| **RESEARCH ARTICLE**

Implementation of Comprehensible Input in Teaching English as a Second Language: Basis for an Action Plan

Jhonrey M. Peras[1] ✉ **and Charity T. Turano[2]**
[1] *MAEd, LPT, DLLE, Program Head, University of San Carlos, Cebu City, Philippines*
[2] *PhD, DComm, Professor IV, University of San Carlos, Cebu City, Philippines*
Corresponding Author: Jhonrey M. Peras, **E-mail**: perasjhonrey7@gmail.com

| **ABSTRACT**

This study explored the extent of the implementation of comprehensible input among ESL teachers. The theoretical underpinning of this study was based on the concept of comprehensible input (i+1), which was introduced by Krashen (1985). Both quantitative and qualitative data were collected to present the strategies that teachers used in implementing comprehensible input, teachers' perceptions, and the challenges they encountered. There were four (4) ESL teachers who voluntarily participated in this study. The results showed that all strategies were rated positively by ESL teachers, indicating that they found them useful in implementing comprehensible input. Teachers perceived that the implementation of comprehensible input in teaching ESL was effective in promoting natural language acquisition and improving students' language skills. Limited credible resources, lack of formal training, and proficiency mismatch were the minor challenges that teachers encountered in the implementation of comprehensible input. The action plan that provides instructional support to ESL teachers has been developed by the researcher in order to effectively implement comprehensible input in teaching English as a second language.

1. Introduction

English is acknowledged as the universal language for communication, utilized by both native and non-native speakers across the globe (Sara, 2015). English is now widespread all over the world and is used in almost all fields of business, education, tourism, commerce, scientific research, etc. Undeniably, English occupies an exceptional area as it is the language that is extensively used, and thus, it forcibly established a dominant world communicative language.

Savignon (1991) mentioned that the traditional teaching method of English, on which grammar instructions are primarily focused, is making way for more innovative, scientific, and effective approaches and teaching practices. While there are numerous strategies for teaching English as a second language, one of the useful strategies for teaching English is implementing comprehensible input for ESL students (Echevarria, Vogt, and Short, 2013). In a school with diverse levels of linguistic competency, the implementation of comprehensible input can be a difficult undertaking (Klinger, 1993). Furthermore, it can also be a challenging task for ESL teachers to determine (i+1) for each level of linguistic proficiency (Freeman & Freeman, 2014).

The traditional teaching method was utilized by the ESL teachers of a language academy to support their students through the learning process. These teachers took flexible teaching strategies most suitable to the topic being studied and the level of the students' language competency. However, there was a sudden change in the curriculum of the language academy when

comprehensible input was implemented. This posed different perceptions among ESL teachers since they did not have experiences in how to appropriately implement comprehensible input in teaching English as a second language.

Teacher training is a vital aspect for both experienced and novices in the teaching profession in order to assist them in developing new teaching strategies that will ignite the students' interest and foster learning. Expertise in the subject, teaching competency, and skills have a significant impact on the teaching and learning process. Comprehensible input was implemented in the academy, but there were no available training opportunities for teachers on how to properly use comprehensible input and how to handle substantial transformative challenges that ESL teachers encounter. This implementation left teachers at a loss. It is a fact that the lack of trained teachers for the implementation of comprehensible input also affects the students' performance.

Observations and lived experiences of ESL teachers claim that the implementation of comprehensible input (CI) is a bit challenging for them since it is slightly more advanced than the students' current ability to comprehend. They need to utilize comprehensible input activities and strategies systematically, creatively, and efficiently to get the full attention and interest of the ESL students. In order to find the appropriate i+1 support structure, teachers must first determine the present students' linguistic capacity as well as their linguistic backgrounds.

Thus, this paper seeks to explore the extent of the implementation of comprehensible input in teaching English as a second language, strategies that teachers use in implementing comprehensible input, teachers' perceptions of the importance of comprehensible input, and challenges that they encounter in order to ascertain how the action plan may be developed for the implementation of CI. Furthermore, it is beneficial to a wider audience in terms of gaining elaborate knowledge and an in-depth understanding of comprehensible input, as not everyone has a full grasp of the term "comprehensible input." They will have an opportunity to broaden their ideas about the particular strategies to use when they plan to implement comprehensible input. This study will serve as their future reference when conducting related studies.

2. Literature Review
Some of the strategies that teachers use in implementing comprehensible input in order to teach their students efficiently, as well as the teachers' perceptions and factors that explain what challenges they encounter, are discussed below.

This study is anchored on the theory of comprehensible input (i+1) that was coined by Krashen (1985), a linguist who specializes in theories and linguistic acquisition in order to teach a new language. According to Krashen (1982), The letter "i" refers to the existing proficiency level of the learner's linguistic competence, while the term "+1" signifies the input that slightly surpasses the learner's current language ability. Krashen (1985) believes that language acquisition does not necessitate substantial application of conscious grammatical rules and tiresome drills.

2.1 Strategies for Implementing Comprehensible Input in teaching ESL
If language acquisition will take place, comprehension is required. For instance, if teachers teach the four sentence structures to their ESL students, they must first ensure that their students have a thorough understanding of simple sentence structure before they learn complex, compound, and complex-compound sentence structures. Some languages have sentence structures that are substantially different from English. For example, all Indo-Iranian languages have an SOV (subject-object-verb) structure (Windfuhr, 2009).

Even the basic sentence structures of the English language would obviously take some time for Indo-Iranian to master. In this kind of situation, it is clear that teachers need to devote a considerable length of time to letting the learners fully understand the structure of simple sentences before proceeding further. The reason why teachers need to determine the students' linguistic proficiency levels is so they can efficiently tailor lessons to serve the diverse needs of their students.

2.2 Interaction
Echevarria, Vogt, & Short (2013) mentioned that ESL students are required to have plenty of chances for interactions in a classroom setting. According to Gibbons (2015), it is imperative to give them opportunities to discuss concepts, ideas, and information, as this will aid in their learning of academic terminologies from diverse fields. ESL students will gain academic fluency in English if they can employ academic terminologies on a daily basis (Cummins, 1981). Classes can be divided into small groups or pairs to share the responsibility of learning (Gibbons, 2015).

Group interaction might help lower the ESL students' affective filter, considering that they are often afraid of committing mistakes while speaking in front of the entire class (Echevarria, Vogt, & Short, 2013). Gibbons (2015) stated that the affective filter of ELLs can be reduced when they are placed in small groups or in pairs. This strategy encourages individuals to engage in higher-level learning, which leads to improved language acquisition outcomes (Echevarria et al.,2013).

2.3 Scaffolding

Bruner coined the term scaffolding in the late 1950s, which is similar to Vygotsky's (1978) Zone of Proximal Development (Mitchell, Myles, & Marsden, 2013). Gibbons (2015) mentioned that if a child has the capacity to carry out something on his or her own, with the assistance of a more knowledgeable individual or with tasks that are supported, he or she can accomplish even more. The Zone of Proximal Development refers to this disparity in achievement. Scaffolding is the aid supplied by a knowledgeable individual, a teacher, or instructional support (Gibbons, 2015).

Teachers scaffold instruction by initially assisting students with new concepts in language learning, then gradually stepping back or reducing the amount of assistance provided (Gibbons, 2015). This is how teachers delegate responsibilities so that students can execute assignments independently (Echevarria, Vogt, and Short, 2013).

2.4 Background Knowledge Integration

Students of English as a second language come from different backgrounds, given their varied cultures, traditions, and customs. ESL students, like other students, bring an abundance of resources or funds of knowledge to the classroom (Echevarria, Vogt, & Short, 2013). It is imperative to tap into these funds of knowledge and integrate them into lesson plans and instruction in order to employ effective, comprehensible input. If ESL students' background knowledge is brought into class, they feel more engaged (Echevarria et al., 2013).

2.5 Linguistic Simplification

Echevarria, Vogt, & Short (2013) stated that another effective way to employ comprehensible input for ESL students is the use of linguistic simplification. Teachers working with ESL students must utilize simple language appropriate to the competency levels of the ESL students (Echevarria et al., 2013). Teachers should attentively monitor the vocabulary they employ to ensure that students understand the essence of the instructions of their teachers (Gibbons, 2015). Idiomatic expressions should be avoided by teachers, especially with beginners. Some of the English idiomatic expressions have no equivalents in other languages, making them difficult for Bengali English language learners (Echevarria et al., 2013). The language used by teachers must be straightforward and simple instead of using figurative idiomatic expressions.

2.6 Mother Tongue-Based Instruction

In the process of second language acquisition, one's mother tongue or native language plays a vital role. According to Gibbons (2015), English language learners who are already proficient in their native language are more likely to learn and master the English language and other subsequent languages. Teachers can employ the native language of ESL students and incorporate diverse strategies while working with them (Spurlin, 1995). The following are the strategies to consider:

- If certain concepts and ideas remain unclear in English, teachers may allow English language learners who speak the same language to work as partners or have a small group discussion in order to clarify concepts with each other (Echevarria, Vogt, & Short, 2013). It will be easier for them to transfer their knowledge from L1 to L2 once they have a firm grasp of a certain concept or idea in their native language (Echevarria et al., 2013).
- Teachers may encourage English language learners to have bilingual dictionaries in order to help them clarify varied technical courses' terminology that can be difficult to understand (Echevarria, Vogt, & Short, 2013).
- When English language learners are having a small group discussion or partner talk, teachers can help them as per scaffolding instructions. Teachers can also translate from English to English language learners' native language if it is necessary (Gibbons, 2015).
- English language learners are encouraged to write if they are verbally proficient in their native language (Gibbons, 2015). Letting them speak in their native language could help learners feel less frustrated when they experience difficulty in communicating (Spurlin, 1995).

2.7 Corrective Feedbacking

Feedback is essential in the learning process. The significance of language instruction, particularly in the context of continuous second language acquisition, highlights the equal importance attributed to both facets (Gibbons, 2015). Even native speakers may find the English language challenging because of inconsistent grammatical rules, prepositions, and the stylistic task of choosing the right words (Cowan, 2016). For instance, many native speakers of English would be unable to explain the difference between "on a bus" versus "in a car" since the grammatical rules that govern these constructions are implicitly acquired rather than explicitly taught in school.

The proper usage of vocabulary can also be difficult. For Instance, the words hear and here. These words are phonetically the same, but their spellings and meaning are completely different. These subtle differences can cause English language learners to become perplexed. Feedback is really needed in the learning process as it helps to clarify grammatical rules, pronunciation, discourse,

rhetoric, and the difference between written and spoken English for ESL students (Nowbakht & Shahnazari, 2015). ESL students become more aware of their common errors and areas for progress when they receive feedback from their teachers and peers.

2.8 Teachers' Perception of the Importance of Comprehensible Input

Krashen (1985) believes that comprehensible input can lead to language acquisition. Comprehensible input is based on two premises: First, speech emerges naturally rather than being taught as a result of comprehensible input acquisition, and second, grammar emerges spontaneously if students obtain adequate comprehensible input. Krashen's theory, according to Brown (2000), is filled with oversimplifications and amplifications. In fact, ESL teachers have different perceptions of the importance of comprehension input in teaching English as a second language due to the fact that they do not have a clear understanding of what comprehensible input means and how it is used in teaching practices. Liu (2015) stated that Krashen never provides an accurate or explicit definition of comprehensible input. Krashen (1985) first pointed out that i refers to the current linguistic competency of the student, and i+1 denotes the student's next level along the natural order. Nonetheless, Krashen restricted this form of competence to grammar alone and interpreted i+1 as structures. Özkaynak (2020) mentioned that there was a misleading understanding regarding the operational definition of comprehensible input. Since Krashen was unable to give a precise definition of i+1 formulation, Lightbown and Spada (2006) attempted to establish a broad interpretation, in which i represents the linguistic level of the student that is already acquired, and i+1 is a metaphor consisting of words, forms of grammar, and aspects of pronunciation that represent a step beyond the current level.

2.9 Challenges in Comprehensible Input

Some researchers found several challenges in the implementation of comprehensible input, posing doubts about its effectiveness in teaching English as a second language (Gregory, 2018). More research is required to fully grasp the role of comprehensible input in second language learning (Kormos & Csizer, 2014).

While ESL students receive comprehensible input from their teachers, ESL students can take steps outside their classrooms to establish comprehensible input for themselves (Kormos & Csizer, 2014). Because their family members are not fluent in English, many ESL students do not receive adequate support from their families when learning English as a second language (Kormos & Csizer, 2014). For that reason, ESL teachers need to be trained in how to employ comprehensible input in their classes.

Due to inadequate resources, learning English as a second language is more challenging in non-native English-speaking countries (Akteruzzaman and Islam, 2017). Moreover, the environment in these countries is not conducive to learning English as a second language. In class, ESL students only receive a little comprehensible input due to the unavailability of resources (Akteruzzaman and Islam, 2017). For instance, ESL teachers in Bangladesh continue to place an excessive emphasis on teaching English grammar without providing relevant contexts (Bengali, 2017). As a result, ESL students in Bangladesh do not receive enough comprehensible input (Bengali). Aside from the unavailability of resources, two of the challenges that ESL teachers encounter in the implementation of comprehensible input are a lack of training for teachers and inconsistency of data results.

3. Methodology

3.1 Research Design

This research study employed mixed methods. It involved the collection of both quantitative and qualitative data in response to research questions (Creswell, 2018). The first method was quantitative, which was used to present a distribution of the strategies that teachers used to implement comprehensible input. Thereafter, the researcher presented the teachers' perception of the importance of comprehensible input and the challenges that they encountered through the qualitative method.

Furthermore, the approach used was explanatory sequential methods, combining quantitative and qualitative data collection analysis in two consecutive phases (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2018). In the first phase, quantitative data were collected and analyzed, the results of which were part of the qualitative phase (Creswell et al., 2018).

3.2 Research Environment

The environment for data collection was a Language Academy, which began to implement comprehensible input in 2017. It offers competency-based language programs specifically designed for students from beginners to advanced levels. Aside from teaching English as a second language, it offers a conversational Cebuano course. During the outbreak of the COVID-19 pandemic, the academy transitioned to synchronized online learning in all language programs that it offers.

3.3 Research Respondents

The respondents of this research were the faculty members of a Language Academy. They graduated with a degree of Bachelor of Secondary Education, Major in English, Linguistics and Literature, Psychology, and Master of Arts in Education. The respondents' number of years of experience in the academy ranges from less than two years to four years.

To keep the identity of the research respondents confidential, their names were changed to pseudonyms. Foremost, the information they sent through the internet was secured by password-protected files. The profile of the respondents is presented in Table 1.

Table 1
Research Respondents

Respondent	Gender	Degree	Years of Teaching Experience in the Academy
Brandon	Male	BSED Major in English MAEd Major in ELT	2 years and 10 months
Charlotte	Female	BA Linguistics and Literature	4 years and 7 moths
Amanda	Female	BA in Psychology	2 years and 4 months
Audrey	Female	BSED Major in English	2 years and 10 months
Total Number of Respondents= 4			

3.4 Research Instruments

The researcher utilized a five-point Likert Scale to survey the strategies of ESL teachers used in implementing comprehensible input. The 5-point Likert Scale survey has seven sub-domains (see Appendix C.1). The rating tool, which contained operational definitions of the subscales with their corresponding items, was sent to the psychometrician and language experts.

The first part of the interview was the teachers' perception of the importance of comprehensible input. The rating tool, which contained the guide interview questions, was given to the validators in order to examine according to the face validity, readability, and content validity. The second part of the interview was a set of open-ended questions to elicit views about the challenges that the respondents encountered. Face validity, readability, and content validity were also examined in order to measure the relevance and appropriateness of the guide interview questions.

3.5 Research Procedure

Gathering of Data. The initial step in data collection was securing a transmittal letter that was submitted to the program coordinator of the teacher-respondents. The transmittal letter explained the purpose of conducting the present research, the roles of the research respondents, and the confidentiality information clause. Upon approval, the informed consent contract was signed individually by the research respondents. This consent contract was meant to address the ethical considerations regarding informing the respondents of the current and future undertakings of this research.

The explanatory sequential method was the specific approach used in this research study. The data were collected over a period of time in two consecutive phases. The first phase of this study was quantitative data collection. The researcher sent the Likert Scale survey to the research respondents via email, giving them a week to return the answered survey form. Thereafter, the data was analyzed statistically using IBM SPSS. The second phase of this research study was qualitative data collection. The research respondents were interviewed one-on-one through their accustomed social media platforms to collect significant findings about the research topic.

3.6. Treatment of Data

The first method that was used in data gathering was quantitative design. The 5-point Likert scale about the strategies that ESL teachers used in implementing comprehensible input was utilized by the researcher to describe the sub-domains. The total mean of the collected data on the Likert scale was obtained by treating it as ordinal data and performing a Pearson correlation test, which is a parameter test for ordinal data. The interpretation table and its corresponding descriptor presented the individual mean score and standard deviation of the research respondents, which have been categorized into five distinct levels: very high, high,

average, low, and very low. The weighted mean score for very high is 4.51-5.0, 3.41-4.20 for high, 2.61-3.40 for average, 1.80-2.60 for low, and 1.0-1.80 for very low.

The second method that was used in data collection was qualitative design. The researcher used open-ended questions for an interview about teachers' perception of the importance of comprehensible input. The method that was used for analyzing qualitative data was the thematic analysis of interview transcripts. The data were coded, utilizing highlighters, in order to make the identification of repetitions more visible and clearer (Braun and Clarke, 2013). Finally, the analyses and interpretations were written based on the themes.

Thereafter, the research respondents were also asked about the challenges they encountered in the implementation of CI. A verbatim transcription software was utilized to transcribe the data collected. The researcher used coding sheets to organize the data collected. The method that was used for analyzing the data was thematic analysis of interview transcripts. The data were coded, utilizing highlighters, in order to make the identification of repetitions more visible and clearer (Braun and Clarke, 2013). The themes were reviewed and refined in order to examine whether they accurately captured the data and whether they were relevant to the research question (Riger et al.,2016). Finally, the analyses and interpretations were written based on the themes.

4. Results and Discussion
This presents the strategies that teachers used in implementing comprehensible input, their perceptions, and the challenges that they encountered in implementing comprehensible input in teaching English as a second language.

It is divided into three main sections: (1) Teachers' strategies in implementing comprehensible input, (2) Teachers' perception of the importance of comprehensible input, and (3) Teachers' challenges in implementing comprehensible input in teaching English as a second language. The first section was statistically analyzed to describe the sub-domains in order to get the overall mean of the data collected utilizing a Likert scale survey. The second and third sections were analyzed thematically through interview transcripts.

4.1 Strategies for Implementing Comprehensible Input in Teaching English as a Second Language
Comprehensible input is relevant to the process of second language acquisition among students (Andres et al., 2022). The theory of comprehensible input holds a significant position in the current language teaching field. ESL teachers used different teaching strategies that could help their students develop their language skills more effectively and efficiently. These strategies include speech adjustment, linguistic simplification, interactive approach, background knowledge integration, scaffolding, corrective feedbacking, and mother tongue-based instruction. Table 2 presents the strategies that the respondents used in implementing comprehensible input in teaching English as a second language.

Table 2
Strategies in Implementing Comprehensible Input in Teaching English as a Second Language.

Subdomain	Strategy	Respondent	Mean	Std. Deviation	Indicator
SD 1	Speech Adjustment	Brandon	4.5	0.41	
		Charlotte	4.5	0.41	
		Amanda	4.6	0.33	Very high
		Audrey	4.5	0.41	
		Total	**4.5**	**0.41**	
SD2	Linguistic Simplification	Brandon	4.4	0.50	
		Charlotte	4.4	0.50	
		Amanda	4.5	0.41	Very high
		Audrey	4.7	0.25	
		Total	**4.4**	**0.50**	
SD3	Interactive Approach	Brandon	4.0	0.81	
		Charlotte	4.2	0.58	
		Amanda	4.0	0.81	High
		Audrey	4.0	0.81	
		Total	**4.2**	**0.56**	
SD4	Background Knowledge Integration	Brandon	4.0	0.81	
		Charlotte	4.0	0.81	
		Amanda	4.0	0.81	High
		Audrey	4.6	0.33	
		Total	**4.1**	**0.57**	
SD5	Scaffolding	Brandon	4.0	0.81	
		Charlotte	4.0	0.81	
		Amanda	3.8	0.98	High
		Audrey	4.5	0.41	
		Total	**4.0**	**0.68**	
SD6	Corrective Feedbacking	Brandon	4.0	0.81	
		Charlotte	3.9	0.90	
		Amanda	3.8	0.98	High
		Audrey	4.2	0.66	
		Total	**4.0**	**0.81**	
SD7	Mother Tongue-Based Instruction	Brandon	3.0	0.94	
		Charlotte	3.0	0.94	
		Amanda	3.0	0.94	Average
		Audrey	3.0	0.94	
		Total	**3.0**	**0.94**	

Weighted Mean Score	Indicator
4.21-5.0	Very high
3.41-4.20	High
2.61-3.40	Average
1.82.60	Low
1.0-1.80	Very low

The result shows that speech adjustment has the highest mean of 4.5 and a standard deviation of 0.41, indicating that this strategy is very highly used by teachers. It is evident that ESL teachers were able to utilize this strategy to implement comprehensible input. In line with Gibbons (2015), a teacher's speech adjustment could have a profound impact on how students develop their own language skills. Teachers can also create a more effective communication channel with their students. This is proven in the study of Gibbons (2015), wherein teachers' speech rate is constantly adjusted to the linguistic competency of the students. According to Giguchi (2012), input is streamlined by utilizing syntactically simpler sentences and a lot of rephrasing. Adjustments have been made to grammar, pronunciation, and vocabulary (Gass & Mackey, 2006).

Further, the result reveals that the interactive approach produces a total mean score of 4.2 and a standard deviation of 0.56. It shows that the respondents evaluated this strategy positively and indicated a high level of use. Teachers utilized an interactive approach by providing students with different interactive activities such as group discussion, first to learn new perspectives from their classmates and, secondly, to experience a real-life setting. It is important that ESL teachers integrate an interactive approach

in their teaching practices as it provides students with opportunities to practice their language skills in real-life situations. By practicing language in context, students also learn how to use the language in appropriate and meaningful ways.

Background knowledge integration has a total mean score of 4.1 and a standard deviation of 0.57. This shows that the respondents rated this strategy relatively positive, indicating that they found it somewhat useful in implementing comprehensible input in teaching English as a second language. The indicator that corresponds to this signifies a high level of implementation. Background knowledge integration is one of the important aspects of teaching English as a Second Language (ESL). It involves connecting the current language learning with students' prior knowledge, experiences, and cultural backgrounds, creating a more meaningful and engaging learning environment.

Scaffolding has a total mean score of 4.0 and a standard deviation of 0.68. The utilization of scaffolding in implementing comprehensible input was positively rated by the respondents, and the associated indicator connotes a high level of use. The result conspicuously shows that the ESL teachers found scaffolding useful in their teaching practices, which could be attributed to its trademark of providing a structured approach that helps students gradually acquire and develop new language skills and knowledge. By breaking down complex tasks into smaller and more manageable steps, scaffolding enables students to build their understanding and confidence over time. ESL teachers are required to help students improve their written language skills as they move from their native languages to English. Scaffolding is necessary to facilitate effective learning (Adoniou, 2007).

Corrective feedbacking shows a total mean score of 4.0 and a standard deviation of 0.81. It means that there is a high level of use. It is apparent that teachers used corrective feedbacking in order to foster motivation in learning English as a second language and ensure the achievement of accuracy in the use of the language. It is also crucial for ESL teachers to consistently integrate corrective feedbacking into their teaching practices as it helps students maintain their confidence. By using a positive tone to acknowledge the student's effort before giving feedback, teachers can ensure that their feedback is supportive.

Finally, mother tongue-based instruction has a total mean score of 3.0 and a standard deviation of 0.94. This shows that mother tongue-based instruction has the lowest mean among the other strategies and is interpreted as average. However, it is plausible that there may be some avenues for enhancement within the sub-domain. It is evident that this strategy can be sometimes challenging to integrate due to a lack of qualified bilingual teachers who can teach in both the student's native language and in English. If this strategy is consistently integrated by ESL teachers, students can easily learn new concepts in their native language, and are better able to apply them to their English language learning. On the other hand, over-reliance on mother tongue- based instruction can inhibit students from using English to communicate, as they may feel more comfortable using their native language.

4.2 Teachers' Perception of the Importance of Comprehensible Input
This section discusses the in-depth responses about the teachers' perceptions of the importance of comprehensible input in teaching English as a second language.

In the field of teaching English as a second language (ESL), teachers' perceptions of comprehensible input play a critical role in the effectiveness of language instruction. In this study, not all respondents agreed that providing comprehensible input is essential for language learning. One of the respondents expressed concerns about the difficulty of providing comprehensible input, especially for students at different language proficiency levels, but those in accord highlighted the importance of using various strategies to provide comprehensible input.

4.3 The Importance of Comprehensible Input in Teaching ESL
ESL teachers were asked about their perceptions in the implementation of comprehensible input in teaching English as a second language. Brandon, Charlotte, and Audrey perceived that the implementation of comprehensible input in teaching English as a second language was an effective way to foster natural language acquisition and develop students' language proficiency. They stated that providing students with comprehensible input helped them with conversing or interacting rather than with learning new vocabularies. On the other hand, Amanda perceived comprehensible input as a bit challenging. Amanda mentioned, "It's challenging for me and for the students since I need to explore the strategies that work for the program."

4.4 Roles of Comprehensible Input in Teaching ESL
Due to a lack of adequate trainings and workshops for teachers, they had different and incompatible ideas on the roles of comprehensible input in teaching English as a second language. Two teachers maintained that the role of comprehensible input was to let the students learn language acquisition naturally instead of acquiring the language in a conscious manner. It is proven in the study of Krashen (1982) that language can be learned naturally as a result of comprehensible input, and grammar emerges when the students acquire adequate comprehensible input. However, Amanda and Audrey believed that the roles of

comprehensible input were to put pressure on the student's learning styles and to achieve fluency in the language. Audrey stated, "I think the role of comprehensible input is to improve fluency in language acquisition."

4.5 Teachers' Challenges in Implementing Comprehensible Input in Teaching English as a Second Language
This section discusses in-depth the responses to challenges in the implementation of comprehensible input in teaching English as a second language. Despite the potential benefits of using comprehensible input in the ESL classroom, the respondents encountered several challenges in implementing comprehensible input effectively. These challenges include difficulties in selecting credible resources due to a lack of available materials, lack of training opportunities for ESL teachers, and mismatch in the proficiency level of the students. By exploring these challenges in-depth, the researcher gained a better understanding of how ESL teachers can overcome them and provide their students with effective and engaging language instruction.

4.6 Limited Credible Resources
The teachers were first asked about the challenges they encountered in the implementation of comprehensible input in teaching English as a second language. Two out of four teachers expressed difficulties in selecting credible materials that were appropriate to the student's competency level due to limited resources. Charlotte stated, "We used to use a different method back in the day. Typically, we would assign books to students based on their levels. While we may argue that these books were level-appropriate, they weren't always the best fit. What I mean to say is that the selection of materials and lessons wasn't as credible as it is with our new method."

4.7 Lack of Formal Training
ESL teachers expressed their desire to undergo training in comprehensible input, as three out of four teachers had no prior knowledge of these teaching strategies and were unsure of how to effectively utilize them in the classroom when they initially began teaching at the academy. Amanda said, "I think so because when I first came, I wasn't familiar with the concept of 'i+1'. I knew about Stephen Krashen's theory of comprehensible input, but I wasn't aware of this specific aspect and the strategies."

Teachers may struggle to effectively teach students with diverse backgrounds and levels of proficiency if they do not have formal training that can provide ESL teachers with the necessary tools to create effective lesson plans, develop curriculum, and implement various teaching strategies that meet the needs of diverse students. Nguyen et al. (2014) proved in their study that teachers need to undergo trainings on how to properly use comprehensible based strategies and curriculum in teaching English as a second language.

4.8 Mismatch in the Proficiency Level of the Students
Another teacher mentioned that there was a mismatch between the level of knowledge of students and their performance. He specifically observed that the students' performance and level of knowledge demonstrated in class varied significantly from their performance on the placement test. Brandon claimed that beginner students were admitted to intermediate classes. Brandon mentioned, "The student's level based on the result of the placement test was A2 or Beginner, then the program that the student had to take is B1 or Intermediate, which was difficult for the student."

Amanda also expressed that the previous practice of selecting learning materials was not as credible as the current one. Amanda said, "What I did was to go back to the student's current linguistic level. We used to use a different method back in the day. Typically, we would assign books to students based on their levels. While we may argue that these books were level-appropriate, they weren't always the best fit. What I mean to say is that the selection of materials and lessons wasn't as credible as it is with our new method."

Furthermore, the respondents were asked about how they coped with the challenges they encountered in the implementation of comprehensible input. Two respondents conveyed that they had to scaffold. One of them provided supplementary activities in order for the students to master language skills. Charlotte said, "I think what we did, or what we usually do, is to scaffold everything. We need to ask questions and provide support to help students learn and understand the concepts." Audrey added, "Supplementary activities are provided to the students."

4.9 Implementation of Comprehensible Input in Teaching ESL Action Plan
The ESL teachers at the institution (language academy) that was subjected to the current study initially utilized a traditional teaching approach to support their students during the learning process. The teachers employed flexible teaching strategies that were best suited to the students' level of language proficiency and the specific topics being studied. However, there was an abrupt change in the language academy's curriculum when they introduced the use of comprehensible input as an alternative approach to teaching.

Teachers were able to utilize comprehensible input strategies in their teaching practices. However, there may be some avenues for enhancement in order to fully implement comprehensible input in teaching ESL. Teachers had different and incompatible ideas on the roles and definition of comprehensible input since they were not able to undergo pieces of training and workshops. The implementation of the comprehensible input elicited varying responses among the teachers, as they were not equipped with credible resources or formal trainings, and there was a mismatch in the proficiency level of the students. Thus, the action plan for the implementation of comprehensible input in teaching ESL is made possible through the support of the school administration in order to enhance the teaching practices of ESL teachers and address the challenges they encounter. The overall approach of the action plan integrates the implementation, and monitoring, and evaluation processes in order to meet the desired outcome.

Objective: To provide instructional support to ESL teachers and address challenges in limited credible resources, lack of formal trainings, and proficiency mismatch in implementing comprehensible input in teaching English as a second language (ESL).

Areas	Activities	Specific Objectives	Time Frame
Implementation	Lectures on the importance of comprehensible input in teaching ESL and its strategies that include: •Interaction Approach •Scaffolding •Background Knowledge Integration •Speech Adjustment •Linguistic Simplification •Mother Tongue-Based Instruction •Corrective Feedbacking	To describe the importance of comprehensible input in teaching English as a second language and to determine the different strategies in implementing comprehensible input;	July 3, 2023 01:00P M- 05:00P M
	A discussion on the different challenges in the implementation of comprehensible input, and its possible solutions	To provide a comprehensive understanding of the challenges that teachers encounter in implementing comprehensible input and to explore possible solutions to overcome the challenges.	July 4, 2023 01:00P M- 02:00P M

Resource/ Budgetary Requiremen ts	Person Responsible	Success Indicator	Areas	Activities	Specific Objectives
Laptop Projector Handouts Venue conducive for the training Reliable internet connection Speaker's Honorarium: Php 2,000.00	Head Teacher	Teachers will have a clear understanding on the importance of implementation of comprehensible input in teaching ESL, and Teachers will develop their teaching strategies in implementing comprehensible input and incorporate new acquired skills.	Implementati on	A lecture on how to examine the reliability and validity of students' assessments	-To define the concepts of reliability and validity in relation to student assessments; and -to identify various methods for assessing the reliability and validity of student assessments.
Laptop Projector Handouts Venue conducive for the training Reliable internet connection Speaker's Honorarium: Php 2,000.00	Head Teacher	Teachers will be able to know how to cope with the challenges they encountered in the implementation of CI in teaching ESL.	Monitoring and Evaluation	Mentoring teachers in creating effective semi-detailed lessons plan incorporating comprehensible input	-To develop effective semi-detailed lesson plans.

Time Frame	Resource/ Budgetary Requiremen ts	Person Responsible	Success Indicator	Areas	Activities
July 5, 2023 01:00PM- 05:00PM	Laptop Projector Handouts Venue Head Teacher Honorarium: Php2,000.00 Language experts Honorarium: Php4,000.00 Psychometri cian Honorarium: Php2,000.00	Head Teacher 2 Language Experts Psychometricia n	Teachers will be able to apply the knowledge gained to evaluate the reliability and validity in order to improve the quality of the students' assessments.		Teaching demonstration
July 6, 2023 01:00PM- 05:00PM	Laptop Projector Handouts Venue Reliable internet connection Speaker's Honorarium: Php 2,000.00	Head Teacher	Teachers will be able to evaluate the effectiveness of their lesson plans and make adjustments as needed to promote student learning.		Mentoring and Coaching: Lesson observation, feedbacking, and recommendation

Time Frame	Recourse/ Budgetary Requirements	Person Responsible	Success Indicator
July 7, 2023 M- 05:00P M- 01:00P	Laptop Projector Handouts Classroom Reliable internet connection / Speaker's Honorarium: Php 4,000.00	Head Teacher Trainer	Teachers will be able to enhance their teaching skills.
July 8, 2023 M- 09:00P M- 12:00N N	Pen Paper Venue conducive for the training / Speaker's Honorarium: Php 4,000.00	Head Teacher trainer	Teacher will gain opportunities to improve their teaching competencies.

5. Conclusion

It is evident that the findings of this study carry significant implications for ESL teaching. The ESL teachers demonstrated a positive outlook in employing teaching strategies used to implement comprehensible input. Despite the implementation challenges that were encountered, the utilization of comprehensible input has shown to be highly effective in enhancing the quality of English language instruction. The action plan was developed in order to explore the optimal strategies for incorporating comprehensible input into the ESL curriculum and identify strategies for overcoming the implementation challenges. The researcher holds a strong belief that if comprehensible input is implemented effectively in teaching English as a second language, it can enable teachers to enhance their teaching skills, thereby improving the quality of ESL programs offered in the country. Proper implementation of comprehensible input can serve as a valuable tool for teachers to foster natural language acquisition and develop their students' language proficiency.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.
Publisher's Note: All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated organizations, or those of the publisher, the editors and the reviewers.

References

[1] Adoniou, M., & Macken-Horarik, M. (2007). Scaffolding literacy meets ESL: Some insights from ACT classrooms. TESOL in Context, 17(1), 5-14.
[2] Allright, D & Bailey, K. M. (1991). Focus on the language classroom. An introduction to classroom research for language readers. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
[3] Akteruzzaman, M., & Islam, R. (2017). English, Education, and Globalisation: A BangladeshPerspective. *IAFOR Journal of Education*, 5(1).
[4] Andres, C. P. J., & Villafuerte Holguín, J. S. (2022). Meaningful Learning in English as a Foreign Language Classrooms: A culinary experience as Comprehensible Input. Education Quarterly Reviews, 5(1).
[5] Attride-Stirling, J. (2001). Thematic networks: an analytic tool for qualitative research. Qualitative research, 1(3), 385-405.
[6] Auerbach, E. (1993). Reexamining English only in the ESL classroom. TESOL Quarter.
[7] Castañeda, M. E. (2013). I Am Proud that I Did It and It's a Piece of Me: Digital Storytelling inthe Foreign Language Classroom. *CALICO Journal*, 30(1), 44-62.
[8] Clarke, V., & Braun, V. (2013). Successful qualitative research. SAGE Publications.

[9] Cowan, R. (2016). The teacher's grammar of English. New York: Cambridge University Press.

[10] Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2018). Designing and conducting mixed methods research.Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

[11] Crossley, S. A., & McNamara, D. S. (2016). Text-based recall and extra-textual generations resulting from simplified and authentic texts.

[12] Cummins, J. P. (1981). Bilingualism and special education: Issues in assessment and pedagogy.San Diego: College-Hill Press.

[13] Dziedzic, J. (2012). A comparison of TPRS and Traditional Instruction, both with SSR.*International Journal of Foreign Language Teaching, 7*(2), 4-7.

[14] Echevarrıa, J., Vogt, M., & Short, D. J. (2013). Making content comprehensible for Englishlearners: The SIOP model.

[15] Eun, B., & Heining-Boynton, A. L. (2007). Impact of an English-as-a-second-language professional development program. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 101(1), 36-49

[16] Freeman, D.E., & Freeman, Y.S. (2014). Essential Linguistics. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

[17] Gibbons, P. (2015). Scaffolding language, scaffolding learning: Teaching English languagelearners in the mainstream classroom. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

[18] Green, A., & Weir, C. (2004). Can placement tests inform instructional decisions? Language Testing, 21(4), 467–494.

[19] Klingner, J. K. (1993). Commentary: Comprehensible comments on Neuman and Koskinen(1992).Reading Research Quarterly, 376-382.

[20] Krashen, S. (1992). The input hypothesis: An update. Linguistics and language pedagogy: The state of the art, 409-431.

[21] Krashen, S. D. (1982). Principles and practices in second language acquisition. Oxford, England: Pergamon Press.

[22] Krashen, S. D. (1985). The input hypothesis: Issues and implications. Lincolnwood, IL: LaredoPublishing.

[23] Kung, C.-C., & Wu, H.-R. (2010). 科技大學新生對大一英文分級教學問卷調查研究 [a survey on students' perceptions toward freshmen English ability grouping instruction]. *Journal of National Formosa University,* 29(2), 65–80.

[24] Lehman, C. (2021). Language-specific professional development: A comparison of for-profit and non-profit international schools. *International Journal of Research in Teacher Education, 1*2(1), 61-76.

[25] Li, Z. (2015). Using an English self-assessment tool to validate an English placement test. Papers in Language Testing and Assessment, 4(1), 59–96.

[26] Liao, Y. F. (2022). Using the English GSAT for placement into EFL classes: accuracy and validity concerns. Language Testing in Asia, 12(1), 1-23.

[27] Loschky, L. (1994). Comprehensible input and second language acquisition: What is the relationship? Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 16(3), 303 – 323.

[28] Lucas, T., & Villegas, A.M. (2013). Preparing linguistically responsive teachers: Laying the foundation in preservice teacher education. Theory Into Practice, 52 (2), 98- 109.

[29] McMillan, B., & Joyce, P. (2011). Teacher perspectives on student placement in university EFL programs. *Journal of NELTA, 16*(1-2), 70–81.

[30] Messick, S. (1996). Validity and washback in language testing. Language Testing, 13, 242–256.

[31] Messick, S. (1989). Meaning and values in test validation: The science and ethics of assessment.Educational Researcher, 18(2), 5–11.

[32] Mitchell, R., Myles, F., & Marsden, E. (2013). Second language learning theories. New York: Routledge.

[33] Munro, M. J., & Derwing, T. M. (2006). The functional load principle in ESL pronunciation instruction: An exploratory study. System, 34(4), 520-531.

[34] Nguyen, K., Stanley, N., & Stanley, L. (2014). Storytelling in Teaching Chinese as aSecond/Foreign Language. Linguistics and Literature Studies, 2, 29-38.

[35] Nowbakht, M., & Shahnazari, M. (2015). The comparative effects of comprehensible input, output, and corrective feedback on the receptive acquisition of L2 vocabulary items. Advances in Language and Literary Studies, 6(4), 103-114.

[36] Pippins, D (2016). How Well do TPRS Students do on the AP? *The International Journal of Foreign Language Teaching, 11(*1), 25-33.

[37] Riger, S. T. E. P. H. A. N. I. E., & Sigurvinsdottir, R. A. N. N. V. E. I. G. (2016). Thematic analysis. Handbook of methodological approaches to community-based research: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods, 33-41.

[38] Rivers, W. (1987). Interactive language teaching. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

[39] Salcedo, D.M. (2010). The SIOP model: Transforming the experiences of college professors.Centro Colombo Americano, 4(1), 78-93.

[40] Savignon, S. J. (1991). Communicative Language Teaching: State of the Art. TESOL Quarterly, 25(2), 261–277

[41] Sheen, Y. (2007). The effect of focused written corrective feedback and language aptitude on ESL learners' acquisition of articles. TESOL Quarterly, 41, 255-283.

[42] Short, D. J., Echevarria, J., & Richards-Tutor, C. (2011). Research on Academic Literacy Development in Sheltered Instruction Classrooms. Language Teaching Research, 15(3), 363- 380.

[43] Spurlin, Q. (1995). Making science comprehensible for language minority students. *Journal of Science Teacher Education,* 6(2), 71-78.

[44] Storch, N. & Aldosari, A. (2010). Learners' use of first language (Arabic) in pair work in an EFL class. Language Teaching Research, 14(2), pp. 355–375.

[45] Tong, F., Luo, W., Irby, B. J., Lara-Alecio, R., & Rivera, H. (2015). Investigating the impact of professional development on teachers' instructional time and English learners' language development: A multilevel cross-classified approach. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism,* 20(3), 292-313.

[46] Tran, Y. (2015). ESL pedagogy and certification: Teacher perceptions and efficacy. *Journal of Education and Learning, 4*(2), 28-42.

[47] VanPatten, B. (1992). Second-language acquisition research and foreign language teaching, part 2. ADFL Bulletin, 23, 23-27.

[48] Watson, B. (2009). A comparison of TPRS and traditional foreign language instruction at the highschool level. *International Journal of Foreign Language Teaching 5* (1): 21-24

[49] Weaver, C. (2016). The TOEIC IP test as a placement test: Its potential formative value. *JALT Journal, 38*(1), 5– 25.

[50] Wiley, T. W. (2008). Language policy and teacher education. In May & Hornberger (Eds.), Encyclopedia of language and education: Language policy and political issues in education, second edition, 1 (229-241).

[51] Windfuhr, G. (Ed.). (2009). The Iranian Languages (p. 418). London: Routledge Wong, C. (2012). A Case Study of College Level Second Language Teachers' Perceptions and Implementations of Communicative Language Teaching. Professional Educator, 36(2),

[52] Youngs, C. S., & Youngs, G. A., Jr. (2001). Predictors of mainstream teachers' attitudes toward ELL students. TESOL Quarterly, 35(1), 97–120.