

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This chapter describes the procedure of the study in order to find out the answers of the two research questions previously stated in chapter one. It includes the research design, population and sample, data collection techniques, and data analysis techniques.

1.1 Research Design

This study employed a quasi-experimental design. This design was chosen for three main reasons: first, the participants in this study were not selected randomly as suggested in true experimental design; second, quasi-experimental design has both experimental and control groups which allow the researcher to make a comparison (Emilia, 2000) which is one of the characteristics of well-designed experiments. Third, Pretest in the quasi-experimental design could be used to detect similarities between the experimental and control groups before treatment was given. Meanwhile, the posttest was used to conclude whether the treatment affected the participants or not.

A quasi-experimental study design has five basic characteristics: 1) there are two groups: experimental and control groups; 2) both of the groups compared with respect to measurement on the dependent variable; 3) both of the groups are measured twice; the first measurement is pretest and the second one is posttest; 4) for both the groups, the dependent variable measurement are conducted with the same test and the same time; and 5) the experimental group is employed with specific treatment (Hatch & Lazaraton, 1991).

There were two groups of year 11 level students of a state senior high school in Bandung regency in this study. Both groups had speaking session. Each session lasted for 90 minutes. The experimental group was treated by the

implementaion of Task-Based Learning with English Conversation Gambits as its language focus material. On the other side, the control group was treated without Task-Based Learning with English Conversation Gambits as its language focus material in their speaking classroom, instead it was treated by Presentation, Practice and Production (PPP) method as it used to learn English language with its English teachers. Both Pretest and Posttest were given to the both groups, the experimental group and the control group.

Besides employing a quasi-experimental design, this study also employed a qualitative design which included classroom observations, questionnaire, and interviews as the instruments to investigate the students' attitudes toward the implementation of Task-Based Learning method with English Conversation Gambits as its language focus material in terms of behavioral, cognitive, and emotional aspects of attitudes. The qualitative design basically has the purpose to understand the phenomenon in depth which is based on how the students in the study perceive it (Gay, 1996) and to find out the information about students' beliefs, point of view, or attitudes of past events which influence to the present condition (Best, 1970 as cited in Cohen et al., 2007).

As this study will be employed in educational setting and will involve the writer both as a researcher and a teacher, thus the term 'practitioner research' will also be taken as a consideration behind the design of the study (Menter et al., 2011).

1.2 Population and Sample

This study was conducted at a State Senior High School in Bandung Regency as its population and involved 2 classes of its students of 11 Year level as its purposive sample. The school was chosen for two main reasons; firstly, because so far there has not been any research on Task-Based Learning with English Conversation Gambits as its language focus material in the school; secondly, the classes of 11 Year level in this school are classified as large classes

consisting of 40 to 49 students in each of the class where Ellis (2009) argued that it is difficult to implement Task-Based Learning in a large class. Purposive sample was selected because it seems to represent all the students and chosen by personal judgment of the writer rather than by chance (Malik & Hamied, 2016).

1.3 Research Procedures

Some research procedures were arranged to make the study runs in a well-organized way. Firstly, the pretest was given to both Class1 and Class2. The results of the test were collected and analyzed as the preliminary data about the students' speaking performance whether both two classes fulfill the requirement of quantitative experimental study. Secondly, grouped those two classes into experimental and control groups. Thirdly, both experimental group and control group got a treatment. However, they got different treatment. On one hand, the experimental group got Task-Based Learning with English Conversation Gambits as its language focus material treatment. On the other hand, the control group was treated without Task-Based Learning with English Conversation Gambits as its language focus material, instead it was treated by conventional method by using Presentation, Practice and Production (PPP) Method. fourthly, the posttest was given to both experimental and control groups to find out whether or not both groups reveal different result. Fifthly, the class observations, questionnaire, and interviews were conducted only to the experimental group.

Table 3.1 Description of Research Procedures

| No. | Date | Procedure | Time Allocation |
|-----|----------------|-----------|-----------------|
| 1 | 24 July 2017 | Pretest | 2 x 45 minutes |
| 2 | 31 July 2017 | Treatment | 2 x 45 minutes |
| 3 | 7 August 2017 | Treatment | 2 x 45 minutes |
| 4 | 14 August 2017 | Treatment | 2 x 45 minutes |
| 5 | 21 August 2017 | Treatment | 2 x 45 minutes |

| | | | |
|---|-------------------|---------------------------|----------------|
| 6 | 28 August 2017 | Treatment | 2 x 45 minutes |
| 7 | 4 September 2017 | Treatment | 2 x 45 minutes |
| 8 | 11 September 2017 | Posttest | 2 x 45 minutes |
| 9 | 18 September 2017 | Questionnaire & Interview | 2 x 45 minutes |

1.4 Data Collection Techniques

Data collection were gained from two types of instruments: quantitative and qualitative instruments. Quantitative instrument included speaking test (pretest and posttest), whereas qualitative instrument included classroom observations, questionnaire, and interviews.

1.5 Data Analysis Techniques

The analysis included the data collection techniques employed: test (pretest and posttest), classroom observations, questionnaire, and interviews.

1. Pretest and Posttest

The pretest and posttest were conducted in the form of classroom debate. Students were asked to work in groups to take part in a classroom debate based on the topics given. There are fourteen groups for each class. Each group consists of three to four students. Classroom debate performance was chosen as this kind of task represents an authentic of target language use and can accommodate students to explore the target language they have already learned for communicative purpose as the Task-Based Learning proposed (Willis, 1996). Students' speaking proficiency scores were assessed by a speaking assessment rubric score which is

adapted from Student Oral Language Observation Matrix (SOLOM) developed by the San Jose Area Bilingual Consortium as shown on the appendices page.

The pretest was given at the beginning of the meeting to diagnose students' speaking proficiency before the teaching and learning processes were conducted. Then, at the end of the meeting, posttest was also given to find out whether or not the students' speaking proficiency had been developed by the implementation of Task-Based Learning method with English Conversation Gambits as its form focus material.

The data from both pretest and posttest were statistically analyzed by using t-test. Before the t-test, test of normality of distribution and test of variance homogeneity were conducted. Those three steps of calculation were done to fulfill the requirement of quantitative data analysis (Hatch & Lazaraton, 1991).

Analysis of normality of distribution was conducted to find out the scores of experimental and control groups whether the scores are normally distributed or not. According to Hatch and Farhady (1982), the normal distribution has three distinct properties allowing us to make inference about the population in general and our sample of that population in particular.

The statistical calculation of normality test used Kolmogorov-Smirnov by following three steps:

- Setting the level of significance (p) at 0.05 and establishing the hypothesis as follow:
 H_0 : the variances of experimental and control group are normally distributed.
- Analyzing the normality distribution with Kolmogorov-Smirnov test.
- Comparing the *Asymp. Sig* (probability) with level of significance (p) to test the hypothesis. If the *Asymp. Sig* > (*higher*) than 0.05 the null hypothesis is accepted and alternative hypothesis is rejected, and the distribution of the data is normal. Hence, if the *Asymp. Sig* < (*smaller*) than 0.05, the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternative hypothesis is accepted, and it means that the data is not normally distributed.

The analysis of homogeneity of variance was conducted to find out the variance of experimental and control group whether the scores were homogenous or not. The homogeneity of variance test used a SPSS program namely Levene test. The steps are as follows:

- Setting the level of significance (p) at 0.05 and establishing the null hypothesis as follow:
 H_0 : the variance of experimental and control group are homogenous.
- Analyzing the homogeneity of variance by using Levene test.
- Comparing the *Asymp. Sig* (probability) with level of significance (p) to test the hypothesis. If the *Asymp. Sig* > (*higher*) than 0.05, the null hypothesis is accepted and alternative hypothesis is rejected. It suggests that variance of the data is homogenous. Hence, if the *Asymp. Sig* \leq 0.05, the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternative hypothesis is accepted. It clarifies that the variances are significantly different.

After revealing the result of normality and homogeneity test, the next statistical calculation namely the independent t-test was conducted. The test was conducted to find out the mean of experimental and control group whether there was significant difference or not. In this study, the independent t-test was calculated by the computation of SPSS statistics 16.0 for windows. The procedures to calculate the independent t-test of pretest and posttest data are as follows:

- Setting the level of significance (p) at 0.05 and establishing the null hypothesis for the pretest and posttest data analysis. The null hypothesis is stated as follow:
 H_0 : there is no significant difference between the mean of experimental and control group.
- Analyzing the independent t-test by using SPSS 16.0.
- Comparing the t_{obt} and the t_{crit} at p 0.05 to examine the hypothesis. If the t_{obt} is > (*higher than*) t_{crit} , the null hypothesis is rejected. It clarifies that that there is difference of mean between experimental and control group. However,

if the $t_{obt} < t_{crit}$ (smaller than) t_{crit} , the null hypothesis is accepted. It means that there is no difference of mean between experimental and control group.

2. Classroom Observations

Observation was conducted to look for the information of the accessed behavior of the participants in the setting where it took place (Creswell & Miller, 2000). Moreover, Cohen et.al (2007) stated that observation has a characteristic which shows natural situation and authentic information. In this study, classroom observations were intended to investigate the students' attitudes toward the method implementation in their learning and teaching activities in terms of behavioral, cognitive, and emotional aspects of attitude.

There were five aspects of the students' attitudes that I observed during the study, including: (1) students' involvement; (2) students' motivation; (3) students' independence; (4) students' self-confidence; and (5) students' interaction and communication. Those five aspects of the students' attitudes were assumed as some of the most important aspects of attitude that must be possessed by the students for successful second or foreign language learning particularly for speaking skill.

In doing the classroom observations, audio-visual recording and field notes were employed. The data gained from the classroom observations were analyzed by content analysis, including transcribed, classified, and interpreted descriptively. These observations were conducted in every lesson while I was implementing the method in the study.

3. Questionnaire

Malik and Hamied (2016) state that the questionnaire helps the researcher to get and collect large data in a relatively a short amount of time. In this study, the questionnaire was conducted to investigate whether the students had positive

or negative attitudes in terms of behavioral, cognitive, and emotional aspects of attitude toward the implementation of Task-Based Learning with English Conversation Gambits as its language focus material during the study. This questionnaire was conducted after all the teaching and learning treatments had finished. Since the Task-Based Learning with English Conversation Gambits as its language focus material had been applied only to the experimental group, this questionnaire was only given to this group.

The questionnaire consists of thirteen statements modified from the Attitude and Motivation Test Battery (AMTB) designed by Gardner (1985) and the attitude questionnaire employed in a study by Susan (2016) concerning language learning and teaching attitudes in terms of behavioral, cognitive, and emotional aspects of attitude.

To avoid misunderstanding in comprehending the questionnaire, the statements were given in Bahasa Indonesia. The questions or statements in the questionnaire were classified into the central theme (Creswell, 2008): the implementation of Task-Based Learning with English Conversation Gambits as its form focus material which covered students' attitudes toward the implementation of Task-Based Learning with English Conversation Gambits as its language focus material in terms of behavioral, cognitive, and emotional aspects of attitude. This close ended questionnaire was in form of Likert scale that measured the extent to which a student agreed or disagreed with the statements. The scale was 1 to 5. The scale was 1 as "strongly disagree", 2 as "disagree", 3 as "neutral", 4 as "agree", and 5 as "strongly agree." It was analyzed through content analysis.

The form of the questionnaire can be seen on appendices page.

4. Interviews

This study employed semi structured interviews. This semi structured interviews were used to confirm the data gained from both the classroom observations and the questionnaire. By this semi structured interviews, the

students were encouraged to speak openly to give as much details as possible. The questions were design to elicit more information from the students, and then the information obtained was compared and contrasted (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2012). In this study, the interviews were intended to verify the findings from the classroom observations and from the questionnaire.

The interviews were addressed to twenty eight students based on the results from the questionnaire data which revealed twenty eight different responses regarding the three aspects of the students' attitudes under investigation i.e., behavioral, cognitive, and emotional aspects of attitude. Thus, this number of students could represent all of the students' responses toward the method implementation.

The interviews were conducted after the learning and teaching processes had finished. It was done after the students answered the questionnaire. This interview was delivered in Bahasa Indonesia according to the students' preference in order to make them feel more comfortable and share their responses freely. The data from interviews were analyzed through content analysis.

1.6 Concluding Remarks

This chapter has discussed the research methodology of the study, including the research design, the population and sample, and the research procedures. It also presented the data collection techniques and analyses for the study, including pretest, posttest, classroom observation, questionnaire, and interview. Moreover, the pretest and posttest instrument were also included in this chapter. The next chapter will elaborate the findings and the discussions of the study.