

## **CHAPTER III**

### **RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

This chapter discusses the methodology that was determined by the purposes of the study. As elaborated in Chapter I, the aims of this study are 1) to analyze how pragmatic competence is taught in the speaking for general communication course; 2) to assess how the development of the students' pragmatic competence; and 3) to discover the students' level of pragmatic competence after being exposed to the teacher's teaching strategies. Hence, this chapter begins with the discussion of research design, followed by the elaboration of the research site and participants, data collection, and data analysis. The research design discusses the method that was employed in this study, the principles and characteristics. The site and participants describe the place where the study was conducted and the participants involved in this study. The data collection presents the instruments and the procedures of data collection. The data analysis elaborates the procedure in analyzing the data.

#### **3.1 Research Design**

This study dealt with analyzing how pragmatic competence is taught in EFL classroom; assessing the development of the students' pragmatic competence; and discovering the students' level of pragmatic competence after being exposed to the teacher's teaching strategies. The primary data for this study was derived from observation, and tests.

The research design selected in this study was qualitative research, which has several main characteristics, among others: (1) importance of context (i.e. conducted in the actual setting of the phenomenon), (2) emphasis on the process, (3) inductive approach (i.e. extracting its concepts from the mass of particular detail), (4) focus on understanding and description (F.A Hamied, 2017).

This research design with the characteristics above is needed to answer the research questions. The first is the importance of context, that is, this research

focused on the words and actions of the teacher and the students in the natural setting, in this case, the words and actions of two teachers and 68 students. The second characteristic is the emphasis on the process. It means that the concern is with “how” rather than the outcome of the research. In this study, how the teachers taught, as well as the development of the students’ pragmatic competence, was observed. Third, the inductive approach implies that data are unstructured at the point of collection. In this study, the data were obtained by observing what the teacher and the students did in the classroom. Finally, focus on understanding and description indicates that this study tried to understand the meaning of the teachers’ teaching strategies, their interaction with the students, on the development of their pragmatic competence as well as the level of their pragmatic competence.

In conducting the qualitative research, this study applied case study. In this study, a case study is defined as “one of the most common qualitative approaches to research which aims to understand social phenomena within a single or a small number of naturally occurring settings” (Tavakoli, 2012). A case study is the study of the particularity and complexity of a single case. Cases are primarily people, but researchers can also explore, in-depth, a program, an institution, an episode, an organization, a process, a school, a class, or a community or other unit of social life. Almost anything can serve as a case as long as it constitutes a single entity with clearly defined boundaries.

The application of the case study approach was based on some reasons (F.A Hamied, 2017). First, this approach aims to study social phenomena, that is, teaching and learning processes taking place in the classroom. Next, multiple data are collected by employing multiple data collection methods. In this study, observation and tests (pretest and posttest) were used. Lastly, a case study is needed to explain some present circumstance, that is, how and why the teaching-learning processes worked.

This case study gathered both qualitative and quantitative data. In the classroom observation, through which qualitative data were collected, the researcher acted as an observer. In the two meetings, the researcher was a complete observer who fully observed the teaching and learning activities in the classroom without interacting at all with the class members. The students were mainly unaware that they were being observed and the researcher did nothing but a video recording of what happened in the classroom that would directly influence the activities under the study. In general, the data in this study were collected and interpreted in the form of descriptive data through audio and video recordings. Nevertheless, quantitative data were applied to determine students' level and development of pragmatic competence. To take precise samples of each level of competence, a descriptive statistical calculation was operated in this study. Then, the result of the calculation was supported qualitatively by describing each criterion of the rubric used to examine students' pragmatic competence.

### **3.2. Research Site and Participants**

This study was administered in a private university in Bandung. There were two reasons why this university was chosen as the research site. Firstly, it is related to the accessibility of the researcher. This university was the place where the researcher taught in 2016/2017 academic year. Since the researcher did the teaching in this university, the researcher could manage the administrative matters related to the research. Secondly, it is related to the background of the school. This university administered an oral communication classroom i.e. the teaching of speaking for general communication. This research related with students' pragmatic competence as the implications of the teachers' implemented strategies in teaching pragmatic competence, and thus the researcher aimed to analyze how pragmatic competence is taught in the speaking for general communication course; to assess the development of the students' pragmatic competence, and to find out the students' level of pragmatic competence after being exposed to the teacher's teaching strategies. Based

Dasep Suprijadi, 2020

*TEACHING PRAGMATIC COMPETENCE IN AN ORAL COMMUNICATION CLASSROOM*

Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia repository.upi.edu perpustakaan.upi.edu

on the agreement between the teacher and the researcher, the name of the teacher, the students, and the university were not revealed in this research paper.

The total number of participants of this study were two classes consisting of 68 students (N = 68 students) who took the subject of speaking for general communication. In qualitative research, a sample is typically purposive. Participants are selected because of who they are, and what they know, rather than by chance (Hamied, 2017). For this purpose, the number of participants taken as the sample was two classes comprising 68 students. In this case, as many as 34 students of the first-grade level studying in each class (class A and B) participated in the test of their pragmatic competence. The test provided information on the initial level of students' pragmatic competence, and the data led to the selection of two sample classes where the EFL teaching/learning practices were to be analyzed. The results of the test were used to provide convincing evidence that the class was appropriately chosen to be the appropriate class where the pragmatic competence was expected to be increased. Besides the results of the students' English test, some conditions were set to choose the class. Not only was the result of the pragmatic competence test used as one of the criteria to select the sample, but another point, namely the class' agreement to get involved in the study.

The nature of the participants was voluntarily based. They signed a consent form (see appendix I) upon the researcher's information on the aim of the research, its procedure, benefits so that they wanted to participate. The consent form was adapted from Dunne (2008) providing students' consent to participate in pretest and posttest and teaching program. To go along with the ethics, the code of TA and TB were addressed to the two teachers and S-1 up to S-n was addressed to the students.

The other participants in the presents study were two EFL teachers. They were teachers in English language education study program of the university who taught speaking for general communication subject. The choice of these teachers as the sample was based on the consideration that they were the ones teaching the

subject of speaking for general communication. The teachers were observed to find the required data of their teaching strategies.

To make the result of this study valid and reliable, inter-raters were used in this study. Two native speakers instructors of *Pusdiklat Bahasa Badiklat Kementerian Pertahanan MoD* of Indonesia, proofread the DCT test items meanwhile three native speakers of English from *Interkultural Edukasi Partner* Indonesia, graduated from Postgraduate school majoring in linguistics, evaluated the test takers' speech acts. They were asked to read the speech acts, along with the transcripts, and to indicate the rating based on the rating descriptions. The average score between the three raters was assigned as the final score.

### **3.3 Data Collection**

This section covers the research instruments and the procedures of collecting data as well as types of data collected.

#### **3.3.1 Research Instruments**

This study employed two instruments of data collection, namely Classroom Observation and Tests using Discourse Completion Tasks (DCT). During classroom observation, the teacher and students activities were observed and the notes of the teaching steps administered by the teachers were taken. The observation sheet adapted from Celce-Murcia's in Soler and Jorda (2008) Communicative competence components and Bachman (1990) pragmatic competence framework were used to analyze the data collected utilizing observation. The observation sheet can be seen in the table below.

**Table 3.1 Classroom Observation Sheet**

<b>Teacher</b> .....				
..... <b>(Fake name)</b> .....				
<b>Teaching Objective</b> .....				
Pragmatic Competence				
<b>No.</b>	EFL classroom activities	Teaching strategies	Sociolinguistic competence	Illocutionary competence
...	...	...	...	...

**Remarks**

1. Sociolinguistic competence' entails the ability to use language appropriately according to context. It thus includes the ability to select communicative acts and appropriate strategies to implement them depending on the contextual features of the situation
2. Illocutionary competence involves four main functions:
  - The ideational function helps language users express their thoughts and feelings; it refers to our use of language to exchange information and our feelings about that information; expressing meaning in terms of our experience of the real world.
  - The manipulative function enables people to obtain what they want; it serves a primary purpose of affecting the behavior of others; the primary purpose is to affect the world around us.
  - The heuristic function creates opportunities to learn new things and use language as a problem-solving tool; it involves our use of language to extend our knowledge of the world around us;
  - The imaginative function improves students' creativity; it involves our ability to play with language to entertain others. It creates or extends our environment for humorous purposes.

As this study was intended to capture how the selected class administered the teaching of speaking for general communication, classroom observation was prominent to be undertaken to gather the data from classroom activities and the interactions. The researcher acted as a non-participant observer. As a non-participant observer, video recorder, voice recorder, and observation sheet were utilized as the tools to record the events that were transcribed, coded, and analyzed subsequently to identify the classroom practices and the exposures that the teachers provided in their speaking for general communication classroom. Two English classes at the university were observed to gain the pattern of the pedagogical practices in the teaching of speaking for general communication. The observation administered in one semester was intended to capture the teachers' activities in the syllabus and their teaching strategies.

To observe the EFL classroom activities, observation sheet and videotape were used as the tools of observation. The observation sheets were mainly handwritten note on how the activities in the field run which were guided by Celce-Murcia in Soler and Jorda (2008) components of Communicative competence namely: sociocultural competence, discourse competence, linguistic competence, formulaic competence, interactional competence, and strategic competence which is categorized by Bachman (1990) into organizational competence and pragmatic competence. To capture the process as comprehensive as possible, all participants' activities in the classroom were videotaped as well. The purpose of this observation was to analyze how pragmatic competence is taught in speaking for a general communication course. The EFL classroom was observed successively until the patterns of teachers' activities in the teaching of speaking could be identified. The observation also used videotape to record more detailed data. The videotaping recorded any activities, specifically during the process of teaching and learning.

Besides, this research developed a test instrument that assessed EFL learners' ability to produce speech acts. The learners' speech acts were elicited through DCT

adapted from Jianda (2006). In his study, Jianda used 12 situation scenarios. However, in this study, the researcher used only eight situation scenarios. Participants as test-takers read situational descriptions and produced speech acts accordingly. Two types of speech acts were elicited: Requests and opinions. These types were both divided into two situation types: Low- and high- imposition situations. Low-imposition situations were informal situations in which the speaker addressed a person with the same power status. High-imposition situations were formal situations in which the speaker addressed a person with a higher power status (see Table 3.2 for the situations used in the DCT).

Before the DCT was tested to the subject of this study, the pragmatic competence test items were tested to the students from a population which has similar characteristic with the students involved in this research. The results of this try out test showed that the number of test items was too many. It took test-takers extra times beyond the time allotment provided. Hence, the number of test items was reduced from 12 to eight test items. Then the DCT containing the eight test items was administered to 68 students studying Speaking for general communication in a university located in Bandung-Indonesia. The DCT was given individually two times over one academic year: Students read directions in English. They were told to read each situational scenario and respond as if they were in a real situation and performing the given role.



**Table 3.3 Situations used in the DCT**


---

<p><b>Low-imposition situations</b></p> <p>Requests</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. You have a free writing task in class today, but you forgot to bring a pen. You want to borrow a pen from your friend in the class. He is sitting next to you. What do you say to him?</li> <li>2. You and your friend are talking about your group presentation for tomorrow's class. Your friend said something about English class to you, but you didn't understand. What do you say to him?</li> </ol> <p>Opinions</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. You are shopping with your friend. Your friend picked up a brown jacket and tried it on. You don't think he looks good in brown. He says, "What do you think?" What do you say to him?</li> <li>2. Your friend asked you to check the first draft of her paper on the Indonesia education system. The paper is well-written, but you think the introduction is too long. What do you say to him?</li> </ol> <p><b>High-imposition situations</b></p> <p>Requests</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. You have a small test in her class next Monday, but you have to go out of town that day because of your cousin's wedding. You want to take the test at some other time. What do you say to the professor?</li> <li>2. Tomorrow is the due date of a paper for your history class. You caught a cold, and you have written only two pages so far. You want to ask for two extra days to finish. What do you say to the professor?</li> </ol> <p>Opinions</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Your professor gave you a mid-semester grade of C, but you don't think it's fair. You missed three classes, but you always turned in homework on time and got 80% on the test. You go to the professor's office to explain. What do you say?</li> <li>2. You like the American professor, but he talks about American history most of the time and you are more interested in American pop culture. One day after class she says, "What do you think about the class?" What do you say to the professor?</li> </ol>
--

---

The speech acts were evaluated on their overall appropriateness, which was defined as the ability to produce speech acts at the proper level of politeness, directness, and formality in the given situations. Appropriateness was assessed using a five-point rating scale ranging from 0.00-1.00 (very poor); 1.01-2.00 (poor); 2.01-3.00 (fair); 3.01-4.00 (good) to 4.01-5.00 (excellent). The sum of the ratings of the

four low imposition and four high-imposition speech acts were calculated. The rubric is shown in the following table.

**Table 3.4 Rubric for Assessing the Students' level of Pragmatic Competence**

<b>Rating Scale</b>	<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Interpretation</b>
<b>4.01-5.00</b>	<b>Excellent</b>	The expression is almost perfectly appropriate and effective in the level of directness, politeness and formality
<b>3.01-4.00</b>	<b>Good</b>	The speech act is not perfect but adequately appropriate in the level of directness, politeness, and formality. Expressions are a little off from target-like but pretty good
<b>2.01-3.00</b>	<b>Fair</b>	The speech act is somewhat appropriate in the level of directness, politeness, and formality, Expressions are more direct or indirect than the situation requires
<b>1.01-2.00</b>	<b>Poor</b>	The speech act is inappropriate, Expressions sound almost rude or too demanding
<b>0.00-1.00</b>	<b>Very poor</b>	Not sure if the target speech act is performed

When collecting data of students' pragmatic competence, the researcher chose to utilize DCT, a well-known and frequently used method in researches on pragmatics, as seen in e.g. (Memarian, 2012; Brubaek, 2012; Brubaek, 2013; Viljamaa, 2012; Reigle, 2011; Baca, 2011; Jernigan, 2007; Rose, 1992).

### **3.3.2 Data Collection Procedures**

The procedures of the data collection in this study were administered through classroom observation and pragmatic competence evaluation. The preliminary study began after the letter of research permission was gained. The first step was to gather general information about the teaching of speaking for general communication by interviewing the head of English Education study program. In the meantime,

documentary checking, particularly the syllabus was studied. As suggested by the head of the English Education study program, another interview was done with the teachers of speaking for general communication subject. This preliminary data collection provided important inputs that enabled the researcher to enhance the focus of the study. From the beginning of May 2015, the consent forms were developed, then in September 2016, the forms were distributed to students to select the sample of the study. To examine the development of students' pragmatic competence, the Pragmatic competence evaluation through DCT was given. The results of the test, particularly the first test, also convinced the selection of the students to be the sample participants where the core of the study was undertaken.

### **3.4 Data Analysis**

The procedures used to analyze the data collected through observation consisted of the steps of recording the events, transcribing, and coding the data subsequently to represent kinds of activities in the teaching-learning strategies developed by the teachers. Celce-Murcia's in Soler and Jorda (2008) components of Communicative competence and the pragmatic competence framework adapted from Bachman (1990) were used to analyze the data collected. During this stage, the researcher read the observation sheet in terms of the teaching process carefully sentence by sentence, drew and dropped the relevant meaning units into the same coding group. New codes were created when new meanings which did not fit into any existing coding groups were encountered. All the discovered codes linked together to form connections, then the theme gradually emerged from the sets of data at the final stage of analyzing. In other words, the data taken from observation were transcribed and subsequently categorized and interpreted to answer the related research question. The transcription of the data was confirmed or sent back (Kvale, 1996) to the participants to make sure that it is exactly what the respondents say and mean.

The score criteria adapted from (Taguchi, 2011) was used to analyze data collected utilizing a DCT test type that consists of various oral communication

**Dasep Suprijadi, 2020**

**TEACHING PRAGMATIC COMPETENCE IN AN ORAL COMMUNICATION CLASSROOM**

Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia repository.upi.edu perpustakaan.upi.edu

situations adapted and modified from Taguchi. The test takers produce spoken responses to these situations and explain how they would express themselves in various situations. In this case, Taguchi proposes Evaluation of speech acts. EFL learners' speech acts were elicited through DCT. Participants read situational descriptions and produced speech acts accordingly. Two types of speech acts were elicited: Requests and opinions. These types were both divided into two situation types: Low- and high-imposition situations. Low-imposition situations are informal situations in which the speaker addressed a person with the same power status. High-imposition situations are formal situations in which the speaker addressed a person with a higher power status. The DCT was administered to 68 students having the subject of Speaking for general communication in a private university located in Bandung-Indonesia.

The speech acts were evaluated on their overall appropriateness, which was defined as the ability to produce speech acts at the proper level of politeness, directness, and formality in the given situations. Appropriateness was assessed using a five-point rating scale: 0.00- 1.00 (very poor); 1.01-2.00 (poor); 2.01-3.00 (fair); 3.01-4.00 (good); 4.01- 5.00 (excellent). The sum of the ratings of the four low imposition and four high-imposition speech acts were calculated. The following are the descriptions of the scale: being very poor means not sure if the target speech act is performed; being poor means that the speech act is inappropriate, expressions sound almost rude or too demanding; being fair means that the speech act is somewhat appropriate in the level of directness, politeness, and formality, expressions are more direct or indirect than the situation requires; being good means that the speech act is not perfect but adequately appropriate in the level of directness, politeness, and formality. Expressions are a little off from target-like but pretty good; being excellent means that the expression is almost perfectly appropriate and effective in the level of directness, politeness and formality. The followings are the samples of analysis results

### Test taker: Student 9 (S9)

There are eight situations described below. The students as test-takers read the description of each situation. It is expected that they would say something in English in each of the situations.

**1. Situation:** You have a free writing task in class today, but you forgot to bring a pen. You want to borrow a pen from your friend in the class. He is sitting next to you. What do you say to him?

S9 says : “Give me your pen please”  
 Rating Scale : 2 (the expression is poor, it is clearly inappropriate. It sounds almost rude or too demanding)  
 Rater’s comment : “This sounds demanding, you do not give him or her a choice, better would be “Do you have an extra pen?” or “Can I please borrow a pen?”

**2. Situation:** You and your friend are talking about your group presentation for tomorrow's class. Your friend said something about English class to you, but you didn't understand. What do you say to him?

S9 says : “What did you say?”  
 Rating Scale : 4 (the expression is good, it is not perfect but adequately appropriate in the level of directness, politeness, and formality. The expression is a little off from target-like, but pretty good)  
 Rater’s comment : “In the situation with a friend, this expression would be fine.”

**3. Situation:** You have a small test in his class next Monday, but you have to go out of town that day because of your cousin's wedding. You want to take the test at some other time. What do you say to the lecturer?

S9 says : “May I test another day”  
 Rating Scale : 3 (the expression is fair, it is somewhat appropriate in the level of directness, politeness, and formality. The expression is more direct than the situation requires.  
 Rater’s comment : “In this situation might be best to begin with the reason you would like to test another day: “ My cousin is getting

married on the day of the test, may I test another day so that I can attend the wedding?"

**4. Situation:** Tomorrow is the due date of a paper for your writing class. You caught a cold, and you've written only two pages so far. You want to ask for two extra days to finish. What do you say to the lecturer?

S9 says : "May I ask for a little longer to do the assignment?"  
 Rating Scale : 4 (the expression is good, it is not perfect but adequately appropriate in the level of directness, politeness, and formality. The expression is a little off from target-like but pretty good)  
 Rater's comment : "adequate and polite, wording feels a bit off to me. I would ask for an "extension" on the assignment."

**5. Situation:** You are shopping with your friend. Your friend picked up a green jacket and tried it on. You don't think he looks good in green. He says, "What do you think?" What do you say to him?

S9 says : "I think green is funny"  
 Rating Scale : 1 (the expression is very poor, not sure if the target speech act is performed)  
 Rater's comment : "In this situation, blame, I'm not sure this response fits at all. I would "blame" the color: "That's weird color green, may be you should try a different color."

**6. Situation:** Your friend asked you to check the first draft of her paper on the Indonesian education system. The paper is well-written, but you think the introduction is too long. What do you say to her?

S9 says : "make the introduction shorter"  
 Rating Scale : 3 (the expression is fair, it is somewhat appropriate in the level of directness, politeness, and formality. The expression is more direct than the situation requires.  
 Rater's comment : "Get the point across, but it feels very direct between friend."

**7. Situation:** Your lecturer gave you a mid-semester grade of C, but you don't think it's fair. You missed three classes, but you always turned in homework on time and got 80% on the test. You go to the lecturer's office to explain. What do you say?

S9 says : "Why can my grade get C?"

Rating Scale : 2 (the expression is poor, it is clearly inappropriate. It sounds almost rude or too demanding)

Rater's comment : "It sounds as if you are blaming your professor, sounds demanding."

"Excuse me, Mr./Mrs....." starts friendly and respectfully. I would then ask for an explanation. "Can you explain my grade to me?"

**8. Situation:** You like the lecturer of speaking subject, but she talks about the story of her own life most of the time and you are more interested in talking about the world culture. One day after class she says, "What do you think about the class?" What do you say to the lecturer?

S9 says : "I interested about your story but I more interested you story or talk about world culture."

Rating Scale : 3 (the expression is fair, it is somewhat appropriate in the level of directness, politeness, and formality. The expression is more direct than the situation requires.

Rater's comment : "There are many grammatical errors in this that make it more difficult to understand."

"You start well with a compliment to her or the class, that is polite and appropriate for the context. After the compliment I would ask whether world culture will be discussed: "I am very interested in world culture, will or could we discuss it in the class?"

Meanwhile, data processing of tests was done using the help of Statistical Package Software System (SPSS) V.24. The findings were described through tables and charts. There were two procedures of analysis. First, statistical analysis was conducted through descriptive statistics to determine to mean, median, variance, standard deviation, range, frequency distribution (Hamied, 2017). These statistics are used to find out the students' level of pragmatic competence before and after being exposed to the teachers' teaching strategies. Next, statistical analysis was done by calculating N-Gain. It was intended to assess the development of the students'

pragmatic competence or to measure the degree of increase from pretest to post-test. N-Gain was calculated manually by applying the following formula.

$$N - Gain = \frac{\text{Mean Score of Posstest} - \text{Mean Score of Pretest}}{\text{Maximum Score} - \text{Mean Score of Pretest}}$$

As soon as the N-Gain was obtained, it was interpreted by referring to Table 3.4.

**Table 3.4 N-Gain (Increase in Normal Scores)**

Scale	Interpretation
0.0 – 0.30	Low
0.31 – 0.70	Moderate
0.71 – 1.00	High

### 3.5 Concluding Remarks

This chapter discussed the research methodology of this study. It consisted of several sections covering research design, research site and participants, data collection procedures, data analysis, and the concluding remarks. The research design discussed the method that was employed in this study, the principles and characteristics. The research site and participants described the participants involved in this study and the place where the study was conducted. The data collection presented the instrument and the procedures of data collection. The data analysis elaborated the procedure in analyzing the data. The next chapter discussed the findings of the research and the discussion.