

**TEXTUAL ENHANCEMENT-BASED GRAMMAR
INSTRUCTIONAL MODEL (TEBGIM)**

DISSERTATION



By

VENI ROZA
NIM 14169030

Submitted as a partial fulfillment of the requirements to obtain
Doctoral Degree in Education Study Program

**EDUCATION STUDY PROGRAM
POSTGRADUATE PROGRAM
GRADUATE PROGRAM
UNIVERSITAS NEGERI PADANG
2017**

DEDICATION

فَإِنَّ مَعَ الْعُسْرِ يُسْرًا ﴿١﴾ إِنَّ مَعَ الْعُسْرِ يُسْرًا ﴿٢﴾ فَإِذَا فَرَغْتَ فَانصَبْ ﴿٣﴾ وَإِلَىٰ رَبِّكَ فَارْغَبْ ﴿٤﴾

5. karena Sesungguhnya sesudah kesulitan itu ada kemudahan,
6. Sesungguhnya sesudah kesulitan itu ada kemudahan.
7. Maka apabila kamu telah selesai (dari sesuatu urusan), kerjakanlah dengan sungguh-sungguh (urusan) yang lain[1586],
8. dan hanya kepada Tuhanmulah hendaknya kamu berharap.

This lovely dissertation is honorably dedicated to my happy little family: my hubby Risdianto, SH, my three kids; Abang Azzam, Uda Hazim and dedekFarhan.

I can't be like this without your support, pray, loves and cares.

My beloved mother, father, brothers and sister, my beloved mother in law and father in law:

Thank you for all of your sacrifice; Thank you for pray and affection.

My beloved friends: Ms. Meme, Ms Ref. Ms Lolli and my Rini:

I am nothing without you are beside me ☺

Moreover, this triumph was also impossible without support, guidance and help from my second handsome promoter, Prof. Dr. Muhammad Zaim, M.Hum.

The best pray was addressed for my dear mom, lecturer, my third promoter, for Ibuku yang berjuang keras melawan penyakit sehingga selalu bisa mendampingi di setiap tahap sidangku. Love you Ibu Dr. Desmawati Radjab, M.Pd. Hopefully you are always in much better condition.

Above all, my adventure during writing dissertation was guided by a wonderful mom, teacher, lecturer, professor, my first promoter. I admire her so much and I love her because of Allah. Her help and attention had brought me to the end of long journey, she is bundaku, Prof. Dr. Hermawati Syarif, M.Hum. Terima kasih bunda telah membuatku doktor dan bonus Cum Laude dibalik kerja keras; jasamu tiada terbalas dan semoga Allah mengganti semua kebaikanmu for the shelter, convenient room, food, love during my study. Semoga Nanda dapat mengikuti jejakmu Bunda. Aamiin.

ABSTRACT

Veni Roza. 2017. **Textual Enhancement-Based Grammar Instructional Model (TEBGIM)**. Dissertation. Postgraduate Program of Universitas Negeri Padang.

The research was due to some problems found by the researcher during preliminary research. The grammar was still taught conventionally which was still held in lecturer-centered; the instructional book used in grammar teaching did not provide students with good input exposure and students' final mark in which more than half of them (65%) failed to achieve the good grade. The purpose of the research was to find out problems related to the model of teaching that is currently used in the grammar instruction at English education department of IAIN Bukittinggi, to design the model of instruction, to develop Textual Enhancement-Based Grammar Instructional Model (TEBGIM) for complex sentences, and to find out the effect of the developed model toward students' grammar mastery. The research design used was Research and Development (R&D) by applying Four-D Model by Thiagarajan et.al (1974) that is defining stage, designing stage, developing stage, and disseminating stage. The product testing was carried out at the third semester English education department students of IAIN Bukittinggi. The instruments used in this research were interview guides, observation sheet, tests, documentation, and questionnaires. To analyze the data, the researcher applied Miles, Huberman and Saldana's interactive model (data condensation, data display and conclusion drawing and verification) for qualitative data and t-test for quantitative ones. The research findings exhibit that (1) the grammar lecturers still applied traditional method in their teaching with limited learning resources. Mostly grammar point was explained at the beginning to introduce the new lesson. This model of teaching did not meet students' needs for getting challenging and active involvement to solve language problems in grammar learning; (2) the design of the prototype model of instruction that can help to solve the problem of instruction was to use Textual Enhancement-Based Grammar Instruction Model (TEBGIM) with the syntax of attending task, noticing task, analyzing task, checking task and production task. (3) The developed model met the criteria valid and practical. (4) TEBGIM promoted students' grammar mastery in using complex sentences.

ABSTRAK

Veni Roza. 2017. **Model Pembelajaran Grammar Berbasis Penguatan Teks**. Disertasi. Program Pascasarjana Universitas Negeri Padang.

Penelitian ini dilatarbelakangi oleh beberapa masalah yang ditemukan peneliti pada riset awal. *Grammar* masih diajarkan secara konvensional; yakni terpusat pada dosen; buku-buku *grammar* yang digunakan tidak memberikan terpaan bahasa yang bermakna; dan nilai *grammar* mahasiswa kebanyakan masih belum baik. Tujuan penelitian ini untuk menemukan masalah terkait model pembelajaran *Grammar* yang sudah diterapkan dosen selama ini, untuk merancang model yang dapat memecahkan masalah tersebut, untuk mengembangkan model pembelajaran *grammar* berbasis penguatan teks dan menemukan pengaruh model tersebut terhadap penguasaan *grammar* mahasiswa. Peneliti perlu memecahkan masalah ini melalui penelitian riset dan pengembangan dengan model Empat-D oleh Thiagarajan, dkk (1974) yakni tahap pendefinisian, perancangan, pengembangan dan pendiseminasian. Uji coba produk dilakukan pada mahasiswa semester tiga pendidikan bahasa Inggris IAIN Bukittinggi. Instrument yang digunakan yaitu pedoman wawancara, lembar observasi, test, dokumen, dan angket. Data kualitatif dianalisis dengan menerapkan model interaktif Miles, Huberman and Saldana dengan *data condensation, data display and conclusion drawing and verification*, sedangkan data kuantitatif dengan uji t. Temuan penelitian menunjukkan bahwa (1) dosen masih menggunakan model tradisional dalam pengajaran *grammar* dengan menjelaskan *lesson* baru dari awal pembelajaran dalam keterbatasan *learning resources*. Model ini kurang sesuai dengan kebutuhan mahasiswa yang ingin tantangan dan ikut berpartisipasi dalam memecahkan masalah *Grammar*. (2) Rancangan model yang sesuai dengan kebutuhan tersebut yakni model pembelajaran *Grammar* berbasis penguatan teks dengan *syntax: attending task* (membaca teks dengan teliti), *noticing task* (mengamati teks), *analyzing task* (penganalisisan teks), *checking task* (pengecekan) dan *production task* (menulis paragraf); (3) Model yang dikembangkan tersebut memenuhi kriteria valid, dan praktis (4) Model pengajaran *grammar* berbasis penguatan teks (*TEBGIM*) efektif dalam meningkatkan penguasaan *grammar* mahasiswa pada *complex sentences*.

LEMBAR PENGESAHAN

PERSETUJUAN KOMISI PROMOTOR/PENGUJI

SURAT PERNYATAAN

Dengan ini saya menyatakan bahwa:

1. Karya tulis saya, Disertasi dengan judul **“Pengembangan Model Pembelajaran Grammar Berbasis Penguatan Teks”** adalah asli dan belum pernah diajukan untuk mendapatkan gelar akademik di Universitas Negeri Padang maupun perguruan tinggi lainnya.
2. Karya tulis ini murni gagasan, penilaian dan rumusan saya sendiri, tanpa bantuan tidak sah dari pihak lain, kecuali arahan Tim Promotor/ Tim Penguji.
3. Di dalam karya tulis ini tidak terdapat hasil karya atau pendapat yang telah ditulis atau dipublikasikan orang lain, kecuali dikutip secara tertulis dengan jelas dan dicantumkan sebagai acuan di dalam naskah saya dengan disebutkan nama pengarang dan dicantumkan pada daftar rujukan.
4. Pernyataan ini saya buat dengan sesungguhnya, dan apabila dikemudian hari terdapat penyimpangan dan ketidakbenaran pernyataan ini, saya bersedia menerima sanksi akademik berupa pencabutan gelar yang telah saya peroleh karena karya tulis ini, serta sanksi lainnya sesuai dengan norma dan ketentuan hukum yang berlaku.

Padang, Mei 2017

Yang membuat pernyataan,

Veni Roza
NIM: 14169030

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

After countless hours spent on toil and hard labor, the researcher eventually manages to finish this research and presents the result for all to read. This arduous journey, however, would not have reached its end, had help and assistance not been lent from those whose contribution will now be paid heed. For the sake of this, this page is dedicated as a scroll of her gratitude for them.

First and foremost, the gratitude is indebted to The Almighty in His Majestic Splendor who has granted the researcher with His unnumbered grace that she is finally able to tread the path of wisdom and knowledge and cross the sea of turbulence to this point of her life. Peace and salutation is also offered to the prophet Muhammad PBUH whose messages of freedom and knowledge have now echoed across spaces and time.

A garland of gratitude also needs to be wreathed for the people who have surrounded the researcher with their support and assistance. Some allow the researcher to luxuriate in their abundant hall of knowledge; others embrace her in the moments of her weak. Now that their aids have been all spent, their contributions will now be recounted:

1. Prof. Dr. Hermawati Syarif, M.Hum as the first Promotor who has guided the researcher and kept encouraging whenever she felt down with her research.
2. Prof. Dr. M. Zaim, M.Hum as the second Promotor who has guided the researcher and taught her about the consistency of the research.

3. Dr. Desmawati Radjab, M.Pd as the third Promotor who has guided the researcher and encouraged her to be more spiritfult and patient.
4. Prof. Ganefri, Ph.D as the Rector of Universitas Negeri Padang for giving the researcher to pursue her doctoral degree in this university.
5. Prof. Dr. Nurhizrah Gistituati, M.Ed. Ed.D as the Director of Graduate Program of Universitas Negeri Padang for her support as well as the contributor of the dissertation.
6. Prof. Dr. Azwar Ananda, M.A as the first vice Director as well as contributor for this dissertation.
7. Prof. Dr. Z. Mawardi Effendi, M.Pd as contributor for the perfection of her dissertation.
8. Prof. Dr. Fauzan, M.Si as the Head of education study program of Graduate Program of Universitas Negeri Padang as well as contributor for this dissertation.
9. Prof. Dr. Jufrizal, M.Hum, Prof. Dr. Mukhaiyar, M.Pd, Dr. Lely Refnita, M.Pd, Dr. Afdaleni, M.Pd, Dr. Darmansyah, ST,M.Pd and Dr. Nunu Burhanuddin, M.Ag as validators of her research.
10. Prof. Dr. Busmin Gurning, M.Pd as the external examiner from Universitas Negeri Medan who has provided his valuable time and willingness to examine her dissertation.
11. Reflinda, SS, M.Pd and Loli Safitri, M.Pd for willingness to be observed and researched for her research.

12. English students who have given support for this research and been sample of her research.

An appreciation is also indebted to others whose each name and aid is too long to be mentioned here. At the closing part of this scroll of gratitude, the researcher really hoped that this scientific enterprise will bring benefit for the development of English language teaching especially in the process of grammar instruction. Finally, the researcher hopes that the readers can give her their comments, suggestions, criticism for the betterment of this present research.

Padang, May 2017

Veni Roza

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT	i
ABSTRAK	ii

LEMBAR PENGESAHAN.....	iii
PERSETUJUAN KOMISI PROMOTOR/ PENGUJI.....	iv
SURAT PERNYATAAN.....	v
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	vi
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	ix
LIST OF FIGURES.....	
LIST OF PICTURES.....	
LIST OF TABLES.....	
LIST OF APPENDICES.....	
CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION.....	1
A. Background of the Problem	1
B. Identification of the Problem	11
C. Limitation of the Problem	13
D. Formulation of the Problem	13
E. Purpose of the Research	14
F. Specification of the Product.....	15
G. Significance of the Research and Development	15
H. Explanation of the Key Terms	17

CHAPTER II REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE.....	19
A. Review of Related Theories.....	19
1. Grammar Instruction.....	19
2. Textual Enhancement-based Grammar Instruction Model (TEBGIM).....	57
3. TEBGIM and Teaching Models of Information Processing.....	73
4. Theories Supporting TEBGIM.....	79
B. Review of Related Study.....	92
C. Conceptual Framework.....	101
CHAPTER III RESEARCH METHOD.....	103
A. Kind of Research.....	103
B. Model of Research and Development.....	104
C. Procedures of Research and Development.....	106
D. Product Testing.....	119
E. Subject of Field Testing.....	120
F. Kinds of Data.....	121

G.	Instrumentation.....	122
H.	Techniques of Data Collection.....	140
I.	Techniques of Data Analysis.....	1446
 CHAPTER IV RESULT OF DEVELOPMENT.....		156
A.	Description of Development Process and Evidence.....	156
	1. Problems Related Current Teaching Model Applied.....	156
	2. Design of Prototype Model of Instruction.....	188
	3. Validity and Practicality of TEBGIM.....	238
	4. Effectiveness of TEBGIM.....	273
B.	Display of Data Testing.....	278
C.	Data Analysis.....	285
D.	Revision of Product	298
E.	Discussion	301
F.	Limitation of Research.....	317
 CHAPTER V CONCLUSION, IMPLICATION AND SUGGESTION.....		321
A.	Conclusion.....	321
B.	Implication	322

C. Suggestion	323
REFERENCES	324
GLOSSARY	332
APPENDICES	335

List of Figures

Name of Figures	Page
Figure 2.1 Traditional Output-Based Instructions.....	51
Figure 2.2 Textual Enhancement-Based Grammar Instruction Model.....	66
Figure 2.3 Memory Processing.....	87
Figure 2.4 A model of Second Language Performance.....	90
Figure 2.5 A Process Model of SLA.....	91
Figure 2.6 Conceptual Framework.....	101
Figure 3.1 Model of Four-D Instructional Design.....	105
Figure 3.2 Procedures of Developing Textual Enhancement- Based Grammar Instruction Model (adapted from Thiagarajan, et.al, 1974 and Trianto 2010).....	

		118
Figure 3.3	Data Analysis of Interactive Model	147
Figure 4.1	Conceptual Model of TEBGIM	197
Figure 4.2	Hypothetic Model of TEBGIM.....	241

List of Pictures

Name of Pictures		Page
Picture 4.1	Grammar Lecturers Are Teaching.....	162
Picture 4.2	Draft of Introduction in TEBGIM.....	200
Picture 4.3	Draft of Theoretical Bases of TEBGIM.....	203
Picture 4.4	Draft of TEBGIM Components.....	207
Picture 4.5	Acknowledgement of Model Book.....	209

Picture 4.6	Draft of Syllabus.....	213
Picture 4.7	Draft of Lesson Plan.....	217
Picture 4.8	Draft of Lecturers' Book Lesson Plan.....	219
Picture 4.9	Stages of learning.....	220
Picture 4.10	Draft of the Answer Keys.....	220
Picture 4.11	Draft of Simple Sentence.....	225
Picture 4.12	Draft of Compound Sentence.....	226
Picture 4.13	Draft of Complex Sentence.....	227
Picture 4.14	Draft of Adverb Clauses of Time and Reason.....	228
Picture 4.15	Draft of Adverb Clauses of Contrast and Purpose....	229
Picture 4.16	Draft of Adverb Clauses Reduction.....	230
Picture 4.17	Draft of Noun Clauses Derived from Statements.....	231
Picture 4.18	Draft of Noun Clause Derived from Question.....	232
Picture 4.19	Draft of Noun Clause Reduction.....	233
Picture 4.20	Draft of Adjective Clause with Subject Replacement	234
Picture 4.21	Draft of Adjective Clause with Object Replacement.....	235

Picture 4.22	Draft of Adjective Clause with Object Possession, Time and Place Replacements.....	236
Picture 4.23	Reduction of Adjective Clause.....	237
Picture 4.24	Syllabus and Lesson Plan.....	257
Picture 4.25	Lecturers' Book.....	258
Picture 4.26	Students' Book.....	260
Picture 4.27	Briefing with Grammar Lecturer.....	263
Picture 4.28	Practicality Test in Class IIIA.....	264
Picture 4.29	Complex Sentence Text.....	265
Picture 4.30	Samples of Students' Answers in Analyzing Task...	268
Picture 4.31	Samples of Students' Production Task.....	269
Picture 4.32	Samples of Students' Homework.....	270
Picture 4.33	Sample of Additional Pictures at Production Task...	271
Picture 4.34	Sample of Glossary.....	271
Picture 4.35	After Revision.....	272
Picture 4.36	Before Revision	272
Picture 4.37	During Treatment.....	275
Picture 4.38	Final Model of TEBGIM.....	276

Picture 4.39	Final Syllabus and Lesson Plan.....	276
Picture 4.40	Final Lecturers' Book.....	277
Picture 4.41	Final Students' Book.....	277
Picture 4.42	Samples of Students' Pretest Answer Sheet.....	284
Picture 4.43	Samples of Students' Posttest Answer Sheet.....	285
Picture 4.44	Revision of Students' Book Cover.....	298
Picture 4.45	Revision of Lecturers' Book Cover	299
Picture 4.46	Samples of Before and After Revision.....	300

List of Tables

Name of Tables	Page
Table 2.1 Subordinators of Noun Clause.....	28
Table 2.2 Pattern of Adverbial Clause.....	31
Table 2.3 Procedure of TEBGIM.....	67
Table 2.4 Example of Task Types.....	71
Table 2.5 Comparing Behaviorist and Cognitivist Views on Learning.....	85
Table 3.1 Activities at Defining Stage.....	106
Table 3.2 Activities at Designing Stage.....	109
Table 3.3 Names of Validators.....	112
Table 3.4 Activities at Developing Stage.....	112

Table 3.5	Rubric to Validate Model Book.....	114
Table 3.6	Rubric to Validate Syllabus and Lesson Plan.....	114
Table 3.7	Rubric to Validate Lecturers' Book.....	115
Table 3.8	Rubric to Validate Students' Book.....	115
Table 3.9	Rubric to Reveal Lecturer's Book Practicality.....	116
Table 3.10	Rubric to Reveal Students' Book Practicality.....	117
Table 3.11	Practicality Test.....	119
Table 3.12	Control-Group Pre-test-Post-test Design.....	120
Table 3.13	Subject of Field Testing.....	121
Tabel 3.14	Rubric of Lecturer's Interview Guide.....	122
Table 3.15	Rubric of Students' Interview Guide.....	125
Table 3.16	Rubric of Observation Sheet.....	127
Table 3.17	Rubric of Questionnaire.....	128
Table 3.18	Type of Grammar Test.....	131
Table 3.19	Rubric of Grammar Test.....	131
Table 3.20	Rubric of Students' Book Practicality.....	136

Table 3.21	Rubric of Lecturer’s Book Practicality.....	137
Table 3.22	Instrument Validation Results.....	138
Table 3.23	Four-D Model as Research and Development Model.....	140
Table 3.24	Level of Validation.....	151
Table 3.25	Level of Reliability.....	152
Table 3.26	Level of ICC.....	152
Table 3.27	Level of Practicality.....	153
Table 3.28	Design of the Research.....	153
Table 4.1	Students’ Grammar Achievement.....	164
Table 4.2	Students’ Difficulties in Grammar Instruction.....	171
Table 4.3	Skills and Sub-skills Needed.....	178
Table 4.4	Grammar Topics.....	179
Table 4.5	Grammar Book Material.....	181
Table 4.6	Result Analysis of Defining Stage.....	185
Table 4.7	The Relationship between the Defining and TEBGIM Design.....	190
Table 4.8	Activities in Designing Stages.....	191

Table 4.9	TEBGIM Frame.....	198
Table 4.10	Syllabus and Lesson Plan Frames.....	210
Table 4.11	Lecturer's Book Frame.....	218
Table 4.12	Students' Book Frame.....	221
Table 4.13	Steps in Development Stage.....	238
Table 4.14	Names of Validators.....	239
Table 4.15	Suggestion toward Model Book Instrument	240
Table 4.16	Stages of Learning.....	254
Table 4.17	Suggestions toward Syllabus and Lesson Plan.....	256
Table 4.18	Suggestions toward Lecturers' Book.....	257
Table 4.19	Suggestions toward Students' Book.....	259
Table 4.20	Result of Lecturer's Questionnaire.....	260
Table 4.21	Result of Students' Questionnaire.....	262
Table 4.22	Complex Sentence Rule.....	266
Table 4.23	The Concept of Complex Sentences.....	267
Table 4.24	Sample of Language Revisions.....	273
Table 4.25	Model Book Validation.....	278

Table 4.26	Suggestions toward Model Book.....	279
Table 4.27	Syllabus and Lesson Plan Validation.....	280
Table 4.28	Suggestions toward Syllabus and Lesson Plan	280
Table 4.29	Lecturers' Book Validation.....	281
Table 4.30	Suggestions toward Lecturers' Book.....	281
Table 4.31	Students' Book Validation.....	281
Table 4.32	Suggestions toward Students' Book.....	282
Table 4.33	Lecturers' Book Practicality.....	283
Table 4.34	Students' Book Practicality.....	283
Table 4.35	Result of Validity of Model Book.....	286
Table 4.36	Result of Reliability of Model Book.....	285
Table 4.37	Result of Model Book ICC.....	287
Table 4.38	Result of Validity of Syllabus and Lesson Plan.....	288
Table 4.39	Result of Reliability of Syllabus and Lesson Plan ...	288
Table 4.40	Result of Syllabus and Lesson Plan ICC.....	288
Table 4.41	Result of Validity of Lecturers' Book.....	289
Table 4.42	Result of Reliability of Lecturers' Book.....	289

Table 4.43	Result of Lecturers' Book ICC.....	290
Table 4.44	Result of Validity of Students' Book.....	291
Table 4.45	Result of Reliability of Students' Book	291
Table 4.46	Result of Students' Book ICC.....	291
Table 4.47	Result of Lecturers' Book Practicality ICC.....	293
Table 4.48	Result of Validity of Students' Book Practicality ...	294
Table 4.49	Result of Reliability of Students' Book Practicality..	294
Table 4.50	Result of Students' Book Practicality ICC.....	294
Table 4.51	Normality Test.....	296
Table 4.52	Homogeneity Test.....	296
Table 4.53	Independent Samples Test.....	297

List of Appendices

Name of Appendices		Page
Appendix 1	Input during Proposal Seminar.....	336

Appendix 2	Research Approval Letter	337
Appendix 3	Letter of Doing Research	338
Appendix 4	Letter of Research Validators	339
Appendix 5	Letter of Advisor	343
Appendix 6	Students' Grammar II Achievement	348
Appendix 7	Lecture's Interview Guideline	356
Appendix 8	Transcript of Lecture's Interview	358
Appendix 9	Rubric of Lectures' Interview Validation	370
Appendix 10	Evidences of Lecture's Interview Validation	371
Appendix 11	Recapitulation of Lectures' Interview Validation ...	380
Appendix 12	SPSS Output on Lectures' Interview Validation	381
Appendix 13	Observation Guideline	382
Appendix 14	Observation Result	383
Appendix 15	Evidence of Doing Observation	385
Appendix 16	Rubric of Observation Validity	386
Appendix 17	Evidences of Observation Validation	387

Appendix 18	Recapitulation of Observation Validation	396
Appendix 19	SPSS Output on Observation Validation	397
Appendix 20	Rubric of Students' Interview	398
Appendix 21	Transcript of Students' Interview	399
Appendix 22	Rubric to Identify Students' Interview Validation ...	441
Appendix 23	Evidences of Students' Interview Validation	442
Appendix 24	Recapitulation of Students' Interview Validation ...	451
Appendix 25	SPSS Output on Students' Interview Validation	452
Appendix 26	Questionnaire Guideline	453
Appendix 27	Samples of Students' Questionnaire Answers	454
Appendix 28	Questionnaire Analysis	458
Appendix 29	Rubric of Questionnaire Validation	459
Appendix 30	Evidences of Questionnaire Validation	460
Appendix 31	Recapitulation of Questionnaire Validation	472
Appendix 32	SPSS Output of Questionnaire Validation	473
Appendix 33	Test-Rubric	474

Appendix 34	Try-Out, Pre-Test and Post-Test Questions	475
Appendix 35	Test Answer Keys	490
Appendix 36	Try-Out Attendance List	494
Appendix 37	Try-Out Scores	495
Appendix 38	Try-Out Analysis	496
Appendix 39	Samples of Students' Answer Sheet in Try-Out	497
Appendix 40	Rubric of Test Validation	500
Appendix 41	Evidences of Test Validation	501
Appendix 42	Recapitulation of Test Validation	513
Appendix 43	SPSS Output on Test Validation	514
Appendix 44	Rubric to Validate Model Book Instrument.....	515
Appendix 45	Evidences of Model Book Instrument Validation ...	516
Appendix 46	Recapitulation of Model Book Instrument Validation.....	528
Appendix 47	SPSS Output of Model Book Instrument Validation.	529
Appendix 48	Rubric to Validate Model Book	530
Appendix 49	Evidences of Model Book Validation	531

Appendix 50	Recapitulation of Model Book Validation	571
Appendix 51	SPSS Output on Model Book Validation	576
Appendix 52	Rubric to Identify Syllabus and Lesson Plan Instrument	577
Appendix 53	Evidences of Syllabus and Lesson Plan Instrument Validation.....	578
Appendix 54	Recapitulation of Syllabus and Lesson Plan Instrument Validation	587
Appendix 55	SPSS Output on Syllabus and Lesson Plan Instrument Validation	588
Appendix 56	Rubric to Identify Syllabus and Lesson Plan Validation	589
Appendix 57	Evidences of Syllabus and Lesson Plan Validation..	590
Appendix 58	Recapitulation of Syllabus and Lesson Plan Validation	599
Appendix 59	SPSS Output on Syllabus and Lesson Plan Validation	601
Appendix 60	Rubric to Identify Lectures' Book Instrument Validity	602
Appendix 61	Evidences of Lectures' Book Instrument Validity...	603
Appendix 62	Recapitulation of Lectures' Book Instrument Validity	612

Appendix 63	SPSS Output on Lectures' Book Instrument Validity	613
Appendix 64	Rubric to Identify Lectures' Book Validity	614
Appendix 65	Evidences of Lectures' Book Validity	615
Appendix 66	Recapitulation of Lectures' Book Validity	635
Appendix 67	SPSS Output on Lectures' Book Validity	637
Appendix 68	Rubric to Identify Students' Book Instrument Validity	638
Appendix 69	Evidences of Students' Book Instrument Validity ...	639
Appendix 70	Recapitulation of Students' Book Instrument Validity	648
Appendix 71	SPSS Output on Students' Book Instrument Validity	649
Appendix 72	Rubric to Identify Students' Book Validity	650
Appendix 73	Evidences of Students' Book Validity	651
Appendix 74	Recapitulation of Students' Book Validity	671
Appendix 75	SPSS Output on Students' Book Validity	673
Appendix 76	Rubric to Identify Lectures' Book Practicality Instrument Validity	674

Appendix 77	Evidences of Lectures' Book Practicality Instrument Validity.....	675
Appendix 78	Recapitulation of Lectures' Book Practicality Instrument Validity	687
Appendix 79	SPSS Output of Lectures' Book Practicality Instrument Validity	688
Appendix 80	Rubric to Identify Lectures' Book Practicality	689
Appendix 81	Evidences of Lectures' Book Practicality	690
Appendix 82	Recapitulation of Lectures' Book Practicality	693
Appendix 83	SPSS Output of Lectures' Book Practicality	694
Appendix 84	Rubric to Identify Students' Book Practicality Instrument Validity	695
Appendix 85	Evidences of Students' Book Practicality Instrument Validity.....	696
Appendix 86	Recapitulation of Students' Book Practicality Instrument Validity	708
Appendix 87	SPSS Output of Students' Book Practicality Instrument Validity.....	709
Appendix 88	Rubric to Identify Students' Book Practicality	710
Appendix 89	Evidences of Students' Book Practicality	711

Appendix 90	Recapitulation of Students' Book Practicality	726
Appendix 91	SPSS Output of Students' Book Practicality	727
Appendix 92	Scores in Pre-Test and Post-Test.....	728
Appendix 93	Letter of Having Done the Research.....	729
Appendix 94	Input during Dissertation Seminar.....	730

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

A. Background of the Problem

It is believed that knowledge of grammar can significantly assist language learners in comprehending and acquiring the target language. It can provide them with the insights of how the linguistic elements of target language work to form meaningful and acceptable use of it, by which they can use to express their ideas

in written form. As proposed by Weaver (1996:9), 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 is important part in helping students acquiring the target language.

Despite helping students to gain mastery over the target language, the process of grammar instruction has long been debated and studied in the history of language teaching. Some decline its practicality; others maintain it. This long debated issue has contributed to the process of grammar instruction in the EFL field since many approaches, methods, and models, each with its own premise, have been proposed to aid students in the learning process.

However, of all those proposed, a new current trend emerged in 1990's and has been widely used and regarded ever since, which is known focus on form (FonF) first defined by Long (1991:45) as drawing students' attention to linguistic elements as they arise incidentally in lessons whose overriding focus is on meaning or communication. In other words, focus on form takes place when students who are involved in performing tasks requiring understanding or conveying a particular message at some point concentrate their attention on formal features of the language.

Focus on form (FonF) emerges in response to the problems presented by traditional approaches to the teaching grammar (accuracy without fluency) and dissatisfaction with purely communication approaches on the other (fluency without accuracy). Long (1991) proposed an approach which he termed focus on

form (FonF) differs from focus on forms (FonFs) and focus on meaning; even though for common people these terms are the same. Focus on forms (FonFs) is equated with traditional teaching of discrete points of grammar in separate lessons. Focus on meaning emphasizes pure meaning-based activities with no attention to form and is based on the assumption that learners are able to analyze language inductively. Conversely, focus on form (FonF) meets optimal conditions for learning by drawing students' attention to linguistic forms in the context of meaningful communication.

Another notion about grammar instruction related to FonF is proposed by Sharwood Smith known as consciousness raising and later called input enhancement. Nunan (2003:153) & Mayén (2013:85) claim that input enhancement is one of FonF grammar instruction techniques. However, the difference between the two is to be found. Nunan (2003:153) suggests that these two grammar teaching techniques enable students to gain mastery over the target structure by drawing their attention to it through specified design tasks. Regardless of this shared premise, the former integrates the grammar instruction process to the communicative function while the latter puts much emphasis on bringing up students explicit knowledge of target grammar without an immediate demand to produce it.

Although FonF and input enhancement differ about the necessity to require students to produce an immediate target structure, the two agree that grammar instructional process requires the exposure of language input by which the students attention is drawn. Nassaji & Fotos (2011:20) assert that the

importance of language input in second language acquisition has become a major consensus among applied linguists, so the exposure to grammatical input is essential in grammar instruction. VanPatten in Nassaji & Fotos (2011:20) proposes input in language teaching that can be seen as the language that the learners see or hear to which they attend for its message. Therefore, any material used in grammar instruction can be regarded as the language input which can be utilized to improve students' grammatical competence.

In the process of teaching grammar, teachers need to focus not only on presenting the input but also transferring it into intake and output. Schmidt (1990:132), Mayen (2013,) Sharwood-Smith and Truscott (2014) agree that there are three levels of consciousness applied in the process of drawing students' attention toward language input. The three levels are perception, noticing, and understanding. Perception is the level where the information or input is processed. Noticing as rehearsal in short term memory is defined by Nassaji & Fotos (2011:21) as conscious registration of the forms in memory. The next level is understanding that is grasping the meanings of rules and becoming thoroughly familiar with learners. Intake, on the other hand, refers to part of the input that the learners has noticed and has stored in their working memory for further processing (Nassaji & Fotos 2011). Hence, intake is what becomes the basis of language learning, and the linguistic resources that the students will use in the language output or production. How the three levels of consciousness are related to transferring input into output is argued by Schmidt (1990) as $\text{input} + \text{noticing} = \text{intake}$.

In order to make students notice and understand language input and transfer it into take, the input needs to be exposed in a way that can easily draw students' attention into it. One of techniques in presenting input in grammar instruction is known as textual enhancement (TE) or visual input enhancement. Nassaji & Fotos (2011:36) state that textual input enhancement is aimed to raise learners' attention to linguistic forms by rendering input perceptually more salient by highlighting certain aspects of input by means of various typographic devices, such as bolding, underlining, and italicizing in written input, or acoustic devices such as added stress or repetition in oral input. By modifying the input, it is assumed that the students will be able to notice it easily.

Considering the importance of grammar competence and presenting input in grammar instruction, it is suggested that the lecturers of Grammar in English education department of IAIN Bukittinggi need to pay more attention to input exposure to the students. As the students who learn English in higher level and who will become English teachers, the requirement to comprehend grammar is undisputable for them. However, the fact remains that the students still lack of grammatical competence. Lack knowledge of grammar makes their language production ignorant and committed errors of English sentence structures particularly in complex sentences as illustrated in the following data:

1. He left the car on the street *that he had just bought*.
2. A teacher *who teach* young children *need* a lot of patience.
3. The movie *that we saw it* last night won Oscar for the best film of the year.
4. Several hundred computer companies *which are located in the city which is not really a valley*.
5. The waiter *who customers had complained about* was fired.

The data shown in these examples are clearly incorrect since sentence 1 does not place an adjective clause *that he had just bought* after its antecedent and as close as to it so that it is not clear whether the adjective clause modifies car or street. Sentence 2 the verb *teach* does not agree with its antecedent *a teacher*. The antecedent *a teacher* is singular but the verbs *teach* and *need* are plural. Sentence 3 comes up with the error of double pronouns. When writing the adjective clause, it is not allowed to use double pronouns; the personal pronoun can be changed with a relative pronoun. Sentences 4 and 5 have problems in sentence fragment and incorrect relative pronoun. So, these incorrect data can be corrected like these:

1. He left the car *that he had just bought* on the street.
2. A teacher *who teaches* young children *needs* a lot of patience.
3. The movie *that we saw* last night won Oscar for the best film of the year.
4. Several hundred computer companies *are located in the city which is not really a valley*.
5. The waiter *whom customers had complained about* was fired.

Considering data above, the researcher assumes that English complex sentence is quite difficult for students to understand (Izumi, 2002). In fact, the use of complex sentence in writing and speaking is unavoidable since it is impossible for someone to use simple sentence merely in both productive skills (Roza, 2015). That is why it is important for lecturers that they be creative in designing their grammar instruction to supply many exposures of language in the classroom which can be noticed by students and further becoming intake for them. One of the ways is through enhancing texts that contain adjective clause, noun clause and

adverbial clause as the dependent clauses (English complex sentences) though manipulation of typography larger type sizes, different types of font, colors, bold, underline or italic in order to draw students' attention to the feature of form.

Referring to the curriculum book of Tarbiyah faculty at IAIN Bukittinggi, the curriculum executed here is based on curriculum 2013 which is colored mainly by Islamic themes. So, all contents in each subject should be integrated with religion, science and culture. It means when a lecturer teaches a subject for instance grammar, she/ he should provide contexts and examples dealing with religion and culture which support the vision of institution to be professional, religious and cultured. (Burhannuuddin, et.al: 2016)

Moreover, the reason why the research is going to be conducted at English students of IAIN Bukittinggi is due to problems found there. One core competence that is demanded to be owned by them is able to master complex sentences and apply them in production correctly. In fact, the reality talks others which exhibit many students were unable to attain the core competence predetermined. Many students were still difficult to create complex sentences that contain dependent clauses functioning as adjective (Bee Eng, 2014 and Phoocharoensil, 2016, noun and adverb in the sentences (Abdollahi, et.al, 2016). The data can be seen in the previous paragraph.

Based on researcher's observation and interview with two grammar lecturers as well as her own grammar teaching experience at IAIN Bukittinggi, the process of teaching grammar was still conducted conventionally i.e lecturer-

centered. Lecturers dominated the class by their talking time 70 % of the total talk and gave less opportunity for students (Cook, 2000, Getachew and Davidson, 2014, Hitotuzi, 2015). Grammar was taught deductively with focus on usage rather than use. In other words, students were demanded to know and memorize the grammatical rules and syntactic patterns of the target language (Jean and Simard, 2012). Despite demanding students to know the rules, the lecturers seemed not to really consider whether their students had understood the rules or noticed the given grammatical features (Roza, 2014).

Furthermore, grammatical points taught were held in discussion form in which a group presented the material and ran the learning process. The lecturers only stood at the back of the classroom and clarified some points discussed, and sometimes they did not elaborate the material. Such process inevitably made students grammatical knowledge low as they only had the grammatical input from their peers whose knowledge were not really different from theirs (Long, 2002, Zamani, 2015)

The instructional book used in grammar teaching did not seem to present students with good input exposure either. In the learning process, lecturers used grammar books designed in PPP (presentation, practice, and production) grammar teaching model, even sometimes they used the book about theoretical grammar, which only exposed students to linguistic foundation of English grammar. (Howard, 2004)

Lack knowledge in grammar could be seen in students' final mark in which more than half of them (65%) failed to achieve the good grade. The similar problem also had impact on students' language production (Tami, 2016 and Vani, 2016). They often produced language in a way that is grammatically unacceptable as illustrated in the previous data. In conclusion, grammar instruction in English Department of IAIN Bukittinggi does not incorporate the exposure of appropriate and beneficial language input by which students' attention is drawn to notice the target structure that is furtherly transferred into intake used in acceptable and accurate students' output or language production.

Among many aspects that should be evaluated, the researcher sees the main problem for this research to take place is because of availability of learning resources. Lecturers and students seemed not maximize to dig the better learning resources for them. So, the researcher needs to solve it by providing grammar learning materials through this research and development. She designs and develops a model for grammar instruction with main **focus on form** and **focus on meaning** as optimal conditions for learning by drawing students' attention to linguistic forms in the context of meaningful communication previously mentioned **FonF** by applying textual enhancement to the Islamic thematic texts. These texts are modified by using boldface, coloring and other devices which can make the grammar features noticeable for students. If they can notice, the learning process will eventually become intake and output, (Thornburry, 1999)

Previous studies have examined the effectiveness of textual enhancement in second language learning. Such studies have investigated types of

enhancement, the nature of the input, the cognitive processing involved in input processing, and their effects on both noticing and learning. One of the studies that examined the effect of textual enhancement (Jourdenais et al., 1995) investigated whether or not textual enhancement had any effect on noticing and learners' processing of target forms. Two groups of Spanish learners were assigned to an enhanced group and a comparison group respectively. The enhancement group received a text in which instances of the target forms (Spanish preterit and imperfect verbs) were typographically highlighted; the enhancement group received the same text with no enhancement. The learners who received the enhanced text outperformed than those who received the unenhanced text in both noticing and subsequent production of the target forms.

Still in 1995, Alanen examined the effect of textual enhancement versus explicit instruction on the acquisition of Finnish locative features and consonant gradation. Four groups of learners participated in the study: a group that received textual enhancement only, a group that received explicit instruction, a group that received both types of treatment, and a group that did not receive any treatment. The study found that the textual enhancement group benefited most from the treatment.

White (1998) examined the effects of textual enhancement on learning third person singular possessives in English among French speaking learners. The study involved 10 hours of instruction in which learners were exposed to textually enhanced target forms in their reading activities. It was found that textual

enhancement promoted noticing of the target forms but did not have a significant effect on developing learners' knowledge of the target structures.

A more recent study (Simard, 2009) investigated the effects of different forms of textual enhancement on learners' learning of English plural markers among French-speaking learners. The result showed that the effects of textual enhancement varied depending on the target form and the number of enhancements. Textual enhancement was most effective when a combination of formats was used. This study suggests that different forms of textual enhancement may have different effects on L2 learning.

Even though there are several studies conducted on the effect of textual enhancement toward grammar features, the researcher still needs to carry out further research to solve the problems through **Textual Enhancement-Based Grammar Instructional Model (TEBGIM) for Complex Sentences at English Education Department of IAIN Bukittinggi in the academic year 2016/2017.** As previously suggested, textual enhancement eases students in noticing target structure input to transfer it into intake and language output. This notion is suitable to the students as the grammar instruction they have experienced still fails to make them notice the taught grammatical point let alone transfer it into intake. By conducting this research, that is research and development (R & D) as the systematic study to produce instructional products and tools, the products expected are learning devices (syllabus and lesson plan), Textual Enhancement-Based Grammar Instruction Model (TEBGIM) book, lecturers' book and

students' workbook. These research products are expected to be beneficial for grammar instruction.

B. Identification of the Problem

Based on background of the problem, there are some problems that are found in teaching grammar at English education department of IAIN Bukittinggi:

1. Grammar was still taught conventionally. It means lecturers explained the material since beginning to introduce new lesson so that lecturers' talk dominated the class with their talking time 70 % of the total talk to present the grammar material explicitly and gave less opportunity for students to use it in the real communication. Lecturers serve as source of knowledge while students serve as passive receivers. In other word, grammar learning looks like jug and mug and learning was very much seen as under the control of the lecturer.
2. Grammar instruction done still failed to make students aware of grammatical point taught. Since lecturers explained the grammar features in detail, students just received the information without realizing how the grammar feature was appeared and used. The way lecturer taught did not attract them to be aware of existence of grammar feature.
3. The instructional book used in grammar teaching did not seem to present students with good input exposure either. The book used was designed in discreet way or PPP (presentation, practice, production)

model which presents grammar rules for the first, practicing the rules, and producing language in lack of context. The design of book pictured out the way lecturer taught in the classroom because she used it in teaching.

4. Students' grammar final mark in which more than half of them (65%) failed to achieve the good grade. Many of them got low score in grammar subject, so that they needed to recourse.
5. Students' language production was erroneous since their grammatical knowledge was highly limited. Students committed many errors of complex sentences in their writing production.
6. Grammar lecturers did not really pay attention to present language input and transfer it into intake and output in the instructional process. To transfer language input into intake, it needs students' attention and noticing to the input so that they think it in their working memory so that it becomes output then.

C. Limitation of the Problem

Based on the identification of problems, the researcher limits the scope of the problem to be researched in the instructional book used in grammar teaching did not seem to present students with good input exposure. Lecturers used limited grammar learning resources in their classes. The materials in the book did not

meet the criteria of good text book for grammar learning which is presented in PPP model or discreet way. Based on these phenomena, the researcher developed grammar model instruction by enhancing language input in this case texts containing complex sentences by using various typographic devices, such as bolding, underlining, italicizing, or coloring in order to draw students' attention to notice it and process it to become intake and output. The topic of complex sentences was compatible with syllabus grammar III. This limitation was administered by the researcher for some reasons that there was not yet textual enhancement researched for that topic and inadequacy of researcher in time, energy and funds for wider context of the research object.

D. Formulation of the Problem

Based on limitation of the problem above, the problem of the research is formulated, "What model is suitable for teaching grammar III which is valid, practical and effective in promoting students' mastery in grammar for English education department students at IAIN Bukittinggi? In detail, this research problem is specified into several questions below:

1. What are problems related to the model of teaching that is currently used in the grammar instruction at IAIN Bukittinggi?
2. What is the design of the prototype model of instruction that can help solve the problem of instruction?
3. How is the model developed seen from validity and practicality?
4. Is the developed Textual Enhancement-Based Grammar Instructional Model (TEBGIM) effective in promoting students' grammar mastery?

E. Purpose of the Research

The aim of this present research is to develop a model for grammar instruction of complex sentences for students taking Grammar III subject at the English education department of IAIN Bukittinggi. The model is developed based on input enhancement. The developed model is aimed at creating a more effective grammar instruction that enables students to notice a particular grammatical structure and consequently gain mastery over the taught point. More specifically, this research is aimed at:

- a) Finding out problems related to the model of teaching that is currently used in the grammar instruction at English education department of IAIN Bukittinggi.
- b) Designing a model of instruction.
- c) Developing Textual Enhancement-Based Grammar Instruction Model (TEBGIM) for complex sentences by applying Four-D Model instructional model through process of validity and practicality tests.
- d) Finding out the effect of the model developed toward students' grammar mastery by conducting a quasi-experimental research.

F. Significance of the Research

By the end of this research, the finding is hoped to give benefit theoretically to many people such as English students, grammar lecturers and other researchers. It can improve their theoretical knowledge and understanding on the essence of Textual Enhancement-based Grammar Instructional Model

(TEBGIM) that draws students' attention to particular grammar features and enables students to the mastery over the taught point especially complex sentences.

Practically, this research might be used by grammar lecturers as a solution for problem in the grammar teaching where there is not yet sufficient model book designed for college students especially dealing with English complex sentences. Similarly, the students may use the model as their reference for learning resources for complex sentences which are considered difficult topic for them. Additionally, other researchers may use this research as the basis for the next research.

At last but not the least, the significance of the research is for the researcher herself to fulfill one of the requirements to obtain Doctoral Degree in Education Study Program.

G. Specification of the Product

The products expected from this research as mentioned in the background are Instructional product (syllabus and lesson plan), Textual Enhancement-based Grammar Instructional Model (TEBGIM), Lecturer's Book (LB) and Students' Book (SB). The TEBGIM is developed in accordance with the curriculum of Tarbiyah Faculty at IAIN Bukittinggi that is curriculum 2013. The TEBGIM presents the theory of teaching model which consists of components of teaching model, they are syntax, principle of reaction, social system, support system and effects of model (instructional and nurturing effects) of TEBGIM.

The syntax of textual enhancement is in line with syntax of information processing teaching model of concept attainment model (CAM) Model;

preparation, implementation, and evaluation. In the preparation step, there are five principles of designing textual enhancement fulfilled namely selecting a particular point the students need to notice of; highlighting that feature in the text; not highlighting many different forms as they distract students' attention; using strategies to keep students' attention from meaning; not providing any additional metalinguistic explanation. In implementation, there are five tasks or activities carried out, they are attending task, noticing task, analyzing task, checking task, and production task.; and in evaluation there are two steps with two activities carried out by students.

The principle of reaction of TEMBGIM arouses students' activeness in the classroom since the role of lecturer is only as facilitator. Students find the rules by noticing the enhanced texts and discussing with their peers. Moreover, the support systems needed in TEBGIM are students need to have the grammar books and read a lot becoming to the classroom; and effects of model are improvement in grammar achievement, lively and meaningful learning as instructional effect and at last but not the least, the TEBGIM arouses students' consciousness of certain grammar features, increases noticing ability and critical thinking in analyzing texts as the nurturing effects.

Furthermore, lecturer's book (LB) provides readers with Islamic texts that contain complex sentences inside. The grammar features are made salient or noticeable by using various typographic devices, such as bolding, underlining, and italicizing and coloring to draw reader's attention. The other specification of the lecturer's book is equipped with lesson plan for each lesson and also completed

with answer keys of the task or exercise to help lecturers in guiding and scoring the students.

Furthermore, students' workbook has its own specification with full of texts and tasks. Some of the texts are also accompanied by pictures and beautiful color. By providing these products in grammar instruction, the process of learning is expected to be effective and practical.

H. Explanation of the Key Terms

The key terms used in the research are explained as follow:

- a. Textual Enhancement is a model of grammar instruction which is based on enhancing language input in this case texts by using various typographic devices, such as bolding, underlining, italicizing, or coloring in order to draw students' attention to notice it and process it to become intake and output. (Nassaji & Fotos 2011:36).
- b. Grammar Instruction is the process of teaching grammar III at the English education department of IAIN Bukittinggi in academic year 2016/2017. It involves textual enhancement that draws learners' attention to some specific grammatical features in such a way that it helps them either to understand the features metalinguistically and or process them in comprehension and production so that they can internalize the features. (Myskowska and Pawlak, 2012).
- c. English Complex Sentence is a multiple sentence in which one or more subordinate clauses are embedded. It consists of a main clause or an

independent clause and a subordinate clause or a dependent clause like noun, adjective and adverb clauses (Patricia, 2007)

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURES

A. Review of the Related Theories