TEACHING-LEARNING PROCESSES: SIMPLE PAST TENSE AND SIMPLE FUTURE TENSE AND THEIR PERCEPTION

Nelvi Handayani[1], Amri Isyam[2], Fitrawati[3]
Program Studi Bahasa dan Sastra Inggris
FBS Universitas Negeri Padang
email: nelvi_handayani90@yahoo.com

Abstrak

Tujuan dari penelitian ini adalah untuk (1) mengidentifikasikan kemampuan siswa dalam memahami simple past tense dan simple future tense dan (2) mengidentifikasikan persepsi siswa dalam proses belajar mengajarnya. Data penelitian ini adalah tes grammar yang berjumlah 30 soal, 15 soal simple past tense dan 15 soal simple future tense dan angket yang berjumlah 19 pernyataan. Temuan penelitian yaitu kemampuan siswa dalam memahami simple past tense dan simple future tense masih sangat kurang yaitu dengan nilai rata-rata 37,31 dari 78 sampel. Sedangkan persepsi siswa terhadap proses belajar mengajarnya tergolong baik dengan TCR 82,32 %.

Key words: Teaching, Learning, Tense, Past, Future, Perception

A. Introduction

Grammar is a foundation in learning language. Basically, grammar is used in spoken and written language. It covers four major skills; listening, speaking, reading and writing. As Coghill and Magedanz (2003: xv) say that grammar is a set of rules that influence its structure and determine how the words are arranged together in achieving a meaningful unit. In daily life, if someone speaks/writes without thinking of language structure, it is difficult for the listeners/readers to understand what he/she means so that the communication target could not be achieved.

Grammar gives benefit to achieve the target of learning language―communication. Veit (1986:2) states the benefits of grammar are as follows:

> "On the other hand, grammar study is not without practical benefits. We use some conscious knowledge about language when we speak and write, and conscious grammatical knowledge can help us to understand what we are doing and allow us to make some enlightened choices. Knowledge of grammar can also give us a tool for analyzing our writing and vocabulary for discussing it." (p.2)

---

[1] Student of English Language Teaching Program of FBS UNP graduated on March 2013
[2] Advisor, Lecturer in Faculty of Languages and Arts, State University of Padang
[3] Co-Advisor, Lecturer in Faculty of Languages and Arts, State University of Padang

Grammar is used for both of spoken and written language. In this context, Veit tries to explain that the knowledge about grammar will help people in their daily life to understand the instructions and make good choices. Moreover, grammar also helps us to understand the writing and vocabulary. Similarly, Hughes (2002:172) explains the importance of learning grammar in school. Grammar is necessary in the school where the grammatical ability is completely valuable for the skills performance. This exactly gives the explanation that grammar is influence other skills such as speaking and writing.

In teaching and learning English, grammar has an immense effect in assisting students to master the major target of learning English in communication. Students who speak and write without having the knowledge about grammar will feel confused, afraid and less-confidence. This is one of the consideration in which grammar must be understood by every learner before he/she uses English. In this case, teachers have a big role in teaching grammar. English teachers must be capable of teaching grammar.

The matter of teaching and learning processes which has the relation to grammatical context could be seen like the problem faced by the students of one of vocational school in Padang namely, SMK Kartika 1-2. The students' learning outcome in grammar test was still low. Meanwhile, the minimum standard competency result that the students should reach in this school is 75.

According to the observation on April 24- May 28 2012, the teacher has already tried to give a better teaching and learning processes in the class by using some methods. Unfortunately, it did not give significant changes on the English students' learning outcome. Many students did not know the rules/patterns for both of simple past tense and simple future tense. They could not achieve the minimum standard competency result decided by the school. In this case, the students still had problem in understanding them.

According to the KTSP curriculum 2006 for vocational school, teaching English is done with for skills; listening, speaking, reading and writing. The additional in vocational school, the students do learn about grammar. The teaching and learning grammar is done around 40% in the classroom. It can be seen from the syllabus of SMK Kartika 1-2 Padang. The second grade of second semester students learn about gerunds, construction with "too" and "enough", simple past tense, simple future tense and grammar review in each expression.

Tense is verb form in showing time of the action. According to Hinkel (2004: 130), "In English, as in other languages, the tense marks the time and connects an action or event to particular time." Huddleston and Pullum (2005: 44), "A tense system is a system associated with the verb where the basic contrasts in meaning have to do with the **location in time** of the situation, or the part of it under consideration." Furthermore, Declerck (2006:22) says that tense is a linguistic concept which has verb and express the time in situations. Folse (2009:74) argues that verb is the central part of English sentences. In English, there are twelve tenses that express different combinations of time (present, past, future) and aspect (simple, perfect and progressive).

Simple past tense is used to express actions/events in past time. Biber, Conrad and Leech (2002: 151) state that Simple Past Tense is most often used in

past time. In some cases, past tense is used to describe past situations and events. In addition, past form has a special use in reported speech or thought. Similarly, Folse (2009:114) states that past tense, "The most common devices used to indicate sequencing of action are the use of time adverbials such as *yesterday* or *before I arrived.*"

Simple future tense is used to express future plans. Yule (2009:58) states that "The verb form that is traditionally called 'the future tense' is actually expressed via a modal verb which indicates the relative possibility of an event." Similarly, Folse (2009:140-141) tries to separate two commons forms used in simple future tense. They are **be going to** and **will**. Be going to is used for an action in the future. Meanwhile, Will is used to talk about future actions that did not have prior plan to do.

The teaching and learning processes will become more valuable if there is cooperation between both of teacher and students. One of the ways to create the process of teaching and learning more valuable is through perception. In relation to the problem faced by the students, it was needed to know the students' perception on the teaching and learning processes. Rookes and Willson (2000:1) say that "perception is a process which involves the recognition and interpretation of stimuli which register on our senses." Similarly, Root (2011: 7) says that "*Perception* is the process, act, or result of perceiving; insight or knowledge gained by perceiving; and the capacity for such insight. In this case, the perception about teaching-learning processes will influence on the students' achievement on their learning outcome.

Learning outcome is the capability of somebody after she/he learns through teaching-learning processes. According to Dimyati (2006:200) learning outcome is students' achievement after they follow the learning processes, where the level of achievement can be measured through score such as alphabet, word or symbol. Moreover, Djamarah (2002:99) explains the level of the students' success in teaching-learning processes, where:
1. Perfect or maximal. All of the students can master the materials.
2. Very good (optimal). The students can master the materials with range (76-99%)
3. Good (minimal). The students can master the materials with range (66-75%)
4. Less. The students can master the materials less than 65%.

In addition, Suryabrata in Ramainas (2006:80) say that the low of students' learning outcome is caused by two main factors; external factor and internal factor. External factor comes from social and non social factor such as teacher's qualification, teacher's method, time, media, tools and learning outcome evaluation. Internal factor comes from physiology and psychology factors such as intelligence, interest, talent, motivation, perception and the way to learn.

Based on the explanation above, the purpose of this study was to identify the students' ability in understanding the simple past tense and simple future tense and their perception on their teaching-learning processes.

B. Research Methodology

The design of this research was quantitative descriptive. As Gay (2000:11) states that "Quantitative descriptive or survey research involves collecting data in order to answer questions about the current status of the subject or topic of study. The samples of this study were 78. They were the students of the second class of second semester of Akutansi 2, TKJ 2 and Bisnis 2. The instrumentation of this study was grammar test and questionnaires. The grammar test consisted of 30 items, 15 items about simple past tense and 15 items about simple future tense in the form of multiple choices. The questionnaires consisted of 19 statements about their teaching-learning processes.

The students' ability was analyzed by using the formula as follow:
Arikunto (2008:236):

$$\text{Score} = \frac{\text{total correct answer}}{\text{maximum score}} \times 100\%$$

Table 1. The Classification of Students' Learning Outcome.

Interval	Classification
100	Perfect
76-99	Very Good
66-75	Good
0-65	Less

Djamarah (2002:99)

Meanwhile, this formula was used to find out the students' level of answer: (Sudjana, 2001:53)

$$\text{TCR} = \frac{\text{mean score of students answer}}{\text{total alternatif answer of students}} \times 100\%$$

The criteria of answer from the respondent as follow:

Table 2. The Classification Students' Answer of Questionnaires.

Interval percentage (%)	Classification
90-100	Very good
80-89	Good
65-79	Enough
55-64	Poor
0-54	Very poor

C. Discussion

Students' ability in understanding simple past tense and simple future tense was still very low. None of the students could get the minimum standard competency result (75). The students' ability in understanding the simple past tense and simple future tense can be seen as follow:

Table 3. SMK Kartika 1-2 Padang Students' Grammar Score

No.	Class Interval	Fi	Fk	%
1.	67-75	4	4	5,13
2.	58-66	6	10	7,69
3.	49-57	9	19	11,54
4.	40-48	10	29	12,82

5.	31-39	19	48	24,36
6.	22-30	19	67	24,36
7.	13-21	11	78	14,10
Total		**78**		**100**
Mean		37,31		
Median		33,33		
Modus		33,33		
≥ KKM		-		
≤ KKM		78 students		
Max		73,33		
Min		13,33		

From 78 samples, the highest score of the student was 73,33 and the lowest score of the student was 13,33. The mean score from the grammar test with the sample 78 students was 37,31. All of the students could not achieve the standard competency result (75). The median score was 33,33. It means that 50% of the students got the grammar test score under 33,33. The modus score was 33,33. It means that many students got the grammar test score 33,33. Standard deviation from the students' score was 15,15. It means the level of deviation for each student's score towards the mean score was 15,15.

Meanwhile, the students' perception on their teaching-learning processes was good. The students' perception can be seen as following:

Table 4. Frequency of Students' Perception on the Teaching-Learning Processes

No.	Indicator	Mean	TCR (%)	Note
1	Pre-Teaching	4,21	84,10	Good
2	Whilst-Teaching	3,97	79,46	Enough
3	Post-Teaching	4,22	84,49	Good
Mean Variable		**4,13**	**82,68**	**Good**

From table 4, it can be seen that the result of students' perception on the teaching learning processes was good. The mean for the three indicators was 4,13 and TCR 82,68% with good category. From the three indicators, post-teaching was the highest indicator with mean score 4,22 and TCR 84,49%. Then, the second was the pre-teaching processes with mean score 4,21 and TCR 84,10%. The last one was the whilst-teaching processes with mean score 3,97 and TCR 79,46%.

Even though the students' perception about the teaching and learning processes was good, from the data showed that students still had problems on the process of teaching learning. These are the data in each indicator: pre-teaching, whilst-teaching and post teaching. Where pre-teaching had 4 sub indicators, whilst-teaching had 9 sub indicators and post-teaching had 6 sub-indicators. The students' perception on the teaching learning processes can be seen as follow:

Table 5. Students' Perception on the Teaching-Learning Processes for Pre-Teaching Indicator

No.	INDICATOR	NO. ITEM	SA		A		U		D		SD		MEAN	TCR (%)
			Fi	%	Fi	%	Fi	%	Fi	%	Fi	%		
1	PRE-TEACHING	1	27	34,62	35	44,87	7	8,97	7	8,97	2	2,56	4	80
		2	52	66,67	24	30,77	2	2,56	0	0,00	0	0,00	4,64	92,82
		3	31	39,74	31	39,74	13	16,67	2	2,56	1	1,28	4,14	82,82
		4	26	33,33	36	46,15	10	12,82	5	6,41	1	1,28	4,04	80,77
	MEAN INDICATOR 1		34	43,59	31	40,38	8	10,26	4	4,49	1	1,28	4,21	84,10

From table 5, it can be seen that the students' perception on the pre-teaching processes had mean score 4,21 with TCR 84,10%. The highest mean score was the item number 2 with mean score 4,64 and TCR 92,82%. For this item, none of the students answered disagree and strongly disagree. Three were only 2 students who answered uncertain and for both of the alternative answer strongly agree and agree there were 52 students and 24 students. The lowest mean score was the item number 1 with mean score 4 and TCR 80%. For this item, there were 2 students who answered strongly disagree, 7 students who answered disagree and 7 students who answered uncertain. Then for the alternative answer strongly agree and agree, there were 27 students and 35 students who answered it.

Table 6. Students' Perception on the Teaching-Learning Processes for Whilst-Teaching Indicator

No.	INDICATOR	NO. ITEM	SA		A		U		D		SD		MEAN	TCR (%)
			Fi	%	Fi	%	Fi	%	Fi	%	Fi	%		
2	WHILST-TEACHING	5	20	25,64	33	42,31	21	26,92	4	5,13	0	0,00	3,88	77,69
		6	28	35,90	30	38,46	13	16,67	5	6,41	2	2,56	3,99	79,74
		7	23	29,49	40	51,28	11	14,10	3	3,85	1	1,28	4,04	80,77
		8	17	21,79	40	51,28	18	23,08	2	2,56	1	1,28	3,90	77,95
		9	20	25,64	34	43,59	19	24,36	3	3,85	2	2,56	3,86	77,18
		10	28	35,90	36	46,15	10	12,82	3	3,85	1	1,28	4,12	82,31
		11	22	28,21	51	65,38	5	6,41	0	0,00	0	0,00	4,22	84,36
		12	16	20,51	39	50,00	14	17,95	7	8,97	2	2,56	3,77	75,38
		13	26	33,33	30	38,46	19	24,36	1	1,28	2	2,56	3,99	79,74
	MEAN INDICATOR 2		22	28,49	37	47,44	15	18,52	3	3,99	1	1,56	3,97	79,46

From table 6, it can be seen that the students' perception on the whilst-teaching processes had mean score 3,97 with TCR 79,46%. The highest mean score was the item number 11 with mean score 4,22 and TCR 84,36%. For the item, teacher gave an appropriate examples about simple past tense and simple future tense,

there were 22 students who answered strongly agree and 51 students who answered agree. Then, there were 5 students who answered uncertain and none of the students who answer both disagree and strongly disagree.

The lowest mean score was the item number 12 with mean score 3,77 and TCR 75,38%. For the item, the teacher gave enough examples about simple past tense and simple future tense and I understood, there were 2 students who answered strongly disagree, 7 students who answered disagree and 14 students who answered uncertain. Then for the alternative answer strongly agree and agree, there were 16 students and 39 students who answered it. From the students' answered, it can be seen that some of the students felt that the teachers' explanation, the media, and the examples still were not enough. So, it influenced to the students while do the exercises.

Table 7. Students' Perception on the Teaching-Learning Processes for Post-Teaching Indicator

No.	INDICATOR	NO. ITEM	SA Fi	SA %	A Fi	A %	U Fi	U %	D Fi	D %	SD Fi	SD %	MEAN	TCR (%)
3	POST-TEACHING	14	34	43,59	38	48,72	6	7,69	0	0,00	0	0,00	4,36	87,18
		15	29	37,18	42	53,85	7	8,97	0	0,00	0	0,00	4,28	85,64
		16	28	35,90	43	55,13	5	6,41	2	2,56	0	0,00	4,24	84,87
		17	27	34,62	35	44,87	10	12,82	5	6,41	1	1,28	4,05	81,03
		18	31	39,74	38	48,72	5	6,41	2	2,56	2	2,56	4,21	84,10
		19	34	43,59	33	42,31	7	8,97	1	1,28	3	3,85	4,21	84,10
MEAN INDICATOR 3			30	39,10	38	48,93	7	8,55	2	2,14	1	1,28	4,22	84,49

From table 7, it can be seen that the students' perception on the post-teaching processes had mean score 4,22 with TCR 84,49%. The highest mean score was the item number 14 with mean score 4,36 and TCR 87,18%. For the item, teacher gives chance to ask for the students during the process of teaching learning, there were 34 students who answered strongly agree and 38 students who answered agree. Then, there were 6 students who answered uncertain and none of the students who answered disagree and strongly disagrees.

The lowest mean score was the item number 17 with mean score 4,05 and TCR 81,03%. For the item, teacher and students make the conclusion about the materials, there was 1 student who answered strongly disagree, 5 students who answered disagree and 10 students who answered uncertain. Then for the alternative answer strongly agree and agree, there were 27 students and 35 students who answered it. From the students' answered about the post-teaching processes, it can be seen that most of the students felt that the teacher already gave the students' need while the others still felt that it was not enough.

Based on the findings, the second class of SMK Kartika 1-2 Padang students' ability in understanding simple past tense and simple future tense was still low. None of the students could get the minimum standard competency result (75). Djamarah (2002:99) says that there are some levels of the students' success in teaching-learning processes:

1. If the students got score 100. It means that the students already mastered the materials with perfect category. Unfortunately, none of the students from 78 samples could get score perfect.
2. If the students got score 76-99. It means that the students already mastered the materials with very good category. From 78 samples, none of the students could get score from 76-99.
3. If the students got score 66-75. It means that the students could master the materials with good category. From 78 samples, there were only 4 students who could get it. They were from Akutansi 2. Meanwhile, all of the students from Bisnis 2 and TKJ 2 were in less category. They only mastered the materials ≤ 65%. The total of students with less category are 74 students.

The students' ability in understanding the simple past tense and simple future tense was still low. The percentage of students who could not mastered the materials well are >90%. This is very high percentage. This low learning outcome gives a signal that there were something mistake for both of the process and the students' ability.

Normally, students' ability will influence their perception on the teaching-learning processes or on the contrary. Unfortunately, the findings were out of the expectation. Both students' ability and their perception were exactly opposite. These differences are influenced by some factors. It can be external or internal factor. Similarly, Suryabrata in Ramainas (2006: 80) says that the low of students' learning outcome is caused by two main factors. They are external factor and internal factor. The external factor comes from social or non social factor such as teacher's qualification, teacher's method, time, media, tools and learning outcome evaluation and the internal factor comes from physiology and psychology factors such as intelligence, interest, talent, motivation, perception and the way to learn.

First, the external factor comes from social or non social factor such as teacher's qualification, teacher's method, time, media, tools and learning outcome evaluation. The students' perception on the teaching-learning processes was good. From the three indicators, the students only had problem in the whilst-teaching processes. The finding showed that the students only felt enough for some of categories such as teacher's explanation, media and examples. Basically, the students will understand the materials if the teacher's explanation, media and examples are good/maximum. On the other hand, they were not maximum yet. The total respondent answer for the teacher's explanation was 77,69 % with enough category, teacher's media was 77,18 % with enough category and teacher's example was 75,38 % with enough category.

Second, the internal factor comes from physiology and psychology factors such as intelligence, interest, talent, motivation, perception and the way to learn. These factors really influence on the students achievements. The students' ability in understanding simple past tense and simple future tense was still low. In fact, the students' intelligence, interest, motivation, perception and the way to learn really influence on their English learning outcome. If the students are low of intelligence meanwhile their interest, motivation, perception and the way to learn are high or on the contrary, the students can understand the materials even though it needs time.

On the other hand, if their intelligence, interest, motivation, perception and the way to learn are low, it is difficult for the students to understand the materials. In this context, not only the students' factors will influence their learning outcome but also teacher's factors in giving the explanation about materials and examples and the use of media. Moreover it also influences the students' achievement, if the teacher can motivate the students to increase their interest and motivation to study.

Based on the research findings related to the theory, it can be implied that there were two main factors which influence on the students' ability in understanding the simple past tense and simple future tense. The first factor was the external factor which came from social or non social factor such as teacher's qualification, teacher's method, time, media, tools and learning outcome evaluation. The second factor was the internal factor which came from physiology and psychology factors such as intelligence, interest, talent, motivation, perception and the way to learn.

D. Conclusion and Suggestions

The students' ability in understanding simple past tense and simple future tense was still low. Meanwhile, their perceptions toward the teaching-learning processes were good. The students' ability was exactly opposite with their perception. None of the students could achieve the minimum standard competency result (75). These findings are indicated by the fact that the teachers' explanation, media and example were not maximum yet. Moreover, the basic problem appeared from the students' ability itself. The students' intelligence, interest, talent and motivation influenced their understanding about simple past tense and simple future tense.

There are some suggestions after conducted this research. First, he students should learn more and have a lot of practice about simple past tense and simple future tense. They have to pay more attention to the rules/patterns used in simple past tense and simple future tense. Second, the teacher should explain again the materials of simple past tense and simple future tense in simple way and use various techniques, methods and media if the students still do not understand about the materials. Last, it is needed to analyze the students' need and teachers' perception on the teaching-learning processes for the next researcher.

Note: This article was written based on the writer's thesis with Drs. Amri Isyam, M.Pd as 1st advisor and Fitrawati, S.S., M.Pd as 2nd advisor.

References

Arikunto, S.2008. *Dasar-Dasar Evaluasi Pendidikan*. rev.ed. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.

Biber, D, Conrad S, and Leech G.2002. *Student Grammar of Spoken and Written*. Inggris: Pearson Education Limited

Coghill, J. and Magedanx, S.2003. *English Grammar*. New York: Wiley Publishing, Inc.

Declerck, R.2006. *The Grammar of the English Tense System: a Comprehension Analysis*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co. KG.

Dimyati, M. 2009. *Belajar dan Pembelajaran*. Jakarta: Rhineka Cipta.

Djamarah.2002. *Guru dan Anak Didik Dalam Interaksi Edukatif*. Jakarta: Rhineka Cipta

Folse, K.S.2009. *Keys to Teaching Grammar to English Language Learners*. Washington: The University of Michigan Press.

Gay, L.R.2000. *Educational Research: Competencies for Analysis and Application Sixth Edition*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Hinkel, E.2004.*Teaching Academic ESL Writing: Practical Techniques in Vocabulary and Grammar*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.,Publishers.

Huddleston, R. and Pullum, G.K.2005. *A students' Introduction to English Grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hughes, A.2002. *Testing for Language Teachers*. Inggris: Cambridge University Press

Ramainas. 2006. *Motivasi Belajar dan Percepsi Siswa Tentang Media Pembelajaran Terhadap Hasil Belajar*. Jurnal Pembelajaran 29 (2006) 79-89

Rookes, P and Willson, J.2000. *Perception: Theories, Development and Organisation*. London: Routledge

Root, S.2011. *Perception*. New York: AuthorHouse.

Sudjana, N.2001. *Pengantar Statistik Pendidikan*. Bandung : Tarsito

Veit, R.1986. *Discovering English Grammar*. New Jersey: Houghton Mifflin Co.

Yule, G.2009. *Explaining English Grammar*. New York: Oxford University Press.