

CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter will briefly present the concluding remarks of this present study. It includes *Conclusions* and *Recommendation*. The *Conclusions* section is started with the short background, the research questions, the findings, and the conclusions. On the other hand, the *Recommendations* section elaborates two recommendations for future research with similar topic, and for stakeholders who are in charge of improving the results of teaching-learning activities, especially English class in Polytechnic.

5.1 Conclusions

To have clear conclusions some elements of this study are revisited. Students studying scientific language need to understand nominalisation, as it dominates the language of science. For Polytechnic students, understanding scientific text is difficult due to the lack of knowledge about nominalisation. Based on this reality, this study was conducted among these students, whose study background is mechanical engineering.

In relation to the above condition, three research questions are revisited. The first is about the students' level of understanding on the realisation of nominalisation in a scientific written text. The second is how nominalisations are manifested in the students' written texts. The last is about the types of nominalisation usually found in students' written texts.

To response those research questions, the main data were collected by employing two methods, conducting two English tests and interviewing some students. In the first test, a reading text was used. The students were asked to underline and to unpack the nominalised words found in the text. The data

resulted from this test were in the form of scores. In the second test, the students were directed to write *Procedure Texts*, resulting the data in the form of texts.

In the interview session some students, representing the low, the medium, and high achievers, were individually interviewed. This method resulted the data in the form of condensed written information, intended to enhance the main ones. The participants were 20 Polytechnic students, performing as the purposive sampling, who are willing to take part in this investigation.

There are three main findings in this study, summarised as follows. Regarding the first research question, this study found that in average, the students moderately understand the nominalisations realised in a scientific written text. Most students could identify (by underlining) nominalisations found in a reading text. Unfortunately, their ability of unpacking nominalisations was lower than underlining. They failed to unpack the nominalised words they had identified. This was an evidence of inconsistency in understanding nominalisations.

This case was revealed by some interview data as follows. The students recognised a certain word was nominalisation but they did not know its root. They often took it for granted when finding a nominalised word, particularly when learning engineering texts in Polytechnic. They lacked of opportunity to learn or discuss about nominalised words. They often made mistakes when turning the nominalised word into its base form. In this case, the students had relatively moderate understanding on nominalisations realised in a scientific text. This level of ability is not high enough for the students to understand academic texts.

Regarding to the second research question, the findings are presented in three parts. Firstly, in average, the students realised four nominalisations in their *Procedure Texts* of about 150-200 words. Referring to this number, it is concluded that they have low capacity in realising nominalisations. This phenomenon may be caused of the use of this *Procedure Text*. Within this text type the sentences are usually in the imperative forms, starting the sentences with verbs. That is why in Test #2 the students only apply a small number of

nominalisations. However, in this construction the students still have some possibilities to use nominalisation after the verbs.

Secondly, nominalisation is usually formed by adding a suffix to its root or base form. Nominalisation suffixes *-ment*, and *-t/sion* are frequently used in students' written texts, because these suffixes were easy to remember and to apply. Most students used those words in their texts correctly. The more often they met these words the more easily they realised these words in their texts.

Thirdly, the students realised 'default' nominalisations in their written texts. 'Default' nominalisation is a nominalised word that might have been subconsciously acquired, since it is frequently found in academic textbooks. Unfortunately, they failed to use those words with different parts of speech. They might take it for granted for the nominalised words they met without having opportunity to learn their roots. It can be stated that most students practised using default nominalisations correctly.

Based on the above presentation, a summary is drawn. In average, most students were able to manifest about four nominalisations in their written texts, mostly using suffixes *-ment*, and *-s/tion*. They were categorised 'default' nominalisations, as they were frequently used in scientific textbooks. They were familiar to the students and easy to practice in the written texts.

Regarding to the third research question, the study found that although there are four types of nominalisation, the students frequently used only two types, Types I and II. Nominalisation Type I is a grammatical shift from adjective to noun. On the other hand, Nominalisation Type II is a grammatical shift from verb to noun. Most students realised nominalisation Type II in their written texts correctly, but few students manifested nominalisation Type I correctly. In interview, some students said that nominalisation Type II was easier to remember since it was often used in academic texts. For most students, nominalisation Type II was more familiar than Type I.

Finally, it is concluded that the students' level of understanding on nominalisations is moderate. In other words, to an average extent the students understand nominalisations. Anyway, this achievement is not sufficient for them to be able to manifest nominalisations optimally in their written texts. It occurs, among others, since the topic of nominalisations is not taught explicitly, and there is no opportunity for the students and teachers to discuss it.

5.2 Recommendations

There are two main recommendations in this present study. They are addressed to the teaching of writing technical English in Polytechnic, and to the future research on the realisation of nominalisation in scientific text.

Firstly, concerning to the teaching activities, some efforts are needed to take into consideration. The teachers should be aware of the important role of nominalisation in scientific language. It is through nominalisation technical terms are contrued. The teachers should manage time to discuss the application of nominalisations in scientific texts.

It is said in the previous chapter, that some Polytechnic students experience difficulties in understanding scientific texts, if not explained. Then, there shoul be explicit teaching on nominalisation to solve this problem, in which the teacher “makes clear what is to be learned to facilitate the acquisition of writing skills” (Hyland, 2004:10). Hopefully, better understanding on nominalisation is reflected in the high consistency and ability to manifest nominalisation in written text properly.

Secondly, concerning to the future research on the realisation of nominalisation in scientific text, it is recommended to conduct an experimental design, particularly *an intact group design*. In this design, there are two groups of students, as control and experimental groups. Both groups will receive a posttest. The experimental group will receive treatment while the control group will not (Hatch & Farhady, 1982). There are some reasons to choose this research design. First, the results of giving treatment can be seen, that is the results of teaching

nominalisation. Second, the results of classroom experiment can be generalised to other students or to other classrooms. Third, the findings of the study can be shared with other teachers and other classrooms.

It is also recommended that in the next research, instead of using *Procedure Text*, other text types *descriptive*, *explanatory* or *argumentative texts* be used in an essay test. These text types provide plenty of opportunities for students to realise nominalised words. So, it is possible for the students to use more nominalisations in their written texts.

