

## **Chapter Three**

### **Research Methodology**

This chapter discusses the methodology which is used by the researcher. There are five things included in this part. The first one is research design explaining about the design used by the researcher. The second is research setting and participants. The third is instrument of the study explains the instruments used in this research. The fourth is technique of data collection telling on how the researcher gather the data. The last is analysis of data explaining about how the data is analyzed.

#### **Research Design**

This research was conducted to find out the characteristics of anxious students at EED of UMY, the factors causing speaking anxiety and to discover the strategies to overcome speaking anxiety. The qualitative research method was suitable to be applied in this study, because the researcher needed to get rich information about speaking anxiety. According to Creswell (2012), “the characteristic of qualitative research is exploring a problem and developing a detailed understanding of a central phenomenon” (p. 16). In addition, the nature of data of qualitative research was words not number. Creswell (2012) further stated that the major characteristic of qualitative approach is using words in collecting the data. Thus, it was appropriate to apply qualitative approach as it was used to explore a problem and it developed a detail understanding of the problem. The

nature of the data was in form of words which would ease the reader to understand the data.

This research was intended to investigate a phenomenon happened in educational context especially in speaking skill in EED of UMY. The method under qualitative research design which was suitable for this research was case study. According to Merriam (1998), case study is an investigation about “particular situation, event, program, or phenomenon” (p. 29) which the end products of case study is thick and rich description of the phenomenon. Merriam (1998) also added that the case can be a student, a program, and a group. Case study was appropriate to be adopted in this research because the problem in this research was students’ speaking anxiety which was a specific phenomenon. Moreover, based on the researcher’s experience, speaking anxiety did not only exist in a particular time, but also existed during the researcher’s study time and in all courses. It meant that speaking anxiety existed in real life context.

The type of case study which was used was interpretive study. According to Merriam (1998), interpretive case study “contains rich, thick description” (p. 38). Merriam (1998) also explained that the descriptive is useful for explaining, giving contribution, or even opposing the previous theory. Hence, the findings in this study could support, challenge the previous theory or add new theory about speaking anxiety. Thus, by adopting interpretive case study, the data would be thick, rich and useful for supporting or opposing the prior theory.

## **Research Setting and Participants**

In this part, the researcher explains the setting and the participants of the study. The research setting discusses the place and the time the study was conducted. The research participants were the people who got involved and helped the researcher to get the findings for the research. The researcher would also give the reasons of choosing the setting and the participants.

**Research setting.** The research was conducted at English Education Department of Universitas Muhammadiyah Yogyakarta (EED of UMY). The researcher chose this place as the setting, because based on the researcher's experience, some EED of UMY students experienced speaking anxiety. The researcher could know that some students experienced speaking anxiety because the researcher did observations. Another reason was because the researcher was the student in this department, so the researcher had been familiar with the environment. The last reason was related to accessibility. It would be easier to get the data from the students in the same department. This study was conducted starting from February up to April 2017.

**Research participants.** The EED of UMY students batch 2016 became the participants in this research. They were appropriate to participate in this study since they were still freshmen, so the researcher considered that they had higher anxiety especially in speaking than the other EED of UMY students in other batches. In addition, they probably had not had many experiences in speaking English or they had not been accustomed to speaking English. The researcher chose six students to be the participants in this study. The participants were

selected based on the observation result. According to Creswell (2012), in qualitative research, the participant was undetermined, as long as the data had answered the research questions, the least number of participant was enough. By having six participants, the data was thick, rich, and various.

There were four female students and two male students who became the participants in this research. The first participant (P1) was a female student. Based on the observation result, she showed three symptoms. In the first observation she kept silent while her friends were speaking English. In the second observation she still kept silent and she also showed other symptoms like nervously touching object and avoiding eye contact. She was silent in both observations.

The second participant (P2) was a female student. She showed three symptoms when she was speaking English. She was silent in both observations. In the second observation, she showed other symptoms like nervously touching object and reading script while giving presentation.

The third participant (P3) was a female student. She showed three symptoms. In the first observation she only showed one symptoms which was nervously touching object. In the second observation, she showed two symptoms. Although she did not speak English during the second observation, she trembled.

The fourth participant (P4) was a male student. He only showed two symptoms. In the first observation, he did not show any symptom, while in the second observation, he was trembling and his voice was staggering when he spoke English.

The fifth participant (P5) was a male student. He showed three symptoms.

In the first observation, he did not speak English at all while his friends spoke English in the speaking activity. In the second observation, he was trembling and touching object nervously.

The sixth participant (P6) was a female student. She showed more symptoms than the other five participants in this research. She showed six symptoms. In the first observation, she touched object nervously and rubbed her palms when speaking English. She nervously touched object again in the second observation. She also showed other symptoms like remaining silent and stuttering or stammering. She spoke too slowly when giving presentation.

### **Instruments of the Study**

This study was conducted to find out the characteristics of students who feel anxious in speaking, the factors causing speaking anxiety and the strategies to overcome speaking anxiety based on the students' experiences. The researcher applied two instruments which were observation and interview.

**Observation.** To gather the data, the researcher did an observation. Observation was appropriate to be applied in this study because it let the researcher to get alive data. According to Cohen, Manion, & Marrison (2011), "observation offers an investigator the opportunity to gather 'live' data from naturally occurring social situation" (p.456). Observation also allows the researchers to record non-verbal behavior. It was useful for adopting observation since one of the aims of this study was to find out the characteristics of students who felt anxious in speaking by seeing the symptoms. Thus, observation became

the main instrument to gather data for the first research question which was about the characteristics of anxious students.

The type of observation used was structured observation. According to Cohen, Manion, & Marrison (2011), in doing a structure observation, the researcher needs to know what it is looking for by having an observation checklist in advance, so the observation will be systematic. Thus, the researcher prepared an observation checklist before doing the observation. The observation checklist contained of the observable symptoms of anxious students. The observable symptoms were “squirming, playing with hair or clothing, nervously touching objects, stuttering or stammering” (Suleimenova, 2013, pp. 1861-1862). Getting sweaty, vomiting, trembling, and perspiring were also experienced by anxious student (Ansari, 2015; Boyce, Alber-Morgan, & Riley, 2007) are also included in the observation checklist. In addition, during the observations the researcher also did note taking on the symptoms which were not included in the observation checklist.

**Interview.** Interview was used to gather the data for all research questions in this study which were about the characteristics of anxious students both observable and non-observable, the factors causing speaking anxiety, and the strategies to overcome speaking anxiety. Besides that, interview also used to confirm the characteristics which shown by the participant during the observation. Interview was suitable because the researcher might get in depth information from the participants. According to Cohen, Manion, & Marrison (2011), “the interview is a flexible tool for data collection, enabling multi-sensory channels to be used:

verbal, non-verbal, spoken and heard” (p. 409). Interview is a verbal or non-verbal interaction between individuals who have certain goal and used structured list of questions (Cohen, Manion, & Marrison, 2011). According to Cohen, Manion, & Marrison (2011), one advantages of the interview is that it permits to get greater depth data collection than the other methods. Interview became appropriate tool in this research since there were specific purposes in this study and the researcher needed to do interaction with the participants in order to gather the depth data.

The type of interview which was used in this research was standardized open-ended interview. According to Cohen, Manion, & Marisson (2011), the characteristic of standardized open-ended interview is all interviewee are asked the same questions in the same order. Thus, the researcher prepared the interview guideline and asked the same questions in the same order to all interviewees. It gives some benefits, because all participants answered the same questions in the same order which can add comparability and responses and it also decreases the interviewer effects and bias (Cohen, Manion, & Marrison, 2011).

To do a standardized open-ended interview, the researcher made an interview guideline. The construction of interview guideline which was used was open-ended questions. By using open-ended questions, the interviewee was able to answer every question freely based on their experience and opinion. The researcher chose open-ended questions to be applied in the interview guideline, because it has some advantages. According to Cohen, Manion, Marrison (2011), the open-ended questions allow the interviewer to go more depth in gathering the data. It also can be used for clearing up any misunderstanding if there is any

unclear answer or the answer is out of line. There were four questions in the interview guideline. The questions were used to find out the characteristics of anxious students, the factors which caused speaking anxiety, the strategy to overcome speaking anxiety, and the suggestion for the lecturer in teaching speaking.

### **Technique of Data Collection**

The researcher did some steps to gather the data. The techniques of data collection were divided into two which are technique of data collection for observation and interview.

**Observation.** Before conducting the observation, the researcher made an observation checklist. The observation checklist contained of the symptoms of speaking anxiety. Then, after having the observation checklist, the researcher asked for permission to the lecturer who teaches Listening and Speaking for Academic Purposes to conduct an observation. After that, the researcher made an appointment with the lecturer to do the observation. The observation was done twice. The first observation was done when the students do a group discussion and the second observation was conducted when the students did a presentation. The duration for each observation was two hundreds minutes.

The researcher role in observation was as the complete observer. Cohen, Manion, & Marrison (2011) explained that a complete observer is an observer who only observes and not a part of the group being observed. During the observation, the researcher observed, recorded, and did note taking. The



researcher did not get involved in the activity done by the group being observed.

The observation was conducted in Listening and Speaking for Academic Purposes class which was only given in the second semester. The researcher decided to choose that subject because it was one of subjects which focused on speaking for the students batch 2016. It was the subject which had more speaking activities compared to other subjects. There are three classes for batch 2016, but the researcher only took class A and B to be observed, because the schedule of class A and C was in the same time. Moreover, the lecturer who teaches Listening and Speaking for Academic Purposes for class A and B is the same lecturer. Thus, the lecturer gives the same material and the same treatment for both classes.

The students who showed the observable symptoms when they were speaking English were considered as anxious students and could be the participants in this study. Hence, the observation was not only intended to find out the characteristics of students who felt anxious in speaking but it was also done to select the participants. The observation was conducted twice. The first observation was done when the students did a group discussion while the second observation was conducted when the students did a presentation. In doing the observation, the researcher used a tripod and a phone to record the observation. When the researcher did the observation, the students knew that they were being recorded. However, this only happened when the students did a group discussion, because the class atmosphere was relaxed. In the second observation, the researcher only did note taking without recording. The researcher did note taking on the symptoms which were not included in the observation checklist like using filler

and showing expressive reactions. The researcher also wrote the description of the symptoms which appeared during the observation. For example when some students were speaking English in front of the class, they were looking at the window or the ceiling instead of looking at the audience. The researcher decided not to record the second observation in order not to make the students became more anxious.

**Interview.** The first thing which was done by the researcher was designing the interview guideline. To make good questions for the interview guideline, the theories related to the problem and the research questions were used. Then, the researcher was able to design some questions. After having the interview guideline, the second step was making appointment with the participants. The researcher texted the participants to ask about the time and place for interviewing. After that, the researcher interviewed the participants in the time and place which had been agreed. The duration of the interview was about twenty up to thirty minutes for each participant. It was done in order to get detail, thick, and rich data from the participants.

The language which was used in the interview was Bahasa Indonesia. The researcher considered that Bahasa Indonesia was appropriate because it is both the participants and the researcher's first language. Moreover, the participants in this study were the students who had anxiety in speaking English, so interviewing using Bahasa Indonesia might comfort them in answering the questions. To get in depth data, the researcher did not limit the participants' answer. The participants were able to answer freely. In interviewing the participants, the researcher used a

mobile phone to record the conversation and also used note and pen to write important points.

### **Analysis of Data**

In this part, the researcher explained about the steps in analyzing the data. There were four steps started from observation checklist analysis, transcribing the data, member checking, and coding.

**Observation analysis.** After conducting an observation in class A and B, the researcher analyzed the observation checklist. In analyzing the observation checklist, the researcher also watched the video that the researcher had in order to make sure that the data was complete. The recording also used to add the information during the observation which was not written by the researcher. The type of observation used in this research was structured observation. In analyzing the data from structured observation, the researcher counted the frequencies. According to Cohen (2011), “for structured observations researchers can count frequencies, and with references to individual, groups, classes, events, activities, behaviors and so on” (p.464). Hence, the researcher counted the frequencies of all symptoms which showed during the observation. After that, the researcher quantified and counted the frequency.

**Transcribing the data.** After having the data from the participants by interviewing them, the researcher transcribed the data. According to Cohen, Manion, & Marrison (2011), transcribing is writing down what the participants said in the recording in order to gain the participants’ answer. This means that

transcribing is the transformation from spoken to written. The transcribing was done in order to ease the researcher in finding the participants' answer. In transcribing the data, the researcher listened to the recorder and write down what the participant was saying. The researcher used verbatim, so the participants' words were written fully. The researcher did not add or omit something. In other words, the data was not manipulated.

**Member checking.** The next step was member checking. The researcher gave the transcript to the participants and asks them to check. The transcript which was given was based on the name of the participants. This was done to ensure that the transcript was the same as what the participants said in the interview or it was not manipulated. After asking the participants to check the transcript, the data did not change, because the participants did not add or omit the data they had given to the researcher.

**Coding.** After the researcher had done with the member checking, the next step to do was coding. Coding is classifying the participants' answers into some categories. According to Cohen, Manion, & Marrison (2011), coding helps the researcher to identify similar information and it also eases the researcher to get acceptable results since the information has been categorized. Coding was done in four steps. The steps were open coding, analytical coding, axial coding, and selective coding.

**Open coding.** The earliest coding was open coding. In open coding, the researcher labels the participants' answers. According to Cohen, Manion, & Marrison (2011), open coding is marking text with codes (labels) that describe

that text and the labels might derive from the researcher's own creation or derive from the word used in the text. Thus, the researcher read the transcript data and labeled the text using the word the researcher has chosen. Based on Cohen, Manion, & Marrison (2011), "open coding can be performed on a line-by-line, phrase-by-phrase, sentence-by-sentence, paragraph-by-paragraph or unit-by-unit. In doing open coding, the researcher read the participants sentences and then labeled the things based on the category. The categories were made based on the research questions which were about the characteristic of anxious students, the factor causing speaking anxiety, and the strategy to overcome speaking anxiety.

*Analytical coding.* The next coding was analytical coding. According to Cohen, Manion, & Marrison (2011), analytical coding is more than descriptive code and it becomes more interpretive. The analytical coding was in the same table as the open coding, because both of them were related to each other. From the open coding, the researcher gave theme or topic. Cohen, Manion, & Marrison (2011) mentioned, "an analytic code might derive from the theme or topic of the research" (p. 561). In doing analytical coding, the researcher translated the participants' sentences, because the language used in interview was Bahasa Indonesia. The sentences which had been labeled were translated into English.

*Axial coding.* After doing open coding and analytical coding, the researcher did axial coding. In axial coding, the researcher classified each item of statement that had the same category into one interpretation. From the analytical coding, the researcher categorized again those which had similar meaning. By doing this, it could be found the frequency for each item.

*Selective coding.* The last coding was selective coding. It was almost same as axial coding. However, the researcher needed to decide the category more selectively. The categories which were chosen were those which related to the research. From the selective coding, the researcher was able to discover the findings of the research. By doing this step, it would ease the researcher to put the quotes of the interview in the finding.