

## CHAPTER II

### LITERATURE REVIEW

#### 2.1 Theoretical Framework

##### 2.1.1 Grammar instruction

According to Ellis (cited in Rod Ellis et al 2009, p.16-20), instruction is an attempt to intervene in interlanguage development. For explicit instruction, DeKeyser (1995 cited in Purpura 2004) defines the characteristic of grammatical instruction as ‘explicit’ when it involves the explanation of a rule or the request to focus on a grammatical feature. Instruction can be explicitly deductive, where learners are given rules and asked to apply them, or explicitly inductive, where they are given samples of language from which to generate rules and make generalizations. Similarly, many types of language test tasks (i.e., gap-filling tasks) seem to measure explicit grammatical knowledge. While for implicit grammar instruction, he classifies grammatical instruction as implicit when it does *not* involve rule presentation or a request to focus on form in the input; rather, implicit grammatical instruction involves semantic processing of the input with any degree of awareness of grammatical form. The hope, of course, is that learners will ‘notice’ the grammatical forms and identify form–meaning relationships so that the forms are recognized in the input and eventually incorporated into the interlanguage. This type of instruction occurs when learners are asked to listen to a passage containing a specific grammatical feature. They are then asked to answer comprehension questions, but not asked to attend to the

feature. Similarly, language test tasks that require examinees to engage in interactive talk might also be said to measure implicit grammatical knowledge.

### 2.1.2 Explicit grammar instruction vs. implicit grammar instruction

The discussion about grammar should be taught explicit or implicit has been debated for years. What are the differences between explicit grammar instructions and implicit grammar instruction? As stated in by Burgess and Etherington (2002), what differentiate explicit grammar instruction vs. implicit grammar instruction is as follows:

#### 2.1.2.1 Explicit grammar instruction

To mark grammar instruction as explicit instruction, it has characteristics as follow:

- a. It deals with conscious learning
- b. It needs explicit knowledge
- c. Cognitive learning through explanation, conceptualization, observation
- d. Monitoring output through conscious rules

#### 2.1.2.2 Implicit grammar instruction

To mark grammar instruction as implicit instruction, it has characteristics as follow:

- a. It deals with subconscious learning
- b. It believes that language is too complex to be fully described and understood in conscious way
- c. It is behaviorist learning where the learners are active not passive

- d. It is exposure to language in use where the learners learn the language through conversation or reading texts.

### 2.1.3 The advantages and disadvantages of the both instructions

Every single thing in this world contains binary opposition, for example “good” or “bad”, “appropriate” or “inappropriate”, etc.. Explicit grammar instruction also has advantages and disadvantages.

#### 2.1.3.1 The advantages and disadvantages of explicit grammar instruction

According to Purpura (2004) and Thornbury (1999, p.30), the advantages of explicit grammar instruction are as follows:

- a. Explicit grammar instruction seems to help L2 learners develop their interlanguage at a more rapid pace.
- b. It helps them achieve higher ultimate levels of grammatical ability
- c. It helps them reduce instances of language fossilization.
- d. It is straight to the point, and can save time. Many rules can be more simply and quickly explained than elicited from examples. This will allow more time for practice and application.
- e. It respects the intelligence and maturity of many adult learners in particular and acknowledges the role of cognitive processes in language acquisition.
- f. It confirms many learners’ expectations about classroom learning particularly for those who have an analytical style.

- g. It allows the teacher to deal with language points as they come up, rather than having to anticipate them and prepare for them in advance.

The disadvantages of explicit grammar instruction according Thornbury (1999, p.30) are as follows:

- a. Starting the lesson with a grammar presentation may be off-putting for some students, especially younger ones.
- b. Grammar explanation encourages a teacher-fronted, transmission-style classroom; teacher explanation is often at the expense of student involvement and interaction.
- c. Explanation is seldom as memorable as other forms of presentation, such as demonstration.
- d. It encourages the belief that learning a language is simply a case of knowing the rules.

#### 2.1.3.2 The advantages and disadvantages of implicit grammar instruction

According to Thornbury (1999, p.54-55), the advantages of implicit grammar instruction are as follow:

- a. Rules learners discover for themselves are likely to fit their existing mental structures than rules they have been presented with. This in turn will make the rules more meaningful, memorable and serviceable.
- b. The mental effort involved ensures a greater degree of cognitive depth which ensures greater memorability.

- c. Students are more actively involved in the learning process. They are therefore likely to be more attentive and more motivated.
- d. It is an approach which favours patterns-recognition and problem-solving abilities which suggest that it is particularly suitable for learners who like this kind of challenge.
- e. If the problem-solving is done collaboratively, and in the target language, learners get the opportunity for extra language practice.
- f. Working things out for themselves prepare students for greater self-reliance and is therefore conducive to learner autonomy.

While the disadvantages of implicit grammar instruction according to Thornbury (1999, p.54-55) are as follows:

- a. The time and energy spent in working out rules may mislead students into believing that rules are the objective of language learning, rather than a means.
- b. The time taken to work out a rule may be at the expense of time spent in putting the rule to some sort of productive practice.
- c. Students may hypothesize the wrong rules, or their version of the rule may be either too broad or too narrow in its application: this is especially a danger where there is no overt testing of their hypotheses, either through practice examples, or by eliciting an explicit statement of the rule.
- d. It can place heavy demands on teachers in planning a lesson. They need to select and organize the data carefully so as to guide learners to an accurate formulation of the rule, while also ensuring the data is intelligible.

- e. However carefully organized the data is, many language areas such as aspect and modality resist easy rule formulation.
- f. An implicit approach frustrated students who, by dint of their personal learning style or their past learning experience, would prefer simply to be told the rule.

There are some implicit grammar teaching activities that can be used in class. According to Sargent (2009), some implicit grammar teaching activities can be seen as follows:

1. Before introducing the grammar point, build schema showing this grammar in use, but do not tell the grammar pattern, using ourselves, our own lives, the students' lives and current events to give the schema.

The right question form will elicit the right statement form. Modelling is crucial.

*Example: Past Continuous.*

- *Teacher: (Modelling) What was I doing at 11 am yesterday? I was talking with teachers in library. (Writes this on the board.)*
- *What was you doing at 11 am yesterday? (Elicit answers, write them on the board.)*

2. Always giving at least five oral and written examples derived from authentic information.

*Example: Past Continuous.*

*(After simple activity above, the following is on the board)*

- *I was talking with the teacher when you called me. I am standing in front of a shop when it began rain.*
- *Jose was listening music while Sue and Hiro were writing paper.*

Then look and show patterns.

3. Keeping it simple, and then expanding.

*Example: Past Continuous.*

- *After positive statements, model and then generate real negative sentences. (I was NOT swimming. Hiro was NOT eating. We were not sleeping.)*
- *Then Yes/No questions (was Hiro writing? was I smiling? were you writing?)*
- *Then WH questions (Where was Sue sitting? What was I doing? How were you feeling ?)*

Students will see the patterns, then show them down by underlining, using colour markers or drawing boxes/circles.

4. Let students discover! Show! Find! Discuss! Compare! Self correct!

Error correction!

Discovery = long-term acquisition. Moreover, it is more motivating.

*Example: Past Continuous.*

*Texts or spoof texts are distributed. 'Students, find PC sentences and then check and present them.'*

#### 2.1.4 L1 as the media instruction

##### 2.1.4.1 Roles of L1 in instruction

To make them understand completely, the writer taught them using L1 or their mother language (Indonesia). Tang (2002) in his research shows that limited and judicious use of the mother tongue in the English classroom does not reduce students' exposure to English, but rather can assist in the teaching, learning processes and useful for explaining complex grammar. If L1 is not used to translate some works, complex ideas or whole passage, the learners would be likely to make often incorrect translations. L1 is also used as a means to the end of improving foreign language proficiency.

Some related studies which the author used also used L1 to explain or teach grammar in their research. Ghabanchi (2010) and Uchibori, Chujo, & Hasegawa, (2006) used L1 to teach explicit grammar teaching to the learners in order to get good results.

## 2.2 Related Theories

According to McLaughlin (1978), the Monitor Model is a theory which has been proposed by Stephen Krashen of the University of Southern California in 1975 and 1977. Krashen posits that an adult L2 performer can 'internalize' the rules of a target language in two separate systems, language acquisition, and language learning. The Monitor Model with 'M' occurs only in language learning.

Krashen says that the Monitor model in language learning deals with conscious language learning. It needs conscious or explicit way to get the Monitor

Model. In the language learning, error detection and correction are central. The formal rules and feedback provide the basis for language instruction in typical classroom settings. The conscious attention to rules distinguishes language acquisition from language learning. It means that in language learning it really needs conscious attention to rules of grammar while in language acquisition attention is given to meaning not form. And learning is said to be the conscious internalization of the rules of language or it needs explicit rule internalization.

Where is the place of grammar in the Monitor model? Krashen (2009) calls grammar a synonym for conscious learning. One of the grammar roles is that it can be used with some profit as a Monitor. Krashen says that learning only has one function that is as a Monitor or editor. This can happen before we speak or write, or after (self-correction). Since the Monitor Model deals with formal rules or conscious learning, it plays only a limited role in second language performance. Second language performers can use conscious rules only on three conditions. The first is time. In order to think about and use conscious rules effectively, a second language performer needs to have sufficient time. For most people, normal conversation does not allow enough time to think about and use rules. If performers have enough time, it will work well. The second is focus on form. To use the Monitor effectively, time is not enough. According to Dulay and Burt, (1978) cited on Krashen (2009) the performer must also be focused on form, or thinking about correctness. The third is knowing the rule. This is a very formidable requirement. Linguistics has taught us that the structure of language is extremely complex, and they claim to have described only a fragment of the best

known languages. It can be sure that our students are exposed only to a small part of the total grammar of the language, and we know that even the best students do not learn every rule they are exposed to.

### 2.3 Related studies

Studies about explicit grammar teaching or explicit instruction for English teaching are abound. Ghabanchi (2010) conducted a study about the effectiveness of incidental teaching of grammar to Iranian students. His participants were EFL learners (total of 30 students; 22 female and 8 male) who were studying at Sabzevar Payam Noor University, Iran. The age range of the participants is 19 to 25. His study met the conditions of true experimental studies by using a control group, random selection, random assignment to control group, and experimental group. He divided the participants into two groups, experimental and control group. The experimental group was taught grammar incidentally while the control group was taught explicitly. His result indicated that explicit teaching was more useful and better than incidental teaching because the analysis showed that there was no significant in the score on the pre test and post test for experimental group. On the other hand, it could be seen the significance in the score of control group on the pre test and the post test. However, he insisted that the use of incidental teaching could be a positive factor in language learning whereas explicit teaching had been proved that it was more appropriate for L2 learners who learn grammar at university students who have age range from 19 to 25 years old.

Uchibori, Chujo, & Hasegawa, (2006) applied explicit grammar teaching and implicit grammar teaching in their research. Their research was about the ways to make the instruction of grammar became more effective, especially for Japanese beginning level English students for doing the TOEIC test. They used thirty-four Japanese college freshmen from an English communication class participated in the one semester (11-week) experiment. The students met once each week for 90 minutes, and received a total of 16.5 hours of instruction. They used explicit grammar teaching on the first step. The instructor gave the students a simple, clear explanation of the grammatical concepts of 'sentence' and 'phrase' using Japanese language. After providing the deductive method described above for the concept of a phrase structure and some simple examples, the addition of these exercises would help students to understand the targeted structure inductively. One-activity students might undertake was this: students were required to underline the part of a sentence that corresponds to a targeted phrase. The exercises suggested here were intended to help students recognize the internal structure of a phrase. Repeating varieties of the target structure as many times as possible during this exercise was quite important, since the instruction did not rely on detailed descriptions, definitions, and/or explanations of the grammatical concept except for the very first stage of instruction (e.g., showing them a general schema of phrase structure). Students were expected to become aware, by themselves, of the existence of the structure and phrase in a sentence by being exposed to the various examples. And the result showed that the enhanced grammar instructions conducted in this case study were effective and they helped

college students at the beginning level to improve their ability to communicate in the English language (as measured by the TOEIC scores) within a short period of time.

Burgess and Etherington (2002) conducted a research about teachers' attitudes to grammar and its teaching and learning within an English as Academic Purpose class. Responses from 48 EAP teachers in British university language centers produced both quantitative and qualitative data. The research was mainly quantitative in design, using a questionnaire to survey attitudes across a large group of teachers. The questionnaire took the form of a five points, Likert-type attitude scale, which was completed by EAP teachers in British universities. And lengthier comments made by some of the teachers formed a body of qualitative data. Qualitative comments often gave further information about individual teachers' beliefs and these were presented with the quantitative data where appropriate. The result of quantitative data showed that the majority of teachers represented appear to see grammatical knowledge as something important for their students and to have a sophisticated understanding of the problems and issues involved in its teaching. While for qualitative data showed that teachers preferred explicit teaching of grammar within communicative or skills-based work.

There are the differences between this study and the related studies. First, it comes from the different of participants' level. Burgess and Etherington (2002), Uchibori, Chujo, & Hasegawa, (2006) and Ghabanchi (2010) used students of university level as their participants, but in this study used the students of senior

high school. Uchibori, Chujo, & Hasegawa, (2006) used participants from an English communication class. It means that the participants have had basic for English while the participants of this study received English only from school and have weak basic of English. Second is the length time of the experiments. This study took eight meetings or four weeks for experiment while Uchibori, Chujo, & Hasegawa, (2006) took 11 weeks for experiment. The last is about the type of the study. This study was quasi-experimental, while Ghabanchi's was true experimental by using a control group, random selection, random assignment to control group, and experimental group. And the study of Burgess and Etherington was both quantitative and qualitative data. The research was mainly quantitative in design, using a questionnaire to survey attitudes across a large group of teachers.