

EVALUATING THE USEFULNESS OF AN ENGLISH COURSE AT BINUS UNIVERSITY: FRESHMEN'S PERSPECTIVES – QUANTITATIVE APPROACH

Almodad B. Asmani

English Department, Faculty of Language and Culture, Bina Nusantara University,
Jln. Kemanggisian Ilir III No. 45, Kemanggisian/Palmerah, Jakarta Barat 11480

ABSTRACT

Article examined the feedback and responses provided by Binus University freshmen students concerning their study experiences of taking an English subject, called English Entrant, as part of their compulsory English course program at Binus University during the odd semester of 2010/2011. The research was to find out whether such program has been useful and effective for these students in terms of the teaching quality, course contents and independent learning system commonly applied at Binus University. The research applied the quantitative approach with the focus on finding the general tendency of these students in evaluating the program based on numerical data. In the initial stage of the research, the writer selects the random sample of four to five English Entrant classes ranging from small to large number of students. The results are that the teaching methodology applied in English Entrant tends to be highly acceptable if the lecturers are more communicative and engaging with their students. The speaking format in the classroom is also more preferred by the students if it focuses more on the fluency and clarity rather than the accuracy. Lastly, the independent learning system is more likely to be appreciated by these students if it can provide the proper feedback and improvement for their English learning experiences.

Keywords: English Course, Freshmen, English Entrant

ABSTRAK

Artikel membahas masukan dan respon mahasiswa baru di Universitas Bina Nusantara yang sedang mengambil mata kuliah English Entrant, sebagai salah satu mata kuliah wajib pada semester ganjil 2010/2011. Tujuan penelitian adalah mengevaluasi apakah English Entrant bermanfaat dan efektif bagi mahasiswa ditinjau dari kualitas pengajar, materi, dan sistem pembelajaran mandiri yang diterapkan di Universitas Bina Nusantara. Penelitian menggunakan metode kuantitatif yang berfokus pada temuan terkait tendensi umum mahasiswa dalam mengevaluasi English Entrant berbasis data angka. Responden ditentukan secara random sampling, yaitu dipilih empat – lima orang dari setiap kelas, tergantung dari besar atau kecilnya jumlah mahasiswa dalam kelas tersebut. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa metode pengajaran yang disukai adalah apabila dosen lebih komunikatif dengan mahasiswa, format berbicara di kelas disukai yang lebih berfokus pada kelancaran dan kejelasan, dari pada ketepatan berbicara, dan sistem pembelajaran mandiri yang disukai adalah apabila sistem tersebut dapat memberi dampak yang benar sehingga mampu memperbaiki pengalaman mereka dalam belajar bahasa Inggris.

Kata kunci: pengajaran bahasa Inggris, mahasiswa baru, English Entrant

INTRODUCTION

The research project is closely linked to the previous study results on the issues of why and how Binus university students value English in terms of the general, academic and ELT (English Language Teaching) contexts (See Asmani: 2010). From the results, it shows that Binus University students have the tendency to value English of *both* benefits and universal factors that English can bring into their lives, such as in economic, communicative (here meaning communication and transport), cultural, social and educational contexts. The information has contributed to the English program design in the institution, including English Entrant course. For the past semesters of 2010/2011, freshmen students of Binusian 2014 have become the first ‘customers’ to ever undergo the teaching and learning process of this new program. A variety of responses, both from teachers and students, has been emerged from this new course scheme with the apparent results of growing needs of collecting and recording the necessary data for future improvement and/or maintenance of the program. Teachers’ responses have been particularly notable and abundant. However, the students’ perspectives have always been the focus of the writer since they are the subjects who experience directly the effects of the new learning process, which is greatly different in nature and procedure from the long-traditional grammar-based English classes in the institution. These are all the reasons why the writer needs to evaluate the running program, so as to gain as much information as possible from the students’ perspectives because their voices contribute significantly to the final establishment of the new scheme. This has been in line with the Binus University attitude, which has always put main emphasis on customer satisfaction in balance with other academic and supporting factors.

Purposes of the Study

The purpose of the research is to find out whether the new English program has proved useful for the students of Binusian 2014 in ways that correspond to their general preferences and future careers, as discussed in the previous study of how and why they value English in certain contexts. The research is also to find out aspects of these students’ evaluation in terms of aspects in the teaching process, course contents, and independent learning system.

Therefore, the research project aims to find out:

- How they rate the usefulness of the teaching process, course contents, and beyond-class learning activities?
- What suggestions or input they may give regarding the teaching process, course contents and beyond-class learning activities?

Significance of the Study

The study has some academic significance in a way that it provides the detailed explanation on the general tendency these students might have in their ways of evaluating the English course program in the institution. The information is very valuable for the institution, since it can show how far these students are satisfied with the teaching-learning process they are dealing with. The result of the findings can also provide important input for the English teachers, since some aspects of the teaching process are directly linked to the actual practice of teaching performance like presentation techniques, materials preparation, individual approach, etc. The research also provides useful input for the curriculum designer of the English course program, since the findings will benefit in two ways. First, it tells how useful the aspects of the course outline for these students either for academic purposes or for future careers. Second, it tells how appropriate the course implementation is with the learning styles and characteristics of these students. Lastly, the research can give feedback information for the Language Center unit and Binus University concerning the usefulness for beyond-class learning activities, such as self-study for reading and listening, conversations clubs and tutorials, extra-curricular activities, etc.

Reviewing the Literature

The research project is based on some observations and studies about the application of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) approach in Asian contexts, in which local cultural values and practices may be in direct conflict with the western teaching and learning ways. Siemon (2010: 40) states that "... Chinese students' English learning strategies are primarily focused on reading and writing, on grammar and translation, and on memorization of vocabulary." However, research has shown that this traditional method has 'failed to develop an adequate level of communicative competence (i.e. the ability to use the target language for authentic communication)' (Hu 2002: 93). However, she also reminds that due to large class sizes of generally 50 to 60 students as well as economic restraints, CLT approach may be difficult to apply in the real classroom, and she suggests arrangements like 'group discussion, pair work and language labs may overcome this difficulty' (2010: 42).

Regarding learner-centered curriculum, Brown (2003: 49) states that "students can be observed working individually or in pairs and small groups on distinct tasks and projects". McCombs and Whistler in Brown (2003: 49) mentioned two essential factors that contribute to the success of the learner-centered approach in educational contexts. The two essential factors include characteristics of the learners and teaching practices.

Furthermore, Richards (2001) specifies four biggest factors that contribute significantly to achieve quality teaching in a language institution. They are institutional factors, teacher factors, teaching factors and learner factors. Under the institutional quality indicators, he highlights the question of "which type of curriculum best meets student needs?" (p. 202). He mentions influential factors such as equipment, support staff, teacher workspace, teaching facilities, and class size. Under the teacher factors, he highlights "practical knowledge", which is the teacher's repertoire of classroom techniques and strategies (p. 209). Under the teaching factors, "the communicative approach" (p. 215) is described as one of the teaching models that can be applied in language programs. In the approach, "the focus of the teaching is authentic communication; extensive use is made of pair and group activities that involve negotiation of meaning and information sharing. Fluency is a priority" (p. 215). In summary, according to Richards, all of these four factors contribute to the improved and high quality of teaching practice at a language institution.

Under the learner factors, Brindley in Richards (2001, 223) states that, "when learners and teachers meet for the first time, they may bring with them different expectations concerning not only the learning process in general, but also concerning what will be learned in a particular course and how it will be learned. The possibility exists, therefore, for misunderstanding to arise. It is, accordingly, of vital importance that, from the beginning of the course, mechanisms for consultation are set up, in order to ensure that the parties involved in the teaching-learning process are aware of each other's expectations. If learners are to become active participants in decision making regarding their own learning, then it is essential that they know the teacher's position and that they be able to state their own. Teachers, conversely, need to canvass learners' expectations and be able to interpret their statements of need."

In the same vein, Richards (2001: 223) mentions that courses may expect their learners to represent some different roles in the learning process, such as "manager of his or her own learning, independent learner, need analyst, collaborator and team member and peer tutor."

Willing (1985, cited in Nunan 1988, 93) specified four different learner types in the population he studied:

- Concrete learners, who preferred games, pictures, films and video, talking in pairs, learning through the use of cassettes, and going on excursions.

- Analytical learners, who liked studying grammar, studying English books, studying alone, finding their own mistakes, having problems to work on, learning through reading newspapers
- Communicative learners, who liked listening to native speakers, talking to friends in English, watching TV in English, using English in shops, and learning English words by hearing them and learning by conversations.
- Authority-oriented learners, who liked the teacher to explain everything, writing everything in a notebook, having their own textbook, learning to read, studying grammar, and learning English words by seeing them.

All of the aspects discussed in the above literature show that in order to be successful in implementing its academic program, a language institution should shift its gravity from a totally teacher-focused direction to a more balance state between teacher-centered and student-centered one. Another factor that contributes significantly to the success of a language institution is the facility of Self-Access Center, in which students can access the additional materials, either in printed copies or in multimedia format, to support their learning experiences in the program.

Concerning the Self-Access Center, Harmer (2007: 404-405) mentions some characteristics of a good self-access center, which are:

- Classification system, where there is a clear description, coding, labeling, indexing or database of all the type of materials and the level they are designed for.
- Pathways, where students are given suggestion about the next materials, suggested by software, or assistants and teachers can help students to use the center's contents and benefits further
- Training students, in which students need to be trained to use programs and centers best
- Making self-access centers appropriate for students, where materials and tasks should be designed specifically to have groups working together in pair or group interaction
- Keeping interest going, where students' involvement in using SAC should be maintained through a variety of means such as feedback sheets, SAC-users' committee, newsletter, website, reward for regular attendance, etc.

Susan McLean Orlando suggests that the kind of learning that happens in formal setting 'may represent only a fraction of the learning experienced by participants' (McLean Orlando in Harmer 2007: 407). Harmer (2007: 407) also adds that students will use English in the real world outside the classroom, so students need to learn to access and investigate English on their own. He also gives some examples of the methods that promote students' independent learning, such as tasks or reports of using English outside the class, extensive reading and listening assignments, learning journals and records, etc.

Research Design

General Research Approach

Instead of trying to find the 'universal laws' underpinning a social world (Cohen et al., 2000), I will focus on the general tendency of these students in evaluating the usefulness of an English course they have studied during the odd semester of 2010/2011. After that, I will try to link their ratings in this regard with some related views in the ELT pedagogy. Thus, I will try to find out their pattern of responses to the statements that I will design in the instrument.

Based on the nature of this knowledge, my position in this research project is more towards the positivist/empiricist epistemology, which is more concerned with generalization, prediction and control.

Based on the nature of my research, I apply the approach of quantitative data gathering and analysis. By using a quantitative methodology in the research project, I focus on more context-free generalizations of the observed social phenomenon by examining the relationship of the variables. Here, I rely on statistical results represented with numerical data.

Data Collection

I use survey questionnaires to collect the data, and my target population consists of all Binusian students of 2014 who take English Entrant classes at Binus University in the odd semester of 2010/2011.

Questionnaires

To find out how these students evaluate the course usefulness, I use statements representing the teaching quality, the course contents and the beyond-class learning activities. I use arguments that are carefully considered as representing the fundamental principles in evaluating an English course, based on the ideas of some authors. These statements provide many possible responses regarding how the students rate the usefulness level of the English course they were taking to find out whether the program has met their needs and demands.

I give the statements in the form of questionnaires of predominantly selected-response questions with some open-ended items. The selected-response items enable me to maintain the precision and clarity of my research problems in a way that the possibility of the students to give answers or responses, which deviate from the real problems, can be put at a minimum level. It is very hard to control this in open-ended questions or interviews alone. Wiersma (1991) notes that "Selected-response items enhance consistency of response across respondents, data tabulation generally is straightforward and less time-consuming than for open-ended items" (p. 176). In my consideration, the pre-coded items also help students think about the criteria they evaluate in this matter, which might already exist unconsciously in their minds. Open-ended items alone take more time and effort for them to think again about these criteria. Furthermore, the statements that I provide in the questionnaire are already thought of and formulated carefully to represent many possible criteria that best reflect how students evaluate an English course in Binus university.

Since I measure how strong their average responses to each statement are, it asks for degrees of agreement. Here, I use a kind of Likert scaling with five or more choices, ranging from 'Strongly Agree' to 'Strongly Disagree'. McDonough and McDonough (1997) note that each statement is related to each other, and the respondents' responses 'can be summed over the whole questionnaire' to produce a measure of strength..

Due to some considerations of the high response rate, non-respondents' exclusion, the spread of respondents and reasonable costs, I personally administer the questionnaire to the participants by asking the permission of time and opportunity from some English lecturers teaching their classes in the odd semester of 2010/2011 across campuses at Binus University.

Participants

I divide the participants into two groups of Binusian freshman 2014 who take English subjects in the odd semester of 2010/2011 at Binus University, which are:

- Undergraduate students studying at Faculty of Computer Studies (120 students)
- Undergraduate students studying at other faculties (120 students):
 - Undergraduate students studying at Faculty of Economics and Business (40 students)
 - Undergraduate students studying at Faculty of Communication and Multimedia (40 students)
 - Undergraduate students studying at Faculty of Language and Culture (40 students)

These Binusian students are chosen as the participants in my research project due to some reasons. First, all students of non-English department studying at Binus University must take English course as the compulsory subjects. This results in a large number of English-studying students who need a special academic consideration and treatment to meet the aims and objectives as expected. Second, because I am the coordinator of all English course program at Binus University, I am in a better position to investigate any issue of the English course running in terms of the appropriateness and usefulness of the teaching methodology delivered, the curriculum designed and the beyond-class activities conducted.

Since there are subpopulations in the population to be sampled and due to the fact that it is not homogeneous, I will use the approach of stratified random sampling, where “all strata are represented in the sample, and the sample members are selected from each stratum at random” (Wiersma, 1991: 253). For allocation of sample size among strata, I will use proportional allocation method, where “the allocation of strata members in the sample is proportional to the numbers of members in the strata of the population” (Wiersma, 1991: 253).

Data Analysis: Quantitative

For quantitative analysis, I use the ANOVA statistical analysis to test the hypotheses as follows:

1. Null Hypothesis 1: the responses means for Binusian students rating English Entrant under two different groups of faculty are equal.
2. Alternate Hypothesis 1: the responses means for Binusian students rating English Entrant under two different groups of faculty are not equal
3. Null hypothesis 2: the responses means for Binusian students rating English Entrant under three different categories of criteria are equal
4. Alternate hypothesis 2: the responses means for Binusian students rating English Entrant under three different categories of criteria are not equal

My independent variable is group difference (*Faculties*) and criteria category (*Teaching Methodology, Course Contents* and *Beyond-Class Activities*), and my dependent variable is the student's responses.

I choose the ANOVA statistical analysis due to various reasons. First, I use single items with Likert scale response format for measurement of the dependent variable (responses), whose data is on interval scale. Second, I will test the significance of the difference between the means of two independent samples under two independent variables, and the ANOVA statistical analysis applies in this procedure.

The data collected will be presented in a 2x2 *Multifactor Analysis of Variance* to find out the combined effect of the faculty difference and the criteria category to the student's responses. By using the model, I will analyze:

1. whether there is a significant difference of the students' responses under two groups of faculty
2. whether there is a significant difference of the students' responses under three categories of criteria

If there is a significant difference in the first point, I describe how different the students' responses are distributed under each group of faculty, and I will interpret the findings as to why they are different. If there is no significant difference in the first point, I describe how similar the students' responses are distributed under each group of faculty, and I will interpret the findings as to why they are similar.

Research Report

Data Presentation

Responses data of Binus University students from two faculty groups in evaluating English Entrant under three categories of criteria is presented in the table below:

Table 1 Students' Evaluation on English Entrant from Two Faculty Groups under Three Categories of Criteria

	Computer Studies 40 means	1	Non-Computer Studies 40 means	4	
Teaching	$\Sigma X = 163.16$ $\overline{X} = 4.08$ $\Sigma X^2 = 670.5$		$\Sigma X = 172$ $\overline{X} = 4.3$ $\Sigma X^2 = 746.38$		$\Sigma X_{r1} = 335.33$ $\overline{X}_{r1} = 4.19$
Course	40 means	2	40 means	5	
	$\Sigma X = 151$ $\overline{X} = 3.77$ $\Sigma X^2 = 574.55$		$\Sigma X = 162.33$ $\overline{X} = 4.05$ $\Sigma X^2 = 667.61$		$\Sigma X_{r2} = 313.33$ $\overline{X}_{r2} = 3.91$
Independent Learning	40 means	3	40 means	6	
	$\Sigma X = 140.83$ $\overline{X} = 3.52$ $\Sigma X^2 = 502.02$		$\Sigma X = 134.83$ $\overline{X} = 3.37$ $\Sigma X^2 = 465.58$		$\Sigma X_{r3} = 275.66$ $\overline{X}_{r3} = 3.44$
	$\Sigma X_{c1} = 455.16$ $\overline{X}_{c1} = 3.79$		$\Sigma X_{c2} = 469.16$ $\overline{X}_{c2} = 3.90$		$\Sigma X_{Total} = 924.33$ $\Sigma X^2_{Total} = 3626.66$ $\overline{X}_{Grand\ Mean} = 3.85$

Data Summary

The responses data of the four student groups under the two faculty groups with two question categories is summarized in the table below:

Table 2 Summary of a 2 x 2 Multifactor Analysis of Variance of Six Student Groups

Source of Variance	SS	df	MS	F	Level of Significance
Between columns (Studies)	0.73	1	0.73	4.29	-
Between rows (Criteria)	22.67	2	11.33	66.64	0.01
Column by rows (Interaction)	2.25	2	1.12	6.58	0.01
Between groups	25.65	5	5.13		
Within groups	41.06	234	0.17		
Total	66.71	239			

Three F ratios are listed in the table. To find the significance of each of these values, the writer consults the table of F values in the appendix. To use the table, the writer uses the number of degrees of freedom associated with each F ratio (df for the numerator) and the number of df associated with the within-groups mean square (df for the denominator).

The between-columns F ratio is 4.29. Consulting the table, with 1 and 234 df , the writer finds that an F ratio of 3.89 or more is needed for significance at the .05 level, and an F ratio of 6.76 or more is needed at the .01 level. Because the obtained value of 4.29 is higher than 3.89, but lower than 6.76, the writer can conclude that the difference between the responses of the students from computer studies and from other studies is statistically significant at the .05 level but not at the .01 level.

The between-rows F ratio is 66.64. With 2 and 234 df on the table, the obtained value of 66.64 far exceeds both 3.04 (.05 level) and 4.71 (.01 level). The writer can conclude that the difference of the students' responses to evaluate English Entrant under criteria of teaching, course and beyond-class activities are statistically significant at both the .05 level and the .01 level.

The column-by-rows F ratio is 6.58. With the same df (2 and 234), the obtained value also exceeds both of the values on the table (3.04 and 4.71), and is thus significant at the .05 level and the .01 level.

Data Interpretation

Data Interpretation of the First F Ratio

The first F ratio (between columns) is not significant and shows that the faculty groups do not differ significantly from one another in their effect on the responses of the students in answering the questions. The analysis, a comparison of the combined responses of groups 1, 2 and 3 ($X = 3.79$) with the combined responses of groups 3, 4 and 5 ($X = 3.90$), was not statistically significant, so I do not have sufficient evidence to make any conclusions about the faculty conditions.

Data Interpretation of the Second F Ratio

The second F ratio (between rows) is significant and shows that the three categories of criteria differ significantly from one another in their effect on the responses of the students. This analysis is a comparison of the combined responses of groups 1 and 4 ($X = 4.19$), with the combined responses of groups 2 and 5 ($X = 3.91$), and the combined responses of groups 3 and 6 ($X = 3.44$). From the significance of this F ratio I can infer that the difference between the evaluation attitudes of the students towards three criteria of English Entrant, which are teaching aspects, course content, and independent learning system, is beyond chance expectation. Because I have a significant F ratio for the difference, I conclude that among freshmen students of Binusian 2014:

- fully supporting attitudes and more can be expected from these students when they evaluate the teaching aspects of English Entrant
- almost fully supporting attitudes can be expected from the students when they evaluate the course contents of English Entrant
- neutral attitudes can be expected from the students when they evaluate the independent learning system of English Entrant

Teaching

Under the teaching criteria, both groups of students give the average mean scores of 4.08 and 4.3 respectively, which indicate that they tend to show a preference towards teaching features in English Entrant. The teaching aspects include whether the teacher has communicated the materials

clearly, has prepared for classes, has organized class effectively, has stimulated students' interest in the subject, has been responsive to student problems, and has delivered an appropriate teaching methodology. Based on statistical results, the writer concludes that generally freshmen students of Binusian 2014, whether they are of computer and non-computer studies, tend to give a more positive attitude towards some teaching aspects of English Entrant.

Course

Under the course criteria, both groups of students give the average mean scores of 3.77 and 4.05 respectively, which again show that they tend to give a more agreement response, though not fully. The course aspects include the materials' aims and objectives, contents, designs, the curriculum methodology, the assessment system, and the overall course program. Based on the statistical results, the writer concludes that freshmen students of Binusian 2014, no matter of which faculty they study at, tend to favor (though not fully) with the course contents in English Entrant.

Independent Learning System

Under the criteria of beyond-class activities, both groups of students render the average mean scores of 3.52 and 3.37, which show that they tend to give a more neutrality response towards beyond-class learning activities. The beyond-class activities include the activities of reading journal, writing tasks on GSLC (Guided-Self Learning Classes), listening assignments at laboratories, speaking practice at tutorial program, English extra-curricular activities, and the independent learning system in general. Based on the statistical results, the writer concludes that freshmen students of Binusian 2014 generally tend to be neutral with some aspects of independent learning activities in and around the campus.

Data Interpretation of the Third *F* Ratio

The third *F* ratio shows the interaction effect between the two variables: faculties and evaluation criteria. The significance in this case means that the effect of faculty differences on these students' responses in evaluating English Entrant depends on the criteria choice.

Among the students evaluating the teaching aspect of English Entrant, the difference between responses of computer students and non-computer students is 0.22 point (4.3 – 4.08). Among the students evaluating the course content of English Entrant, the difference between responses of computer students and non-computer students is 0.28 point (4.05 – 3.77). Among the students evaluating the independent learning system of English Entrant, I find a difference between responses of computer students and non-computer students of only 0.15 point (3.52 – 3.37). Because the *F* test indicates that the interaction is significant, I can conclude that responses of non-computer students makes more difference when they evaluate the course content of English Entrant than when they evaluate the teaching aspect or the independent learning system.

CONCLUSION

The first quantitative finding shows that the average responses of the computer students are not statistically different from those of the non-computer students. This means that the faculty group difference does not make any effect on the way these students value English Entrant. So, both groups of students generally tend to judge English Entrant in relatively the same way of perspectives.

The second quantitative finding shows that there are significant differences among all students' average responses to teaching criteria questions, those to course criteria questions, and those to independent learning system questions. This means that the criteria choices give effects on the way these students evaluate English Entrant, with the results that:

- fully supporting attitudes (mean 4.19) can be expected from these students when they evaluate the teaching aspects of English Entrant
- almost fully supporting attitudes (mean 3.91) can be expected from these students when they evaluate the course contents of English Entrant
- more neutral attitudes (mean 3.44) can be expected from these students when they evaluate the independent learning system of English Entrant

The third quantitative finding shows that the interaction effect of the faculty differences and evaluation criteria are significant. The significance in this case means that the effect of faculty differences on these students' responses in evaluating English Entrant depends on the criteria choice. Since the difference between average responses of computer students and non-computer students evaluating the course content is the highest (0.28 point), I can conclude that responses of non-computer students makes more difference when they evaluate the course content of English Entrant rather than when they evaluate the teaching aspect or the independent learning system.

Results of the Study

The findings of the quantitative analysis have generated some valuable input and implications for the ELT contexts at Binus University:

- The teaching methodology of communicative language approach, which is predominantly employed in English Entrant, can achieve a high degree of acceptance and success in term of students' feedback and achievements, if only the instructors are socially communicative and highly engaging with their students.
- The course content of English Entrant will be more appreciated by these students if the speaking format still emphasize on fluency and clarity rather than accuracy,
- The independent learning system will be more appreciated by these students if it provides access for these students to improve their language learning experiences beyond the class activities.

REFERENCES

- Asmani, A.B. (2010). How do Binus University Undergraduate Students Value English in the General, Academic, and ELT Context? *Lingua Cultura*. 4(1), 51-61.
- Breen, M. No date. A Pragmatics of Language Teaching: From Practice to Principles. In Richard, J. C. (2001). *Curriculum Development in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brindley, G. (1984). *Needs Analysis and Objectives Setting in the Adult Migrant Education Program*. In Richard, J. C. (2001). *Curriculum Development in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brown, K. Laboard. (2003). From Teacher-centered to Learner-centered Curriculum: Improving Learning in Diverse Classrooms. *Education*. 124 (1), 49-54.
- Cohen, L., L. Manion, et al. (2000). *Research Methods in Education*. London: Routledge Farmer.

- Harmer, J. (2007). *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. Essex: Pearson Education Limited.
- Hu, G. (2002). Potential Cultural Resistance to Pedagogical Imports: The Case of Communicative Language Teaching in China. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*. 15(2), 93-105
- McCombs, B. L. (1997). Self-assessment and Reflection: Tools for Promoting Teacher Changes toward Learner-centered Practices. In Brown, K. Laboard. (2003). From Teacher-centered to Learner-centered Curriculum: Improving Learning in Diverse Classrooms. *Education*. 124 (1), 50.
- McCombs, B. L. and Whistler, J. S. (1997). Learner-centered Classroom and Schools: Strategies for Increasing Student Motivation and Achievement. In Brown, K. Laboard. (2003). From Teacher-centered to Learner-centered Curriculum: Improving Learning in Diverse Classrooms. *Education*. 124 (1), 49.
- McDonough J., and McDonough S. (1997). *Research Methods for English Language Teachers*. UK: Arnold.
- McLean Orlando, S. (2006). The Importance of Informal Learning in EFL. In Harmer, J. (2007). *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. Essex: Pearson Education Limited
- Nunan, D. (1988). *The Learner-centered Curriculum*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Richard, J. C. (2001). *Curriculum Development in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Simon, Anne. (2010). Learning English in China: Is Communicative Language Teaching a Reality? *Australian Journal of Language and Literacy*. 33 (2), 39-42.
- Usher, R. (1996). A critique of neglected epistemological assumptions of educational research. In D. Scott and R. Usher (eds), *Understanding educational research*. London: Routledge.
- Wiersma, W. (1991). *Research Methods in Education*. USA: Allyn and Bacon.

Appendices

Computation for Quantitative Data

The total sum of squares is found by using the formula:

$$SS_t = \sum X_t^2 - \frac{(\sum X_t)^2}{N}$$

Based on the above formula, the value of the total sum of squares is:

$$SS_t = 3626.66 - \frac{(924.33)^2}{240}$$

$$SS_t = 3626.66 - \frac{854385.94}{240}$$

$$SS_t = 3626.66 - 3559.94$$

$$SS_t = \mathbf{66.71}$$

The sum of squares between groups is found by applying the formula

$$SS_b = \sum X_b^2 = \frac{(\sum X_1)^2}{n_1} + \frac{(\sum X_2)^2}{n_2} \dots - \frac{(\sum X)^2}{N}$$

Based on the above formula, the value of the sum of squares between groups is

$$SS_b = \frac{(163.33)^2}{40} + \frac{(151)^2}{40} + \frac{(140.8)^2}{40} + \frac{(172)^2}{40} + \frac{(162.33)^2}{40} + \frac{(134.83)^2}{40} - \frac{(924.33)^2}{240}$$

$$SS_b = \frac{26676.68}{40} + \frac{22801}{40} + \frac{19833.0}{40} + \frac{29584}{40} + \frac{26351.02}{40} + \frac{18179.12}{40} - \frac{854385.94}{240}$$

$$SS_b = 666.91 + 570.02 + 495.82 + 739.6 + 658.77 + 454.47 - 3559.94$$

$$SS_b = 3585.59 - 3559.94$$

$$SS_b = \mathbf{25.65}$$

The sum of the squares within groups is obtained by subtracting the sum of squares between groups from the total sum of squares:

$$SS_w = SS_t - SS_b$$

The value of the sum of squares within groups is

$$SS_w = 66.71 - 25.65$$

$$SS_w = 41.06$$

The between-columns sum of squares represents the sum of the squared deviations caused by the difference between the column means and the grand means. It is found by using the formula:

$$SS_{bc} = \frac{(\sum X_{c1})^2}{n_{c1}} + \frac{(\sum X_{c2})^2}{n_{c2}} + \dots - \frac{(\sum X)^2}{N}$$

The sum of squares between the columns for the data shown in the table is

$$SS_{bc} = \frac{(455.16)^2}{120} + \frac{(469.16)^2}{120} - \frac{(924.33)^2}{240}$$

$$SS_{bc} = \frac{207170.62}{120} + \frac{220111.10}{120} - \frac{854385.94}{240}$$

$$SS_{bc} = 1726.42 + 1834.25 - 3559.94$$

$$SS_{bc} = 0.73$$

The between-rows sum of squares is the sum of the squared deviations caused by the difference between the row means and the grand mean. The value is found by using the formula:

$$SS_{br} = \frac{(\sum X_{r1})^2}{n_{r1}} + \frac{(\sum X_{r2})^2}{n_{r2}} + \dots - \frac{(\sum X)^2}{N}$$

The sum of squares between the rows for the data shown in the table is

$$SS_{br} = \frac{(335.33)^2}{80} + \frac{(313.33)^2}{80} + \frac{(275.66)^2}{80} - \frac{(924.33)^2}{240}$$

$$SS_{br} = \frac{112446.20}{80} + \frac{98175.68}{80} + \frac{75988.43}{80} - \frac{854385.94}{240}$$

$$SS_{br} = 1405.57 + 1227.19 + 949.85 - 3559.94$$

$$SS_{br} = 22.67$$

$$SS_{int} = SS_b - (SS_{bc} + SS_{br})$$

$$SS_{int} = 25.65 - (0.73 + 22.67)$$

$$SS_{int} = 2.25$$

$$df \text{ for between-columns sum of squares} = C - 1 = 2 - 1 = 1$$

$$df \text{ for between-rows sum of squares} = R - 1 = 3 - 1 = 2$$

$$df \text{ for interaction} = (C - 1)(R - 1) = (2 - 1)(3 - 1) = 1 \times 2 = 2$$

$$df \text{ for between-groups sum of squares} = G - 1 = 6 - 1 = 5$$

df for within-groups sum of squares = $N - G = 240 - 6 = 234$
 df for total sum of squares = $N - 1 = 240 - 1 = 239$

Questionnaire

English Entrant Student Appraisal Form

Explanation

The purpose of this questionnaire is to provide the New English MKU program with feedback on its performance during the Odd Semester of 2010/2011 in Binus University. Your feedback is an important element in the ongoing process of assessing and improving the teaching and learning process within the institution. Please think carefully before making your judgments.

Direction:

Student comments should apply ONLY to the performance of the teacher, undertaken course, and beyond-class learning activities

Course : _____
 Class Code : _____
 Semester : _____
 Academic Year : _____

Teaching

In general, I have found that this teacher:

1. has communicated class materials clearly (Presentations, Strategies, Tips, etc)

<input type="checkbox"/>				
Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

2. has been well prepared for classes (Textbook Contents, Multimedia Application, Activities format, etc)

<input type="checkbox"/>				
Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

3. has organized class effectively (Time Management, Tasks Allocations, Speaking Spots, etc)

<input type="checkbox"/>				
Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

4. has stimulated my interest in the subject (Motivation, Sense of Humor, Comfortable learning environment, etc)

<input type="checkbox"/>				
Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

5. has been responsive to student problems (Feedback, Questions, Answers, etc)
-
- Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree**
6. Having considered various aspects of the performance of the designated teacher, how would you rate the teaching methodology overall?
-
- Excellent Good Acceptable Poor Very Poor**

Course

In meeting your study needs and abilities:

1. How do you rate the aims and objectives (target scores, fluency in speaking, etc) of this course?
-
- Very Appropriate Appropriate Somewhat Appropriate Least Appropriate Not Appropriate**
2. How do you rate the materials content (business/academic topics, speaking/listening/reading/writing skills, no formal grammar etc) of this course?
-
- Very Appropriate Appropriate Somewhat Appropriate Least Appropriate Not Appropriate**
3. How do you rate the materials design and organizations (activities sequence, textbook grading, tasks composition, etc) of this course?
-
- Very Appropriate Appropriate Somewhat Appropriate Least Appropriate Not Appropriate**
4. How do you rate the curriculum methodology (communicative approach) of this course?
-
- Very Appropriate Appropriate Somewhat Appropriate Least Appropriate Not Appropriate**
5. How do you rate the assessment system (task-based and computer-based scoring) of this course?
-
- Very Appropriate Appropriate Somewhat Appropriate Least Appropriate Not Appropriate**
6. Having considered various aspects of the performance of the undertaken course, how would you rate the course program overall?
-
- Very Appropriate Appropriate Somewhat Appropriate Least Appropriate Not Appropriate**

Independent Learning System

For your study support and improvement:

1. How do you rate the reading journal (textbook timetable, vocabulary development, etc)?

Very Useful Useful Somewhat Useful Least Useful Not Useful

2. How do you rate the writing tasks on GSLC sessions?

Very Useful Useful Somewhat Useful Least Useful Not Useful

3. How do you rate the listening assignments at Lab?

Very Useful Useful Somewhat Useful Least Useful Not Useful

4. How do you rate the speaking practice at Tutorial program?

Very Useful Useful Somewhat Useful Least Useful Not Useful

5. How do you rate other English extra-curricular activities groups?

Very Useful Useful Somewhat Useful Least Useful Not Useful

6. Having considered various aspects of the performance of yourself as a student, how would you rate the independent learning system overall?

Very Useful Useful Somewhat Useful Least Useful Not Useful