

### III. METHODOLOGY

The methodology used in this research was survey method (by spreading out questionnaire) which applied Likert technique, since the writer intended to measure the language attitude of Chinese students of SMA Kristen Petra III toward their Chinese language as an indicator of their ethnic identity.

The procedure went as below: The writer joined with the SMA Kristen Petra III in collecting data, she came into the classes and gave a brief explanation about her study and spread out the questionnaire and asked the students to answer it honestly. She told the students that they should not answer the questionnaire with true or false, but they had to be agree or disagree.

This method was relevant to overcome the problem of the validity, since the writer just intended to measure the attitude toward Chinese language as an indicator of their ethnic identity (mentalist view).

#### III. A. The Location and Population of the Research

The location of the research was SMA Kristen Petra III, Surabaya on Jln. Kalianyar no. 43, Surabaya.

The reasons of choosing this location were: first, by considering the limited time, it was easier to collect the

data since the respondents were in one place, namely in a school. So it was not necessary to meet and get data by visiting each respondents' home. Second, most of the students of SMA Kristen Petra III were Chinese. Third, most the students in this school were the third generation of Chinese trait.

The population of the research were members of the students of the first, second and third year Chinese students. The reason to choose them was to make the answer of the questionnaire to be representative for the larger group (all students of SMA Kristen Petra III).

### III. B. Sampling

The method of getting respondents in this research was random sampling, namely by choosing randomly three classes from twenty- two classes. The respondents:

1. Should be Chinese students.
2. Were male or female.

### III. C. Technique of Colecting Data

The technique of colecting data used in this research was closed questionnaire consisting Likert technique of attitude scale. These questions were necessary to get the mental-istical data of their attitudes toward Chinese language.

These scale designated some statements about language attitude into two classes, favourable and unfavorable, with approximately the same number of statements in each class. These statements were given to the respondents who were asked to respond to each one in terms of their agreement or disagreement with the statements. In obtaining responses from subjects, the writer permitted them to use any one of five categories: strongly agree, agree, neither agree nor disagree, disagree and strongly disagree.

### III. D. Technique of Analyzing Data

#### III. D. 1. Normal Deviate Weighting of Response Categories

In the development of the method of attitude scale construction described in this chapter, Likert (1932) found that scores based upon the relatively simple assignment of integral weights correlated .99 with the more complicated normal deviate system of weights. He therefore used the simple system. We shall do the same. For favorable statements, the strongly agree response will be given a weight of 4, the agree response a weight of 3, the undecided response a weight of 2, the disagree response a weight of 1, and strongly disagree response a weight of 0. For unfavorable statements, the scoring system is reversed, with the strongly disagree response being given the 4 weight and strongly agree response the 0 weight.

For each subject we obtain a total score by summing his scores for the individual items. Because each response to a statement may be considered a rating and because these are summated over all statements, Bird (1940, p. 159) called the Likert method of scale construction the *method of summated ratings* and this term has come into rather general use.

### III. D. 2. Interpretation of scores

In equal appearing interval scales, the attitude score is obtained by a single subject has an absolute interpretation in terms of the psychological continuum of scale values of the statements making up the scale. That is because the attitude score is taken as the median of the scale values of the statements with which the subject agrees. Each attitude scores is this itself a scale value on the psychological continuum on which the statements have been scaled. In scaling the statement, one of this continuum has been defined as unfavorable and the other as favorable, with the the middle category being defined as *neutral*. If an attitude score thus falls in the middle section of the psychological continuum, it, in turn, can be described as *neutral*. If it falls toward the favorable end of the continuum, it can be described as *favorable*, and if it falls toward the unfavorable end, it can be described as *unfavorable*. This interpretation of an attitude score on an equal-appearing interval

scale can be made independently of the distribution of scores for a particular group of subject.

In general, the interpretation of an attitude score on a summated-rating scale can not be made independently of the distribution of scores of some defined group. If a subject obtain a score of 0 on a 25-item sumated-rating scale, we could interpret this score as indicating an unfavorable attitude, since, in order to obtain this score, the subject would have had to have given a strongly agree response to every unfavorable statement and a strongly disagree response to every favorable statement in the scale. Similarly, we could interprete a score of 100 as indicating a favorable attitude, since this score could be obtained only if the subject gave strongly agree response to every favorable statement and a strongly disagree response to every unfavorable statement. The interpretation of scores falling between the maximum and minimum possible scores is more difficult, if our interest is in describing an individual as having either a favorable or an unfavorable attitude toward the object under consideration. That is because the summated-rating score corresponding to the zero or neutral point on a favorable-unfavorable continuum is not known as it is assumed to be known in the case of equal-appearing interval scores. Nor is there any evidence to indicate that the neutral point on a summated-rating scale necessarily corresponds to the midpoint

of the possible range of scores, that is, to the score of 50 on a 25-item scale.

The absence of knowledge of such a point is a handicap only if our major interest is in being able to assign, on the basis of an attitude score, a single subject to the class of those favorable or unfavorable in attitude toward the psychological object under consideration.

If, in terms of research, our interest is in comparing the mean change in attitude scores as a result of introducing some experimental variable, such as a motion picture film, then the lack of knowledge of a zero point should cause no concern. Similarly, if our respondents are larger, this can be done with summated-rating scales as well as with equal-appearing interval scales. Or if we wish to correlate scores on other scales or with other measures of interest, this can also be done without any reference to the zero point on the favorable-unfavorable continuum.

### III. D. 3. Expressing attitude scores as *T* scores

If our interest is in the attitude of the single subject relative to the attitude of other subject, then scores on summated rating scales can be interpreted in this relative sense—as can also score on equal-appearing interval scales. A relative interpretation of attitude scores is made in the same manner in which relative interpretations of

scores on other psychological test is made, that is, in terms of the distribution of scores obtained from a particular group.

We can define the mean attitude score for a particular group subject as:

$$\bar{X} = \frac{\sum X}{n}$$

where  $\bar{X}$  = the arithmetic mean

$\sum X$  = the sum of scores of all subjects on the attitude scale.

$n$  = the number of subject in the group under consideration.

If we use the mean of the group as our point of origin, then each of the individual attitude scores can be expressed as a deviation from this origin. We assume that the mean represents the typical or average attitude of the group. Then scores that are higher than the mean can be interpreted as scores that are more favorable than the average for the group and scores that are lower than the mean can be interpreted as scores that are less favorable than the average.

As convenient frame of reference, the distribution of attitude score for a given group can be translated into  $T$  scores in terms of the following formula:

$$T = 50 + 10 \frac{[X - \bar{X}]}{s}$$

where  $T$  = a  $T$  score

$X$  = the score of a given subject.

$\bar{X}$  = the arithmetic mean of the distribution.

$s$  = the standard deviation of the distribution  
of scores

Expressing the attitude scores as  $T$  scores yields a new distribution of scores that will have a mean of 50 and a standard deviation of 10. Scores on a psychological test are frequently translated into  $T$  scores free from differences in means and standard deviations of the various tests.



## **CHAPTER IV**

# **ANALYSIS**