an ESP program are directed to the acquisition of reading skills in specific subject areas, whereas the learner population values English language learning mainly in order to be able to speak the language in social context. In connection to that problem, Hutchinson and Waters (cited in Chamberlain and Baumgardner 1988: 81) state that:

The apparent problem of a mis-match between learners' needs (or wants?) and sponsors' needs should be confronted and seen as a beginning of communication and negotiation and therefore as an essential foundation for a communicative approach in ESP.
To solve the problem, the writer suggests that the teachers should be more tolerant to the students' needs by making clear at the first time of teaching learning activity that the objective of the English lesson is to help the students improving their reading skill. Moreover, as the classes are too big, it is not possible to give speaking activity to students of the Economics Faculty. It means that the classes should be made smaller first, if the lecturers want to give speaking activity.

Concerning the creativity of making the material, Hutchinson and Waters (cited in Chamberlain and Baumgardner 1988:81) state that:

The main cause of low student interest in ESP materials is that they are too often uncreative: the scope of the language activities they attempt to engage the learners in is limited and their knowledge content is large unexploited.

According to the writer, the reading passages could still be exploited. First, by providing background information, as stated by Krashen (1989: 28) that substantial research showed that background information can help a great deal in making input comprehensible. Second, by giving some questions as Bowen (1985: 225) says:
Even at the beginning level teachers should engage students in discussion of reading materials, ever encouraging readers to think beyond the decoding processes. The types of questions employed for discussion may be categorized as information, inferential and interpretive.

Concerning the types of questions, the writer suggests Bloom’s taxonomy as it comprises all types of questions — knowledge, comprehension, application, analysis, synthesis, and evaluation — so it will help the students understanding the reading passages better. However, there are still many kinds of reading comprehension that can be applied.

In relation to the text version, the writer think that it will be better if the book consists of two text versions — authentic and simplified — since in this way, the students can have the experience in reading both authentic and simplified texts. Some research bears on the use of simplication as a means of making texts comprehensible, however, according to Blau (cited in Krasen, 1987: 28) found that simplification could impair comprehension by removing elements crucial to comprehension. Concerning this issue, King identifies two kinds of modifications, input modification and
interactional modification. Furthermore, King (1987) says that:

interactional structure modification may be more desirable option than input modification, since the former maintains the same level of syntactic and lexical complexity as the native-speaker text, and, hence, allows faster acquisitional opportunities to a learner of a target grammar.

The last suggestion that the writer wants to suggest is concerned with the sequence of the units in the book. It would be better if the units has relation one to another, for instance, if the reading passages contain many passive voice, the next lesson (grammar section) discusses the passive voice. In this way, the students can decipher the reading passage better by delving into the grammar. Krashen states that one of the ways of fluent reading comprehension is by using knowledge of grammar and knowledge of the conventions of written language, the writer can then convert the predicted meaning into graphic form. Therefore, it is better if the grammar sections have relation with the reading texts.
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