

THE MAPPING OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNING PROBLEM (PBL) FOR PRIVATE HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS IN BANDAR LAMPUNG

Mieke Rahayu¹, Linda Septarina², BettyMagdalena³
Institute Informatics and Business (IBI)Darmajaya^{1,2,3}
Jl.Z.A.PagarAlam no 93 LabuhanRatuBandarLampung
miekerahayu@gmail.com , lindaseptarinaeff@yahoo.com,
bettymagdalen1969@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This article discusses a mapping of problems of learning English encountered by students freshmen higher educations in Bandar Lampung. A set questionnaire which asked the learners' difficulties of learning English was distributed to 180 students from higher education institutions: IBI Darmajaya, Universitas Bandar Lampung, STKIP PGRI, DCC,

UniversitasSaburai and UniversitasParamadinaMandiri.Universitas Tulang Bawang. From 180 students recruited for the study, 165 students responded to the questionnaire. The questionnaire consists of 40 item Likert-scale questions asking students difficulties in comprehending and utilizing elements of pronunciaton, grammar, vocabular, functions, discourse and strategic in learning English.

The results show that students encountered difficulties in pronunciations, vocabulary, function and strategic elements of English learning. Students did not encounter difficulties in discourse elements. This might be due to the fact that students got intensive trainings on discourse during their high school learning experiences.

One of the implications of the study is a design of English course for higher education institutions in Bandar Lampung based the mapping of the problems encountered.

Key words: mapping, Language Learning Problems, Higher Education institutions

1. Introduction

In second and foreign language learning, there are three aspects that must mastered by the learners. The aspects are pronunciation), grammar and structure) and vocabulary. These aspect are blended in three four language skills: (listening skill, speaking skill), reading skill and writing skill. One can be called proficient when he/she can master these three aspects and skills. However, as Professor BambangSetiyadi confessed in his professorship inauguration on November 2009 that the teaching of English in Indonesia has failed. This failure is proven by the facts that university graduates in Indonesia use English for coomunication and other purposes.

Learning achievement can be used as an indicator for students' language capability. Djaali, 2008 states that the higher the learning ability, the higher the learning achievement will be. However, learning English as foreign or second language is not similar to the learning of other subjects. In learning general subjects, students' success is measured by the mastery of the subject. Learning language is much more complex, learning success is not only measured by the learning achievement

but also by mastering the language as well as using the language as a complete skill. Many factors influence the success or failure of second and foreign language learning. Some of the factors are coming from the external side of the learning called external factors, and some coming from the internal (internal factors (see Brown 2009). Among the external factors are: school environment, teachers, learning facilities, etc. Among the internal factors are: students' age, motivation, attitude, learning style, learning strategies, and other affective factors. Two factors among those factors are leaning design. Many studies have discussed the roles of learning design on students' achievement in foreign language learning and general subject. This research studies use different theoretical and research paradigms. In terms of the relationship between learning design and general subjects, some studies have tried to find out this relationship. Among others are Arianti (2013), DewiUtami (2013), danBakri (2012), all seem to agree that there is a significant correlation between students' learning design and their achievement on their learning achievement of some content learning. In his research study, Yufrizal (2010) stated that students of junior and senior high schools in TulangBawang regency have different achievement in English based on their learning design. Likewise YusepPanduwinata (2012) in an experiment of writing ability of students in Lampung Polytechnic found that students with concrete learning design produce better writing results than students with analytic learning or problem based learning. Sadewo (2011), Arianti (2013), DewiUtami (2013), danBakri (2012). These studies have shown that there is a significant correlation between learning design and their learning achievement. The higher the level of motivation the students have, the better students would achieve in their learning effort. However, there are some differences in research and construct paradigms among those studies resulting in different results of studies. A more compact research on this matter will give us a clearer idea on how

learning design affect learning particularly the learning of English as a second/foreign language in Indonesia. This current study attempts to find out whether there is any significant effect of learning design on their achievement in learning English at higher students in Bandar Lampung city, Indonesia

2. Literature Review

Students' learning design preferences have been a major concern of some research. Reid (1987), for example, based on survey data, distinguished four perceptual learning modalities:

1. visual learning (for example, reading and studying charts);
2. auditory learning (for example, listening to lectures or audio tapes);
3. kinaesthetic learning (involving physical responses); and
4. tactile learning (hands-on learning, as in building models).

He then administered a questionnaire to 1,388 students of varying language backgrounds to investigate their preferred modalities. This revealed that the learners' preferences often differed significantly from those of native speakers of American English. They showed a general preference for kinesthetic and tactile learning styles, and for individual as opposed to group learning. Willing (1987) investigated the learning styles of 517 adult ESL learners in Australia. Based on their responses to a 30-item questionnaire, Willing tried to identify how differences in problem based learning design affected learners' preferences in six different areas: 1. preferences for particular kinds of classroom activities; 2. preferences for particular types of teacher behaviour; 3. preferences for particular grouping arrangements; 4. preferences for particular aspects of language which need emphasis; 5. preferences for particular sensory modes, such as visual, auditory, or tactile learning; and 6. preferences for particular modes of learning on one's own outside class. It was found that differences in cognitive styles affected learners' preferences for particular approaches to learning.

For example, concrete learners tended to choose the following: □ In class, I like to learn by games. □ I like to learn English by working in pairs. Learners with analytical learning styles, however, reported the following preferences: □ I like to study grammar. □ I like the teacher to let me find my mistakes. [-2-] Although Richards and Lockhart (1994) argue that such information can prove to be significant as to whether both teachers and learners approach learning in the same way, they still oppose the idea of putting "learners into boxes labelled according to cognitive styles" (pp. 62-63). Nunan (1989) points out that accommodating learners' needs and preferences is vital in designing a learner-centered curriculum. Such importance given to students' feelings has also been stressed in Barkhuizen's (1998) study, in which he reports an investigation of high school ESL learners' perceptions of the language teaching-learning activities presented in their classes. The outcome of such investigation surprised the teachers in that perceptions of teachers and students differed greatly from each other. A series of research by Yufrizal (2000,2001,2009) also have shown that learning styles influence significantly on students' English achievement in Indonesia. He found that students with communicative learning styles tend to have higher achievement than students with other learning design.

Research methodologi A non-experimental quantitative with variant analysis (Gal et al. 1998) is used to achieve the objective of the studi Untuk mencapai tujuan penelitian ini digunakan penelitian kuantitatif non experimental dengan rancangan analisis varian. The method used in the study is cross-sectional with a design of non-correlational ex-post de facto. (Setiyadi: 144). In this case, the research examines phenomena exist during the research without giving any treatment to the subjects, in which samples were given tests and questionnaire to get the data for students' achievement, Population of the research is all students universities in Bandar Lampung city. The sample was taken through purposive random

sampling, i.e. by taking students from six kinds of private universities:

3. Learning Design

Learning design As previously mentioned, in order to identify students' learning achievement. A set of questionnaire consisting of 40 questions with multiple choice alternatives were given. The alternatives are: 1 strongly disagree, 2 disagree, 3 Agree, and 4 strongly agree. All students' answers were analyzed through data reduction factor analysis resulting four types of learning styles: a) Communicative, b) Concrete, c) Authority oriented, and analytic learning styles. Another design was added, that is 5) undecided or mixed design referring to students with combination of design or non-dominating design identified. The number and percentage of students' learning design and their English achievement is shown in the following table. .

Problem based learning to measure the students' achievement, a set of validated questionnaire consisting of 40 questions with four alternative: a = 1, b = 2, c=3 dan d = 4. Students' motivation was accumulated resulting three categories of motivation: high, middle, and low motivation..

4. Findings and Discussion

This article discusses a mapping of problems of learning English encountered by students freshmen higher educations in Bandar Lampung. A set questionnaire which asked the learners' difficulties of learning English was distributed to 180 students from higher education institutions: IBI Darmajaya, Universitas Bandar Lampung, STKIP PGRI, DCC, Universitas Saburai and Universitas Paramadina Mandiri. Universitas Tulang Bawang. From 180 students recruited for the study, 165 students responded to the questionnaire. The questionnaire consists of 40 item Likert-scale questions asking students difficulties in

comprehending and utilizing elements of pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, functions, discourse and strategic in learning English.

The results show that students encountered difficulties in pronunciations, vocabulary, function and strategic elements of English learning. Students did not encounter difficulties in discourse elements. This might be due to the fact that students got intensive trainings on discourse during their high school learning experiences

5. Conclusion And Implications. .

One of the implications of the study is a design of English course for higher education institutions in Bandar Lampung based the mapping of the problems encountered. .

Others seem to to enjoy learning language by listening to th teachers' explanation of the language. Therefore, the teachers are recommended to vary his/her teaching by giving different types learning task in their instruction. 2). Teachers also should pay attention to motivation. The learning tasks should also arouse students' motivation. Teachers must be able to maintain their students who have high motivation and attempt raise those who have middle and lower level of learning motivation. This can be done by giving evidences on whatbenefiy students can get when they are able to communicate in a foreign/second language.

References

- [1] AJ. Romiszowski, Designing Instructional Systems, Kogan Page Ltd, London,1981,p.17. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey : Prentice Hall Inc.
- [2]Bower,Gordon.H & Hilgard,Ernest R.1981.Theory of Learning

[3]Ernest T Stringer , Action Research, USA, Sage Publication, 1999, p.27

[4]Jan Pouwer,The Structural Configurational Approach a Methodological Outline, dalam The Unconscious in Culture. New York: Dutton & Co. 1974. p.243

[5]Gagne,Robert,M.1985. The Conditions of Learning and Theory of Instruction. New York : HOLT, Rinehart & Winston

[6]Galloway,Charles.1976.Psychology for Learning and Teaching.New York : McGraw-Hill Book Co.

[7]Gosling ,David.,D'Andrea,Vaneeta.2001.Quality Development : a new concept for higher education .Proceeding of The Sixth QHE Seminar

[8]J.E.Mitchell, Communication System II, PBL Implementation Plan, http://www.ee.ucl.ac.uk/~nina/DepartmentalDocs/KeySkills/PBL_Plan.pdf, diakses 23 November 2005

[9]Latchem.Colin., Parker, Lesley.1995.Developing a Teaching and Learning Strategic Plan : A Case Study .Proceeding of HERDSA'95 annual conference,UCQ,Rockampton.

[10]Lev N. Landa, , The Algo-Heuristic Theory of Instruction, in Charles M Reigeluth, Instruction-Design Theories and Models, New Jersey Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc. Publisher, 1983, p.166.

[11]Mills, Geoffrey E, Action Research : A Guide for Teacher Researcher, New Jersey, Prentice Hall, Inc, 2000, pp.73-77