

**THE EFFECTIVENESS OF DRILLING TECHNIQUE IN USING SIMPLE PRESENT
TENSE CORRECTLY: AN EXPERIMENTAL STUDY AT THE ELEVENTH GRADE
OF SMAN 8 MATARAM IN ACADEMIC YEAR 2015/2016**



ARTICLE

*Submitted as a Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for Bachelor Degree in English
Department Faculty of Teacher Training and Education University of Mataram*

By:

HARNI SURIYANI
NIM : E1D 012 021

**ENGLISH EDUCATION PROGRAM
LANGUAGE AND ART DEPARTMENT
FACULTY OF TEACHER TRAINING AND EDUCATION
UNIVERSITY OF MATARAM
2016**

RATIFICATION

The article entitled “ **The Effectiveness of Drilling Technique in Using Simple Present Tense Correctly: An Experimental Study at the Eleventh Grade of SMAN 8 Mataram in Academic Year 2015/2016** ” by Harni Suriyani (E1D012021) has been approved to be examined on May 2016

By the board examiners:

First Consultant



Dr. Sudirman Wilian, MA
NIP. 19590505198521001

**The Effectiveness of Drilling Technique in Using Simple Present Tense Correctly: An
Experimental Study at the Eleventh Grade of SMAN 8 Mataram**

Harni Suriyani

E1D 012 021

Harni499@gmail.com

Dr. Sudirman Wilian, MA

Edy Syahrial,S.pd.,MA

Abstrak: Tujuan dari penelitian ini adalah untuk mencari tahu kegunaan dari drilling tehnik dalam penggunaan simple present tense. Penelitian dilakukan pada pada kelas XI SMAN 8 Mataram tahun ajaran 2015/2016. Selama melaksanakan penelitian, penulis menggunakan metode kuantitatif untuk mengetahui apakah drilling tehnik efektif atau tidak. 2 kelas dipilih secara acak sebagai sampel, yaitu kelas XI IPA 1 (kelas kontrol), dan XI IPA 3 (kelas eksperimen). Tehnik drilling diaplikasikan pada kelas eksperimen selama melakukan penelitian, sementara kelas yang lainnya tidak. Guna mendapatkan data yang dibutuhkan, peneliti akan memberikan pre-test dan post-test pada setiap kelas, yang kemudian menganalisa secara mendalam data yang didapatkan. Setelah analisa dilakukan, ternyata hasilnya menyatakan bahwa drilling tehnik efektif dalam penggunaan simple presente tense dengan benar pada confidence level .05(95%) sama dengan 1.681.

Abstract: The aim of this research was to find out the use of drilling technique in using simple present tense correctly. The research was conducted at the eleventh grade of SMAN 8 Mataram in academic year 2015/2016. During the research, the writer used Quantitative Method to find out whether drilling technique is effective in using simple present tense correctly or not. Two classes of the eleventh grade were taken randomly as sample, and they were XI IPA 1 (Control Group) and XI IPA 3 (Experimental Group). The drilling technique was applied in the Experimental Group during the experiment, while in the other class was not. In order to gain the data needed, the researcher delivered pre-test and post-test to both classes, and did throughout analysis. However, as a result, it was found that drilling technique is effective in using simple present tense correctly at the confidence level of .05 (95%) equal to 1.681.

Key words: drilling technique, grammar, and Audio-lingual Method.

A. INTRODUCTION

Language is a very important aspect in our lives. Collins COBUILD Dictionary (2006) defines language as a “system of communication which consists of a set of sounds and written symbols which are used by the people of a particular country or region for talking or writing”. It is a medium of shaping thoughts, emotions and perceptions; building friendships, cultural ties, and economic relationships; expressing the social identity of the speaker, and many more depending on the intention of the speakers (Kilgour, 1999). There are so many countries in this world and all of them consist of a wide variety of languages. However, a universal language which is accepted throughout the globe in order to unite all the countries is English.

As an international language, English has been taught to so many people in this world whether as first language, second language or foreign language. English has become so globally widespread through education. In Indonesia, English is taught as a foreign language which nowadays introduced and taught in kindergarten until a high-level educational institution. In the process of becoming so globally widespread, English is not only taught in the school but also in English courses. Nowadays, there are so many English courses for those who seriously want to master English.

In order to master English well, students should know four skills, they are listening, speaking, reading, and writing. Those skills also contain language aspects such as phonology, pronunciation, vocabulary and grammar. Long and Richards (1987) add that it cannot be ignored that grammar plays a central role in the four language skills and vocabulary to establish communicative tasks. Therefore, to be able to master all of the four skills students should have a well knowledge of Grammar.

Grammar may consists of such types of tenses, active and passive voice, modals, degrees of comparison and others. Grammar, based on Oxford Dictionary (1995) is the whole system and structure of a language or of languages in general, usually taken as consisting of syntax and morphology or a set of prescriptive notions about correct use of a language. However, grammar itself is inherently difficult and confusing. A lot of students in senior high school still find it difficult in studying grammar. There are sixteen rules of tenses that must be mastered by the students in senior high school and one of them is simple present tense. Eastwood (2002: 49) states that simple present tense is used for expressing the repeated actions, thought, feelings, states, permanent facts and routine. However, we can say that simple present tense is one of the simplest tenses in grammar.

The fact that grammar is difficult and confusing is true. This is proven by the fact that they can't even distinguish the use of verb be "am, is, are" and other verbs in simple present tense. They often do not understand why some sentences use verb be "am, is and are" instead of other verbs such as "do , does, have and has". Moreover, most of students were confused in distinguishing which subject used verbs do and which one used does. Most of the students still chose "She is speak English" instead of saying "She speaks English"

However, they are still poor in understanding about simple present tense. The problem often gets worse because the teacher is not able to give good explanation when she or he is teaching grammar because of their ways of teaching which is more like "giving and memorizing formula" which can't be understood for most of the students.

Due to the problem mentioned, the researcher conducts a research referencing to technique in using simple present tense correctly using drilling technique in modelling and drilling the students in the hope of improving students' grammar mastery especially simple present tense.

B. METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This experimental research is aimed to provide the information about the role of Drilling technique to improve students' grammar mastery. The writer used a group as the sample of students who get no effect from the independent variable, as well as a sample which is being experimented. The design of experimental used is pre-test and post-test design. The pre-test was given to the sample group before they were given the treatment, and post-test was given after they were given it. The two results of the test then would be used as starting point in doing this research.

Population

Deciding the population that is going to be the sample is a crucial thing in doing this research. Population taken is described as all cases, individual, or situations which share one or even more characteristics (Nunan, 1992). In this research, the writer took all of the eleventh graders in 6 classes with the total number of population is 197 respondents.

Sample

“Sample is a division of individuals from a given population” (Nunan, 1992;27). In this research, the sample is two classes in the eleventh grade, the experimental group and the control group.

The classes that the writer chose are science classes which consist of 4 classes in total. To decide

two classes of the four, the researcher used Cluster random sampling as the technique. A lottery was used to choose them randomly from the four classes of science in SMA 8 MATARAM. In addition, the lottery would also decide which experimental group is and which control group is. The reason why the researcher chose this sampling technique is to increase the reliability of this research by preventing any assumption in the future about including personal feeling in choosing the classes.

Variables of The Study

Nunan (1992) stated that variable is a property or characteristic which may differ from individual to individual or from group to group. The main issue of research is to find out the strength of the relation between certain variables. Variable is divided into two kinds; the first is dependant variable, and the other one is independent variable. Independent variable is a variable that the experimenter expects to influence the other variable. On the other side, dependant variable is a variable upon which the independent variable is acting. (Nunan, 1992).

In this research, the independent variable was drilling technique, while the dependent variable was Simple Present Tense.

Method of Data Collection

Data collection is gained by giving the students questions about grammar (simple present tense). The focus of the questions themselves is whether the students can decide the right choice in order to make a good structured sentence or not.

In conducting the research to find out the researcher's desires about this study, there are three steps taken.

Three steps were applied and respectively presented as follows:

- **Pre-test**

The Pre-test was given in the first meeting by providing test to determine their knowledge of simple present tense. The pre-test consists of thirty questions about simple present tense.

- **Treatment**

The treatment was held twice a week for two weeks, twice in control group and also twice in experimental group. It was based on the PPP (Presentation, Practice and Production) technique.

The treatments given can be seen in lesson plans in appendices and the procedure of PPP (presentation, practice, production) technique that was used as follows:

1. Teacher gave a situation related to the topic
2. Teacher gave a short dialogue to the students
3. Teacher gave some questions related to the dialogue, and modeled the right answers which then was repeated by the students chorally and individually.
4. Teacher presented mechanical and meaningful drilling.
5. Teacher presented a situation where the students should use the new language in sentences of their own.

- **Post-test**

Post test was given in the last meeting of this research. The aim of giving post-test was that to find out the result of class taught using drilling technique and class taught without such

technique. Basically, the test given was the same test as the pre-test; however, difference was made by jumbling the sequence of the number.

Doing the three steps mentioned above has resulted in the scores of the students, followed by analysis of the data statistically. The result of the data has given information needed about the differences of the groups' performances before treatment and after treatment.

Method of Data Analysis

After gaining the scores of the data, T- Test formula was applied. First, the data of the two tests were listed in two columns and the analysis was made by using the following formulas;

Tabulating the scores (Pre-test and Post-test)

$$S = \frac{R}{N} \times 100$$

Where;

S = score

R = Right answer

N = Total number of the test items

The score calculated, then was inserted into the table of data. Mean deviation is needed to do the next calculation.

Mean deviation formula of pre-test and post-test was calculated (Yusra, 2009)

Experimental Group:

$$X = \frac{\sum x}{n}$$

Nx

Where;

X = Mean deviation score of the experimental group

x = Deviation score of Pre-test and Post-test

Nx = Number of samples

Σ = the sum of ...

Controlled Group

$$Y = \frac{\Sigma y}{Ny}$$

Where;

Y = Mean deviation score for the control group

y = Deviation score of Pre-test and Post-test

Ny = Number of samples

Σ = the sum of...

The results of mean deviation score of the two groups were inserted into formula below to find the significance of two mean scores

$$t = \frac{X - Y}{\sqrt{\left[\frac{\Sigma x^2 + \Sigma y^2}{Nx + Ny - 2} \right] \left[\frac{1}{Nx} + \frac{1}{Ny} \right]}}$$

Where;

X = The mean deviation score of the experimental group

\bar{Y} = The mean deviation score of the control group

x^2 = The square deviation score of the experimental group

y^2 = The square deviation score of the control group

N_x = Number of samples of the experimental group

N_y = Number of samples of the control group

Σ = The sum of ...

Testing Hypothesis

The testing hypothesis is formulated below:

- a. If the mean score of Pre-test is lower than that of Post-test, then the alternate hypothesis (H_a) is accepted and the null hypothesis (H_0) is rejected.
- b. If the mean score of Pre-test is higher than that of Post-test, then the alternate hypothesis (H_a) is rejected and the null hypothesis (H_0) is accepted.
- c. If the t-test value is higher than the t-table value at the significance level of 0.01 and 0.05 it means that the technique gives positive effects.
- d. If the t-test value is lower than the t-table value at the significance level of 0.01 and 0.05 it means that the technique does not give positive effects.

C. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The data were gained during research conducted in both control group and experimental group of XI graders, SMAN 8 Mataram in the academic year of 2015/2016.

The research had been conducted for 2 weeks, or about 8 meetings of 90 minutes each. In details, 4 meetings were used to deliver the lessons while the other four were used to conduct the pre-test

and post-test. In the experimental group, the treatment was applied. The various drilling technique was conducted during teaching process. In contrast, the control group was not given any treatment with drilling technique, in order to provide the data needed in this research.

During the research, simple present tense was chosen as the topic, considering that simple present tense is the most basic tense. The pretest and post-test consisted of 30 questions about positive, negative and interrogative sentences in simple present tense.

The experiment had been conducted on March 28th, 30th, April 11th and 12th 2016 for both the experimental group (Class XI IPA 3) and the control group (Class XI IPA 1). The first meeting was on March 28th 2016 on both control and experimental groups. The students were given pre-test that consisted of 30 questions about simple present tense. The second meeting was on March 30th 2016. On that day, both of groups were led to play miming games first in order to introduce some vocabulary about verbs then they learned about verbal simple present tense as the treatment and daily activities as the topic but in that meeting, the control group was only given the usual explanation about verbal simple present tense while the experimental group was given the drilling as a technique. The third meeting was on April 11th 2016 in which both of groups also learned about verbal and nominal simple present tense which also began with miming games with professions or jobs as the topic. Besides, as usual, the control group was only given the usual explanation about verbal and nominal simple present tense while the experimental group was given drilling as a technique. The fourth meeting was on April 13th 2016 both of them were finally given a post-test.

Table 1: Pre- test and post- test of the Experimental and the Control Group

No	Experimental group	Pre- test	Post-test	Control group	Pre- test	Post-test
1	RR	56	87	VAY	29	28
2	AL	27	38	YA	4	13
3	NJ	24	56	GAY	13	18
4	AA	24	49	SR	7	32
5	GT	22	44	MA	15	24
6	NR	18	42	FO	7	27
7	NM	11	31	RN	13	18
8	YD	11	33	YD	17	54
9	SS	13	49	APS	2	23
10	MI	11	40	NDW	56	36
11	LS	18	28	DLP	53	60
12	AR	20	56	IAR	51	69
13	MR	53	63	DH	4	22
14	LR	53	73	SM	13	31
15	FD	29	49	AH	2	23
16	SF	24	46	FB	20	11
17	GWD	27	56	RC	78	93
18	MR	29	46	NAH	49	48
19	BSL	22	38	PGDD	13	58
20	LT	22	56	NKLYD	9	35
21	WK	7	42	ESW	18	25
22				TGDG	16	53
23				AF	18	62
24				NJ	11	27
Lowest score		7	31	2		11
Highest score		56	87	78		93
Average score		24.80952	48.67	21.583		36.875

score in the pre- test, which means that the difference between the control and experimental group's grammar mastery is not really far different. However, the result of the post- test showed that average score of the experimental group increased more significantly as compared to the control groups. Therefore, further analysis and calculation are needed in this research to find out value of the t-test, which then will be compared with the t- table

Table 2: The comparison between the t-test and t-table

Value of t-test	Value of t-table		
	Degree of freedom	.05 (Confidence level of 95%)	.01 (Confidence level of 99%)
2.225	43	1.681	2.416

The table above showed the correlation between number of participants (45) and degree of freedom 43, t-test result (2.225) that was higher than 1.681 in the t-table that corresponded to the confidence level of 95% and error margin (type 1 error) of 0.05 (5%). That means null hypothesis was rejected and the possibility of that rejection to be wrong due to mere sampling error was 5%.

Although this result indicated that drilling technique could increase students' grammar mastery especially simple present tense, it was not significant because it was below 99% confidence level. In order to be significant and successful, the result must reject null hypothesis at both 95% and 99%. This study only rejected null hypothesis at 95% and failed to reject it at 99%.

Therefore, this study concluded that drilling technique was effective in grammar learning at the confidence level of 95%.

The result of this experiment after the statistical calculation and t-test was 2.225. To find out how significant it was, the t-table was needed to refer to. It was shown on the t-table that with N (number of participant) = 45, degree of freedom 43 and t-test value = 2.225 (which was higher than 1.681 on the t-table that referred to) the confidence level was 95% (0.05). However, it was not significant. In order to be significant, the t-test result should be at least 99% (0.01) of the confidence level. Therefore, drilling technique was effective in increasing students' grammar (simple present tense) mastery at the confidence level of 95%.

Let us see deeper to the details of the tests results to compare them with the general conclusion of the t-table. The different scores of pre-test and post-test in experimental group and control group were quite noticeable. The average improvement of grammar (simple present tense) mastery in experimental group was 48.67 and the average improvement on the control group was averagely 36.875. That meant using drilling technique scored higher by 11.795 compared to not using it. This was another way of seeing the difference between using and not using drilling technique to improve students' grammar (simple present tense) mastery.

D. CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

Conclusion

1. Based on the data analysis, the research question whether drilling technique could improve students' grammar (simple present tense) mastery or not had been answered and found to be positive. As has been shown in the previous chapter, the result of mean score shows that the mean score of Pre-test (24.80952) is lower than the Post-

test (48.67), then the alternate hypothesis (H_a) which states “Drilling technique is effective to improve students’ grammar mastery” is accepted and the null hypothesis (H_o) which states “Drilling technique is not effective to improve students’ grammar mastery” is rejected.

2. Since drilling technique is found to be positive in improving students’ grammar (simple present tense) mastery, how significant drilling technique had been answered in previous chapter. It had been shown that drilling technique only fulfills the conditions required to reject the confidence level of .05 (95%) equal to 1.681 but does not fulfill the conditions to reject the confidence level of .01 (99%) equal to 2.416 in degree of freedom (df) of 43. Therefore, drilling technique is effective to improve students’ grammar mastery only at the confidence level of .05 (95%) equal to 1.681.

Suggestion

The result of this study indicated that using drilling technique was effective at the confidence level of 95% to improve students’ grammar (simple present tense) mastery. However, since this technique does not fulfill the conditions required to reject both of the confidence levels, it is suggested that teachers might choose other methods in their class. Therefore, in order to make them more effective, a teacher is expected to be wise, because there are strategies, methods, and techniques which work successfully in one class, but do not in another.

1. To the teacher

There are various techniques of teaching English, yet not all of those techniques can be applied in a class effectively. Since drilling technique is not found to be effective for both of confidence

level in teaching grammar, an English teacher is expected to be more creative in finding techniques, or methods which suit to his class.

2. To researchers

The next researcher should develop this research to find out the further influence of drilling technique, not only for grammar mastery but also towards other language components, such as vocabulary, pronunciation, etc.

REFERENCES

- Anonym. (2009, April 5). *The Effect of Communicative Language Teaching on the English Achievement of the Second Year Students at Ma Mamba'ul Ulum Awang-Awang Mojosari*. Retrieved August 20, 2011, from <http://insight01.wordpress.com/2009/04/07/17/>
- Azar, B. (1989). *Understanding and Using English Grammar*. New Jersey: Prentice- Hall, Inc.
- Brno (2009). *Grammar Translation Method and Communicative Approach in Teaching English* : Bachelor Thesis.
- Brumfit, C. J. & K. Johnson. (2000). *The Communicative Approach to Language Teaching*. Shanghai: Shanghai.
- Collins COBUILD Advanced Learner's English Dictionary*. 2006. Harper Collins Publishers.
- Declerck, R. (1991). *Tense in English: Its Structure and Use in Discourse*. Routledge.
- Doff, A. (1990) *Teach English: A Training Course for Teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press in Association with the British Council.
- Eastwood, J. (2002). *Oxford Practice Grammar with Answer*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Finocchiaro, M. & Brumfit, C. (1983). *The Functional- National Approach: From Theory to Practice*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Gustilianingsih, E. (2010). *The Effectiveness of Drilling Technique in Teaching Prepositions to the Eighth Grade Students of SMP Negeri 21 Mataram Academic Year of 2010*. Mataram: Mataram University.

- Harmer, J. (2001). *The Practice of English Language*. Harlow: Longman.
- Hubbard, P., Jones, H., Thornton, B., and Wheeler, R.(1993). *A Training Course for TEFL*.Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kilgour, D.(1999, October 9). Retrieved April 2011, from The Importance of Language:
<http://www.david-kilgour.com/mp/sahla.htm>
- 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. (1986). *Teachiques and Principles in Language Teaching*. England: Oxford University Press.
- Matthews, (1991).“*The Practice Stage, Discourse Chains.*” In the Chalk face: Practical Techniques in Language Teaching, eds. A. Matthews, M. Spratt, and L. Dangerfield.Walton-on-Thames, UK: Thomas Nelson.
- Murphy, R. (1998). *English Grammar in Use*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nunan, D. (1992). *Research Methods in Language Learning*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary (5th ed)*. 1995. Oxford University Press.
- Richards, J. (1987). *Beyond methods: alternative approaches to instructional design in language teaching. Prospect. 3 (1): 11-30*
- Richards, J. C. & Rodgers, T. (2001). *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching* (2nd Ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- Savage, K., L. (2010). *Grammar Matters teaching Grammar in Adult ESL Programs*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 2010.
- Spratt, M. (1991).“*The Practice Stage, Discourse Chains.*” In At the Chalkface: Practical Techniques in Language Teaching, eds. A. Matthews, M. Spratt, and L. Dangerfield.Walton-on-Thames, UK: Thomas Nelson.
- Stern, H.H. (1983). *Fundamental Concepts of Language Teaching*. Oxford: University Press

Ur, P. (1999). *Grammar Practice Activities: A Practical Guide for Teachers* (12th ed.).
Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Webster's Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary. (1990). Springfield, Massachusetts, USA:
MARIAM-WEBSTER INC.

Yusra, K. (2009). *Research in English Language Teaching: A Compiled Coursebook*. Mataram.