

Chapter 4

Results

This chapter reports the results from the research study. It incorporates the statistical analysis of the collected data and findings from the research participants from Pibulsongkram Rajabhat University in Phitsanulok, Thailand. The two research objectives and hypotheses devised in Chapter 1 operate as the framework for the presentation of the findings. The entire non parametric data obtained was analysed through a computerised system.

Table 1 represents the pre-test and post-test scores for the first research objective to investigate the effects of using task-based learning and drama for students' communicative competence under the rubric to test strategic competence. The table shows the number of participant groups, mean scores, standard deviation and the minimum and maximum scores from the rubric. The participants for both the pre and post tests contained 9 groups which is depicted in the table with 'N'. The table in this chapter indicated the results appertaining to the first research objective and hypothesis. The data was retrieved from the participants to reflect the effects of using task-based learning and drama to show if communicative competence had increased from the pre-test drama task set under the rubric to the post test drama task.

Table 7 Non parametric test in relation to the first research objective and hypothesis
NPar Tests

| Descriptive Statistics | | | | | |
|--|---|--------|----------------|---------|---------|
| | n | Mean | Std. Deviation | Minimum | Maximum |
| Pre test cognitive Indicators | 9 | 3.11 | .601 | 2 | 4 |
| Pre test Communicative Indicators | 9 | 3.11 | .333 | 3 | 4 |
| Pre test Educational compensatory Indicators | 9 | 2.44 | .527 | 2 | 3 |
| Pre test Average | 9 | 2.8889 | .37268 | 3.33 | 3.67 |
| Posts test cognitive Indicators | 9 | 3.67 | .707 | 3 | 5 |
| Posts test Communicative Indicators | 9 | 3.89 | .333 | 3 | 4 |
| Posts test Educational compensatory Indicators | 9 | 3.78 | .441 | 3 | 4 |
| Posts test Average | 9 | 3.7778 | .33333 | .33 | 14.33 |

There were 9 groups generated for the pre-test and post-test from the total of 34 English major participants. The data was computerised and analysed using Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test non parametric system. The pre-test revealed a mean score of 3.11 in both the cognitive and communicative indicators. The post-test cognitive mean score increased to 3.67 whilst the post- test communicative mean score grew to 3.89. A pre-test mean result showed a score of 2.44 in the educational compensatory indicators whilst the post-test highlighted an increase to 3.78. The group's pre-test results displayed a standard deviation in the cognitive of .601 whilst achieving a minimum score of 2 points and a maximum of 4 points set under the evaluation rubric. The score of 2 represented long pauses in communication from the cognitive indicators whilst 4 depicted a good response speed for EFL students. The post-test standard deviation was .707 with an increased rubric score that ranged

between 3 and 5. The cognitive rubric score of 3 represented slight delays in responses whereas 5 showed native like retorts. A pre-test standard deviation of .333 was shown in the communicative indicators with students achieving between a range of 3 to 4 only under the rubric for communicative competence and a post-test standard deviation of .333 with a rubric range of 3 and 4 too.3 was identified by students having some break downs or some failures to complete speech acts. A score of 4 signalled a good level for EFL students for completing utterances. The pre-test educational compensatory displayed a standard deviation result of .527 with a rubric rating between 2 and 3. Level 2 was categorised by students displaying non verbal strategies with errors and level 3 indicated a moderate amount of non verbal strategies. The post-test standard deviation in the educational compensatory was .441, with an increase of scores of 3 to 4 under the communicative competence criterion. A score of 4 reflected a range of non verbal strategies for EFL learners. An overall mean score increased by .98889 from the pre-test to the post-test results.

Figures below describe the parametric mean rating scale in relation to the closed ended questions appertaining to the second research objective and hypothesis.

Poor = 1.00 – 1.49

Fair = 1.50 – 2.49

Good = 2.50 – 3.49

Very good = 3.50 – 3.49

Excellent = 4.50 – 5.00

Table 2 indicates the descriptive statistics from the pre and post questionnaire closed questions from the 34 participants of the study. The table highlights the mean scores, standard deviation, t value and the level of significance in relation to the second objective of student's perceptions towards learning English by using task-based learning and drama. The table includes all 10 closed questions and the average pre and post scores for mean, standard deviation, t values and level of significance.

Table 8 Pre and post test questionnaires in relation to the second research objective and hypothesis

| | | Mean | Std. Deviation | T | sig |
|--------|--|------|-------------------|--------|-----|
| Pair 1 | Pre1. How would you rate your overall speaking ability using the English language? | 2.47 | .748 | -6.685 | .00 |
| | Post1. How would you rate your overall speaking ability using the English language? | 3.32 | .638 | | |
| Pair 2 | Pre2. How would you rate your ability to respond to a person speaking in English? | 2.09 | .753 | -8.611 | .00 |
| | Post2. How would you rate your ability to respond to a person speaking in English? | 3.26 | .710 | | |
| Pair 3 | Pre3. How would you rate your ability to continue a flow of conversation in the English language? | 1.91 | .668 | -8.535 | .00 |
| | Post3. How would you rate your ability to continue a flow of conversation in the English language? | 3.06 | .736 | | |
| Pair 4 | Pre4. How would you rate your ability to use non verbal strategies in the English language? | 2.85 | .925 | -3.973 | .00 |
| | Post4. How would you rate your ability to use non verbal strategies in the English language? | 3.50 | .749 | | |

Table 8 (per)

| | | Mean | Std. Deviation | T | sig |
|--------|--|------|-------------------|--------|-----|
| Pair 5 | Pre5. How would you rate your ability to use small filling words or expressions in order to keep the flow in English communication? | 2.38 | .652 | -4.221 | .00 |
| | Post5. How would you rate your ability to use small filling words or expressions in order to keep the flow in English communication? | 3.00 | .778 | | |
| Pair 6 | Pre6. How would you rate your overall pronunciation ability using the English language? | 2.68 | .806 | -3.919 | .00 |
| | Post6. How would you rate your overall pronunciation ability using the English language? | 3.21 | .641 | | |
| Pair 7 | Pre7. How would you rate your overall confidence to speak in front of your peers using the English language? | 2.29 | .676 | -6.764 | .00 |
| | Post7. How would you rate your overall confidence to speak in front of your peers using the English language? | 3.44 | .860 | | |
| Pair 8 | Pre8. How would you rate your ability to collaborate with your peers using the English language? | 2.47 | .706 | -5.907 | .00 |
| | Post8. How would you rate your ability to collaborate with your peers using the English language? | 3.38 | .853 | | |

Table 8 (per)

| | | Mean | Std. Deviation | T | sig |
|---------|--|--------|-------------------|--------|-----|
| Pair 9 | Pre9. How would you rate your ability to search and construct new vocabulary using the English language? | 2.26 | .751 | -6.260 | .00 |
| | Post9. How would you rate your ability to search and construct new vocabulary using the English language? | 3.24 | .855 | | |
| Pair 10 | Pre10. How would you rate your ability to use the appropriate language in certain real life and fantasy situation? | 2.47 | .788 | -5.907 | .00 |
| | Pre10. How would you rate your ability to use the appropriate language in certain real life and fantasy situation? | 3.38 | .817 | | |
| Pair 11 | Average Pre Test | 2.3882 | .50678 | -9.881 | .00 |
| | Average Post Test | 3.2794 | .55964 | | |

As can be seen in table 2, all the mean post questionnaire ratings posed to the participants showed an increase from their mean pre questionnaire ratings. A low variance in standard deviation of less than 1 was shown in both pre and post questionnaire scores. The t-test value remained in the negative thus resulting in accordance of the second hypothesis set in the research. The significant value showed all questions to be .00 score. The average mean value for all questions increased in the post questionnaire scores. Additionally, the average t-test value and significant value also resulted favourably to the second research objective and hypothesis.

Questionnaire analysis

The questionnaire also presented the participants with four open ended questions in relation to their satisfaction towards learning English by using the task-based learning method.

The first question posed was what problems students had in communicating using the English language. The post questionnaire differed from the pre questionnaire with many students reporting an increase in confidence and a reduction of anxieties after the treatment. Students in the pre-test highlighted a lack of vocabulary and shyness; this was greatly reduced in the post test results. The post-test results revealed an increase in problems of pronunciation from the pre-test data.

The second question posed was in relation to student's anxieties or fears when using the English language. Pre-test concerns included fears about grammar, using the appropriate vocabulary, fears amongst peers, lack of confidence and shyness as well as pronunciation. The post-test data reported that all of these factors either reduced or disappeared excluding anxieties about using the appropriate vocabulary, this albeit remained a student concern.

The third open ended question determined what concerns students had about learning drama and task-based learning. Students revealed apprehensions about being shy and no confidence, acting fears and projects as well as time constraints in the pre-test data. The post questionnaire data displayed many participants as having no concerns and a reduction in their pre questionnaire apprehensions of shyness and lack of confidence. Nevertheless, time constraints still remained a relative concern.

The final question administered was to investigate students concerns appertaining to communicating in both verbal and non verbal methods. Pre questionnaire data showed that students had particular concerns about shyness, lack of confidence and acting skills. These three major concerns greatly reduced in the post-test data. A minimal amount of students stated concerns over test scores whilst performing and reported a lack of non verbal strategies.