

Chapter III

Methodology

In order to accomplish the goals and objectives, the methodology to implement such research includes the following essential elements: 1) research design, 2) population and sample, 3) data collection method, 4) data collection technique, 5) validity and reliability, and 6) data analysis. It contains detailed description of the whole parts to collect and to analyze the data from the participants.

Research Design

This research was conducted using a descriptive correlational research since its purposes were to describe the learners' speaking strategies and their speaking proficiency, also the correlation between those variables. Descriptive correlational research examines variables in their natural environment and avoids changing the behavior of the people interacting with (Simon & Goes, 2011). In this study, the researcher would like to see the correlation on speaking strategies that most frequently used by EFL learners (independent variable) and their speaking proficiency (dependent variable).

Population of the Research

The present research was carried out to expose the correlation on the speaking strategies used by EFL learners and their speaking proficiency. For this purpose, the population of this research was 156 EFL learners at English Education Department of UMY batch 2015. There were two considerable reasons in choosing learners of batch 2015. Firstly, in term of curiosity in learning, the

researcher wanted to know what strategies used by the learners. The researcher believed that the learners of this batch still had fresh experiences in learning speaking, thus, they would have tried to seek out the strategies suitable for them in achieving their learning goal in which to be able to speak in English. Secondly, in term of accessibility, since the learners of batch 2015 still had to attend 'make up class' with other lecturer, it eased the researcher to gather the data.

Sample of the research

A total of 52 EFL learners in English Education Department of UMY batch 2015 participated in this research. The number also fulfilled the standard of sample in a research as mentioned by Dornyei (2007) that correlational research should have at least 30 people to enroll in the study. Two classes were selected from four classes based on convenience and availability of the required class in Listening and Speaking of Academic Purpose. Convenience sampling is a sampling chosen accidentally when the research is conducted (Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2011). There were two reasons of choosing these classes. Firstly, as the learners encountered with the subject once a week for four credits to purposely able at 200 minutes with academic oral practices such as having debate, discussion, and academic presentation, this subject fulfilled the requirement of measuring the speaking proficiency. Moreover, at the end of the semester, the learners had academic presentation to examine their ability in speaking as their final project.

Secondly, in term of accessibility, the learners still had class in June, hence, it means that they still had activity in the campus that enabled the researcher to

have opportunity to collect the data at limited time. Due to this situation, the researcher got the participants who were accessible and available at that time.

Instruments of the Research

The instruments used in this research included questionnaire and learners' speaking score.

Questionnaire. In order to obtain information about the use of the strategies, a questionnaire was employed mainly to find out if the learners used the strategies. The questionnaire used for data collection was primarily modified from Moriam Quadir (2014) questionnaires and judged by the experts. The researcher translated the speaking strategies questionnaire into *Bahasa Indonesia* to make it easier for the participants to answer. The detailed specification of the item categories were presented in Appendix B:

Table 3.1. Item Categories

Strategies Categories	Number of Items
<i>Metacognitive</i>	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7
<i>Cognitive</i>	8, 9, 10, 11, 12
<i>Compensation</i>	13, 14, 15, 16, 17
<i>Memory</i>	18, 19, 20, 21, 22
<i>Affective</i>	23, 24, 25, 26, 27
<i>Social</i>	28, 29, 30, 31, 32

Table 3.2. The Scales of Questionnaire

Score	Scale
1	Never
2	Rarely
3	Sometimes
4	Often
5	Always

The questionnaire was administered to learners of the second semester who were studying English as a Foreign Language at EED UMY. The researcher selected those five scales to determine their degree of the use of speaking strategies among the learners. For verifying the validity of the questionnaire, the researcher involved three expert judgments to check whether the questionnaire was valid or not.

Speaking Score. The speaking scores were collected using documentation technique which means the researcher obtained the scores from the lecturer. The speaking scores were obtained from the accumulation of the oral tests and other tasks related to the use of oral communication. The scores were acquired at the end of the semester. The acquired scores were from debate, discussion, and academic presentations. The score indicator rubric of the speaking task and assessment was explained in Table 3.3.

No.	Categories	Highlited to be Assessed
1.	Manner	Fluency
		Grammar
2.	Matter	Content
3.	Method	The way how deliver the information or knowledge

Data Collection Technique

Since the Listening and Speaking for Academic Purposes class ended with final assessment, the researcher distributed the questionnaires on the other class where learners batch 2015 still had ‘make up class’ with the other lecture in June 2016. Consequently, the researcher spread the questionnaires to two classes for two days. The researcher asked permission to the lecturer of the class, and then distributed the questionnaire when the class began. There were some learners who did not come to the class, thus 52 learners were available at that time to enroll in this study. Thus, the researcher was able to monitor the process of the questionnaire administration, hence, when some learners had difficulties in understanding each item in the questionnaire, the researcher was able to assist them. The speaking scores were taken from the lecturer of Listening and Speaking for Academic Purposes course at the end of June. After the data were collected, the researcher decided to manage the data by analyzing the frequency of speaking

strategies usage. The collected data were analyzed by using two tools including SPSS software and Ms. Excel.

Validity and Reliability

Validity. Validity refers to the measurement which can indicate meaningful and useful inferences from score on particular instruments (Creswell, 2013). To ensure the validity of the data, the researcher applied construct validity and instrument piloting by involving the three expert judgments to check whether the data were applicable for measuring the speaking strategies or not. The expert judgments were the lecturers of EED UMY who master in linguistics. The translated questionnaire was validated by the three experts in order to check the construct validity and to avoid the misconceptions of each item's statement. The first expert judgment suggested some additions like giving an information about where the Original Questionnaire was taken from, several word replacements (item 8, 9, 10, 11, 15, 22, 25, 28, 31, 32), word additions (item 2, 3, 13, 14), and word deletions (item 30) as seen in Appendix C.

The second expert judgment corrected the translation into *Bahasa Indonesia* in the questionnaire such as: avoiding frequency use of certain adverb of time in Indonesian such as '*sering, tak jarang*' which were written in (items 1, 16, 19, 24, 26, 27, 28, 32), using some of the English named such as "English native speaker" (items 9), deleting some wordings in *Bahasa Indonesia* to make them easier to be understood by the respondents as in (item 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 16, 20, 25).

The third expert judgment, said that the item number 1 was not valid and should be deleted because it was not appropriate to the speaking strategies, then,

also some word replacements and additions in (item 10- 23), word deletions as in (item 28, 29) as detailed shown in Appendix D. The researcher combined the suggestions from the experts in order to revise the questionnaires. Finally, from 32 items taken from Moriam Quadir (2014) questionnaire, there were 31 items which measured as valid items, and the researcher got a valid data see Appendix E.

Reliability. As stated by Salwa (2012, p. 48), “reliability refers to the consistency of test result”. By applying instrument piloting, the researcher tested the questionnaires to prove the reliability and found the accepted standard of Cronbach’s Alpha index at 0.841. It is in accordance with Sekaran in Nazaruddin and Basuki (2015), that an instrument could be said reliable if the coefficient of Cronbach’s Alpha (α) > 0.70.

Cronbach’s Alpha	N of Items
.841	31

From the table above, it could be seen that the speaking strategies questionnaire is reliable to measure the speaking strategies used by the learners.

Data Analysis

Quantitative research method was applied in this research. The researcher studie the result from the collected data to make a data analysis that stood after the data collection from questionnaire, and later the data were transformed into the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS version 16.0). The data were analyzed in two phases. Firstly, a frequencies statistic was employed to analyze

the speaking strategies that were often used by the learners, and the learners' speaking score as mentioned in the research questions number one and two. The descriptive statistic used in this research are modus, median and mean. Secondly, the relationship between speaking strategies used and speaking proficiency were investigated by using Pearson product moment correlation coefficient (r).