

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

CHAPTER OVERVIEW

This chapter identifies the participants of this study and selection method; it explains the research instruments and measures to ensure their validity and reliability; it also describes how the data were collected and how they were analyzed.

3.1 POPULATION AND SAMPLE

The population of this study consisted of DPU postgraduate business students, namely MBA and DBA students.

Table 3.1: Population and Sample

Program	Population	Sample
Doctor of Business Administration (DBA)	30	13
Master of Business Administration (MBA)	700	118

As of the first semester of the academic year 2009, there were 700 MBA students and 30 DBA students. The sample size was 131 graduate students: 118 MBA students and 13 DBA students.

3.2 RESEARCH INSTRUMENTS, DEVELOPMENT OF THE INSTRUMENTS, AND DATA COLLECTION

3.2.1 Research Instruments

The instruments were the questionnaire and the guided questions of the roundtable discussions.

The questionnaire consists of seven parts:

1. General information
2. Identity and perception of the Thai academic community
3. Perceived English Competency
4. Use of English within the Community
5. Perceived Language Problems and Difficulties
6. Perceived Language Coping Ability
7. Perceived Support Needed from the University.

3.2.2 Development of the Research Instruments

Two measures were implemented to ensure the high quality of the data collection instruments: content analysis and reliability analysis.

After reviewing the relevant literature, the researcher constructed the questionnaire. For the analysis of the contents, the researcher asked a panel of four EFL experienced teachers to validate or invalidate each of the items within each construct. The index obtained was the ratio between what was regarded as being relevant and necessary for the measurement of a particular construct and what was deemed to be unnecessary and irrelevant. This technique is called Lawshe's Content Validity Ratio or CVR, which has been widely used among researchers. This CVR, hence, was used to determine whether the items were essential/necessary for the measurement of the designed construct.

The CVR values range from +1 (All of the experts agree that the statement is necessary for the measurement of the construct) to -1 (They all say that the statement in question is unnecessary). Therefore, the values that are closer to +1 indicate that the experts are in agreement that the item is essential to content validity. See Appendix A for the detailed report of the analysis.

Once the content analysis was completed, the remaining items were selected to form the questionnaire. The trial was conducted to analyze its reliability. Thirty DPU postgraduate students answered the questionnaire.

Table 3.2 Reliability of the Constructs within the Questionnaire

Constructs Within the Questionnaire	Trialed α	Actual α
The Use of Listening Skill with Other members of the Thai Academic Community	0.68	0.73
The Use of Speaking Skill with Other members of the Thai Academic Community	0.86	0.85
The Use of Reading Skill with Other members of the Thai Academic Community	0.86	0.83
The Use of Writing Skill with Other members of the Thai Academic Community	0.84	0.85
Perceived Problems in Listening	0.71	0.82
Perceived Problems in Speaking	0.78	0.78
Perceived Problems in Reading	0.82	0.80
Perceived Problems in Writing	0.74	0.83
Perceived Coping Ability	0.74	0.85
English Support from the Institution	0.85	0.77

3.2.3 Data Collection

A questionnaire was distributed to the MBA and DBA students who took courses during the second semester of the academic year 2008. The analysis was based on the data from 131 copies of the answered questionnaires.

Quantitative Data and Qualitative Data

Quantitative data were collected from parts 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7 of the questionnaire. The questionnaire was distributed through the cooperation from the graduate school of Dhurakij Pundit university.

Qualitative data were collected from two sources: (1) Data from the open-ended questions (Part 2 of the questionnaire) and (2) Data collected from the two focus group discussions.

3.3 DATA ANALYSIS

The quantitative data were analyzed using the descriptive statistics: frequency distribution, percentages (%), arithmetic mean (\bar{X}), and standard deviation (SD), t-test One-way ANOVA, and Pearson's product moment correlation coefficient were also used. Data from the open-ended questions were analyzed qualitatively using the content analysis method.

3.4 CRITERIA FOR INTERPRETING THE FINDINGS

The following are the criteria for the interpretation of the results of the analyses.

3.4.1 Respondents' Use of English

Data analyzed were interpreted based on the following criteria.

Table 3.3 Criteria for Interpreting Respondents' English Use

Mean Range	Level of English Use
1.00 – 1.49	Very Low
1.50 – 2.49	Low
2.50 – 3.49	Moderate
3.50 – 4.49	High
4.50 – 5.00	Very High

The higher mean range (3.50-5.00) reflects the higher levels of English use. The lower mean range (2.49-1.00) reflects the lower levels of English use.

3.4.2 Perceived Language Problems & Difficulties in Using English

Table 3.4 Criteria for Interpreting Respondents' Problems of English Use

Mean Range	Level of Problems & Difficulties in Using English
1.00 – 1.49	Lowest
1.50 – 2.49	Low
2.50 – 3.49	Moderate
3.50 – 4.49	High
4.50 – 5.00	Very High

The higher mean range (3.50-5.00) reflects the higher levels of language problems. The lower mean range (2.49-1.00) reflects the lower levels of language problems.

3.4.3 Perceived English Language Coping Ability

Table 3.5 Criteria for Interpreting Respondents' Coping Ability

Mean Range	Coping Ability Level
1.00 – 1.49	Lowest
1.50 – 2.49	Low
2.50 – 3.49	Moderate
3.50 – 4.49	High
4.50 – 5.00	Very High

The range between 4.50 and 5.00 means that the respondents perceived themselves as having the very level of coping ability. The range between 1.00-1.49 means that they have the lowest level of coping ability.

3.4.4 Perceived Levels of Support Needed from the University

Table 3.6 Criteria for Interpreting Respondents' Needs for English Support

Mean Range	Level of English Support
1.00 – 1.49	Lowest
1.50 – 2.49	Low
2.50 – 3.49	Moderate
3.50 – 4.49	High
4.50 – 5.00	Very High

The range between 3.50 - 5.00 indicates that the respondents perceived that they need to receive high level of English support from the university. The higher mean reflects the higher level of support needed from the university. The range from 1.00-2.49 shows that they need

the lower English support from the university. In between, the range between 2.50-3.49 means that they need the moderate level of English support.

3.4.5 Criteria for Determining the English Proficiency

Table 3.7 Criteria for Determining the English Proficiency

Mean Range	Meaning
1.00 – 1.49	Very Poor
1.50 – 2.49	Poor
2.50 – 3.49	Average
3.50 – 4.49	Good
4.50 – 5.00	Very good

The higher mean range (3.50-5.00) reflects the higher level of perceived English proficiency; the lower mean range (1.00-2.49) shows that they perceive themselves as having the low level of proficiency.

3.5 ROUNDTABLE SEMINARS

Two roundtable seminars were conducted. The title was: *English for Graduate Study: What, Why, and How Much?*

The first roundtable seminar was the one for the MBA student participants. There were five participants and it was conducted on Sunday, August 2, 2009. The second roundtable seminar was attended by 4 DBA students, held on Sunday, August 9, 2009. Both roundtable seminars were conducted at DPU. They were to elicit qualitative data to help support the findings from the questionnaires. See Appendix 3 for summaries of the two roundtable seminars.

CHAPTER SUMMARY

This chapter has explained who the research participants were and how the research instruments were developed and validated; how the data were collected, analyzed, and interpreted. This research analyzed both quantitative and qualitative data.

