THE EFFECTIVENESS OF USING GRAMMATICAL CONSCIOUSNESS-RAISING TASK (GCRT) TOWARD STUDENTS' GRAMMAR COMPREHENSION AT THE FOURTH SEMESTER STUDENTS OF ENGLISH EDUCATION DEPARTMENT AT IAIN BUKITTINGGI

Veni Roza
IAIN Bukittinggi
veniroz_501@yahoo.com

Abstract
Grammar as a micro skill is often deemed as a difficult and boring subject in learning a language inasmuch as it is a study of number of patterns or rules. This judgment unconsciously causes the difficulty for learners to learn in spite of it has been learned in several levels. To cope with this problem, Grammar Consciousness Raising Task (GCRT) strategy was used to help English Education Department students in order to master grammar. The procedure in GCRT includes discovery, consolidation, and use. In this research paper, the researcher explained that the GCRT strategy was effective to be used in grammar class, seen from the students' test results which was 78,9% and it is categorized into effective based on the effectiveness scale.

Keywords:Effectiveness, GCRT, Grammar Comprehension.

1. INTRODUCTION

It is believed that the knowledge of grammar could significantly assist language learners in comprehending and acquiring the target language. It could provide them with the insights of how the linguistic elements of target language work to form meaningful and acceptable use of the language. As proposed by Weaver (1996), grammar gives students the description of how words are combined into meaningful syntactic structure, which enables them to understand and produce the language described. Therefore, the study of grammar should not likely be abandoned in the process of teaching a foreign language including English.

Despite of being long debated, Grammar is still important to be taught in EFL class. The learnability of language is deeply rooted from the systematic rules in the language which is known as grammar. Without explaining grammatical rules, students will likely be hard to distinguish which utterances are acceptable and which are not. For example, students having no knowledge and learning experience of grammar might say "Study you night last?" instead of "Did you study last night?"

In addition, the knowledge of grammar is main support for communicative competence, i.e linguistic competence. Celce-Murcia et.al (1995) propose that communicative competence is practically unusable unless it is supported by other competences such as linguistic competence, sociolinguistic competence, strategic competence, sociolinguistic competence, discourse competence, and pragmatic competence. Among these five competences, linguistic competence seems to be the most crucial one as it contains the knowledge of linguistic elements, grammar, and vocabulary. Absence of this competence will make acquisition impossible since students do not understand the input from what they read, and they hear. Moreover, lack knowledge of grammar makes students' language production sound ignorant and difficult to understand.

2. REVIEW OF THE RELATED THEORIES
1. Grammar and Language Teaching

Grammar is the heart of language, so studying language will inevitably bring the notion of grammar into attention. In fact, in the beginning of language teaching, grammar held a prominent position. Grammar translation method as the oldest language teaching method considers grammar so important that the process of teaching a foreign language is spent on drilling students to gain mastery

over grammar. Teaching material is designed based on grammatical point. In the classroom, teacher exposes students to grammar, training them with many exercises and memorizing rules, which seems to be impractical in daily communication. Eventually, the grammar instruction given in this method only brings students to know the rules but not to know how to use them since the concept of communicative ability was abandoned in GTM.

The failure of GTM brought the controversy over the grammar instruction within EFL framework. Some suggest that grammar instruction should be neglected in the language teaching; others maintain its necessity. Those in the favor of neglecting the importance of teaching grammar claim many FL students who have been studying grammatical rules for long period of time cannot use them. Hence, they conclude that grammar instruction is not necessary to help students gain mastery over the target language.

Despite these counter arguments against the grammar instruction, many still consider that grammar is still needed to be taught to the students. White (1987) claimed that grammar instruction is still necessary as some grammatical points cannot be acquired through exposure only. Language consists of a large number of syntactic points some of which students cannot master just through experiencing language, direct instruction is still needed. In addition, Larsen-Freeman (1997) proposed that even though grammar can naturally be acquired, it does not mean teaching grammar is insignificant. In fact, formal instruction can enhance the acquisition of grammar and speed up the process. In other word, Larsen-Freeman attempts to compromise the proponent and opponent of grammar instruction by suggesting that students can expose themselves to language as well as learn grammar since these two processes can be mutually helpful.

Although the failure of grammar instruction to lead students be able to use the language is evident in the EFL field, the blame should not be cast over the grammar itself but over how the grammar is presented in the instructional process. It can be seen in the EFL fields that grammar is taught from the traditional view. Newby (1998) suggested that traditional grammar sees a language as a set of forms and structures. The sentence is main unit of analysis and emphasis is placed on the students' ability to form sentence correctly. The importance of communication is negated in this kind of instruction since the most common form of grammar exercises given is gapped sentences and sentences formation rather than contextual use of grammar.

One of the ways proposed to deal with this problem is consciousness raising. This approach views a language can only be acquired in which the teacher takes role as a facilitator of this process. Hence, grammatical rules given by the teacher gives way to discovery technique and awareness-raising task by the pupils. In other words, the students try to discover the rules on their own.

The notion of consciousness raising or C R is also influenced from the view of language awareness. Many teachers and researchers in the field of EFL argue that awareness, attention and noticing are particular features of language which add to learning. Smith (1981) said, "the teaching of formal aspects of language need not necessarily proceed by rules and drills, but can be done by judiciously highlighting relevant aspects of language." This notion suggests that in the process of grammar instruction the teacher sometimes need to point out certain aspect of language in order to provide clarity.

Ellis (2002) defined CR as an attempt to equip learners with an understanding of a specific grammatical feature to develop declarative knowledge (describing a rule of grammar and applying it in pattern practice drills) rather than procedural one (applying a rule of grammar in communication). Richards, Plat and Plat (1992: 78) defined CR in Widodo(2006) as an approach to the teaching of grammar in which instruction in grammar through drills, grammar explanation, and other form-focused activities is viewed as a way of raising learner's awareness of grammatical features of the language. This is thought to indirectly facilitate second language acquisition. A CR approach is contrasted with traditional approaches to the teaching of grammar in which the goal is to instill correct grammatical patterns and habits directly.

2. Grammar Consciousness Raising Task (GCRT) in Teaching EFL Grammar

GCRT is a set of activities designed to bring up students' language awareness. This task was firstly introduced by Sharwood (1981) and Rutherford (1988). The purpose of this task, in their view,

is to make students aware of specific grammatical features using task without immediate demanding to produce the target structure. The notion of GCRT to raise students' awareness of target language is also proposed by Svalberg (2009) who said that the immediate objective of CR tasks is to help students' notice something about the language that they are unable to notice on their own. CR tasks can help them build their conscious knowledge and understanding of how language works.

Gerngross et.al (2006) provided three divided stages of awareness raising activities discovery, consolidation, and use. At glance, these three divisions quite resemble traditional PPP format: presentation, practice, and production. However, the concept underlying the terms is different.

a. Discovery

Unlike in presentation, discovery stage will make learning much less mechanistic and much more learner directed than the PPP model.

b. Consolidation

Activities in consolidation is not to force students to speak before they are ready as in 'practice', but the activities given focused on students understanding on the tasks without demanding them to speak.

c. Use

The final step is use in which learners are required to put the new item to work in ways that are relevant to them.

Furthermore, Gerngross et.al proposed the following activities that can be used in CGRT:

a) Lead in activities

These activities aim to prepare students with the material by introducing the topic discussed, reviewing vocabulary and bringing up their language awareness.

b) Presentation of model text

Mode texts used are commonly shortly written text presenting the target structure discussed along with its meaning, form, and use. Text presentation can familiarize student with how the target structure used and it can be done by dictation or projector.

c) Reconstruction of model text

This step can be done both in oral and in written tasks which remind students with text model presented before, especially the contents related to the target grammatical feature. Through reconstructing the text, it is expected that the students are able to understand the target structure as well as to use it accurately.

d) Text creation

This is the final step in which the students create their own text based on the model text previously given. In this step, students likely need many vocabularies and teachers are expected to provide them with the new words needed. Writing a text can make students be more focus on grammatical accuracy as they have time to edit, correct, and revise what they have written.

Willis and Willis also proposed C R activities that can be used in raising students' language awareness. There are six activities they propose as follows:

a) Identify/consolidate

Students are asked to search of data to identify a particular pattern or usage and the language forms associated with it.

b) Classify

Students are required to work with a set of data and sort it according to similarities and differences based on formal and semantic criteria.

c) Hypothesis building/checking

Students are given a generalization about language and asked to check this against more language data.

d) Cross language exploration

Students are encouraged to find similarities and differences between patterning in their own language and patterning in English.

e) Reconstruction/deconstruction

Students are required to manipulate language in ways which reveal underlying pattern.

f) Reference training

Students need to learn to use reference works such as dictionaries, grammars and study guides.

3. DATA ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

This research is descriptive quantitative in nature and was conducted in fourth semester students of English Department in IAIN Bukittinggi. The population of this research was the entire fourth semester students which consisted of 120 students divided into five classes and taught by the same lecturer with CGRT. The number of samples used was 30 students taken by using random sampling technique.

A grammar test concerning sentence structure was used as the instrument.The test consisted of 30 items and was given in the form of multiple choice completion. For each item, the students completed the sentence with the four choices given in order to create the sentence with an acceptable grammatical structure. The test covered the whole concepts of Grammar IV. From the result of the test, the researcher obtained the score which illustrated students' comprehension, and the data of this obtained score were used to determine the effectiveness of CGRT.

In analyzing the documentation of the students' grammar test results, the researcher found that the range (R) of the data was 36, amount of class (B) was 6, and interval of the data was 6, and f $i = 9, f(kb) = 20, f (ka) = 5, \sum F = 34, \sum FX = 2683, \sum fx^2 = 1412460,5$, and $N = 34$.

Moreover, after arranging the data into the table distribution, the researcher found out the mean (X) was 78,9, median (Me) was 81,5, and modus (Mo) was 86,2. Furthermore, 6 students got the score between 60-65, 2 students got score from 66-71, 6 students got score from 72-77, 6 students got score from 78-83, 9 students got score from 84-89, 5 students got score from 90-95. And the researcher found that the students' mean score was 78,9%. Thus, the use of Grammar Consciousness Raising Task strategy in teaching grammar was effective.

Based on the description and analysis of the data above, the score of the students' test results was gotten from students' final examination. The test was conducted to measure the students' achievement about the future tense after being taught by using GCRT strategy. The researcher found that the mean score of the students' test results was 78,9% which means that GCRT was effective to be used as a strategy in teaching grammar based on students' grammar test result toward English Education Department students at IAIN Bukittinggi.

In brief, apart from the fact that the use of Grammar Consciousness-Raising Task was effective in teaching grammar, the lecturer still needs to consider the use of such task which will determine the effectiveness of the strategy used. For example, the structure which has few rules in its use is better for task performance than structure with many rules.

4. CONCLUSION

To conclude, the use of Grammar Consciousness-Raising Task (GCRT) strategy in teaching grammar was effective based on the results gotten from the students' test results which was 78,9%. The rating scale shows that 78,9% lies on the range 72-89% and it is effective.

REFERENCES

Andrews, S. 2007. *Teacher Language Awareness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Celce-Murcia, M. 1995. *Communicative Competence: A Pedagogically Motivated Model with Content Specification*

Ellis, R. 1993. Second language acquistion research: how does it help teachers? An Interview with Rod Ellis. *ELT Journal Vol. 47/1*. OUP

Gerngross. G et.al. 2006. *Teaching Grammar Creatively*. Heilbling Language

Krashen. S. 1982. *Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Pergamon

Larsen-Freeman,D.1995. On the teaching and learning of grammar:challenging the myths' in Eckman et.al (eds).

Newby, D.1998. Theory and practice in communicative grammar: a guide for teachers in R. De Beaugraunde, M.Grosman, B.Seidholfer (eds.) *Language Policy and Language Education in Emerging Nations, Series: Advances in Discourse Process Vol. LXIII, 151-164.* Stamford

Newby, T et.al. 2000. *Instructional Technology for Teaching and Learning: Designing Instruction, Integrating Computers, and Using Media.* New Jersey: Prentice Hall

Rutherford,W. E. & Sharwood-Smith, M .1988. *Grammar and Second Language Teaching.* Newbury House

Sadeghi, F. 2012. The effect of grammar consciousness raising tasks on efl learners performance. *International Journal of Linguistics*, Vol. 6 No.3 708-720

Sharwood-Smith, M. 1981. Consciousness raising and the second language learner. *Applied Linguistics Vol 2. No. 2*

Stevick. E. 1996. *Memory, Meaning and Method* (2nd edition). Canada: Heinle & Heinle

Sugiharto, S. 2006. Consciousness-raising and the acquisition of the simple present tense rule. Paper presented at the sixth Malaysia International Conference on English Language Teaching (MICELT), Equatorial Hotel, Melaka, Malaysia, May 8-10.

Svalberg. A. 2009. Engagement with Language: Developing a Construct. *Language Awareness*, 18/ 3-4: 242-258.

Thornburry, S. 1998. *How To Teach Grammar.* New York: Longman

Weaver, C. 1996. *Teaching Grammar In Context.* Portsmouth: Boyston/Cook

White, L. 1987. Against comprehensible input: the input hypothesis and the development of second language competence. *Applied Linguistics* 8/2: 95-110

Yip, V. (1994). *Grammatical consciousness-raising and learnability.* In T. Odlin (Ed.), Perspective on pedagogical grammar (pp.123-139). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.