

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

It has been stated in 1994 curriculum that English is taught in elementary school. English is taught from grade four and is taught in 40 minute sessions twice a week (Chodidjah, 2007). However, in several school English is started at second grade. In the second grade, students learn not only singing an English song but also some vocabularies of English are introduced, such as number and color. Furthermore, English in elementary school becomes local content subject based on Mendiknas policy no. 060/U/1993 about English subject as local content subject. As a result, this policy increases the requirement of English teacher for elementary school.

Unfortunately, the survey conducted in Bandung (Damayanti, 2008; Defianty, 2008) showed the lack of proficient English teacher for elementary school. There are a lot of teachers who teach English in elementary school with no academic background in English education. Therefore, it impacts not only to students' motivation towards English but also to the way teachers teach English in the class.

There are a lot of teachers who teach English by neglecting the context of using it. Students are forced to use the language without knowing the context of using the language. There is no obvious reason for them to use the language. Grassick (2007) concluded that teaching methodology in Indonesia emphasizes on grammar translation method, grammatical accuracy, disregards student involvement, lacks of meaningful

communication and employs teacher-centre approach. Grassick's study showed that teachers in Indonesia neglect the context and focus on grammatical pattern in teaching English.

Most of elementary teachers use grammar translation method in teaching English. They ask students to practice the dialogue or memorize some vocabularies. Teachers will translate the English words to the first language. Then, they are forced to memorize the grammatical pattern. The previous study conducted by Damayanti, dkk (2008) showed that most of elementary teachers who have no academic background in English often use grammar translation method. They assumed that if students have able in memorizing the grammatical pattern, they are likely able in using English.

Grammar is essential in learning English. It is necessary to be learned because it is needed to express meaning in communication; it very relates to vocabulary in learning foreign language (Cameron, 2001). Although young learners may not aware of the grammar of the sentence, they will meet grammar in a whole phrase that is called chunk. When chunks are broken down and combine it again, the process of grammar construction is happened.

Young learners need to learn English grammar in the context. By giving them the context, there is an obvious reason for them to learn English. As stated by Moon (2005) that in language learning, children learn through meaning. They use the language from everyday situation. If there is no reason for them to learn grammar, students will not be eager to learn English grammar. Pinter also stated (2006: p.18), "*Children will pick up*

and learn the second or foreign language if they are having fun and if they can work out the message from meaningful context”.

Teachers should teach English grammar in child friendly way. It means that they should consider children’s characteristic in teaching grammar. They have to provide meaningful input and create good atmosphere to make the students enjoy their learning. Moon (2005) stated that young learners are more highly motivated to talk in class than older learners. Therefore, teacher should provide young learners with interesting activities that engage them to practice the language and give them exposure in foreign language. It will encourage them to use language freely without being afraid of making mistake.

Meaning-Use-Form (MUF) framework developed by Jayne Moon (2008) is used to assist the development of students’ grammatical competence. The framework supports teaching grammar in child-friendly way since it includes three important aspects in teaching grammar namely *meaning*, *use* and *form*. By considering these three aspects in teaching grammar, children are given the opportunities to practice and use the language. Furthermore, they become aware of patterns in language.

Based on the problem above, it is assumed that the use of child friendly way method is crucial to improve students’ competence on grammar. Then hopefully, their academic achievement in English will increase too. Therefore, this experimental research on the fifth grade of elementary school of an elementary school aims to find out whether the use of *M-U-F* framework can improve students’ grammatical competence.

1.2 Research Question

Based on the background mentioned above, the research is conducted to answer the following questions:

1. Does the use of *M-U-F* framework significantly improve students' grammatical competence?
2. What strengths and challenges does the teacher face in implementing *M-U-F* framework?

1.3 Aims of the Research

The research has several aims as follows:

1. To find out whether the use of *M-U-F* framework can improve students' grammatical competence.
2. To find out the strengths and challenges that was faced by the teacher in implementing *M-U-F* framework.

1.4 Limitation of the Research

The research emphasized on the use of *M-U-F* framework in improving students' competence on grammar.

The research was conducted only at the fifth grade students in one of the elementary school in Western Bandung.

1.5 Hypothesis

According to Gerald (1999), the research hypothesis is the hypothesis that will be proved. The hypothesis that is used in the research is null hypothesis (H_0) and alternative hypothesis (H_A).

H_0 : there is no difference in mean adjustment level between those who receive *M-U-F* framework and those who do not.

In statistical notation, the hypothesis is formulated as follows:

$$H_0: \bar{X}_1 = \bar{X}_2$$

H_A : there is a difference in adjustment level between those who receive *M-U-F* framework and those who do not.

In statistical notation, the hypothesis formulated as follows:

$$H_A: \bar{X}_1 \neq \bar{X}_2$$

1.6. Research Methodology

1.6.1 Research Design

The method employed was quantitative research with using quasi-experimental design. Hatch and farhady (1982:23-24) stated that because of some limitations, it was difficult to construct a true experimental design. However, it did not mean that the researcher can abandon the research and let it invalid. We have to reach the goal as closely as possible to meet the standards of true experimental design. This table was the representation of the design.

Table 1.1

The Quasi-Experimental Design

Group	Pre-test	Treatment	Post-Test
Experimental	Xe1	T	Xe2
Control	Xc1	-	Xc2

Note:

T = the treatment for the true experiment

Xe1 = the observation of pre-test in experimental class

Xe2 = the observation of post-test in the experimental class

Xc1 = the observation of pre-test in the control class

Xc2 = the observation of post-test in the control class

1.6.2 Data Collection

The population of the study was the fifth grade students in one of the elementary school in Western Bandung. Two classes were used as the sample. The first class was 5A as the experimental group and the second was 5B as the control group. Each group consisted of 24 students.

Both experimental and control group were given a pretest before the treatment. The pretest was 20 items of the multiple choices. It was used to find out the initial differences of grammar acquisition between the groups. The treatment was only administered in experimental group. Then, a posttest was given in the last program of

the research to both groups. The procedure and the item of post-test were similar to the pre-test. It was used to find out whether or not the students make progress in their grammar ability.

Video recording was employed to gain the data for answering the second research question. It was employed in every meeting of the treatment both in experimental and control group. The data from video recording was used to find out the strengths and challenges faced by the teacher in implementing *M-U-F* framework.

1.6.3 Data Analysis

Quantitative and qualitative analysis were used to analyze the data. The quantitative data from pretest and posttest were analyzed by using the scoring criteria. Then, the score from the pretest and posttest were analyzed by using dependent and independent t-test. Independent t-test was used to compare means between posttest score from experimental and control group. While, dependent t-test was used to compare means between pretest and posttest score in experimental group.

The qualitative data from video recording were transcribed. The strengths and challenges that the teacher faced in experimental and control group were noted from the video. Then, it was compared each other from the first treatment until the six treatments.

1.7 Clarification of Terms

1. Young learners : refers to elementary school students grade 4-6, aged nine to twelve years old.
2. Grammar : description of the rules that govern how a language's sentences are formed.
(Thornbury, 1999).
3. Context : the situation within which something exists or happens, and that can help explain it.
(Cambridge Advance Learner's Dictionary, 2008)

