

1511 **CHAPTER THREE**

1512 **RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

1513

1514

1515 **3.0 Introduction**

1516 This chapter explains the methods applied in the research. First, the design of the study will  
1517 be presented. Then, data collection, including respondents, instruments, and administration of  
1518 the questionnaires and interviews, will be introduced. The researcher will report the data  
1519 collection procedures through which the data was collected. The chapter will conclude with a  
1520 description of the tools of data analysis.

1521

1522 **3.1 Research Design**

1523 In this study the researcher has adopted a mixed methods approach, using both quantitative  
1524 and qualitative data. A questionnaire was used to obtain the former; it was designed and  
1525 administered to 210 international students in two faculties at the university, and statistical  
1526 analyses were used to identify the most frequently mentioned problems. Qualitative data was  
1527 obtained via interviews conducted with 25 of the participants in the study in order to further  
1528 validate the findings from questionnaires and also triangulate the data. The use of mixed  
1529 methods and triangulated data has been encouraged and recommended in the literature of  
1530 needs analysis (Long, 2005). By applying both quantitative and qualitative methods the  
1531 researcher hoped to get a better and more real picture of the situation as far as the problems of  
1532 the international students with the use of English for Academic Purposes were concerned.

1533 Also, using two complementary methods for data collection and analysis would yield better  
1534 results and cover the drawbacks or the problems of either one used just by itself.

1535

## 1536 **3.2 Data Collection**

### 1537 **3.2.1 Respondents**

#### 1538 **3.2.1.1 International Students**

1539 This study proposed to survey the problems that the international students face when they use  
1540 English for Academic Purposes in the University of Malaya. In order to do so, the students  
1541 from two faculties were chosen to represent the whole population of the international students  
1542 in the university. The two faculties which were chosen were the Faculty of Computer Science  
1543 and Information Technology (representing the hard sciences), and the Faculty of Education  
1544 (representing the humanities). The other rationale for the selection of these two faculties was  
1545 the fact that these two faculties held the largest number of international student enrolment  
1546 among the different faculties of the University of Malaya in the first semester of the academic  
1547 year 2008-2009. (See tables below).

1548 Table 3.1 Number of International Students in the Faculty of Computer Science and Information  
1549 Technology (Academic Year 2008-2009)

<b>Country</b>	<b>IRA N</b>	<b>IRA Q</b>	<b>S.ARABI A</b>	<b>SUDA N</b>	<b>INDONESI A</b>	<b>CHIN A</b>	<b>OTHER S</b>	<b>TOTA L</b>
<b>NO. OF STUDENT S</b>	93	38	18	18	14	12	80	273

1550

1551

1552 In the academic year 2008-2009 there were 273 active international students in the Faculty of  
 1553 Computer Science and Information Technology (FCSIT) at the postgraduate level. These  
 1554 students were from 31 different countries, mostly from Asia and Africa, except for one from  
 1555 England. The number of post graduate students from Iran (93), Iraq (38), Saudi Arabia (18),  
 1556 Sudan (18), Indonesia (14), and China (12) was above 10 and these countries had the biggest  
 1557 population of post graduate students in the Faculty of Computer Science and Information  
 1558 Technology. Following Iran were the Middle East Arab countries (Iraq, Jordan, Palestine,  
 1559 Saudi Arabia, Yemen, U.A.E., Kuwait, and Oman) which composed 90 of the whole  
 1560 population of the international post graduate students in this faculty. (According to the  
 1561 Institute of Post Graduate Studies of the University of Malaya)

1562 Table 3.2 Number of International Students in the Faculty of Education

1563 (Academic Year 2008-2009)

Country	IRAN	INDONESIA	CHINA	OMAN	OTHERS	TOTAL
NO. OF STUDENTS	40	37	24	16	33	150

1564

1565 At the same time there were 150 registered international post graduate students in the Faculty  
 1566 of Education (FE). Again, the largest number was from Iran (40), followed by Indonesia (37),  
 1567 China (24), and Oman (16). Middle East Arab students were altogether 20, from Jordan,  
 1568 Oman, Saudi Arabia, and Syria. The students in the faculty of Education came from 23  
 1569 different countries of Asia and Africa, with the exception of one student from England.  
 1570 (According to the Institute of Post Graduate Studies of the University of Malaya)

1571

1572

1573

1574 **3.2.1.2 Lecturers**

1575 The other group of participants in this study was the lecturers of the two Faculties (5 from  
1576 FCSIT and 4 from FE). They were the people who taught the students in the two faculties,  
1577 supervised their research and theses, and were generally involved in the academic activities  
1578 of the students. In the first semester of the academic year 2008-2009 there were 57 lecturers  
1579 in the FCSIT and 73 in the FE. Their academic rank varied from professor, associate  
1580 professor, senior lecturers, and lecturer. Almost all the lecturers were Malaysian, although  
1581 most of them had done at least some part of their education abroad, except for two, one in FE  
1582 and one in FCSIT who were visiting professors from the U.S.A and the U.K respectively. Not  
1583 all these lecturers taught at the graduate level and supervised theses. However, those asked to  
1584 participate in the study all taught at the graduate level and supervised post graduate theses at  
1585 masters and/or doctoral levels. The researcher emailed all of the lecturers and explained the  
1586 study and asked if they were willing to help her to collect some data through interviews with  
1587 them. As mentioned above, 5 lecturers from the FCSIT and 4 from the FE responded saying  
1588 they could participate in the study. Some lecturers replied they were on leave, some said they  
1589 did not supervise graduate theses, some mentioned they did not have the time to participate,  
1590 and some did not reply the emails.

1591 Table 3.3 Lecturer Participants from the Faculties of Computer Science and Information  
1592 Technology and Education (Academic Year 2008-2009)

<b>Faculty</b>	<b>Professors</b>	<b>Associate Professors</b>	<b>Lecturers</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Computer</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Education</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>

1593

1594

1595 **3.3 Instruments**

1596 As stated earlier, in order to answer the research questions and achieve the objectives of the  
1597 study two instruments were used: a questionnaire and interviews. Also, as mentioned earlier,  
1598 interviews were conducted to validate, clarify, and elaborate the findings of the survey.

1599

1600 **3.3.1 Questionnaire**

1601 The questionnaire was a means for understanding the problems that the international students  
1602 in the mentioned faculties encountered with the use of English for Academic Purposes. It  
1603 consisted of two parts; the first part included questions about the respondents' bio data (See  
1604 appendix I). The second part listed a number of problems that students might have faced with  
1605 the use of English for Academic Purpose. They had to grade their responses on a 4 point  
1606 Likert Scale. The questionnaire was in English and the language used was as simple as  
1607 possible so that the students would find it more accessible.

1608 In order to develop the questionnaire, the researcher initially listed down the areas of  
1609 language use in the university and the problems that may arise in each. In order to do this, she  
1610 did informal interviews and surveys around the campus by asking fellow students from  
1611 different faculties, especially those from the FCSIT and FE, about the different areas in their  
1612 post graduate studies where they used English, for example comprehending lectures, writing  
1613 reviews, and answering exam questions. At the same time, the students were asked about the  
1614 possible problems one may face while using English in these domains. This was added to the  
1615 list that the researcher herself had prepared.

1616

1617 Literature was also consulted (Tanaka, 2002) to check if every thing had been mentioned.

1618 The final list included 7 items:

- 1619           • Understanding lectures,
- 1620           • Note taking during lectures,
- 1621           • Reading comprehension of text books and journals,
- 1622           • Writing reviews and other project papers,
- 1623           • Participating in group discussions and tutorials,
- 1624           • Oral presentations, and
- 1625           • Answering exam questions.

1626 The researcher considered the problems that might occur while conducting each task and that  
1627 was added to what the students had mentioned. The first area was about ‘understanding the  
1628 lectures’. There were 7 problems mentioned in this category (See appendix I) which varied  
1629 from the content to the lecturers’ accents and even the examples used to explain the content.  
1630 The second area was ‘note taking’ which might be difficult due to three reasons: the first is  
1631 that they might not be able to write fast enough in English, second, they do not know how to  
1632 summarize lecture points, and third, that it is difficult for them to listen and take notes in  
1633 English at the same time.

1634

1635

1636

1637 The third part involved reading books and academic journals and what might make it difficult  
1638 for the second language reader. The problems would vary from a lack of basic proficiency in  
1639 general English, vocabulary or grammar, to content-related problems where the students have  
1640 problems understanding the subject matter (See appendix I).

1641 Writing was the fourth task on the questionnaire and the problems associated with that would  
1642 be considered from different aspects. Lack of a basic grammar knowledge and/or vocabulary  
1643 would be one side of the problem, and not knowing how to write different genres would be  
1644 the other side. Transferring from the first language to the second language might also be  
1645 another source of problem in writing (See appendix I).

1646 There were mainly three barriers to a successful participation in the tutorials or group work  
1647 activities. The students might have difficulty understanding what is discussed in the group  
1648 discussions. They may not be good enough to speak fluently and accurately which makes it  
1649 difficult for the other group members to understand them. Sometimes, thinking in the first  
1650 language and transferring that into the second language might prevent the students from  
1651 participating actively in the tutorials.

1652 The other area of language use was 'giving oral presentations'. This might pose a problem to  
1653 the international students when they cannot speak well or they can not understand what they  
1654 are being asked (See appendix I). Finally, 'answering the exam questions' was the last area of  
1655 language use for the international students in an academic setting. As it could be seen in the  
1656 questionnaire (appendix I), sometimes the students do not understand the questions, although  
1657 they might know the answer, or sometimes they know the answer but they are not successful  
1658 in transferring their ideas into the English language.

1659

1660 At the end of each area of language use and the problems involved there was an item named  
1661 “others” where the students could add any problems which they thought would exist and had  
1662 not been included. Also, at the end of the questionnaire there was space for students to write  
1663 any other problems they thought they had with the use of English in the university (See  
1664 appendix I).

1665 Once the list of different areas of the use of English together with the problems associated  
1666 with each was prepared, the researcher developed the initial questionnaire. It was piloted on  
1667 a small number of students (10 from the FCSIT and 10 from the FE) who resembled the  
1668 actual target population. They were friends or fellow post graduate students who agreed to  
1669 help to revise the questionnaire. The researcher met them in the faculties, libraries, or the  
1670 institute of the postgraduate studies. The entire pilot group mentioned that the questionnaire  
1671 was too long and they believed it had to be much shorter for the final administration to be  
1672 successful. They also mentioned points about the items and the problems, and even the lay-  
1673 out of the questionnaire. After considering all the points mentioned and making the necessary  
1674 changes, the revised version was piloted. This time the researcher gave the questionnaire to  
1675 both the previous group and a new group of 15 students (9 from FCSIT and 6 from FE) to be  
1676 piloted again. After the second administration and considering the second feedback, the final  
1677 version of the questionnaire was ready to be administered to the target population which is  
1678 comprehensively explained in the data collection procedures section (3.4.1) below.

1679

1680

1681

1682



### 1683 3.3.2 Interviews

1684 The second instrument used in this study was interviews. Interviews were carried out with the  
1685 students (15 from the FCSIT and 10 from the FE) and the lecturers (5 from the FCSIT and 4  
1686 from the FE) mainly because of two reasons.

1687 As we know, in survey studies, the tools of research are mainly questionnaires and  
1688 interviews. And it is also known that tools of research can not be 100% perfect due to various  
1689 intervening factors such as time constraint, or misunderstanding the questions. So  
1690 complementing the survey with other tools would add to the validity and the reliability of the  
1691 findings. The questionnaire was designed to quantitatively describe the problems of the  
1692 students with the use of English; for triangulation purposes interviews were conducted with  
1693 the participants to validate, clarify, and confirm the findings. So the first reason to have  
1694 interviews was to benefit from both tools of research in a mixed design.

1695 The second reason to do interviews with the students was to further explore the problems in  
1696 more detailed ways. Although the questionnaire contained all the areas of language use  
1697 together with the problems that may have existed with regard to them, interviews were  
1698 carried out to obtain necessary and relevant elaboration. Also interviews could give a better  
1699 picture of the situation by going deeper into the problems and the issues involved. So  
1700 interviews were used to give an in-depth and fuller account of the problems from the  
1701 students' voices.

1702

1703 As mentioned earlier in the literature review, in the research about the problems of the  
1704 international students the lecturers' points of view were not taken into consideration. That is  
1705 the reason for the researcher to have interviews with the lecturers in addition to the students'

1706 interviews. By interviewing the lecturers the researcher hoped to see the problems from the  
1707 view point of the people who were academically involved with the students.

1708 Interview sessions were held in groups and individually. Depending on the students'  
1709 schedule, the researcher had to do group and individual interviews. For the lecturers all the  
1710 interview sessions were done individually. A fuller account of the interview sessions and how  
1711 they were conducted is given in section 3.4.2 below.

1712

1713 The interviews were semi-structured. The sessions started with an introduction of the study.  
1714 Then, the different areas of language use in the university were reintroduced and the  
1715 problems with each area were discussed. The students further elaborated on the mentioned  
1716 areas of language use and their problems. That was a chance for the problems to be more  
1717 thoroughly investigated. The lecturers also heard the problems at the beginning of the session  
1718 and later talked about what they believed to be the problems of the students with the use of  
1719 English as far as they were concerned (See section 3.4.2.2).

1720

## 1721 **3.4 Data Collection Procedures**

1722

### 1723 **3.4.1 Administration of Questionnaires**

1724 The data collection for this research took about forty five days (from September 7<sup>th</sup> until  
1725 October 21<sup>st</sup> 2008). Once the final revised version of the questionnaire, as described above,  
1726 was prepared, the researcher started collecting the data.

1727 According to the post graduate offices at the FCSIT and FE, all the post graduate classes  
1728 were held in the afternoons. For the faculty of education, since most of the students work in  
1729 schools during the day, some classes are held on Saturday mornings too.

1730

1731 The researcher stationed herself and an assistant, who was thoroughly tutored, at the two  
1732 faculties for about three weeks to ask the international students to complete the questionnaire.  
1733 We approached students, introduced ourselves and the study, and asked them if they could  
1734 take their time to fill a questionnaire. We also asked selected lecturers to let us enter their  
1735 classes, either at the beginning, during the mid-class break, or at the end, to ask the  
1736 international students for their cooperation. The other places that we went regularly to look  
1737 for the international students in these two faculties were the libraries of the two faculties and  
1738 the laboratories of the two faculties.

1739

1740 In classes the researcher and her assistant stayed for about 15 minutes and gave further  
1741 explanations on how to fill the questionnaire and walked around to help the students fill up  
1742 the questionnaires or answer any questions about the items. In other cases the students were  
1743 briefed on the study, questionnaire, and how to fill this, then they were given a copy. We  
1744 asked the students to tell us where and how to recollect the filled questionnaires. In these  
1745 three weeks we also had chosen to sit at a certain place (the lobbies of the two faculty's  
1746 buildings) for the students to know where to find us if they had any inquiries on filling the  
1747 questionnaire, or if they wanted to return the completed ones. We also gave them our hand  
1748 phone numbers so that they would be able to reach us in case of any inquiries. The other  
1749 places we looked for the international students were the workshops that were occasionally  
1750 held at the two faculties. Since the electronic mailing system in which all the post graduate

1751 students have an e-mail account did not let us send an email to the whole group, by the above  
1752 mentioned ways we tried to visit as many international students as possible present at the  
1753 university at the time of data collection.

1754

1755 However, we did not get to meet those students who were on leave that semester, or were  
1756 doing their theses only and did not go to university as often, or did not go to university during  
1757 these three weeks for other reasons of their own.

1758

1759

### 1760 **3.4.2 Administration of Interviews**

1761 There were two more stages in the data collection procedures: interviews with the students  
1762 and the lecturers.

#### 1763 **3.4.2.1 Students' Interviews**

1764 At the end of the questionnaire there was a part which asked the students their telephone  
1765 numbers and e-mail addresses; not many respondents had left us their telephone numbers or e  
1766 mail addresses, however.

1767 The researcher wrote e-mails to the students who had left their electronic mail addresses  
1768 asking them if they could spend thirty minutes on a follow-up interview session on their  
1769 English problems. She also sent text messages to all who had given her their hand phone  
1770 numbers. A total of 25 students (15 from the FCSIT and 10 from the FE) agreed to participate  
1771 in interviews. For those who replied, the researcher arranged interview sessions. She tried to  
1772 hold the interview sessions in groups for two reasons. The first reason was to benefit from the

1773 group discussion potentials: in groups, there would be more views leading to more  
1774 comprehensive discussions; it could also help to identify if the problems discussed were  
1775 general or individual. The other advantage was that it could save time in the course of data  
1776 collection. However, for those students who could not attend the group interview sessions  
1777 individual interviews were held. In total, 7 interview sessions were held with the students.  
1778 There were four sessions with 5 participants, one session with 3, and 2 sessions with 2  
1779 individuals. The group interviews took around 75 minutes and the individual ones each took  
1780 about 30 minutes. The interview sessions were recorded and the notes were extracted from  
1781 the recording on the same day in order to have precise notes with a clear memory of the  
1782 sessions.

1783

#### 1784 **3.4.2.2 Lecturers' Interviews**

1785 For the lecturers' interviews the researcher first went to the post graduate offices at the two  
1786 faculties for a list of the lecturers who taught at the post graduate levels and supervised  
1787 students' post graduate theses. Once she got the list, she sent them e-mails to introduce the  
1788 research and ask them if they had the time to have an interview with the researcher.

1789 The lecturers' interviews were done individually, not in groups. The reason was that the  
1790 lecturers were busy and each of them had allocated a different time for the interview  
1791 compared with the others, so this made it impossible to have a group interview session with  
1792 the lecturers. The lecturers, however, were not involved with the language use and its  
1793 problems as much as the students themselves were; but they could comment on some areas of  
1794 language use, mostly production (in written or spoken). The lecturers were, however, busy  
1795 and the interviews had to be as short and fruitful as possible. The interview sessions of the  
1796 lectures lasted between 15 to 20 minutes each. This concluded the data collection procedures.

1797

1798

1799

### 1800 **3. 5 Data Analysis**

1801 The SPSS software (version 15) was used to enter and analyze the questionnaire responses.

1802 As mentioned earlier, for each area of language use and the problems associated with that, the

1803 students would choose from a four-point Likert Scale, ranging from ‘Never’ through

1804 ‘Sometimes’, and ‘Usually’, to ‘Always’. The main tool in the analysis was the frequency of

1805 the occurrence of the problems. The researcher looked at both the most frequently occurring

1806 problems, including ‘sometimes’, and also those problems that ‘always’ or ‘usually’ occurs to

1807 the students. The second set of data, which was obtained from the interviews, relies on what

1808 the students and lecturers commented. In this part, the problems mentioned by the students

1809 are presented and discussed first, and then their perspectives of how to attend to these

1810 problems are given. For the lecturers’ interview results, the same order has also been

1811 followed. The results are given in the following chapter.

1812

### 1813 **3.6 Conclusion**

1814 This chapter gave a detailed and comprehensive account of the research methodology used in

1815 this study. It started by explaining the nature, design, and the method of the research reported.

1816 The participants of the study were also introduced in detail. The researcher then discussed

1817 the tools and instruments of the research; how they were designed and developed and the

1818 rationale for using them. The other focus of the chapter was on the data collection procedures

1819 where the researcher gave an in-depth step by step report of the procedures through which the

1820 data were collected. The methodology chapter ends with a section on data entry and analysis  
1821 processes. In the next chapter a comprehensive report on data analysis findings will be  
1822 presented.

1823

1824

1825

1826

1827

1828

1829

1830

1831

1832

1833

1834

1835

1836

1837

1838