

MEASUREMENT OF THE STUDENTS' ATTITUDE TOWARD A WHOLE-LANGUAGE-APPROACH-BASED LECTURE USING SCORE QUESTIONNAIRES

Nizamuddin Sadiq
Universitas Islam Indonesia
email: sadiq_syah@yahoo.com

Abstract: The objective was to investigate students' attitude toward the implementation of a whole language approach on Reading and Writing for Occupational Purposes Course in the academic year of 2013/2014. The approaches employed were phonological and phoneme awareness, phonic and word study, fluency, vocabulary, comprehension skills and strategies, and writing. The participants were 15 students of the English Language Education Department, Universitas Islam Indonesia. SCORE questionnaire using the Likert's scale was the instrument. Calculation was to find out score index and categorization by following Riduwan's (2007) score interpretation criteria. The findings showed that in the simple category, two of ten questions were agreed absolutely (100%), in the clear category, all questions were agreed for 80 %, in the original category, five of thirteen questions reached majority of agreement (100%), in the relevant category, one of five questions was agreed absolutely (100%), and in the enjoyable category, all questions were agreed by 93%.

Keywords: *a whole language approach, SCORE, score interpretation criteria*

PENGUKURAN SIKAP MAHASISWA TENTANG PERKULIAHAN BERBASIS A WHOLE LANGUAGE APPROACH DENGAN KUESIONER SCORE

Abstrak: Tujuan penelitian ini adalah mengukur sikap mahasiswa terhadap pelaksanaan *a whole language approach* dalam perkuliahan *Reading and Writing for Occupational Purposes Course* tahun akademik 2013/2014. Pendekatan yang diterapkan adalah kesadaran fonetik dan fonemik, pelafalan dan kata, kelancaran, kosakata, keterampilan dan strategi membaca komprehensif, dan menulis. Responden penelitian ini adalah 15 mahasiswa Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris Universitas Islam Indonesia. Kuesioner SCOREs dengan skala Likert sebagai instrumen. Penghitungan ditujukan kepada skor indeks dan kategorisasi mengikuti kriteria interpretasi skor Riduwan (2007). Hasilnya menunjukkan bahwa pada kategori *simple*, dua pertanyaan disetujui mutlak (100%), pada kategori *clear*, semua pertanyaan disetujui sebesar 80%, pada kategori *original*, lima pertanyaan disetujui mutlak (100%), pada kategori *relevant*, satu pertanyaan disetujui mutlak (100%), dan pada kategori *enjoyable*, semua pertanyaan disetujui sebesar 93%.

Kata Kunci: *pendekatan a whole language, kuesioner SCORE, kriteria interpretasi skor*

INTRODUCTION

In academic year 2013/2014, *Reading and Writing for Occupational Purposes Course* applied a whole language approach (Brown: 2001). As it was implemented for the first occasion, investigating students' attitude toward its course delivery would be significant in order to obtain feedback for continuous improvement.

Before this occurrence, the feedback often used was student reflection that was taken place in the end of the course. In writing their reflection, students were asked to express two-

fold substances – knowledge and personal emotion that they experience during the running class. Meanwhile, to develop feedback instrument, the author have created a SCORE-based questionnaire. SCORE stands for simple, clear, original, relevant, and enjoyable. Simply put, this questionnaire is set up to know students' attitude toward a learning program in terms of simplicity, clarity, originality, relevancy, and enjoyable.

Since 1990s, a role of reading in supporting developing writing has been being admitted

by scholars. Read (1985) states that comprehensible input before output is needed to integrate several skills. The importance of comprehensible or meaningful input as written by Aldosari (2012) is supported by researches done by scholars and practitioners. One idea is that meaningful input provides not only data but also special components related to writing such as thinking and finding solution in the process of writing. In addition, meaningful input reveals supporting writing through reading activities as these two abilities and skills complete one another. For example, language learners will recognize various discourses in writing such as structure, rhetoric, linguistic features, lexicons, and stylistic characters. This condition invites Aldosari (2012) to conclude that several reading skills have characteristics that are missing in the reading comprehension but they are important in writing. If those characters are integrated and implemented in the reading course, learners may obtain important input in their writing.

Ling (2012) supports the idea that a whole language approach can be applied in the teaching reading and writing. She argues that by reading completely from understanding its vocabulary, pronunciation, and grammar, learners have sufficient accumulative capital knowledge to write. However, Krashen (2000) gives a note on this fact that the application of a whole language approach is done truly for reading skill, the results will be excellent in the senses that learners have a better attitude toward texts. In addition, they are eager to read more texts and show a better development in using language read from the texts. Therefore, by having vision and ability to understand a learning context, a whole language approach reveals effective in building teaching and learning atmosphere and enthusiast (Sumara, 1990).

According to Brown (2001), one of the informed approaches is a whole language approach. This approach is used to describe cooperative learning, participatory learning, student-centred learning, community of learners, social nature of language, meaning-centres language, holistic assessment techniques in testing, and integration of the four skills. It is therefore, for

its highest achievement, a whole language approach aims at guiding and supporting learners to be independent learners, readers, and writers (Weaver, 2002). Besides that, when learners participate actively in the learning process, they will develop their capacity into significant learners, readers, and writers (Stephens, 1992). It would not be an exaggeration to say that a whole language approach is a comprehensive learning approach because a whole language approach is an educational of life. It helps people to build meaningful connections between everyday and school learning (Brown, 2001). More importantly, Sukyadi (2010) points out that a whole language approach can be combined with skill approach that is suitable with learning needs.

Considering a concept and use of a whole language approach in language teaching and learning, the author comes to a conclusion that a whole language approach will be fundamentally applicable when it is applied for students' exposure with an encouraging learning atmosphere. In this context, therefore, a whole language approach is intended not to writing-for-writing (Harmer, 2007) or real writing (Brown, 2001) but to writing-for-learning (Harmer, 2007) or display writing (Brown, 2001).

Furthermore, the current research shows that attitude represents assessment toward an object psychologically and the assessment can be described internally and externally in the form of good-bad, like-dislike, useful-useless, and enjoyable-unenjoyable (Siragusa et al, 2008). According to Wenden (as cited in Al-Tamimi, 2009, p.33) the term attitudes includes three components namely, cognitive, affective and behavioural. A cognitive component is made up of the beliefs and ideas or opinions about the object of the attitude. The affective one refers to the feeling and emotions that one has towards an object, 'likes' or 'dislikes', 'with' or 'against'. Finally, the behavioural component refers to one's consisting actions or behavioural intentions towards the object.

Attitude is closely related to language learning. Al-Tamimi et al (2009) reported that learning a language was closely related to the attitudes towards the languages. When students

have positive attitudes toward a language, they will have positive orientation towards learning English (Karahan as cited in Al-Tamimi, 2009). Ahmed et al (2012) found Peacock's (1998) study that the attitude of students is detrimental to language learning.

METHOD

This study was conducted to investigate students' attitude toward learning with a whole language approach in the English Language Education Department. To achieve this objective, a research tool namely questionnaire SCORE was used. It was designed based on the SCORE abbreviation – simple, clear, original, relevant, and enjoyable.

The participants of this study were all the students who took Reading and Writing for Occupational Purposes Course in the academic year 2013-2014 in Universitas Islam Indonesia, Yogyakarta, Indonesia. The total number of the students was 15, which consists of 6 males, and 9 females.

Questionnaires which consisted of five sections that were SCORE were the main method of inquiry used in this study. In Section S, 10 questions with engagement, moving, and need fulfilment as keywords were used to collect information regarding simplicity. Section C consisted of three questions with easy to follow, simple, and positive mindset as keywords were included to identify clarity. Section O consisted of thirteen questions with keywords different from other, unusual, creative, knowledge-skill-insight enhancement, and changing behaviour to investigate originality. Section R consisted of 5 items which included questions to see learning relevancy. The keywords were skilful, necessities, materials, and activities. Section E which consisted of 4 questions to collect information regarding enjoyment has 4 keywords that were enthusiasts, task accomplishment, and teaching method.

All questions were created by using of Likert scale with five options that were very disagree (VD), disagree (Di), doubtful (Do), agree (A), and absolutely agree (AA). Each option will obtain score from 1 to 5 respectively.

To ensure its validity, the questionnaire was tested by applying comparing validity test. This way of doing the validity is by comparing coefficient validity score with Pearson table (r product moment table), with $\alpha = 0,482$ and $n = 15$. The criteria are the following:

Valid instrument, when $r_{count} \geq t_{table}$, and

Invalid instrument, when $r_{count} < t_{table}$.

The researcher had taught English through Formula 33 from March to August 2014. The researcher has designed the questions and also announced that the participants would fill in a questionnaire in the last meeting of the course. After it was finished, the questionnaire was distributed and the participants answered it anonymously. They were called for stating their true and honest responses, although the results would not be considered for their final score. In addition, the participants were notified to ask for any clarifications they might have. To ensure that all participants have answered all the questions, they were requested to check their responses for incompleteness or missing answers prior to submit the questionnaire.

The data collected in the present study was of quantitative. The quantitative data of the questionnaires were analysed in terms of percentages, using the statistical formula provided in MS Excel. To measure the percentage index, the formula was $= \text{total score} / Y \times 100$ where Y is the highest score of Likert scale. Total score is gained from $T \times P_n$ where T is the total score of respondent choice and P_n is the choice of Likert score option. Meanwhile, majority score percentage = total score of agree and absolutely agree answer and then is divided by total score Likert times 100.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

It might be worth indicating that the analysis of the data was based on the students' responses to thirty-five questions, for which they were required to tick any of the five options from very disagree to absolutely agree. Percentages were given to enhance the data analysis. Firstly, the results for simple category are displayed in the Table 1.

The above table shows that absolute majority of students agree that they were engaging in with song and its words pronunciation in RAWFOP course with an excellent index. In a whole language approach, pronunciation belongs to phonic awareness. It is understandable that students are engaging with song and the way to pronounce the words. In addition, they were also absolute agree that studying English in the RAWFOP course was fun. Conversely, question six has gotten the lowest agreement. In this respect, students tend to dislike doing their assignments through log book. The main reason given by students is that the tasks weight is too demanding that they find difficulty to spare their time into four tasks in the log book.

In addition, several students complain that doing tasks with tight schedule in the log book do not fit with their learning style. Therefore, there is no doubt that percentage of the agreement only reaches a good category. However, students generally like to engage in the RAWFOP course. When they have enjoyed with what they do in the classroom and those are fulfilling with their needs, students will be voluntarily involving in all activities designed. The students' involvement in learning a foreign la-

nguage is one of the important elements. As Harmer (2007) points out that involvement in all activities emotionally where heart and thought integrate in it is a fundamental capital to be successful in learning a language. Meanwhile, although the percentage of agreement was not taking place in the absolute position, students agreed with the rest of the questions in the simple category.

Secondly, the results of clear category are displayed in Table 2.

The above table shows that majority of students agree that explanation in RAWFOP course is easy to follow, learning English in RAWFOP course is simple, and their point of view of learning English in RAWFOP course is positive. These results are accordance to Aydoğan and Akbarov (2014:678), (2014, p.678) study in terms of interactivity in learning English through a whole language. In their study, the level of interest, affection and motivation of students can be enhanced because of good interactivity in the class.

Thirdly, the results of clear category are displayed in Table 3.

Table 1. Score, Index, and Majority of Simple Item

No.	Questions	Total Score	% Index	% Majority
1.	Do you engage in with Formula 33 materials in RAWFOP course?	64	85	93
2.	Do you engage in with songs and its words pronunciation in RAWFOP course?	69	92	100
3.	Do you engage in with vocabulary materials in RAWFOP course?	61	81	93
4.	Do you engage in with reading comprehension materials in RAWFOP course?	63	84	87
5.	Do you engage in with writing paragraph and essay materials in RAWFOP course?	63	84	93
6.	Do you engage in with tasks using LOG BOOK in RAWFOP course?	57	76	73
7.	Do you voluntarily move on learning English through the concept in RAWFOP course?	63	84	87
8.	Is in general studying in RAWFOP course fun?	67	89	100
9.	Does learning English in RAWFOP course fulfil your willing to learn English?	60	80	80
10.	Does learning English in RAWFOP course fulfil your need in learning English?	60	80	87

Table 2. Score, Index, and Majority of Clear Item

No.	Questions	Total Score	% Index	% Majority
11.	Is the explanation (Formula 33, vocabulary, paragraph and essay writing) in RAWFOP course easy to follow?	62	83	80
12.	Is learning English in RAWFOP course simple?	57	76	80
13.	Is your point of view of learning English in RAWFOP course positive?	60	80	80

Table 3. Score, Index, and Majority of Original Item

No.	Questions	Total Score	% Index	% Majority
14.	Is the way of learning English in RAWFOP course different from other way of learning English?	60	80	73
15.	Do you like the way of learning English in RAWFOP course?	63	84	73
16.	Do you think that learning English in RAWFOP course creative?	64	85	93
17.	Do you think that learning English in RAWFOP course increase your knowledge on English sentences?	64	85	100
18.	Do you think that learning English in RAWFOP course increase your knowledge on vocabularies?	64	85	100
19.	Do you think that learning English in RAWFOP course increase your knowledge on English words pronunciation?	64	85	93
20.	Do you think that learning English in RAWFOP course increase your knowledge on writing persuasive paragraph?	62	83	87
21.	Do you think that learning English in RAWFOP course increase your knowledge on writing persuasive essay?	66	88	100
22.	Do you think that learning English in RAWFOP course increase your skill on writing persuasive paragraph?	68	91	93
23.	Do you think that learning English in RAWFOP course increase your skill on writing persuasive essay?	66	88	100
24.	Do you think RAWFOP course change your attitude about learning English?	70	93	100
25.	Do you think that task accomplishment in the Log Book increase your vocabularies?	58	77	73
26.	Do you think that task accomplishment in the Log Book increase your insight on English expression?	58	77	93

Table 4. Score, Index, and Majority of Relevant Item

No.	Questions	Total score	% Index	% Majority
27.	Is learning English through Formula 33 relevant in making English sentences?	65	87	100
28.	Is learning English through Formula 33 relevant with your need in making English sentences?	62	83	73
29.	Are learning materials in RAWFOP course relevant in increasing skills on writing persuasive paragraph?	62	83	80
30.	Are learning materials in RAWFOP course relevant in increasing skills on writing persuasive essay?	62	83	87
31.	Is Movie Class activity in RAWFOP course relevant in assisting writing persuasive?	60	80	67

Table 5. Score, Index, and Majority of Enjoyable Item

No.	Questions	Total Score	% Index	% Majority
32.	Are you enthusiast in learning English in RAWFOP course?	65	87	93
33.	Are you enthusiast in following in and outdoor activities in RAWFOP course?	62	83	93
34.	Are you enthusiast in doing every assignment in RAWFOP course?	65	87	93
35.	Are you enthusiast with the way of learning English in RAWFOP course?	62	83	93

For originality category, the results reveal that students absolutely agree with that learning English in RAWFOP course increase their knowledge on the concept of English sentences, and writing persuasive essay. In addition, it also enhances their skill on writing persuasive essay and changes their view about the way of learning English.

Furthermore, there are three questions showing unbalance percentage. Question number fourteen and fifteen shows high index but low majority of agreement and question number twenty-six is otherwise, low index but high majority of agreement. This unbalance percentage shows that the way of learning English in RAWFOP course is truly different from other way of learning English and students do not really like the way of learning English in RAWFOP course. More importantly, students do not think that task accomplishment in the Log Book increase their insight on English expression.

The consistent fact found is that students do not think that the accomplishment of the tasks through log book increase their vocabularies. It reveals from the percentage that both index and majority of agreement are in the low criteria.

Fourthly, secondly, the results of clear category are displayed in Table 4.

The table showing relevancy category above illustrates an absolute percentage on question 27. Students agree that learning English through Formula 33 relevant in making English sentences. However it is not sufficient because it is not really relevant with their need in making English sentences. They seem to learn more complex English sentences.

Students express that Formula 33 enlightens their conceptual framework in making English

sentences and this formula is relevant with their willing to make English sentences easily. It goes without saying that students who are taking this course are the first year intake. The characteristic of those students are senior high school graduates who have random knowledge of grammar and the knowledge is still dysfunctional. If their knowledge is directed to be more operational, well-rounded, and systemic; the students become exceptionally grateful because they could make English sentences correctly and easily (Gunawan, 1996:1998).

Conversely, in majority number of agreement, students agree that learning materials in RAWFOP course relevant in increasing their skills on writing persuasive paragraph and essay. This fact is in line with Al-Darayseh (2014) study. He states “the steps implemented while teaching writing according to the whole language approach made it easier for students to write and to improve both their writing quality and quantity”.

One surprising result is that almost a half of students do not think that Movie Class activity in RAWFOP course is relevant in assisting writing persuasive. It means that a movie class tend to be noticed as entertainment only. They do not use this occasion to dig ideas and facts to write persuasive paragraph. However, this activity is highly appreciated by students because learning becomes more attractive and enjoyable. These positive views are vital capital in learning languages. According to Helgesen (2014), students who perceive something positively and happily would learn more, have high attention, and are not willing to leave the school.

Fifthly, the results of clear category are displayed in Table 5.

The table for enjoyable category demonstrates that students absolutely agree that they are enthusiastic in learning English, in following in and outdoor activities, in doing every assignment, and with the way of learning English in RAWFOP course.

The participating instructor who got involved in teaching the experimental group for the whole semester according to the whole language approach stressed this point saying that his students worked seriously and reacted positively to the concessive activities lead by the instructor, and they felt happy and proud to have clear progress in their writing ability by the end of the semester (Al-Darayseh, 2014).

CONCLUSION

It is concluded that students' attitude toward learning process in the RAWFOP course through a whole language approach overall is excellent. Of 35 questions, 8 (22.8%) questions are absolutely agreed by students (100%). Students are consistently in their attitude for two items that are the use of log book and too much and demanding tasks. The use of log book is considered too mechanical and tasks are heavy so that they cannot do it well because of time constraints.

Furthermore, running this course through a whole language approach is not easy but worth challenging. Several things to be felt burdening are learning preparations. In every cycle of learning, all materials including words pronunciation, vocabularies, affixes, and exercises must be well prepared. In addition, reading, listening, and movie materials must also be designed to meet learning outcomes.

Other activities such as observation, field note taking, and evaluation will be daily menus to be undeniable. These activities must be done because a subtle change and progress will give impact on overall evaluation. One more demanding activity is correction time for both task accomplishment and individual consultation. Therefore, successful keys in applying this whole language approach are commitment and dedication.

These findings can be used as a beginning point for providing several recommendations, as follow:

- A whole language approach reveals to create a learning atmosphere how to use English. Although, this approach is well-known as an approach in kindergarten, the use of it can be applied and developed continuously in higher education, especially in a course to increase skills and abilities in language learning.
- The use of log book as a student daily note is appreciated by almost half of the students. The aim of providing the log book is to force students to do an independent study as additional time for regular class which is limited. Therefore, it is recommended to design the log book that is suitable with the need of the course and students learning style.
- The class must be designed for small number of students. For skills course, 20 students are more than enough. Besides it does not need a large size of classroom, the small number of students will give more chances and rooms for intensive interaction between teacher to student, and student to student.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This research was funded by Universitas Islam Indonesia (UII) through a grant competition of teaching quality enhancement held by Board of Academic Development (BAD) UII academic year 2013/2014. Therefore, I acknowledged the contributions made to the accomplishment of writing this research to: (1) Rector of UII through Dr. Ir. Sugini, MT, IAI as the Head of BAD UII 2010-2014 and Fathul Wahid, PhD., as the Head of BAD UII 2014-2018; (2) proposal reviewers Dr. Hujair Sanaki and Dra. Sri Haningsih, M.Pd; (3) reviewer Dr. Muh. Idrus; (4) content reviewer Dr. Arief Fahmi; (5) the Head of English Department UII Irma Windi Astuti, M.Hum; (6) administration staff of BAD UII Puthut Sutarwan; (7) research staff Tri Ruswantoro.

REFERENCES

- Ahmed, C.M., Yossatorn, Y., & Yossiri, V. 2012. "Students' Attitude toward Teacher's Using Activities in EFL Class". *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 158-164.
- Al-Darayseh, A.-M. A. 2014. The Effect of "Using the Whole Language Approach on Improving English Majors' Writing Ability at Jerash Private University". *Journal of Human Sciences* , 401-415.
- Aldosari, H. 2012. Effects of Integrating "Reading and Writing during the Reading Process on Efl English Writing". *I Forum Internasional Sobre Pratica Dosentre Universitaria* , 325-345.
- Al-Tamimi, A., & Shuib, M. 2009. "Motivation and Attitude Towards Learning EnglishL A Study of Petroleum Engineering Undergraduates at Hadhramout University of Sciences and Technology". *GEMA Online Journal of Language Studies*, 22-55.
- Aydogan, H., & Akbarov, A. A. 2014. The Four "Basic Language Skills, Whole Language & Intergrated Skill Approach in Mainstream University Classrooms in Turkey". *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences* , 672-680.
- Brown, H. D. 2001. *Teaching by Principles. An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy. 2nd Edition*. New York: Longman.
- Gunawan. 1998. "Penumbuhan Keterampilan Terpadu Berbahasa Inggris Mahasiswa Peserta MKDU Bahasa Inggris". *Jurnal Kependidikan* , Edisi 11 th XXXIII 1998.
- Gunawan. 1996. "Status Kemampuan Awal Bahasa Inggris Masyarakat Terpelajar Indonesia dan Kemungkinan Pengembangan untuk Mencapai Kemampuan Awal Berkomunikasi Nyata dalam Bahasa Inggris". *Jurnal Diksi*, 10-20.
- Harmer, J. 2007. *How to Teach English*. China: Longman.
- Harmer, J. 2001. *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. Malaysia: Longman.
- Helgesen, M. 2014 (June, 18-19). "Positive Psychology (the Science of Happiness) in the English Language Classroom". *Program Book* . Yogyakarta: JETA - PBI UII.
- Krashen, S. 2000 (January). *www.rossier.usc.edu*. Retrieved February 7, 2014, from *www.usc.edu*: http://www.usc.edu/dept/-education/CMMR/text/ Krashen_WholeLang.PDF
- Ling, P. 2012. "The Whole Language Theory and Its Application to the Teaching of English Reading". *English Language Teaching* , 147 - 152.
- Riduan. 2007. *Belajar Mudah Penelitian untuk Guru, Karyawan, dan Peneliti Muda*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Riduwan. 2007. *Rumus dan Data dalam Analisis Statistika*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Siragusa, L., & Dixon, K. 2008. "Planned Behaviour: Student Attitudes Toward the Use of ICT Interactions in Higher Education". *Proceeding ASCILITE* (pp. 942-953). Melbourne: ASCILITE.
- Stephens, D. 1992. *Whole Language in Context*. Illinois: University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign Library.
- Sukyadi, D. 2010. "Approaches to Teaching Early Reading: Whole Language or Phonic Approach?" *TEFLIN Journal* .
- Sumara, D. J. 1990. *Effective Whole-Language Teaching: Case Studies Of Two Teachers' Practice*. Alberta: University of Lethbridge.
- Weaver, C. 2002. *Teaching Reading and Developing Literacy: Contrasting Perspective*. Portsmouth: Heinemann.