



ACOLISM II

Annual Conference On Language And Tourism –

30 Maret 2017

Prosiding

stba_sas@yahoo.co.id

PROSIDING

S eminar Nasional

“Annual Conference on Language and Tourism “

Tema: “Peran Bahasa dan Sastra di Bidang Pariwisata”



Pembicara:

Prof. Suminto A. Sayuti, Ph.D
(Sastrawan dan Guru Besar UNY)

Prof. Emi Emilia, M.Ed., Ph.D (Kepala Pusat
Pengembangan Strategi dan Diplomasi
Kebudayaan, Guru Besar UPI)

Dr. Imas Maryanah, M.Pd (Pemerhati
Budaya dan Pariwisata, Dosen STBA
Sebelas April Sumedang)

Sumedang, 30 Maret 2017



Penyelenggara:

**SEKOLAH TINGGI BAHASA ASING (STBA)
SEBELAS APRIL SUMEDANG**
Jalan Angkrek Situ No. 19 Sumedang Telp.
(0261) 203800, 202911 e-mail:
stba_sas@yahoo.co.id

SUSUNAN REDAKSI

Penanggungjawab : Iwan Israwan, Drs., M.Pd. (Ketua STBA Sebelas April Sumedang)
Pengarah : Syarif Hidayat, S.Pd.,M.T. (Ketua UPT. Penelitian dan Pengabdian Masyarakat)

DEWAN REDAKSI

Pemimpin Redaksi : Dr. Denny Kodrat., M.Pd.
Anggota : Suroto, S.S., M.Hum.
Nurhasanah, S.S., M.Hum.
Riany Puspitasari, S.Pd.,M.Pd.
Unu Nurahman, S.S.,M.Pd.

REVIEWER

Dr. E. Sulyati (STBA Sebelas April)
Dr. Imas Maryanah (STBA Sebelas April)
Kasno Pamungkas, M.Hum (Universitas Padjajaran)
Eri Kurniawan, P.hD (Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia)
Lina Susanti, M.Pd (Universitas Pakuan)
Rita Hayati, M.Pd (Universitas Pamulang)
Ika Yatmikasari, S.S., M.Pd (Universitas Islam Negeri Sunan Gunung Djati Bandung)

ALAMAT REDAKSI:

Sekolah Tinggi Bahasa Asing, Perguruan Tinggi Sebelas April Sumedang,
Jalan Angkrek Situ No. 19 Sumedang, Jawa Barat, Indonesia,
Telephone/Fax (0261) 203800, 202911E-Mail: stba_sas@yahoo.co.id

Hak Cipta © STBA Sebelas April Sumedang, Perguruan Tinggi Sebelas April Sumedang, Jawa Barat, Indonesia.

SAMBUTAN KETUA STBA SEBELAS APRIL SUMEDANG

Assalamu'alaikum Wr. Wb

Puji Syukur saya panjatkan kehadirat Allah SWT atas terbitnya Prosiding STBA Sebelas April Sumedang. Sebagaimana Jurnal Syntax STBA, prosiding ini juga merupakan representasi dari upaya membangun kultur akademik di bidang penelitian dan publikasi ilmiah serta pengabdian kepada masyarakat. Prosiding tahun ini juga merupakan jurnal yang special karena menjadi wadah publikasi ilmiah dari seminar perdana tahunan ACOLISM.

Sekedar memberikan apresiasi, pelaksanaan ACOLISM II tahun ini mengambil tema besar “Peran Bahasa dan Sastra di Bidang Pariwisata”. Tema ini merupakan kelanjutan dari ACOLISM I sekaligus merupakan tema yang masih umum untuk memberikan penguatan kembali tentang bagaimana peran bahasa dan sastra di bidang pariwisata. Tema umum semacam ini terus diangkat mengingat STBA Sebelas April masih mengkaji dan memetakan bagian mana saja dari pariwisata yang memungkinkan bahasa dan sastra dapat berperan di dalamnya. Semoga ACOLISM di masa yang akan datang akan mampu mengangkat tema-tema yang lebih spesifik sehingga kontribusi bahasa dan sastra di bidang pariwisata dapat menjadi jelas.

Akhirnya, semoga prosiding ini dapat menjadi wadah publikasi ilmiah ACOLISM yang tahun ini. Kami berharap kegiatan akademik dan publikasi ilmiah semacam ini dapat dipertahankan dan diselenggarakan setiap tahunnya. Terbitnya prosiding ini semoga juga menjadi motivasi bagi para dosen dan para peneliti untuk meningkatkan kapasitasnya terkait dengan penelitian dan pengabdian kepada masyarakat.

Wassalamu'alaikum Wr. Wb

Sumedang, 30 Maret 2017

Ketua STBA Sebelas April Sumedang

Iwan Israwan, Drs., M.Pd.

NIP: 195801041986021001

SAMBUTAN KETUA PROGRAM STUDI SAstra INGGRIS

Assalamu'alaikum Wr. Wb.

Segala puji hanyalah milik Allah Swt yang atas ijinNya-lah seminar nasional tahunan *Annual Conference on Language and Tourism* (ACOLISM) ini dapat dilaksanakan dengan sukses. Shalawat dan salam semoga tetap tercurah kepada Nabi Muhammad Saw.

Tahun 2017 merupakan tahun kedua penyelenggaraan ACOLISM, diikuti oleh peserta dari berbagai daerah di Indonesia. Mereka semua hadir di kota Sumedang, tidak hanya sekedar mengikuti kegiatan ini, untuk mendengar hasil kajian dan silaturahmi akademik, melainkan pula menikmati hidangan dan suasana khas kota yang disebut sebagai *Puseur Budaya Sunda*. ACOLISM tahun ini, tetap mengusung dua isu, yang pertama adalah isu tentang kebahasaan, dan kedua membahas isu pariwisata. Kedua isu ini kemudian dikaitkan dan menjadi menarik disaat ternyata bahasa bisa menjadi alat untuk memperkuat situs-situs budaya. Dari sinilah tema sentral ACOLISM “Peran Bahasa dan Sastra di Bidang Pariwisata” ingin dibedah, dielaborasi dan diperkaya.

Sementara itu, pada prosiding ini terhimpun berbagai macam karya dan khasanah intelektual, baik merupakan hasil penelitian dan kajian yang melengkapi diskusi pada acara ini. Semoga keseluruhan karya tulis ilmiah ini menjadi bahan yang dapat menambah referensi bacaan, sekaligus dapat mendorong dan menginspirasi kita untuk lebih berkarya.

Terakhir, atas nama panitia dan pimpinan, kami sampaikan terima kasih telah berpartisipasi dalam kegiatan ini. Semoga tahun depan kita bertemu kembali pada ACOLISM III, *Insyallah*.

Wassalamu'alaikum Wr. Wb

Sumedang, 30 Maret 2017

Ketua Program Studi Sastra Inggris

Dr. Denny Kodrat, M.Pd

NIDK. 8842810016

DAFTAR ISI

Sambutan Ketua STBA Sebelas April Sumedang – iii

Sambutan Ketua Program Studi Sastra Inggris – iv

DAFTAR ISI - v**KAJIAN BAHASA, SASTRA, BUDAYA DAN PARIWISATA**

Wisata Budaya “Dengan” Dan “Melalui” Sastra, Mengapa Tidak? -1-3

Catatan Prof. Suminto A. Sayuti, Ph.D, *Sastrawan dan Guru Besar
Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta*

Sastradan Pariwisata: Fungsi Kearifan Lokal dalam Upaya Pengembangan Kepariwisata
- 4 -17

Dr. Imas Maryanah, M.Pd, *STBA Sebelas April Sumedang*

Alam Sebagai Kekuatan dalam Teks Destinasi Wisata Indonesia – 18-28

Dr. Ekaning Krisnawati, M.Hum, *Departemen Linguistik, Fakultas Ilmu Budaya,
Universitas Padjadjaran*

**Persepsi Wisatawan Eropa terhadap Komodifikasi Agrowisata di Toraja
Sulawesi Selatan – 29-41**

Dr. Muhammad Hasyim, M.Si, *Departemen Sastra Prancis, Fakultas Ilmu
Budaya, Universitas Hasanuddin*

Tour Guide Pada Wisata Ekoturisme– 42-48

Ypsi Soeria Soemantri, *Fakultas Ilmu Budaya, Universitas Padjadjaran*

Pemanfaatan Museum sebagai Wahana Wisata Edukasi - 49-57

Mohamad Uilly Purwasatria, S.Pd, *Program Studi Pendidikan Sejarah, Sekolah
Pascasarjana, Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia*

**Optimalisasi Batik Kasumedangan Sebagai Upaya Mewujudkan Sumedang
“Puseur Budaya” dan Pusat Pariwisata Budaya Sunda – 58-63**

Nani Sunarni, Adung Danasubrata, *Fakultas Ilmu Budaya,
Universitas Padjadjaran*

Menyibak Mitos Samagaha dalam Budaya Sunda (Tinjauan Semiotik)–64-73

Ridha Herdiani, *SMA Negeri Tanjungsari Sumedang*

**Pelestarian Budaya Lokal dalam Upaya Meningkatkan Ekowisata di
Kabupaten Bandung Barat - 74-79**

Nani Sunarni, Susi Machdalena, Ypsi Soeria Soemantri, *Fakultas Ilmu Budaya,
Universitas Padjadjaran*

Pesan Sosial dan Budaya dalam Lagu Daerah Jambi – 80-90

Yusra D dan Pamela Mikaresti, *Universitas Jambi*

**Pemertahanan Bahasa Melayu pada Mahasiswa Riau dalam Pertunjukan
Kesenian Daerah di Yogyakarta -91-103**

Juni Mahsusi, *Program Pascasarjana Universitas Sebelas Maret Surakarta*

**Potret Kedudukan Bahasa Indonesia Dibalik Penisbatan Lombok
sebagai Destinasi Wisata – 104-114**

M. Rosyidi, *Universitas Sebelas Maret, Surakarta*

**Ekspresi Verbal dan Non Verbal dalam Adat *Mombolasuako* Sebagai
Refleksi Kearifan Lokal Etnik Tolaki di Konawe, Sulawesi Tenggara (Kajian
Etnolinguistik) -115-136**

Ifan Askul Pehala, *Program Pascasarjana Linguistik Deskriptif Universitas
Sebelas Maret Surakarta*

**Pemberdayaan Masyarakat Melalui Pengembangan Destinasi Wisata
Desacipaku Kecamatan Darmaraja Kabupaten Sumedang – 137- 151**

Lalas Sulastri, *Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Administrasi (STIA) Sebelas April Sumedang*

**Representasi Penamaan Objek Daya Tarik Wisata Sumedang
Selatan (Kajian Etnolinguistik) -152-157**

Nurhasanah, M.Hum dan Heryani, *Sekolah Tinggi Bahasa Asing Sebelas April
Sumedang*

KAJIAN BAHASA DAN SASTRA**Telaah Kritis Kesantunan Bahasa Dalam Kalimat Pernyataan di Masjid
Kabupaten Sumedang – 158-168**

Dr. Denny Kodrat, M.Pd, *Sekolah Tinggi Bahasa Asing Sebelas April Sumedang*

**Hermeuneutika Feminisme dalam Teks “Presiden Bahas Soal Perempuan” -
169-175**

Teti Sobari, Yesi Maylani Kartiwi, *STKIP Siliwangi Bandung*

Si Kabayan, Sebuah Paradoks – 176-186

Cicin Kuraesin, *SMAN Tanjungsari*

Reaksi Semantik dalam Konteks Sosiokultural Pengguna Bahasa Indonesia (Studi Kasus di Kecamatan Baleendah, Kabupaten Bandung)– 187-195

Nissa Kustianita, Furi Rachmah Nifira, Anis Lathifah Ulfah, *Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia*

Perbandingan Kemampuan Bercerita dalam Bahasa Madura antara Dua Orang Partisipan (Siswa dan Siswi SMP) pada “The Frog, Where Are You?”- 196-211

Qurratul A’ini, *Universitas Sebelas Maret, Surakarta*

Analisis Percakapan (Spoken Text) Dilihat Dari Aspek Hubungan Interpersonal pada Dialog Interaktif Dr. Oz Indonesia di Trans TV - 212-227

Nur Aini Syah, *Universitas Sebelas Maret, Surakarta*

Nilai-Nilai Pendidikan Karakter dalam Naskah Drama *Jangan Menangis Indonesia* Karya Putu Wijaya – 228-241

Dimas Anugrah Adiyadmo, *Universitas Jambi*

Menilai Kembali Kualitas Dongeng Anak Berjudul “Cichi Kelinci Iseng” Karya Ombang Oeban dan “Gajah” Karya Arfan Al-Fayyad – 242-249

Suci Khaofia, *Universitas Sebelas Maret Surakarta*

Menoropong Klausa dan Kalimat Bahasa Lolonda di Halmahera Utara di Propinsi Maluku Utara – 250-265

Maklon Gane, Guru SMP Kristen Dorume, Loloda Utara, Kab. Halmahera Utara, Prop. Maluku Utara

The Sketch of Teaching Grammar in Islamic Tertiary Level of Education – 266-276

Andang Saehu, Dewi Kustanti, *UIN Sunan Gunung Djati Bandung, Indonesia*

Kualitas Gramatika pada Teks Eksposisi Karya Siswa Kelas X SMK Sakti Gemolong Tahun 2016/2017 – 277-283

Yeyen Zakiah, Nur Rosidah, *Universitas Sebelas Maret*

**Pemakaian Bahasa oleh Netizen dalam Berkomentar di Situs Web Bola.net –
284-292**

Sukron Marzuki, *Universitas Sebelas Maret*

**Penanda Referensial Teks Muqaddimah Buku *Ja'ud-Duru Sil- 'Arabiyyati*
Karya Mushthafa Al-Ghulayni – 293-302**

Anisak Syaid Fauziah, *Program Pascasarjana Linguistik Deskriptif Universitas Sebelas
Maret Surakarta*

**THE SKETCH OF TEACHING GRAMMAR IN ISLAMIC TERTIARY
LEVEL OF EDUCATION**

(A Case Study at English Studies Department of Faculty of Adab and Humanities
of UIN Sunan Gunung Djati Bandung)

Andang Saehu

Email: andangsaehu@gmail.com

Dewi Kustanti

Email: dewikustanti70@gmail.com

State Islamic University (UIN) Sunan Gunung Djati Bandung, Indonesia
Jl. A.H. Nasution No.105, Bandung, West Java.

ABSTRACT

This study sketches the activities of teaching grammar, especially Basic Structure subject, in two of EFL classes at each of which is English Studies Department and English Vocational Program of Faculty of Adab and Humanities of UIN Sunan Gunung Djati Bandung. This study employed a case study method through classroom observations as it could investigate new phenomenon within its real context. The classroom observations were conducted in four class periods consecutively. The samples of the study consisted of two lecturers of whom were one from English Studies Department and one from English Vocational Program. The instruments used in the data gathering process were classroom observations and semi-structured interviews. The result showed that the lecturer designed various activities in teaching Basic Structure in the EFL class. The lecturer applied teaching activities of which they were set up in three stages: pre-teaching, while-teaching, and post-teaching. The activities in the pre-teaching stage were aimed at generating students' interest, building up students' knowledge of the rule, and trying to identify the students' grammar ability through pre-test. The while-teaching stage is to invite students to be involved at various teaching grammar activities, such as deductive approach, consciousness-raising approach, game—role-playing, social networking tool, and lecturer feedback. The post-teaching stage is to check the students' comprehension or rule activation, to internalize what they have learned and to expand students' knowledge.

Keywords: Teaching grammar, Basic Structure, Teaching Stages, Classroom Observation, Sketch.

INTRODUCTION

Should grammar be taught? This debatable question has been discussed since some decades ago. Krashen (1987) asserted that grammar does not need to be taught as it is acquired naturally. This notion is contradictory with Larsen-Freeman (2000) argues that “although grammar is naturally acquired, it does not simply mean that it should not be taught because learners need to have a sufficient knowledge of grammar.” In the context of Indonesia, English is placed as an international language of which it has been taught for very long time ago for all aspects of English language, such as reading, listening, speaking, writing, pronunciation, vocabulary, and grammar. This coincides with Long and Richards (1987) who said that grammar plays a central role in the four language skills and vocabulary to establish communicative tasks. The main reason of teaching English is to help Indonesian people able to speak or communicate with each other in English. To communicate means to have a mutual understanding (meaning) between a speaker and a listener. The mutual understanding could be created by using English grammatically correct. So, the notion by Larsen-Freeman does support the condition of Indonesian people who crucially need to prepare language communication.

Among the aspects of English language covering language skills and language components, grammar should get much more attention to teach than others since it usually takes part in the oral and written communication between speaker and listener or writers and readers. Teaching grammar is not an easy task for the English lecturers as grammar is the ‘head’ for transferring the information and communicating orally and in written (Corder, 1988). The failure of teaching grammar will limit the students’ ability in expressing meaning. Teaching grammar becomes a must because by learning grammar, quoting Doff’s statement (2000), students can express meanings in the form of phrases, clauses, and sentences. The failure of teaching grammar will also affect other courses, such as writing, speaking, listening, translation, and interpreting courses. The illustration of this condition is my teaching experience in translation course have that been conducted for seven years ago. At that time, having given the principles of translation to students, the next session was to practice translating a text. The same weekly problems were the lack of grammar mastery. They could not translate the text not because of the vocabulary size they had but the grammar mistakes they made. I then chatted with other lecturers of different courses, they experienced the same phenomenon.

In contrast to the condition of students at seven years ago, in the odd semester of Academic Year 2015/2017 I felt different learning atmosphere from that of previous atmospheres. The majority of students showed their accuracy in language use when translating the text. I assumed that this was due to the success of teaching grammar. Looking at the students’ accuracy in using English

grammar, thus in this Even semester of Academic Year 2016/2017, I and my friend observed two English grammar classrooms to see the activities conducted in teaching Basic Structure course. Each of whom was in English studies department class (ESD) and English vocational program class (EVP). Fortunately, we were allowed by the Basic Structure lecturers to observe the teaching grammar activities consecutively.

PROBLEM

With regard to the aforementioned case, this study aims at sketching the teaching activities or strategies applied by the Basic Grammar lecturers in two of EFL classes of English Studies Department and English Vocational Program of Faculty of Adab and Humanities of UIN Sunan Gunung Djati, Bandung.

LITERATURE REVIEW

This paper leaned on the previous research and review of theories relating to the teaching strategies of grammar would be elaborated below. Grammar, Basic Structure course, is a language component, which was, and still is, a core research field. Some previous studies relating to this present study have been conducted by many researchers. For example, Syahara (2012) conducted a study on improving students' grammar mastery through EGRA technique the Class VIII E of SMP N 01 Jaten Karang anyar in the academic year 2011/2012. Her classroom action research focused on whether or not EGRA technique can effectively improve the students' grammar mastery. She found that having given a pre- and post-test, the mean score for post-test was 91.8. This means that EGRA technique help students improve their grammar mastery effectively. Saraswati (2015) conducted a study on the use of Board Game to improve students' grammar mastery at the Eight grade of SMP N in the academic year 2014/2015. She found that based on the T-calculation of each cycle within three cycles of teaching was high. It means that using board game can improve the students' grammar mastery. Taufik (2011) conducted research on investigating the use of social networking tools in improving students' grammar: a case study. The study revealed that by using the social networking, there is notable improvement in the motivation level and students are actually having fun using emails in their English classes.

At the English Studies Department of Faculty of Adab and Humanities of UIN Bandung, grammar or structure is not served as integrated courses but as discrete one due to the students' needs to master various problems in constructing sentences intensively as part of their curricular activities. The teaching of grammar in this Department is not only focused on training the students to learn the theories of the structure but also focused on encouraging the students to practice of what they have learned through writing and speaking skills. The aim of

teaching grammar is to make learners able to communicate orally and in written and the lecturer, therefore, plays a role more as a facilitator than a lecturer.

METHOD

Descriptive qualitative design was employed in this study to understand and report the characteristics of current and past situation by describing what already exists in a focus group as individuals with similar characteristics. To run this design, the researchers involved two Basic Lecturers teaching in different departments: one was teaching in English studies department, and another was teaching in English vocational program. The research instruments used to gather the data were observation checklist and interview guidance. The observation checklist was used as the main instrument of which it focuses on the speaking lecturer's actions or behaviors in teaching Basic Structure. It consisted of variables and descriptors concerning how the Basic Structure lecturer taught in the classroom. Meanwhile, interview guidance was used to 'support or confirm or verify the impression of which has been gained through observation' in collecting the data relating to how the lecturer taught the students in the classroom (Kvale, (1996:35).

There were two classes observed, Class A of English studies department and Class B of English vocational program, amounting to around 40 students for each of them. The class period was 90 minutes long and was conducted from 8.40 a.m. to 10.10 a.m. on Tuesday and Thursday, which ran for one semester from February to late –May 2017. The lecturer of the ESD was a male, while the EVP's was a female. The classes were tailored for facilitating grammar activities. In the four class periods of observations, we served as non-participant observers in the first two and four period classes of EVP and as a participant observer in the third-period class of ESD consecutively. Checking the word *consecutively*—the root of consecutive—in an Advanced English Dictionary and Thesaurus results in some other words relate to it. The possible words are *straight*, *sequent*, *serial*, and *successive*. Here, we attended the class in the second four class periods, while absent in the first class period as the classes conducted only the pre-test. During attending the Basic Structure classes, we took some notes relating to teaching and learning Basic Grammar activities, as the lecturer didn't allow us to take a camera. Besides, we also interviewed the lecturer in the end of every class period relating to the design of the teaching activities.

FINDING AND ANALYSIS

This study attempts to report the sketch of the teaching activities designed by the lecturers in teaching Basic Structure course to ESD and EVP students of Faculty of Adab and Humanities of UIN Sunan Gunung Djati, Bandung. Having analyzed the data gained from observation and interview, it was found that in

general the stages of teaching Basic Structure course can be divided into three stages: pre-teaching, while-teaching, and post-teaching. Each of which has some activities that have been designed by the lecturers prior to teaching. Although we could only do the observation for three meetings to which it should be all meetings, we could capture the first class period of the respondents through interviewing. As stated by Seidman (2006), the interview guide is used as it can capture the meaning people involved in education make of their experience.

The design of teaching activities, which was presented in four class periods, was divided into three stages: pre-teaching activity, while-teaching activity, and post-teaching activity. Besides, the lecturer also prepared suitable and appropriate materials pursuant to the activities being done, in addition to teaching activities to make students more active during class.

1. Pre-teaching Activity

Due to the fact that we didn't come to the class at the first class period, we interviewed the lecturers on what they have done in the class. The result of interviews showed that in the stage of pre-teaching, they held a pre-test to check the students' background knowledge. The pre-test consisted of 20 items that should be responded in 25 minutes. The first ten items were multiple choice and the rests were written expression items. The lecturers then asked the students to exchange their answers with their friends' answers. The lecturers then gave the best answer for each item. While giving the best answer to the item, the students gave a checklist for the right answer and gave a cross sign for the wrong ones. Having known the mean scores of the pre-test of which the scores were less than 50%, the lecturers then coded some items that were mostly answered incorrectly. This activity lasted in 10 minutes. The lecturers then decided that at that first class period, the first lecturer should teach about simple past tense and the second lecturer should teach about subject verb agreement of the sentence. They spent about 40 minutes to teach the topics they have just decided. Having taught such topics, the lecturers then designed the syllabus, including the topics to be taught, based on the coding they have made from the pre-test. The students agreed with what the lecturers were going to design. This kind of a study contract was done in 15 minutes.

This pre-teaching activity was different from that of pre-teaching activity at the second-class period. We attended the class under the permission of the lecturers. I attended the ESD class and my friend attended the EVP class. During observing the pre-teaching activities, we have noted some important points relating to the teaching Basic Structure activities. At that time, the lecturer started the lesson by recalling the topic presented in the first class period. We interviewed the lecturers to find the reasons of recalling the topic. They said that they were worried about the students' mastery on the topic. If the students were failed to recall the topic, they will skip the topic that should be presented at the

second-class period and represent the previous topic. Having recalled the topic for about 10 minutes, the lecturer then said to the students that they are going to discuss noun clause. The lecturer asked the students' prior knowledge of what they have learned at home prior to learning the topic in the class. This was performed in 15 minutes.

The pre-teaching activity in the third-class period was almost the same as that of the second-class period's, in terms of recalling the topic. One thing different from those of the first and second-class periods of pre-teaching activities were, here, the lecturers asked the students to create a Basic Structure group in a social media. When interviewed, they said that they tried to use the free hotspot provided by the IT center of the university. The lecturer then told things to do in the group to the students, such as sharing materials, giving assignment, etc. Even, the lecturers initiated the group by asking the topic going to be learned at that time. "What do you know about adjective clause?" The students were all online through laptops, smartphones, and tablets and felt free when answering the questions through the social media group. This was conducted around 25 minutes.

The activity of pre-teaching stage at the fourth-class period was performed by building up the students' knowledge of the grammar rules. The lecturer starts with teaching Basic Structure by proposing some questions using types of questions: wh-question and yes/no question. Having interviewed the lecturers, it was known that such activities were geared to build up students' knowledge of the grammatical items taught. Interestingly, at this pre-teaching stage, the lecturer was required to ask students to respond to the questions orally. This kind of activity, according to Widodo (2006), can stimulate students' self-confidence in using the grammatical item learned communicatively. He adds that more importantly, this activity encourages students to communicate in a spoken form; thus building the students' confidence in using the rule and the students' awareness of using it in the context of communicative tasks (for example, speaking). This pre-teaching activity was done within 15 to 20 minutes.

2. While-teaching Activity

In the stage of while-teaching, it was found that the lecturers applied several activities about 45 to 50 minutes as follows.

a. Deductive Approach

The deductive approach to teaching grammar teaching is a more teacher-centered approach as compared to that of inductive instruction. This means that the teacher introduces the students with a new concept, explains it, and then has the students practice using the concept. This coincides with Krashen's statement (1982) "Teachers should present a clear explanation and have students practice until the rule is internalized". In the context of this study, having given a pre-test at the first class period, the lecturer taught about simple past tense (ESD class) and Subject-verb agreement (EVP class) deductively.

In the process of teaching Basic Structure course using deductive approach at the first class period, the lecturer started with presenting the formula of simple past tense and subject-verb agreement. Following this, the lecturers gave some examples of the topics and practice applying the formulas given orally or in written. In line with this, Thornbury (1999) and Norris & Ortega (2000 cited in Erlam, 2003) said that the lecturer starts with the presentation of a rule by a teacher who then provides examples in which the target structure is applied. Next, students engage in language practices in the process of applying a general rule to specific examples (Gollin, 1998).

b. Conscious-raising Approach

In this second-class period, the lecturer presented about the noun clause as this topic was incorrectly answered in the pre-test. The pre-test showed that the students had some problems with the construction (formula) of noun clause. Even, when the lecturer wrote some questions in the form of *wh*-questions on the whiteboard and asked the students to construct a noun clause based on the questions, the majority of them were still getting confused as they perhaps had not been given the explanation about noun clause yet. For example, the question like *What is your name?* was then changed by the students into *I don't know what is your name?*

It seems to be claimed that such mistakes occurred due to the students' prior knowledge of the *wh*-question formula which maintain the position of *to be* before the subject and put *the question mark (?)* at the end of the question. In dealing with this condition, the lecturer firstly differentiated the form of *wh*-question and statement. He said that to form a statement (noun clause) from the *wh*-question, the position of *to be* should be placed at the end of the sentence without followed by question mark. So, it should be *I don't know what your name is*. However, he added that if the question proposed is *Where does she live?* No need to insert a *to be*, even, the *auxiliary verb—does* must be removed. So, it would be *I don't know where she lives*.

The lecturer then asked the students to identify and differentiate the *wh*-question and statement.

1. *where are you going?*
2. *I want to know where you are going.*

Besides, the lecturer finally gave some questions and wrong statements. The lecturer required the students to convert the questions into statements and rewrite the sentences correctly.

1. Who is she? I don't know
2. When did she leave? Can you tell me?
3. Whose house is that? I wonder
4. Please tell me what did he say.
5. Can you tell me who is in the office.

By looking at the series of teaching activities designed in this second-class period, we are sure that these activities go to the term *consciousness raising approach* proposed by Ellis (2002). She defines it as an attempt to equip learners with an understanding of a specific grammatical feature and to develop declarative rather than procedural knowledge of it. The specific grammatical feature presented in this class-period was noun clause whose rules or formulas were described and applied in pattern practice drill.

c. Game

One of interesting activities in teaching Basic Structure is through role-playing game. The majority of students felt motivated to practice and encouraged to active participation in the lesson. The lecturer designed a dialogue not to be long but relevant, realistic, and appropriate with the students' interest. In working with this dialogue activity, the lecturer asked for me to play a role as one of the characters mentioned in the dialogue. In this class period, I served as a participant observer that the lecturer assigned for becoming a partner in a role-play. It was a simple dialogue asking about condition, hobby, planning, and daily activities. The lecturer together with me acted it out in pairs to give the students an idea of how to play a role in the dialogue. In this case, the lecturer became a role model of what a good player is like (Day & Bamford, 2002).

Having played the role, the lecturer asked the students to write a conversation in pairs and to act their conversations out by their own ways in front of the class. Other students were asked to listen and write some grammatical mistakes coming out from the mouths playing the role in front of the class. They were then required to show and explain the correct forms or the appropriate grammatical corrections of what have been written during listening to the dialogues. This was done by all students in pairs with different topics of conversation. This perhaps need much time to do but successfully boosted the students' motivation level.

d. Social Networking Tool

At the third-class period, the lecturer previously asked the students to create a group in a social media (See pre-teaching stage). The main reason of using social media in teaching Basic Structure is to help the silent students become active through writing their opinion in English grammatically correct. This reason is in line with the statement by Kim (2008) that the teacher should reduce the students' anxiety in learning grammar in a way they are comfort. He added that by reducing their anxiety in learning grammar would inevitably gain students' interest and boost their motivation level.

The process of teaching Basic Structure using the group created in a social media seemed to be effective as the students could express their ideas freely when given some questions by the lecturer. The topics presented at the third-class

period were future tense and conditional clause. The following was the activity done by the lecturers in the class.

The lecturer mentioned some names, say Ahmad and Sarah, listed in the group. He then asked Ahmad “What are you going to do next three days?” another question asked to Sarah “you have your own daily learning schedule, what to do if you fail unintentionally to do your plan?” In answering to the question, Ahmad and Sarah wrote their answers directly in the group. The lecturer could check their answers. If it is found that the answers were still grammatically incorrect, the lecturer asked other students to edit the answers. The lecturer supported the ways the students edited the answers of Ahmad and Sarah by elaborating the problems encountered.

e. Feedback

This feedback was facilitated by the lecturers both in ESD and EVP at the forth-class period. In working with the process of giving feedback, the students were required to answer orally some *wh*-questions addressed in the pre-teaching stage. All the answers were recorded by the lecturers. Each of which was replayed and heard by all students. To those answers, the lecturers evaluated and describe precisely. This coincides with the statement by Lewis (2002) that feedback is a way for teachers to describe their learning. She also added that it is an ongoing form of assessment by giving advices, suggestions, comments, and corrections.

When observing this activity, we were sure that this feedback activity was similar to that of previous activity, social media, designed at the third-class period. The similarity could be seen in the ways of giving questions and describing the problems existed in the written answers, which were easily found in the group of social media. One thing different between them was the sentences produced; one was produced orally and another was in written. But, one thing the same was the creativity of lecturers in designing the teaching activities at the third- and forth-class periods.

3. Post-Speaking Activity

The post-speaking stage was designed to extend the understanding of the students learned at pre-teaching and while-teaching stages into other learning tasks like writing the answers or analyzing the language accuracy of a text. EFL students need to act upon what they have learned to expand their thinking, and as stated by Linse (2005), a well-planned post-teaching activity is a useful device for them to speak and think. This post-teaching stage helps students internalize what they have written, spoken, and listened to. The ways the lecturers internalize it can be done through applying the grammar practices to other language skills, such as speaking and writing. The students were required to write a text or to tell a story or do a speech in front of the class. The lecturers checked the students' grammar mastery of the tasks given. Connecting the grammar task with the

writing and speaking tasks is essentially related because EFL grammar can be taught in an integrated way along with other language skills (Cahyono & Widiati, 2011). This post-teaching stage was run in 15 minutes.

In short, the teaching procedures or stages starting from pre-, while-, to post-teaching have helped the lecturer, teacher, or those working on teaching organize the lesson in order to provide the students with step-by-step instruction. In addition, by using those stages, the lecturer could have an opportunity to set how much time should be spent on each stage. Besides, those stages, according to Widodo (2009:43), enable the lecturer to decide what kinds of learning activities or strategies that the students would go through in one lesson.

CONCLUSION

This study has sketched various types of activities designed by the speaking lecturer in the teaching of speaking for general communication course in English Studies Program of Faculty of Humanities of UIN SGD Bandung. These various activities were intended to help students improve their speaking skill. One principle thing designed by the lecturer in every meeting of teaching is the use of three phase techniques of teaching: pre-speaking activity, while-speaking activity, and post- speaking activity. These phases, which are relevant to the principles of effective learning strategies, are supported by physical movements to attract the students' interests. Unfortunately, the students were only asked to find texts or to choose one of existing texts. It would be better if the students were asked to write their own stories. Although the three phases are advisable to be applied by other lecturers, the lecturers should notice that when there are problems, they should see the problems as challenges and look for solutions.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Cahyono, B.Y., &Widiati, U. (2011). *The Teaching of English as a Foreign Language in Indonesia*. Malang: State University of Malang Press.
- Corder, S. (1988). Pedagogic grammar. In W. Rutherford & M. Sharwood-Smith (Eds.), *Grammar and second language teaching* (pp. 123-145). New York:Harper & Row Publishers, Inc.
- Day, R.R., &Bamford, J. (2002). Top ten principles in teaching extensive reader. *Reading in a Foreign Language, 14, 136-141*.
- Doff, A. (2000). *Teach English: A training course for teachers* (14th ed.). Cambridge:Cambridge University Press.
- Ellis, R (2002). Grammar teaching practice or consciousness-raising? In J.C. Richards & W.A. Renandya (Eds.), *Methodology in language teaching: An anthology of current practice* (pp.167-174). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Erlam, R. (2003). The effects of deductive and inductive instruction on the acquisition of direct object pronouns in French as a second language. *The Modern Language Journal*, 87(2), 242-260.
- Kim, C.M. (2008). Using email to enable E3 (effective, efficient, and engaging) learning. *Distance Education, Vol 29, 2, 187-198*.
- Kvale, S. (1996). *Interviews: An Introduction to Qualitative Research Interviewing*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition* (pp. 65-78). Pergamon: Oxford.
- Krashen, S. (1987). Applications of psycholinguistic research to the classroom. In M.Long & J. Richards (Eds.), *Methodology in TESOL* (pp. 33-44). New Jersey: Heinle&Heinle Publishers.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (2001). Teaching grammar. *Teaching English as a second or foreign language*, 2, 279-296. In M. Celce-Murcia (Ed.), *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language (3rd ed.)*. Boston: Heinle&Heinle.
- Linse, C.T. (2005). *Practical English Language Teaching*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Saraswati, D. (2015). *The Use of Board Game to Improve Students' Grammar Mastery*. Unpublished Paper. Salatiga: IAIN Salatiga.
- Seidman, I. (2006). *Interviewing as Qualitative Research*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Syahara, F.R. (2012). *Improving the Students' Grammar Mastery through EGRA Technique*. Unpublished Paper. Surakarta: SebelasMaret University.
- Taufik, A.A.T. (2011). Investigating the use of social networking tools in improving students' grammar: A Case Study. *The Journal of Distance Education and e-learning, vol 2, 4, 1-10*.
- Thornbury, S. (1999). *How to teach grammar*. Harlow, Essex: Pearson Education Limited.
- Widodo, H.P. (2006). Approaches and Procedures for Teaching Grammar. *A Journal of English Teaching: Practice and Critique, Vol 5, 1, 122-141*.
- Widodo, H.P. (2009). Key Issues in Teaching EFL/ESL Intensive Reading: A Videotaped Self-Observation Report. *The Journal of Effective Teaching, Vol 9, 3, 38-58*.



Divisi Penerbit

**SEKOLAH TINGGI BAHASA ASING (STBA)
SEBELAS APRIL SUMEDANG**

Jalan An gkreng Situ No. 19 Sumedang Telp. (0261) 203800, 202911
e-mail: stba_sas@yahoo.co.id