# Development of Basic English Grammar Teaching Materials Based on Situational Approach in English Language Education Study Program of Universitas Muslim Indonesia

**Muhammad Yunus**
muhammadyunus@umi.ac.id
**Universitas Muslim Indonesia**


**Abdollah**
abdollah@umi.ac.id
**Universitas Muslim Indonesia**

**Andi Hudriati**
andi.hudriati@umi.ac.id
**Universitas Muslim Indonesia**

**Abstract**


This research is a research development of Basic English Grammar teaching materials in the English Language Education Study Program of the Faculty of Literature UMI. This research aims to obtain more effective teaching methods between Oral Approach and Teacher Center Learning or lecture methods. This research was conducted using the pseudo experiment method *(quasi experimental* research). *Quasi Experimental Design in* this design was used by two groups of subjects. One group was given a specific treatment (experiment), while the other was used as a control group. Both groups were given pre-test *measurements.* After that the group given treatment (Situational Based Approach) is an experimental group, then both groups are done measurement (*post-test)* or acquisition. *Pre-test Group* - Treatment - *Post-test*. Research site at UMI Faculty of Literature. The number of respondents as many as 50 students is divided into two groups, namely the experiment group and the control group of 25 people each. The results showed that there was a significant difference between the Oral *Approach method* and the *Teacher Center Learning method* or the lecture method in improving the student's learning outcomes in Basic English Grammar learning. The cause is that the *Oral Approach method* has a higher average and improvement compared to the Teacher Center *Learning method* or lecture method because the *Oral Approach* method brings more active students into learning. Although given the same material at the same time, but in oral *approach method* therefore students are active in the learning process. So, lecturers are just facilitators. While in the method of lecture students are only fixated on the explanation of teachers and students are less active in learning. Therefore, oral approach teaching method is more effective than Teacher Center Learning method on Basic English Grammar teaching.

**Keywords**: Experimentation, Development, Basic English Grammar English

## INTRODUCTION

Basic English Grammar is one of the courses entered in the Core Scientific Course (MKIK) group which is programmed in the first semester of the Fak English Education Study Program. UMI literature. English grammar is a set of rules used to organize words into larger units (Greenbaum, S and Nelson, 2002). In addition  Cowan (2008) explains that grammar is a set of rules that describe how words and word groups can be composed to form sentences in a particular language. Then Seaton and Mew's Basic English Grammar (2007) included basic teaching on eight sections of English words— nouns, pronouns, verbs, adjectives, adjectives, fore passes, conjunctions, and words that included standard patterns of English sentences. Therefore, understanding Basic English Grammar is a basic foundation that will help someone compose sentences correctly and make it easier for someone to improve their writing and speaking skills.

The purpose of this course is to equip students with basic skills that will help them compose sentences correctly and make it easier to improve their writing and English skills. Writing skills are related to how to write paragraphs because of all kinds of academic writing such as essays, activity reports, and scientific work based on paragraphs, whereas English language skills are related to words or phrases that help us to express what we will say, for example we use words or phrases to introduce our topic of conversation, to connect what we should say when responding to someone who says agree or disagrees.

As the core course of science in the Education Study Program of the Faculty of Literature UMI, Basic English Grammar is presented in the form of an explanation of a subject about the understanding, form, use, and examples of the subject. After being adequately explained and students are considered to have understood the material, then given exercises in the form of making examples related to the subject. If this is considered adequate, then, students are given more tasks to complete the questions such as: refresher questions, relationship words in the form of equations and opposing words, searching for new words, completing sentences, and identifying the correct sentences. If these tasks are deemed inadequate to support the understanding of the topic of discussion, then it is given additional tasks to be done at home so that students can further understand the subject matter.

The learning model above is a teacher-centered approach model. It was according to Westwood (2008) that  teachers dominated the classroom. The teacher explains to provide an understanding related to the learning materials that are targeted to be achieved.  This kind of approach does not give students much opportunity to interact with each other to acquire English language skills independently. In addition to this, students do not have greater autonomy, basic English grammar construction is not obtained through the student experience itself.

In addition to the above, the teaching materials for Basic English Grammar used by lecturers are still using grammar books that speak English and American that are designed for native speakers, not designed for foreign language learners, so students have difficulty learning independently, because the explanation of the book uses English that is not yet understood by new students.

Based on the above, basic English Grammar learning in the English Education Program using textbooks adopted from foreign-issued textbooks that do not suit the needs and abilities of students then the results of learning will not be effective. In addition, the learning model used does not allow students to interact with each other because students do tasks only to achieve the target of solving questions rather than as an exercise in improving their speech skills and writing skills in English. Therefore, in order to obtain good English learning results, namely the ability of students to

communicate English both verbally and in writing, then there needs to be teaching materials or materials as well as learning methods that suit the needs and abilities of students.

One of the english learning methods currently widely used in Australia, New Guinea, and the Pacific Territories is Oral Approach (Richards, J.C. and Rodgers, 2001). The characteristics of this method are as follows: (1) language teaching begins with spoken language. Material taught orally before being presented in writing, (2) The target language is the class language, (3) New language units are introduced and practiced situationally, (4) Then followed by word choice procedures to ensure that the required vocabulary is covered, (5) Grammar items are assessed in the principle that simple forms should be taught before complicated forms. (6) Reading and writing are taught when enough vocabulary and basic grammar are established.

## METHOD

This research was conducted using the pseudo experiment method *(quasi experimental* research). *Quasi Experimental Design in* this design was used by two groups of subjects. One group was given a specific treatment (experiment), while the other was used as a control group. Both groups were given pre-test *measurements.* After that the group given treatment (Situational Based Approach) is an experimental group, then both groups are donemeasurement (*post-test*) or acquisition. *Pre-test Group -* Treatment - *Post-test.* Research site at UMI Faculty of Literature. The number of respondents as many as 50 students is divided into two groups, namely the experiment group and the control group of 25 people each.

## FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS
 **Findings**
a.   Experimental Class Study Results

The following table is a group of experiment classes given *a pre-test to* find out their initial abilities before being given treatment. The pre-test results can be seen in the following table.

**Table 1**. Results of Study Experiment Classes Before Treatment

| № | STUDENT NAME | CORRECT | Weights Value | Score |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Congratulations | 21 | 3.3 | 69.3 |
| 2 | Mitrah | 21 | 3.3 | 69.3 |
| 3 | Mukhlisha | 28 | 3.3 | 92.4 |
| 4 | Al Wafiah | 18 | 3.3 | 59.4 |
| 5 | Aldayanti | 15 | 3.3 | 49.5 |
| 6 | Husnul | 24 | 3.3 | 79.2 |
| 7 | 19 Reviews , 13 | 26 | 3.3 | 85.8 |
| 8 | R | 18 | 3.3 | 59.4 |
| 9 | Majesty | 22 | 3.3 | 72.6 |
| 10 | 19Reviews , | 20 | 3.3 | 66 |
| 11 | 19Reviews , | 21 | 3.3 | 69.3 |
| 12 | Rheina | 16 | 3.3 | 52.8 |
| 13 | Astuti | 26 | 3.3 | 85.8 |
| 14 | Zahirah | 29 | 3.3 | 95.7 |

| 15 | Blessing | 18 | 3.3 | 59.4 |
|----|----------|----|-----|------|
| 16 | Fatimah | 22 | 3.3 | 72.6 |
| 17 | 19Reviews , | 17 | 3.3 | 56.1 |
| 18 | 19Reviews , 100 | 20 | 3.3 | 66 |
| 19 | Saskia | 16 | 3.3 | 52.8 |
| 20 | 19Reviews , | 28 | 3.3 | 92.4 |
| 21 | Asmi | 21 | 3.3 | 69.3 |
| 22 | Atisah | 18 | 3.3 | 59.4 |
| 23 | Alwia | 8 | 3.3 | 26.4 |
| 24 | Deviana | 25 | 3.3 | 82.5 |
| 25 | Annisa | 25 | 3.3 | 82.5 |
| | | | | 1725.9 |
| | Average Score | | | 69.036 |
| | Lowest Score | | | 26.4 |
| | Highest Score | | | 95.7 |
| | | | | |

The calculation results using simple statistics on the data before treatment in the experiment class with a sample count of 25, an average score = 69,036, a low value = 26.4 and a top value = 97.5.

Furthermore, the following Table 2 is a frequency distribution of *the pre-test* score of the experiment class above:

**Table 2**. Experiment class *pre-test* frequency distribution

| № | Interval Class | Frequency | Relative |
|---|----------------|-----------|----------|
| 1 | 3.3 to 27.3 | 1 | 4% |
| 2 | 27.4 to 51.4 | 1 | 4% |
| 3 | 51.5 to 75.5 | 15 | 60% |
| 4 | 75.6 to 99.6 | 8 | 32% |
| | Amount | 25 | |

Based on the *pre-test frequency distribution table of* the experiment class above, *the pre-test frequency of the* experiment class is located at intervals of 51.5 to 75.5 as many as 15 students (60%).

The following table 3 is a group of experiment classes after *the post-test treatment* to find out how far the impact of the treatment (Situational approach) is. The post-test results can be seen in the following table.

**Table 3**: Post-test Results of *Study After Treatment*

| № | STUDENT NAME | CORRECT | Weights Value | Score |
|---|--------------|---------|---------------|-------|
| 1 | Congratulations | 27 | 3.3 | 89.1 |
| 2 | Mitrah | 28 | 3.3 | 92.4 |
| 3 | Mukhlisha | 30 | 3.3 | 99 |

| 4 | Al Wafiah | 26 | 3.3 | 85.8 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 5 | Aldayanti | 27 | 3.3 | 89.1 |
| 6 | Husnul | 26 | 3.3 | 85.8 |
| 7 | 19 Reviews , 13 | 30 | 3.3 | 99 |
| 8 | R | 22 | 3.3 | 72.6 |
| 9 | Majesty | 29 | 3.3 | 95.7 |
| 10 | 19Reviews , | 27 | 3.3 | 89.1 |
| 11 | 19Reviews , | 26 | 3.3 | 85.8 |
| 12 | Rheina | 23 | 3.3 | 75.9 |
| 13 | Astuti | 29 | 3.3 | 95.7 |
| 14 | Zahirah | 30 | 3.3 | 99 |
| 15 | Blessing | 26 | 3.3 | 85.8 |
| 16 | Fatimah | 28 | 3.3 | 92.4 |
| 17 | 19Reviews , | 22 | 3.3 | 72.6 |
| 18 | 19Reviews , 100 | 26 | 3.3 | 85.8 |
| 19 | Saskia | 25 | 3.3 | 82.5 |
| 20 | 19Reviews , | 30 | 3.3 | 99 |
| 21 | Asmi | 27 | 3.3 | 89.1 |
| 22 | Atisah | 26 | 3.3 | 85.8 |
| 23 | Alwia | 21 | 3.3 | 69.3 |
| 24 | Deviana | 29 | 3.3 | 95.7 |
| 25 | Annisa | 29 | 3.3 | 95.7 |
|  |  |  |  | 2207.7 |
|  | Average Score |  |  | 88.308 |
|  | Lowest Score |  |  | 72.6 |
|  | Highest Score |  |  | 99 |
|  |  |  |  |  |

The calculation results by using simple statistics on the data after treatment in the experiment class with a sample count of 25, an average score =88,308,  the  lowest value =  72.6 and the highest value  =  99.

Furthermore, the following Table 4 is a frequency distribution of the *post-test* score of the experiment class above:  *post*

**Table 4**. Frequency distribution of experiment classes after treatment

| № | Interval Class | Frequency | Relative |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 3.3 to 27.3 |  |  |
| 2 | 27.4 to 51.4 |  |  |
| 3 | 51.5 to 75.5 | 2 | 8% |
| 4 | 75.6 to 99.6 | 23 | 92% |

| | Amount | 25 | |
|---|---|---|---|

Based on the *post-test frequency distribution table* of the experiment class above,  *the post-test frequency of the* experiment class is located at intervals  of 75.6 to 99.6  as many as 23 students (60%).

b.   Control Class Learning Results

The following table is a group of control classes given *a pre-test to* find out their initial abilities before being given treatment. The pre-test results can be seen in the following table.

Table 5. Control Class Learning Results Before Treatment

| № | STUDENT NAME | CORRECT | Weights Value | Score |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 19 Reviews , | 20 | 3.3 | 66 |
| 2 | 19 Reviews , | 19 | 3.3 | 62.7 |
| 3 | Wa Ode | 20 | 3.3 | 66 |
| 4 | 19Reviews , | 29 | 3.3 | 95.7 |
| 5 | 19 Reviews , 13 | 20 | 3.3 | 66 |
| 6 | 19 Reviews , 13 | 27 | 3.3 | 89.1 |
| 7 | 19 Reviews , 13 | 24 | 3.3 | 79.2 |
| 8 | Rika Ananda | 22 | 3.3 | 72.6 |
| 9 | Anastasya | 19 | 3.3 | 62.7 |
| 10 | 19Reviews , | 20 | 3.3 | 66 |
| 11 | Nirwana | 17 | 3.3 | 56.1 |
| 12 | .12 miles away | 28 | 3.3 | 92.4 |
| 13 | 19Reviews , | 26 | 3.3 | 85.8 |
| 14 | Rabiah | 24 | 3.3 | 79.2 |
| 15 | 19Reviews , | 17 | 3.3 | 56.1 |
| 16 | Musdalipa | 26 | 3.3 | 85.8 |
| 17 | 19 Reviews , | 13 | 3.3 | 42.9 |
| 18 | Alfiyah | 29 | 3.3 | 95.7 |
| 19 | Soraya | 26 | 3.3 | 85.8 |
| 20 | Diliyanti | 20 | 3.3 | 66 |
| 21 | Riskawati | 14 | 3.3 | 46.2 |
| 22 | Fuji Nada | 25 | 3.3 | 82.5 |
| 23 | Mila Selvian | 21 | 3.3 | 69.3 |
| 24 | Dwi Cindy | 16 | 3.3 | 52.8 |
| 25 | 19 Reviews , 13 | 17 | 3.3 | 56.1 |
| | | | | 1778.7 |
| | **Average Score** | | | 71.148 |
| | **Lowest Score** | | | 42.9 |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Highest Score** | | | 95.7 |
| | | | |

The table above shows that the calculation results using simple statistics on the data before treatment on the control class with a sample count of 25, average score = 71,148, lowest value = 42.9 and highest value = 95.7

The next frequency distribution of the control class score before treatment can be seen from the following table:

**Table 6**. Frequency distribution control class before pre-test treatment

| № | Interval Class | Frequency | Relative |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 3.3 to 27.3 | 0 | |
| 2 | 27.4 to 51.4 | 3 | 12% |
| 3 | 51.5 to 75.5 | 12 | 48% |
| 4 | 75.6 to 99.6 | 10 | 40% |
| | Amount | 25 | |

Based on the *pre-test frequency distribution table of* the control class above, *the pre-test frequency of the* control class is located at intervals of 51.5 to 75.5 as many as 12 students (48%).

The following table 7 is a group of control classes after *the post-test treatment to* find out how far the impact of such treatment (Traditional approach). The post-test results can be seen in the following table.

Table 7. Control Class Learning Results After Treatment

| № | STUDENT NAME | CORRECT | Weights Value | Score |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 19 Reviews , | 24 | 3.3 | 79.2 |
| 2 | 19 Reviews , | 20 | 3.3 | 66 |
| 3 | Wa Ode | 22 | 3.3 | 72.6 |
| 4 | 19Reviews , | 25 | 3.3 | 82.5 |
| 5 | 19 Reviews , 13 | 22 | 3.3 | 72.6 |
| 6 | 19 Reviews , 13 | 30 | 3.3 | 99 |
| 7 | 19 Reviews , 13 | 26 | 3.3 | 85.8 |
| 8 | Rika Ananda | 24 | 3.3 | 79.2 |
| 9 | Anastasya | 25 | 3.3 | 82.5 |
| 10 | 19Reviews , | 24 | 3.3 | 79.2 |
| 11 | Nirwana | 24 | 3.3 | 79.2 |
| 12 | .12 miles away | 30 | 3.3 | 99 |
| 13 | 19Reviews , | 30 | 3.3 | 99 |
| 14 | Rabiah | 27 | 3.3 | 89.1 |
| 15 | 19Reviews , | 25 | 3.3 | 82.5 |
| 16 | Musdalipa | 28 | 3.3 | 92.4 |

| 17 | 19 Reviews , | 18 | 3.3 | 59.4 |
|----|--------------|----|-----|------|
| 18 | Alfiyah | 30 | 3.3 | 99 |
| 19 | Soraya | 27 | 3.3 | 89.1 |
| 20 | Diliyanti | 28 | 3.3 | 92.4 |
| 21 | Riskawati | 26 | 3.3 | 85.8 |
| 22 | Fuji Nada | 27 | 3.3 | 89.1 |
| 23 | Mila Selvian | 25 | 3.3 | 82.5 |
| 24 | Dwi Cindy | 22 | 3.3 | 72.6 |
| 25 | 19 Reviews, 13 | 29 | 3.3 | 95.7 |
|    |             |    |     | 2105.4 |
|    | Average Score |  |   | 84.216 |
|    | Lowest Score |  |   | 59.4 |
|    | Highest Score |  |   | 99 |
|    |             |    |     |      |

The table above shows that the calculation results using simple statistics on the data after treatment  after  the control class with a sample count  of 25,the average score =84,216, the  lowest value  =  59.4 and the highest  value  =  99.

The next frequency distribution of the control class score after treatment can be seen from the following table:

Table 8. Frequency distribution of control class after post-test treatment

| № | Interval Class | Frequency | Relative |
|---|----------------|-----------|----------|
| 1 | 3.3 to 27.3 | 0 | - |
| 2 | 27.4 to 51.4 | 0 | - |
| 3 | 51.5 to 75.5 | 5 | 25% |
| 4 | 75.6 to 99.6 | 20 | 75% |
|   | Amount | 25 |  |

Based on the *post-test frequency distribution table* of the control class above, *the post-test frequency of the* control class is located at intervals of 75.6 to 99.6 as many as 20 students (75%).

**Discussion**

Based on simple statistical test results known *pre-test average* 69.03 after *post-test* 88.30 so the increase is 19.00. Based on this, this method of learning can be stated there is a significant improvement in the study scores of experimental group students or given oral approach method. The focus of the study of oral approach method is four language skills, namely, how to hear, speak, read and write. So according to this method, the language is what is heard and what is spoken, which has implications on the development of interactive communication between individuals, as well as the human need for language to be used in the communication in question. From this context, this method departs from a basic assumption that the first language is a saying. Therefore, language learning must begin by ingesting the sounds of language in the form of words or sentences, then speaking them, of course before stepping into the learning of reading and writing.

Based on simple statistical test results known *the pre-test average* of 71.14 after *post-test* 84.21 resulted in an increase of 13.07. Based on this, this method of learning can be stated there is a significant improvement in the study scores of experimental group students or given the Teacher Center Learning method or Lecture Method. The Lecture Method is one of the most widely used teaching methods in the teaching and learning process. This method of lecture is done by conveying the subject matter to the learner directly or by oral means. The use of this method is very practical and efficient for teaching with many materials and has many students. The method of lectures is the most traditional and long-running way of teaching in the history of education, therefore this method can be said as a traditional teaching method because it has been used as a means of communication of teachers in conveying the subject matter.

Based on the above analysis, it has been proven that there is a significant difference *between oral approach method* and Teacher Center *Learning method* or lecture method in improving student learning outcomes in Basic English Grammar learning. This causes the *Oral Aprroach method to* have a higher average and improvement compared to the Teacher Center *Learning method* or lecture method because the *Oral Approach method* brings more active students into learning. Although given the same material at the same time, but in *oral approach method* then students are active in the learning process. So, lecturers are just facilitators. While in the method of lecture students are only fixated on the explanation of teachers and students are less active in learning.

**CONCLUSION**

Based on the results of the research obtained by data analysis, the following conclusions can be drawn: There is a significant difference between *oral approach* method and Teacher *Center Learning* in increasing the activities  of students in  Basic English Grammar learning. Based on the above analysis, it has been proven that there is a significant difference between the Oral *Approach method*  and the Teacher *Center Learning method*  or the lecture method in improving the student's learning outcomes in  Basic English Grammar learning. This causes the Oral *Aprroach method to* have a higher average and improvement compared to *the Teacher Center Learning method* or lecture method because *the Oral Approach* method brings more active students into learning. Although given the same material at the same time, but in oral *approach method* students are active in the learning process. So, lecturers are just facilitators. While in the method of lecture students are only fixated on the explanation of teachers and students are less active in learning.

**REFERENCES**

Branch, R. (2009). *Instructional Design: The ADDIE Approach.* New York: Springer.

Brown, H. D. (2000). *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching* (4th ed). New York: Pearson Education.

Cowan, R. (2008). Teacher's Grammar of English. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Dick. W, Carey. Lou, and C. J. O. (2015). *The Systematic Design of Instruction.* New York: Pearson.

Gall, M., Borg, W., & Gall, J. (2003). Educational research: An introduction. New York: Pearson Education.

Gay, L. R. (2012). *Educational Research*. New York: Pearson.

Greenbaum, S and Nelson, G. (2002). *An Introduction to English Grammar.  Journal of Chemical Information and Modeling.* New York: Pearson Education. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781107415324.004

Hasyim, S., Burhanuddin, B., & Hafid, S. (2017). The Use of English Punctuation in Improving Students' Writing Skills at The Sixth Semester of Letters of UMI Makassar. *Tamaddun*, *16*(1), 47-56.

Hutchinson, Tom and Waters, A. (1991). *English for Specific Purposes.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Plomp, T. (1999). *Design Approaches and Tools in Education and* Training.  *Design Approaches and Tools in Education and* Training. New York: Kluwer Academic Publishers. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-011-4255-7

Richards, J.C. and Rodgers, T. S. (2001). *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*. New York: Canbridge University Press.

Rosmiaty, R., Ratnawati, R., & Latukau, H. (2019). Students' Ability in Using Direct and Indirect Speech of English Department Students at Universitas Muslim Indonesia. *ELT WORLDWIDE*, *6*(1), 73-82.

Seaton, A and Mew, Y. H. (2007). *Basic English Grammar.* New York: Saddleback.

Tomlinson, B. (2008). *English Language Learning Material*. (B. Tomlinson, Ed.). New York: International Publishing Group.

Westwood, P. (2008). *Teaching methods*. Victoria: ACER Press.