

## Chapter III

### Research Methodology

This chapter presents methodology of this current research in detail. It covers the research design, population and sample of the research, data collection procedures and data analysis procedures.

#### 3.1 Method of Research

##### 3.1.1 Research Design

This current research was interested to reveal the variety of the University EFL students' strategies and the ways the strategies were employed in learning English speaking skills. In accordance with this research' interests, the research applied the descriptive research design to describe the students' LLS. Arikunto (1990: 310) states that descriptive research is not intended to test certain hypothesis, its chief job is to describe about certain variable, symptoms, or condition. Best and Khan (1989) also says that descriptive research describes objects as what they are through describing, recording, analyzing, and interpreting conditions that exist.

Descriptive statistic analysis was applied in this research to obtain information related to frequency of occurrence of certain phenomena (see Tarigan, 1993: 190). Data obtained from the research's inquiry were both qualitatively and quantitatively analyzed.

## 3.2 Population and Sample of Research

### 3.2.1 Population

The population of this study was the fourth grade students of English Education Department of Indonesia University of Education. Due to the large number of the population, this research decided to use a sample of the population.

### 3.2.2 Sample

Purposive-random sampling design was applied. The sample selection was based on some considerations. First, English speaking skills are established as one of the compulsory subjects and are integrated with reading, writing, and listening. Therefore, the students were presumed to have a broad view about English speaking skills. Second, as the students are faced with various speaking tasks during their speaking courses and activities outside the speaking course, they were assumed to have numerous LLS used to fulfill the requirements. Third, regarding the students' maturity and awareness, they were considered to be able to analyze and report their LLS thoroughly. The selected sample was believed to be information rich-cases which means that sample has the desirable characteristics and that data they can provide are relevant to the research (see Wiersma, 1995: 298; Arikunto, 2002: 117).

A sample has the same characteristics as its population but it is much smaller in numbers (Oppenheim, 1996: 38). In terms of the number of sample, Arikunto (2002: 112) states that 10% - 15% of the population is quite acceptable as sample when the population is large. Therefore, this research took 30 fourth grade university students of

English major as the sample to approximately represent the 10% of population. The students in the sample were randomly selected. They were the students who voluntarily participated in the research.

### **3.3 Data Collection Procedures**

Since different types of data collection procedures may lead to different conclusions about the character and the use of LLS (O'Malley and Chamot, 1990: 95), a multi-method approach, triangulation, the use of two or more methods of data collection in the study of some aspect of human behavior (Cohen and Manion cf. Vidal, 2002) has been chosen to obtain data as accurate as possible. Such design integrates quantitative and qualitative approaches which complement each other to provide a much more detailed and comprehensive picture of that which is being explored (Lan, 2004).

There were two phases of collecting the data in this research. In phase I, the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) was administered to the respondents to gather the general profile of the respondents' strategies type and frequency of use. Phase II involved group interviews with the sub-sample to collect data on the application of the strategies.

#### **3.3.1 Instruments**

The researcher used two data collection approaches which involved two instruments as follows:

##### **3.3.1.1 Self-Report Surveys**

Self-report surveys are instruments used to gather systematic, written data on LLS use (Oxford, 1990: 198). In this research,

questionnaire which consists of close-ended questions was used as the instrument for self-report survey. A questioner benefits the researcher as it delimits the responses to information that is relevant and simplifying data manipulation for data coding and analysis (O'Malley and Chamot, 1990: 94). Meanwhile, closed-ended type of questions are easy to fill out as no writing is required, take little time, keep the respondents on the subject and relatively objective (Best and Khan, 1989: 185).

This research employed Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) 7.0 to find out the general profile of the students' wide range of strategies. SILL is developed based on the Oxford's LLS taxonomy which is widely considered as the most comprehensive classification. The SILL as a standardized measure has been used extensively with large number of language students and languages (Vidal, 2002; Hismanoglu, 2000; Cohen, 1996).

The 50-SILL items were selected with regard to speaking skills. The items were further adapted and edited and developed by the researcher to fit the context where the research was conducted and respondents' level of education without eliminating the essence of the original SILL (see Appendix A). The phrase '*English speaking skills*' or '*speaking skills*' was written constantly in some items to emphasis that the strategies are specifically used to learn speaking skills. Oxford's (1990), Griffiths (2004), Rifkin (2004), Lan (2004) and Bond (2007) were some of the

references used in developing the SILL items used in this research.

The SILL 5 point scale provides five optional responses – *never or almost used, generally not used, sometimes used, usually used, always or almost used*. The responses were valued from 1 to 5 (see Table 3.2 for SILL scoring). The overall average score indicates how often the students tend to use the LLS in general, while average scores of each strategies category indicate which strategy categories the students tend to use most frequently (Oxford, 1990: 199).

The modified SILL consists of 21 items, covering memory strategies which deal with memorizing information; cognitive strategies which involve processing and using information; compensation strategies which compensate inadequacy in language knowledge; metacognitive strategies which involve planning and evaluating the learning; affective strategies which regulate affective sides; and social strategies which engage cooperation with others. Each statement represented one strategy (see Table 3.1 for the complete SILL items). The SILL was administered in English version and was distributed, filled out and handed back on 26<sup>th</sup> of November 2007.

**Table 3.1**  
**Final SILL Items**

Statement	Class	Strategy group	Item No	Total items
I relate information I already know with materials I learn when studying English speaking skills	Direct	Memory	1	3
I associate new English words with image, function, opposite, classes of words, related words	Direct	Memory	3	

I use new learned vocabulary or expression into conversation with English speakers	Direct	Memory	4	
I say out loud new vocabularies or expressions by repeatedly	Direct	Cognitive	2	
I try to find grammar rules of English and learn them	Direct	Cognitive	5	4
I try to pronounce English words/ expressions like a native speaker	Direct	Cognitive	6	
I plan in advance what I want to say	Direct	Cognitive	7	
When I can't think of an English word, I use gesture to convey my message	Direct	Compensation	8	
I use my native language (L1) words when I don't know the exact words in English	Direct	Compensation	9	3
If I don't know the vocabulary I want to use, I use similar words/phrases or using function, location, and description	Direct	Compensation	10	
I look for people I can talk in English	Indirect	Metacognitive	11	
If I'm corrected while speaking, I try to remember the correction and avoid making the same mistake again	Indirect	Metacognitive	12	4
I look for opportunities to speak in English	Indirect	Metacognitive	13	
I think of my speaking progress	Indirect	Metacognitive	14	
I don't worry about correctness as long as I can communicate my meaning	Indirect	Affective	15	
I give myself reward or treats when I do well in English speaking task	Indirect	Affective	16	3
I always lower my anxiety when I talk in English through deep breathing	Indirect	Affective	17	
If I don't understand, I ask the speaker to slow down or say it again	Indirect	Social	18	
I practice English with other students	Indirect	Social	19	
I ask for helps when I find difficulties in learning speaking skills	Indirect	Social	20	4
I learn about the culture of the English speakers	Indirect	Social	21	
			Total items	21

Table 3.2  
The SILL Scoring System

Responses	Never/ almost used	Generally not used	Sometimes Used	Usually used	Always/almost always used
Score	1	2	3	4	5

### 3.3.1.2 Interview

Interview adds the richness of information and descriptions of the respondents' LLS. Interview which involves self-observation interview was employed in this research to gather oral responses from the respondents. The respondents were not required to perform particular speaking task during the interview, instead they were asked to consider how they typically do the task (see Oxford, 1990: 197). In this way the interview could be done outside the speaking class.

Semi-structured type of interview was applied in this research. Specific questions were set up in order to get consistence answers from all the respondents but still allowed expansion of questions to guide the respondents and to verify and clarify the respondents' answers. The interview consists of 6 parts designed to get in-depth descriptions on the respondents' speaking strategies (see Appendix C). Part I consists of 4 questions intended to obtain general information concerning the respondents' motivations and the students' speaking skills. Part 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 consist of 2 – 3 questions focused on revealing the application of the speaking strategies. The respondents were asked to explain how to use their specific strategies which were intended to learn 5 components of speaking i.e. vocabulary, grammar, pronunciation, fluency and comprehension (Harris cited in Holis, 2005).

Since the time to conduct the interviews was limited, the interviews were conducted in a small group of three and four. Ten

respondents as the sub-sample were randomly selected and were divided into 3 groups. Each group was interviewed separately in succession days, starting from 26<sup>th</sup> of November 2007 until 30<sup>th</sup> of November 2007. In order to avoid losing important information and the identity of the interviewees, the interviews were audio – taped and the interviewees were coded with R1, R2, R3, and R4.

There were some advantages of conducting the group interview. First, the presence of other interviewees in the group enabled the interviewees to complete each other's explanations without influencing the individual report. Second, friendly and fun atmosphere could be created during the interview. However, there were also few weaknesses of group interview; it required quite a long time to conduct (one interview spent 50 – 60 minutes to complete) and the interviewer had to work hard to maintain the interviewees' enthusiasm and attention.

### **3.4.2 Preliminary Studies**

To ensure the validity and reliability of this research's instruments, few ground-works were taken. They are as follows:

#### **3.4.2.1 Literary Studies**

To comprehend areas of LLS studies and imperative information from previous research, the researcher of this current research has conducted some explorations on LLS literatures and studies from many sources – books, journals, and articles.



### 3.4.2.2 Try-out the instruments

A pilot work is conducted to check for ambiguity, confusion, and poorly prepared items (Wiersma, 1995: 176). The final draft of SILL has been tried out with 10 respondents (other than the sample) from the population on 22<sup>nd</sup> of November 2007. Informal interviews have been also conducted to gather the respondents' personal on LLS and speaking learning experiences. The results showed that the SILL items represented most of the pilot respondents' strategies and the wordings were understandable.

## 3.5 Data Analysis Procedures

The data analyses covered the following steps:

### 3.5.1 Quantitative Data Analysis

Data gathered from the questionnaire were analyzed quantitatively through several steps. The steps were:

#### 3.5.1.1 Examining the obtained data

Data from both questionnaires and interviews were rechecked to make sure that the obtained data were clear and complete.

#### 3.5.1.2 Selecting and Classifying the data

The data were further selected and classified into categories based on the types of information of the data. Analysis of the SILL was based on intensity (frequency of use) categories. Oxford (1990) categorizes strategies intensity into \*low with two score ranges: 1.0–1.4 (never/almost used) and 1.5 – 2.4 (generally not used),

medium with range score 2.5–3.4 (sometimes used), and \*high with two score ranges: 3.5–4.4 (usually used) and 4.5–5.0 (almost/always used). Since there is one category for two intensities (\*), it was concerned there would be a possibility of misinterpreting them. Thus, this current research used five intensity categories proposed by Lengkanawati cited in Frandono (2005) which are expanded from the Oxford's intensity categories. Each range of score represents one intensity category (see Table 3.3 for the strategies intensity categories).

**Table 3.3**  
Strategies Intensity Categories

No	Score	Category	Intensity	% of use
1.	4.5 – 5.0	Very high	Always or almost always used	81 – 100% of the time
2.	3.5 – 4.4	High	Usually used	61 – 80% of the time
3.	2.5 – 3.4	Medium	Sometimes used	41 – 60% of the time
4.	1.5 – 2.4	Low	Generally not used	21 – 40% of the time
5.	1.0 – 1.4	Very low	Never or almost never used	0 – 20% of the time

### 3.5.1.3 Tabulating the data

In tabulating and presenting the data obtained from the questionnaire, the researcher employed the following steps:

3.5.1.3.1 Finding out the frequency of each response per item.

3.5.1.3.2 Finding out the total raw score by multiplying frequency of each response with each point scale (see Table 3.4 for the example)

**Table 3.4**  
Example of Raw Score Computation Item X

Response	Frequency (1)	Point scale (2)	Frequency times point scale (1) X (2)
Never used	0	1	0
Generally not used	4	2	8
Sometimes used	6	3	18

Usually used	12	4	48
Always used	8	5	40
Total Raw Score (R)			144

3.5.1.3.3 Calculating the strategy average score of individual strategy by subdividing total raw score with total number of respondents (n) (see Table 3.5 for the example).

**Table 3.5**  
**Example of Average Score Computation Item X**

Total number of respondents (n) (3)	Raw score (R) Item X (4)	Average score (A) (4) : (3)	Intensity category
30	144	4.8	Very high

3.5.1.3.4 Checking the average score with intensity categories

3.5.1.3.5 Calculating the percentage of each response based on the frequency by using this formula:

$$p = \frac{fo}{n} \times 100\%$$

(Sugana, 1986 in Haryanti, 2007: 46)

Where:

$p$  = percentage

$fo$  = frequency of answers

$n$  = total respondents

3.5.1.3.6 Calculating the average score of each strategy category by computing all the average score of the individual strategies in each strategies category and then

dividing them with the number of items in the category (see the example in Table 3.6).

**Table 3.6**  
Example of Overall Score Computation Group X

Strategy group	Strategy	Average Score	Intensity category
Cognitive	Item 1	3.2	Medium
	Item 2	2.16	
	Item 3	3.0	
Total	8.36 : 3 = 2.78		

3.5.1.3.7 Calculating the overall strategies use by computing the raw scores of all the six strategies categories and dividing the, with number of the respondents (n) (see the example in Table 3.7).

**Table 3.7**  
Example of Overall Strategies Use Computation

Strategy Group	Raw Score of Strategy Group	Total number of respondents (n) (3)	Intensity category
Memory	9.69	30	Medium
Cognitive	12.4		
Compensation	10.5		
Metacognitive	14.8		
Affective	7.6		
Social	9.8		
Total	64.79 : 30 = 3.08		

#### 3.5.1.4 Presenting the tabulation data

The each data analyses results is presented in tables, graphics and charts to clarify the data.

#### 3.5.1.5 Interpreting the results

Exploring and interpreting the findings by relating them with theories, some previous research and data gathered from the interviews.

### 3.5.2 Qualitative Data Analysis

In analyzing the qualitative data gathered from the interviews, the data were analyzed through several steps as follows:

- 3.5.2.1 Transcribing the taped interviews
- 3.5.2.2 Categorizing the strategies into strategies for grammar, pronunciation, vocabulary, fluency and comprehension.
- 3.5.2.3 Classifying the strategies based on LLS taxonomy proposed by Oxford (1990).
- 3.5.2.4 Examining the application of the strategies including the condition of occurrence and the combination of the strategies.
- 3.5.2.5 Interpreting the results.

