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ABSTRACT

This study focused on whether the use of nursery rhymes in ESL classroom could significantly promote the interests towards learning English of the elementary students in Yogyakarta, Indonesia. Eight third grade level students participated in this study with the intervention of two elementary teachers. The quasi-experimental research design was employed. The experimental group has taught English language using nursery rhymes while the control group was taught using the conventional method over a period of eight weeks. A survey based on questionnaires regarding their interest towards learning English, which was used as the instruments to gather data for the study in the pre-intervention and post-intervention. The findings indicated that the optimisation of nursery rhymes significantly promoted the students’ interests towards learning English. The students from the experimental group affected higher interests on their preferences in learning, teacher’s
performances, communication, and interaction. These students also took more class activities' participation, and they were more confident to improve their English compared to their counterparts in the control group. Due to its interesting nature, this study concluded that the use of nursery rhymes can significantly enhance the students’ interests towards learning English. This study affirmed that nursery rhymes provided strong pedagogical innovation and stimulated motivation for the students. Hopefully, the ministry of education in Indonesia and the teachers’ training institution might train teachers to use nursery rhymes to promote the young Indonesian learners’ interests towards learning English.
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1. INTRODUCTION

The effectiveness of new ESL (English as Second Language) instructional materials which incorporate pedagogical innovation and socio-cultural content in the era of decentralisation of education in Indonesia is very needed [1]. English as a second language has been used by over a billion people to communicate with without having same cultural and linguistic background. Kirkpatrick [2] stated that this is due to “widespread demand” of English for the expected future need for being in collaboration and communication with other global partners.

With a population of almost 250,585,668 and the 4th largest country as populations census in the year 2014. Gordon Jr [3] referred Indonesia as sleeping giant of South East Asia on the basis of large population. Despite the language diversity of 737 local languages, Bahasa Indonesia remains the common language for communication by the large majority of Indonesians [4]. English was chosen by the government as the “first foreign language” right after independence in 1945 and thus remained as a compulsory subject in secondary and high school curriculum.

Indonesian government gave permission for teaching English in primary schools since 1994 as a Decree of Minister of Education and Culture; Number 060/U/1993 considering English as a local content subject matter with hope to enhance Indonesians’ English Proficiency. It was a good step because previous researchers hypothesised that the more time one can have to deal with it, the better will be one's proficiency in it [4,5]. Generally in Indonesia, a normal English class time in elementary schools is 35 minutes in which a teacher have only 25 minutes of actual instruction time remaining after attendance and other formalities. There are some suggestions contained herein for the first time you teach a class. The limited time for teaching English at elementary schools should be taken critically due to nature of English language [6].

One such issue is how teachers of English at elementary schools could be able to develop the second language learning competencies and methodologies been highlighted by the curriculum planners. Extensive training can promote their ability to translate and implement curriculum principles into English learning classroom [7]. Empowerment and training of English teachers at elementary schools would enable them to be more productive and get involved in the design of course syllabi and assessment instructions.

Policymakers at every level of decision-making hierarchy seem to be interested in a global competitive Indonesian education system to enable Indonesian entrepreneurs and workers to exploit more opportunities in global markets using their communicative competencies of English language [8]. Musthafa [1] highlighted the need for identifying research-based effective learning interventions for young second language learners of English in schools at the elementary level to drive pedagogical innovations and curriculum planning in Indonesia.

The studies by Intani [9] and Shwetha [4] are related to the effect of socio-cultural songs for second language learners in the second language learning process. Other studies by Lamb and Coleman [10] and Shwetha [4] elaborated the role of self-identity and social identity of second language learners, it discussed yet without any empirical evidence about the use of nursery rhymes as the mechanism to drive the second language learners’ interests of English in the Indonesian context. In the interview with English teachers of some elementary schools in Indonesia, most of them expressed their views about songs, but they are very seldom using nursery rhymes in
their English classes. One teacher said that she taught certain songs and the students liked it very much however she added that they cannot apply and practice in their daily speaking activities. Even in a preliminary study, the researcher found 30 elementary schools in Yogyakarta did not apply nursery rhymes in their English classes.

Nursery rhymes defined as a “composition of fantastic and charming stories, vibrant language and colourful characters” [4]. For centuries, these poems have caught the attention of children and charmed them while learning new things. Through the introduction of the fantasy worlds, nursery rhymes help children to expand the horizons of their imagination. As seen before, instructors teach nursery rhymes to the children with actions. The actions from the teacher help the children to understand words and rhymes in the effective and active way. Children learn better by associating meaning of the word with those actions performed by the teachers. Teachers recite nursery rhymes in class using numerous gestures in front of learners to understand the meaning in a more effective and productive way.

In the Indonesian context, Intani [9], Lamb and Coleman [10] and Sari [11] have conducted studies to assess the effect of songs on vocabulary acquisition among elementary students’ language performance outcomes. Other recent studies by Shwetha [4], Sikki, Rahman [12] and Widyaningrum [13] found more related to the use of songs to promote oral proficiency among young second language learners. Many studies conducted outside Indonesia indicated that nursery rhymes can help to promote oral proficiency, interest and motivation towards learning English. Studies conducted by Fox [14], Harper [15] and Shwetha [4] noted that nursery rhymes can also help students to develop listening and thinking skills. Unfortunately, there is very little empirical evidence found for the use of nursery rhymes, specifically in Indonesia, there are very limited number of studies that emphasise on optimising the nursery rhymes to enhance students’ interests toward learning English.

The features of nursery rhymes such as enjoyableness and fun, physical activities, the joy of music and movement the children experienced make them more interested in learning even a very difficult thing for instance English. As suggested by Alcuaz Casanova [16] nursery rhymes have become a completely accurate skill in ESL process for Infant Education because children naturally appealed by rhythm and rhyme, so it is a really interesting way of oral proficiency in English. Students can enrich with a meaningful learning and interested in practising speaking through nursery rhymes without being aware of it.

As Fox [14] mentioned that nursery rhymes are full of fun, children love them, and nursery rhymes provide a warm, nurturing learning experience to children. Meanwhile, Vidal [17] conducted research on the use of nursery rhymes to promote oral proficiency skill, interests, and motivation towards learning English and Fauziati [18] reviewed on nursery rhymes and songs to teach English to young learners. What we may not be aware as we recite simple nursery rhymes or sing songs with children are their enormous educational values. Experts in literacy and child development have discovered that if children know eight nursery rhymes by heart by the time they’re four years old, they’re usually among the best readers by the time they’re eight. The current study was aimed to compare the difference in the interest towards learning English of two groups among the third-grade students at 8-9 years old. The major focus was on promoting their interests such as the preferences of learning, the teachers’ performance, the communication and interactions among the class members, and the active participation during their English classes. Students in both groups were exposed to their interests through different format i.e. using the nursery rhymes and the conventional method of teaching. Based on the above discussion this current study examine the students’ interest towards learning English by ten items valuing their interests, such as the preferences in learning, teacher’s performances, communication and interaction, class’ activities, active participation and interest to improve their English. The specific objectives of the study were as follows:

1. To know the interest of students in the experimental group and the control group towards learning English.
2. To examine the difference between students in the experimental group and the control group for their interest towards learning English in the pre-test.
3. To examine the difference between students in the experimental group and control group for their interest towards learning English in the post-test.
1.1 Promoting Students’ Interests towards Learning ESL

In the literature of a second language acquisition, the interests or motivation of an individual is given more attention and found as a determinant of second language achievement. Motivation is always considered as a stable learner’s trait for decades before the 1990s, but this shifted into a dynamic construct in an actual learning setting. Motivation, according to Vandergrift [19] is analysed with respect to the language-learning process that linked with the classroom activities. For keeping the students’ interests in learning English, it is suggested the teacher to use some effective media. Uberman [20], affirmed this by stating, “Teacher must make sure that students have understood and interested to learn the new words. They will remember longer if a teacher uses an appropriate method while teaching them”, p. 46. Bayless and Ramsey [21] mentioned that vocabulary of children extended as they were attracted to folk songs, country music, and commercials. Development of interest and attention span, improvement of comprehension and memory. The usage of rhyming words and images can be promoted easily by activities which involve music. It has concluded that teaching English vocabulary through nursery rhyme could be one of the appropriate techniques to create interest of elementary school students.

In his meaningful learning theory, Ausubel [22] viewed that an individual’s organisation of knowledge is a cognitive structure. The advance organiser model of teaching founded by Ausubel was also predominantly used by teachers to model and benchmark practical teaching pedagogies. The theory of meaningful learning emphasised that the content of the material should be meaningful so that second language learners can learn it in more meaningful way. It formed the argument that students must possess the previously established concept in an organised way so that the newly learned knowledge can easily link with the prior knowledge. Furthermore, in this second language learning process, learners should exhibit more positive attitudes towards meaningful learning; this will demonstrate his/her temperament to relate the newly acquired knowledge with their cognitive structure.

In his social constructivist theory Vygotsky [23] advocated that a child learns better when assisted by an adult or more competent peers. In this current study, the second language learning process involved the students to observe their teachers, interact with others and sing the nursery rhymes with full body movements. Tracey and Morrow [24] investigated how children internalise language through interaction with others. They discovered that the social context of language or inner speech occurs when children learn language through interaction with others; language development depends on sign systems. Moreover, to learn new concepts, one must be functioning in the “zone of proximal development” and learning support occurs through “scaffolding”.

Krashen [25] proposed five hypothesis based on the theory of second language acquisition. These five hypotheses are (1) Acquisition-Learning Hypothesis: The Acquisition-Learning Hypothesis states that second language performance has two independent systems. The first is the acquired system or acquisition, which is the product of the subconscious, like children acquiring their first language [25]. The second is the learned system or learning, which is a conscious process derived from formal instruction. (2) Natural Order Hypothesis: the Natural Order Hypothesis based on the findings of the research Dulay and Burt [26], Fathman [27], Makino [28] as cited in Krashen [29] suggests that predictable natural order preceded by the acquisition of grammatical structures. When the target is the acquisition of language, according to Krashen [29] grammatical sequencing is rejected, and the language program syllabus should not base on the order in the studies. (3) Input Hypothesis: the Input Hypothesis is an attempt by Krashen to explain how the second language acquisitions acquired by the learners. According to this hypothesis, the input must be comprehensible for language learners to retain the information [25]. He stated that for learning to take place, learners must receive interesting linguistic content which is at their level of competence or slightly above “comprehensible input (i+1)” [30]. Dividing language into smaller comprehensible parts (chunking), can assist language learning [30]. (4) Affective Filter Hypothesis: the Affective Filter Hypothesis states that second language acquisition is facilitated by many affective variables [25]. These variables are motivation, self-confidence, and anxiety. High motivation, low self-confidence, and low anxiety facilitate language acquisition, whereas low motivation, low self-esteem, high anxiety raise the affective filter and create a mental block that prevents language acquisition. However, in this current
study, only four hypotheses have been employed. The Monitor Hypothesis in this study excluded due to its wide application in teaching interventions for adults.

Fox [14] developed English teaching approaches and methods termed as Total Physical Response (TPR). It has used for almost thirty years in English teaching. This method encourages the students to listen and answer their teachers' commands to learning English. In other words, TPR is a method of teaching by using speech and actions; to teach through motor activity. Asher believes that first and second language learning is a parallel process, and that is why TPR is a "natural method". He stated that second language teaching should be a reflection of first language learning, and it is crucial. Children are happy when they can play, move and sing; even better if these activities would combine. TPR is designed and based on how children can learn the mother tongue. Al Harrasi [31] concluded that there are various approaches to teaching and learning a second language but among them, TPR is the most natural way to stimulate children and enable them to acquire language. Instructors asked students to do activities through commands in a new language and students respond accordingly through physical gestures.

Tibbetts [32] documented that some of our earliest memories based on rhymes recited by our parents. Most native speakers of English are familiar with the counting rhyme "One, two, buckle my shoe. . ." the children if asked, they could continue. Nursery rhymes are usually learned at the early age, although we don't use them for many years, they are retained and trotted out to our children even after a gap of twenty years or more. Children's nursery rhymes work as an aid to the memorization and internalisation of knowledge in several ways. Some studies have explained that the use of nursery rhymes as effective ways to improve pronunciation and should be incorporated into language classrooms in second language learning as a learning tool [14,16,33-36].

Nursery rhymes, tongue twisters, and songs play an effective role in improving pronunciation and language in the classroom as they are one of the best tools in promoting interest and motivation. Nursery rhymes make a student enthusiastic and give a taste of cultures of the country [34,36]. Repetition of different sounds makes a student articulates different sounds in the nursery rhymes. Furthermore [Vandergriff [19]] defined that students get attracted to the tongue twisters that challenge them to differentiate between the similar sounds. Nursery rhymes attract the students and they take songs as an entertainment and learn sound rather getting bored of it. Nursery rhymes also represent cultures of the people speaking that language. Nursery rhymes can capture students' enthusiasms and also help students learn to articulate different sounds because repetition has frequently used within nursery rhymes [14].

By using nursery rhymes as an alternative technique in promoting interests, elementary school students in Yogyakarta, Indonesia learned something new and different from they used to get in the previously classes. They were not only the subject of teaching-learning process but also the participant. Accordingly, the current study intended to optimise the use of nursery rhymes to promote the students' interests towards learning English among young second language learners in Indonesia.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

The current study employed a quasi-experimental study using the quantitative approach. The sample of this current study consisted of 80 students about 8 to 9 years old who belonged to third grade from two elementary schools in Yogyakarta, Indonesia. The sample from the two schools was similar in their academic achievement, a combination of gender and the schools' grade. The subjects from school A (40 students) were assigned to the experimental group while the subjects from school B (40 students) were assigned to be the control group. The experimental group was promoted their interests using nursery rhymes with the students' centred learning approach while the control group promoted their interests of the same materials using the conventional method of teaching. The researcher had made such of this arrangement that the learning instructions given to one group did not influence to the other one.

The duration of this study was ten weeks. During the first week, both the experimental and the control groups were given the pre-test consisting of 10 items of questionnaires related to the interests towards learning English. These ten items measures (1) how their preferences of learning English referred to item 1 and (2). The teachers' performances referred to questions numbers 2 and 3. The communication and interaction referred to questions numbers 4, 5, and 6. While the active participation referred to
questions numbers 7 and 8, whereas the interest to improve the English referred to question numbers 9 and 10. These questionnaire items spiritualized with the use of eight nursery rhymes. Following this pre-test, within eight weeks (week 2nd to week 9th), the students in the experimental group were taught using nursery rhymes while the students in the control group were taught using the conventional methods for 70 minutes per week. During the tenth week, both groups were given the post-test to evaluate their interests towards learning English. The contents of the questionnaires given in the pre-test and the post-test were the same.

Before the actual study, a pilot test was carried out on forty students studying in third grade of elementary school in Yogyakarta. The purpose was to ascertain the validity of the instruments used in this study. The findings indicated that the face value of content, clarity and the time allocated for the pre-test and the post-test were suitable. In conducting the pilot study, the researcher carried out a survey with students whereby in which two lecturers from the field of education and TESOL validate the questionnaire. Each item was given a scale from one to four and the lectures rated each item based on these scales. The questionnaires administered to the students and they did not face any problems in answering the questionnaires.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Cronbach’s Alpha was used to test the reliability and validity of the questionnaire on interest toward learning English. The alpha value for the questionnaire was 0.647, had a high reliability as shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Cronbach’s Alpha Reliability Test

| Reliability statistics | N of items |
|-------------------------|------------|
| Cronbach’s alpha        | 10         |
| .647                    |            |

3.1 Students’ Interest toward Learning English

To know the interest towards learning English for the students in the experimental group and control group, the frequency of the individual items have been calculated. In responding to the question one: “I like learning English”, forty-five percent of the students in the control group were reported unhappy, twenty-five percent happy, while eighteen percent very unhappy and twelve percent are very happy. On the other hand, seventy-seven percent of the students in the experimental group were reported very happy, twenty percent happy and only three percent unhappy.

While responding to question two: “I like my English teacher”, forty percent of the students in the control group were reported unhappy, thirty percent very unhappy, seventeen percent happy and thirteen percent very happy. On the other hand, sixty-eight percent of the students in the experimental group were reported very happy and thirty-two percent happy.

In responding to question three: “I like the way my teacher teaches English”, forty-two percent of the students in the control group reported unhappy, twenty-seven percent reported happy, while twenty-three percent mentioned they are very unhappy and eight percent reported as very happy. On the other hand, eighty percent of the students reported they are very happy and twenty percent reported as they are happy.

There were forty-five percent of the students in the control group who were reported unhappy in responding to question four: "I like to speak English", thirty percent very unhappy, thirteen percent very happy and twelve percent happy. But the sixty-eight percent of the students in the experimental group were reported very happy and thirty-two percent were happy with the statement.

While responding to question five: “I like to answer questions in English”, forty-five percent of the students in the control group felt very unhappy, thirty percent unhappy, fifteen percent happy and ten percent very happy. On the other hand, thirty-five percent of the students in the experimental group were reported happy and sixty-five percent very happy.

In responding to question six: “I like to talk to my friends in English”, forty-seven percent of the students in the control group were reported unhappy, twenty-three percent reported unhappy, while seventeen percent mentioned they are happy and thirteen percent reported as very happy. On the other hand, sixty-three percent of the students reported they are very happy and thirty-seven percent reported as they are happy.

Forty percent of the students in the control group were reported unhappy for the statement seven: “I like to take part class’s activities using English”, 
thirty percent unhappy, eighteen percent happy and twelve percent very happy. While, sixty-two percent of the students in the experimental group were reported very happy and thirty-eight percent happy against the statement.

In responding to question eight: “I like to sing in English”, forty-two percent of the students in the control group were reported unhappy, thirty percent very unhappy, eighteen percent very happy and ten percent happy. On the other hand, seventy percent of the students in the experimental group were reported very happy and thirty percent happy.

While responding to the statement nine: “I am happy during my English Class”, forty percent of the students in the control group felt unhappy, twenty-eight percent happy, twenty-two percent very happy and ten percent very happy. On the other hand, sixty percent of the students in the experimental group felt to be happy.

Forty-seven percent of the students in the control group were reported unhappy for the statement ten: “I like to improve my English”, twenty-three percent very unhappy, seventeen percent happy and thirteen percent very happy. But seventy percent of the students in the experimental group were reported very happy and thirty percent happy. Table 2 contains the details of the results.

To know the average responses of the students in the experimental group and control group, mean values for ten statements was calculated. The results of the analysis showed that the students’ responses on interest towards learning English inclined to be happy. The mean value for the statement one: “I like learning English” for the control group was (x̄=2.23), while for the experimental group was (x̄=3.68), which showed that the inclination of students in experimental group inclined more towards very happy as compared to the control group which inclined towards happy. The mean value of statement two: “I like my English teacher” for control group was (x̄=2.13) while for experimental group was (x̄=3.48). It indicated that the students in the experimental group felt to be happier as compared to the students in the control group who felt to be unhappy.

The mean value of statement three: “I like the way my teacher teaches English” for the control group was (x̄=2.20) and for the experimental group was (x̄=3.65). This indicated that the students in the experimental group felt to be very happy as it was compared to the students in the control group who felt to be unhappy. The mean value of the statement four: “I like to speak English” for the control group was (x̄=2.08), while for the experimental group was (x̄=3.52), which showed that the students in the experimental group felt to be very happy as it was compared to their counterparts in the control group who felt to be unhappy. The mean value of the statement five: “I like to answer questions in English” for the control group was (x̄=2.05), while the experimental group was (x̄=3.78), which indicated that the students in the experimental group were very happy as it was compared to the students in the control group were unhappy. The details are shown in Table 3.

The mean value for the statement six: “I like to talk to my friends in English” for the control group was (x̄=2.20), while the experimental group was (x̄=3.28). It showed the contradictory, in which the students in the experimental group were happy as it was compared to those in the control group who were unhappy. In response to the statement seven: “I like to take part class’s activities using English” the mean value for the control group was (x̄=2.13), while the experimental group was (x̄=3.40). It seemed that the students in the experimental group were happy to take more activities as it was compared to the students in the control group who were not happy to take activities during their English classes.

The result for statement eight: “I like to sing in English” the mean value of the control group is (x̄=2.15) while the mean value of student in experimental group is (x̄=3.60). The differences of mean values indicated that the students in experimental group felt to be very happy to sing in English and students in control group felt to be unhappy to sing in English. In responding to the statement nine: “I am happy during my English Class” the mean value for control group was at (x̄=2.25) while the mean value for the experimental group was (x̄=3.53). The results indicated that students in the experimental group felt to be very happy while students in the control group felt to be unhappy. The last test was to know the mean value for the statement ten: “I like to improve my English”, It was calculated that the mean value for the control group was (x̄=3.20) and for the experimental group was (x̄=3.53). The results indicated that the students in the experimental group felt to be very happy as it was compared to the students in the control group who felt to be happy.
Table 2. Percentage of student' interest towards learning English in experimental and control group

| No | Item                                                                 | Control group % | Experimental group % |
|----|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|----------------------|
| 1  | I like learning English                                               |                 |                      |
|    | Very unhappy                                                          | 18              | 0                    |
|    | Unhappy                                                               | 45              | 3                    |
|    | Happy                                                                 | 25              | 20                   |
|    | Very happy                                                            | 12              | 77                   |
| 2  | I like my English teacher                                            |                 |                      |
|    | Very unhappy                                                          | 30              | 0                    |
|    | Unhappy                                                               | 40              | 0                    |
|    | Happy                                                                 | 17              | 32                   |
|    | Very happy                                                            | 13              | 68                   |
| 3  | I like the way my teacher teaches English                             |                 |                      |
|    | Very unhappy                                                          | 23              | 0                    |
|    | Unhappy                                                               | 42              | 0                    |
|    | Happy                                                                 | 27              | 20                   |
|    | Very happy                                                            | 8               | 80                   |
| 4  | I like to speak English                                               |                 |                      |
|    | Very Unhappy                                                          | 30              | 0                    |
|    | Unhappy                                                               | 45              | 0                    |
|    | Happy                                                                 | 12              | 32                   |
|    | Very happy                                                            | 13              | 68                   |
| 5  | I like to answer questions in English                                  |                 |                      |
|    | Very unhappy                                                          | 30              | 0                    |
|    | Unhappy                                                               | 45              | 0                    |
|    | Happy                                                                 | 15              | 35                   |
|    | Very happy                                                            | 10              | 65                   |
| 6  | I like to talk to my friends in English                               |                 |                      |
|    | Very unhappy                                                          | 23              | 0                    |
|    | Unhappy                                                               | 47              | 0                    |
|    | Happy                                                                 | 17              | 37                   |
|    | Very happy                                                            | 13              | 63                   |
| 7  | I like to take part class’s activities using English                  |                 |                      |
|    | Very unhappy                                                          | 30              | 0                    |
|    | Unhappy                                                               | 40              | 0                    |
|    | Happy                                                                 | 18              | 38                   |
|    | Very happy                                                            | 12              | 62                   |
| 8  | I like to sing in English                                             |                 |                      |
|    | Very unhappy                                                          | 30              | 0                    |
|    | Unhappy                                                               | 42              | 0                    |
|    | Happy                                                                 | 10              | 30                   |
|    | Very happy                                                            | 18              | 70                   |
| 9  | I am happy during my English class                                    |                 |                      |
|    | Very unhappy                                                          | 22              | 0                    |
|    | Unhappy                                                               | 40              | 0                    |
|    | Happy                                                                 | 28              | 40                   |
|    | Very happy                                                            | 10              | 60                   |
| 10 | I like to improve my English                                          |                 |                      |
|    | Very unhappy                                                          | 23              | 0                    |
|    | Unhappy                                                               | 47              | 0                    |
|    | Happy                                                                 | 17              | 30                   |
|    | Very happy                                                            | 13              | 70                   |

Table 3. Results of the students' interest survey

| No | Item                                                                 | Mean of control group | Mean of experimental group |
|----|----------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|
| 1  | I like learning English                                              | 2.23                  | 3.68                      |
| 2  | I like my English teacher                                            | 2.13                  | 3.48                      |
| 3  | I like the way my teacher teaches English                            | 2.20                  | 3.65                      |
| 4  | I like to speak English                                              | 2.08                  | 3.52                      |
| 5  | I like to answer questions in English                                 | 2.05                  | 3.78                      |
| 6  | I like to talk to my friends in English                              | 2.20                  | 3.28                      |
| 7  | I like to take part class’s activities using English                 | 2.13                  | 3.40                      |
| 8  | I like to sing in English                                            | 2.15                  | 3.60                      |
| 9  | I am happy during my English class                                   | 2.25                  | 3.53                      |
| 10 | I like to improve my English                                         | 3.20                  | 3.65                      |
Table 4. Comparison of mean scores for Interest toward Learning English in the pre-test

| Group       | N  | Mean | SD  | Mean difference | t-value | df  | p-value |
|-------------|----|------|-----|-----------------|---------|-----|---------|
| Experimental| 40 | 20.53| 4.24| -.35            | -.399   | 78  | .210    |
| Control     | 40 | 20.88| 3.58|                 |         |     |         |

*Level of significance is at p<0.05*

Table 5. Comparison of mean score for Interest toward Learning English in the post-test

| Group       | N  | Mean | SD  | Mean difference | t-value | df  | p-value |
|-------------|----|------|-----|-----------------|---------|-----|---------|
| Experimental| 40 | 36.80| 1.47| 15.10           | 22.891  | 78  | .000    |
| Control     | 40 | 21.70| 3.90|                 |         |     |         |

*Level of significance is at p<0.05*

3.2 The Difference between Students in the Experimental Group and the Control Group for Their Interest towards Learning English in the Pre-test

During the pre-test, the mean score for the experimental group was (\( \bar{x} = 20.53 \)), while the mean score for the control group was (\( \bar{x} = 20.88 \)). The results from the independent sample t-test revealed that there was no significance difference exist between the mean scores of the students in the experimental group as compared to the students in the control groups for their interest towards learning English (t=-0.399, df=78, p<0.05) as depicted Table 4.

3.3 The Difference between Students in the Experimental Group and the Control Group for Their Interest towards Learning English in the Post-test

During the post-test, the mean score for the experimental group was (\( \bar{x} = 36.80 \)) while the control group had a mean score of (\( \bar{x} = 21.70 \)). The results from the independent sample t-test indicated that there was a significant difference exist between the mean scores of the experimental group as compared to the control group for interest towards learning English (t=22.891, df = 78, p<0.05). The details are shown in Table 5.

The comparison results from pre-test (Table 4) and post-test (Table 5) showed that there is a significant different of mean scores of the students in the experimental group and control group. The experimental group obtained higher mean scores in the post-test. These findings revealed that the use of nursery rhyme significantly enhanced the interest towards learning English of the students in the experimental group as compared to their counterparts in the control group who were taught using the conventional method.

4. CONCLUSION

The findings from the current study showed that the use of nursery rhymes is an effective method that can be employed by teachers to promote interests towards learning English among young Indonesian second language learners. This method able to promote the students’ interests towards learning English based on ten items which were related to their preferences of learning English, their teachers’ performances, their communication, interaction, their active participation and the interest to improve their English. Students in the experimental group achieved higher scores in interest test as compared to those in the control group who were taught using the conventional method.

The findings from this current study are in line with Harper [15], Schiller [37]; and Shwetha [4]. These studies concluded that integrating nursery rhymes, jingles and chants, and traditional literature contributes to a linguistically rich environment into the early childhood curriculum. In such environment, young children exposed to the rich vocabulary, syntactic complexity, and decontextualized language contained within the English language and teachers used nursery rhymes to get children focused and to get them up and to move further. Nursery rhymes have always proven to be one of the best ways to teach a language to young learners, as they convey a lot to learn and keeping the learner’s attention intact.

However, in teaching nursery rhymes the teacher is the main person who has the responsibility for planning and implementing the cooperative
learning activities during the English learning interventions in the classroom. As such teachers need through training and exposure on how to carry out the activities in the classrooms before implementing the nursery rhymes. The finding of the study also serves as a guide to the Ministry of Education in particular to the Teachers' Training Institution to make the nursery rhymes method an important input for the innovation in English language teaching, especially in the elementary schools. Modules (eight nursery rhymes) as introduced in the current study could serve as a model for English teachers in their English classes. This model can also enrich understanding of academicians and policymakers by describing the effects of nursery rhymes as compared to other material using conventional teaching method. This study has some limitations, as it involved eighty students and two teachers as samples, it is essential to do further research using a larger sample and different age groups to determine the effects of optimising nursery rhymes in promoting interests of young English learners in Indonesia. In this study, the researcher only analysed the four aspects of interests using the quantitative data; the future researcher can use qualitative data to investigate the optimisation of nursery rhymes in promoting the students’ interests towards learning English among young Indonesian second language learners.
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APPENDIX

List of Nursery Rhymes

1. ITSY BITSY SPIDER

The itsy-bitsy spider
Climbed up the water spout
Down came the rain
And washed the spider out
Out came the sun
And dried up all the rain
And the itsy-bitsy spider
Climbed up the spout again

2. PEAS PORRIDGE HOT

Peas, porridge hot!
Peas, porridge cold!
Peas porridge in the pot
Nine days old.
Some like it hot,
Some like it cold,
I like it in the pot
Nine days old!

3. HOT CROSS BUNS

Hot cross buns!
Hot cross buns!
One a penny, two a penny.
Hot cross buns!
If you have no daughters,
Give them to your sons!
One a penny, two a penny.
Hot cross buns!

4. THE NUMBER RHymes

One, two, three, four, five,
Once I caught a fish alive,
Six, seven, eight, nine, ten,
Then I let it go again.

Why did you let it go?
Because it bite my finger so.
Which finger did it bite?
This little finger on the right.

5. OLD MACDONALD

Old MacDonald had a farm E-I-E-I-O
And on his farm he had a cow E-I-E-I-O
With a moo moo here
And a moo moo there
Here a moo, there a moo
Everywhere a moo moo
Old MacDonald had a farm E-I-E-I-O
Old MacDonald had a farm E-I-E-I-O
And on his farm he had a duck E-I-E-I-O
  With a quack quack here
  And a quack quack there
  Here a quack, there a quack
  Everywhere a quack quack
Old MacDonald had a farm E-I-E-I-O

Old MacDonald had a farm E-I-E-I-O
And on his farm he had a horse E-I-E-I-O
  With a neigh neigh here
  And a neigh neigh there
  Here a neigh, there a neigh
  Everywhere a neigh neigh
Old MacDonald had a farm E-I-E-I-O

Old MacDonald had a farm E-I-E-I-O
And on his farm he had a lamb E-I-E-I-O
  With a baa baa here
  And a baa baa there
  Here a baa, there a baa
  Everywhere a baa baa
Old MacDonald had a farm E-I-E-I-O

6. JACK AND JILL

Jack and Jill went up the hill,
To fetch a pail of water.
Jack fell down and broke his crown,
And Jill came tumbling after.
Up Jack got and home he ran,
As fast as he could caper.
There his mother bound his head
With vinegar and brown paper.

7. HEY DIDDLE-DIDDLE

Hey diddle-diddle,
The cat and the fiddle,
The cow jumped over the moon,
The little dog laughed
to see such sport,
And the dish ran away
with the spoon.

8. SING A SONG OF SIXPENCE

Sing a song of sixpence,
A pocket full of rye;
Four and twenty blackbirds
Baked in a pie.
When the pie was opened,
They all began to sing.
Wasn't that a dainty dish
To set before the King?
The King was in his palace
Counting out his money;
The Queen was in the parlour
Eating bread and honey.
The maid was in the garden,
Hanging out the clothes.
Along there came a big black bird
And snipped off her nose!
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