CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1   Data Collection

In this study, the writer examined parents' attitudes towards heritage language and their efforts to maintain the heritage language. To address those research questions, the writer employed quantitative method. Quantitative method is a method that uses numeric and manipulation of observation to describe and explain the phenomenon of observation (Babbie, 1979). Quantitative method also points out the systematic and qualification of variables, the use mathematic models and causal inference, and statistical analysis of quantitative data (Johnson, 1992).There are nine characteristics of quantitative research. Quantitative method finds out the facts or causes of the phenomenon. Next, quantitative method is obtrusive and controlled measurements. Third, it was objective. Then, the quantitative method is an outside perspective. Later, it is underground, reductionist, verification oriented, and hypothetic – deductive. Furthermore, it is outcome – oriented. The quantitative method is also reliable (hard and replicable data). Other characteristics are generalized; multiple case studies. Last but not least, it is particularistic (Oakley, 1991).

In doing research, the writer used the quantitative method. Based on the objectives of this research, the writer chose the descriptive statistic used to find out the parents' attitudes towards language maintenance and their efforts to

maintain the heritage language. After distributing the questionnaire, the writer analyzed the data by using SPSS and then presented the findings.

3.1.1 Participants

In this study, the participants are the parents of Chinese Indonesian students who come from Kalimantan. The writer chose students' parents from Kalimantan as respondents because the writer is Soegijapranata Catholic University's student and she has easy access to the respondents. Basedon 2016 data from *Biro Manajemen Sistem Informasi (BMSI),* there were 178 participants who came from Kalimantan. To get 95 % perfect confidence, according to Cohen, Manion, & Morrison (2007), this study needed 135 participants.

The respondents are Soegijapranata Catholic University (later the writer will call it "Unika") students' parents who are from Kalimantan. 74 respondents are men and 61 respondents are women. Most of them are 40 until 60 years and high school graduates and undergraduates. Almost half of them are entrepreneurs. Others are employee (22.2%), civil servant (6.7%), and others (21.5%).

3.1.2 Instrument

Instrumentis used to collect the research data, to achieve the goals of research. The whole process to collect the data is called instrumentation and the tool andprocedure to collect the data are instrument (Fraenkel & Wallen, 1993).In

this case, the writer used questionnaire to collect the data. The writer asked the respondents to fill out the formand check statement options ranging from Agree or Disagree to represent the points of their view (Babbie, 1979). The reason why the writer chose questionnaire to collect the data was because itwas more effective to collect the data. It needed less time, inexpensive, and could obtain data from the larger sample (Gay, 1987).

There are two kinds of questionnaire, open-ended questionnaire and close-ended questionnaire. Close-ended questionnaire is a questionnaire that prescribes categories of responses that respondents may choose. For example, Strongly Agree, Agree, Neutral, Disagree, and Strongly Disagree. Open-ended questionnaire contains questions that the respondents need to give descriptive answers. It is usually used when the researcher needs more explanation from the respondents. Responses to questionnaires usually reflect (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2007).

For this study, the writer chose close-ended questionnaire. The questionnaires consisted of 20 statements. Statements number one until ten were about the parents' attitudes towards heritage language and questions number eleven until twenty were about the parents' efforts to help the children maintain the heritage language. The instruments analysis could be seen in below table.

Table 1

Instrument Analysis

Number	Objectives	Question Number
1	Parents' attitudes toward heritage language maintenance.	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10.
2	Parents' efforts to maintain the heritage language.	11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20.

The questionnaire for number 1 until 10 were adopted from Malini (2012) entitled *Kebertahanan Bahasa Bali Pada Transmigran Bali di Provinsi Lampung* (Language Maintenance towards BalineseTrans migrants in Lampung). In her study, Malini found that Balinese transmigrants had positive attitudes towards Balinese language. They used Balinese language in family, art, and religion. For the rest of the questions, the writer designed them, with the guidance from her supervisor. The respondents were asked to choose one of the options. They are: Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, and Strongly Agree. For number eleven until twenty, the options were Very Often, Often, Rare, Very Rare.

3.1.3 Procedure

To obtain the results, the writer did the following steps:

First the writer determined the participants. The sample of this study was the student's parents in Unika who are from Kalimantan. As previously stated, the total respondents are 135 people. The respondents should be able to speak Mandarin language as their daily language.

Second, the writer made questionnaire. The writer adopted questionnaire research entitled *Kebertahanan Bahasa Bali Pada Transmigran Bali di Provinsi Lampung* (Language Maintenance towards Balinese Transmigrants in Lampung) by Malini (2007). The writer modified some questions items to suit the culture and the situation in the research site. For the rest of the questions, the writer designed them herself.

Next, the writer piloted the questionnaire to fifteen respondents. Piloting was used to determine whether the statements were valid. The validity standard of the fifteen respondents from Unika students' parents from Kalimantan was 0.441. Table 2 presents the result of the pilot study.From the table, we can see that statements6, 7, and 17 were not valid because the corrected item score were under 0.441. Therefore, the writer dropped the statements. After that, the final version of the questionnaire was distributed to the respondents.

Table 2

The Result of Pilot Study

No		Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
1	VAR00001	66.40	41.829	.514	.884
2	VAR00002	66.13	41.981	.809	.879
3	VAR00003	66.27	41.352	.782	.878
4	VAR00004	66.13	42.124	.781	.879
5	VAR00005	66.33	41.524	.721	.879
6	**VAR00006**	**66.40**	**43.543**	**.394**	**.887**
7	**VAR00007**	**66.87**	**46.410**	**-.051**	**.906**
8	VAR00008	66.40	42.686	.525	.884
9	VAR00009	66.40	41.829	.659	.881
10	VAR0010	66.53	42.838	.512	.884
11	VAR0011	66.40	38.686	.686	.878
12	VAR0012	66.40	41.829	.659	.881
13	VAR0013	66.60	40.400	.606	.881
14	VAR0014	66.40	43.400	.416	.887
15	VAR0015	66.33	43.381	.428	.887
16	VAR0016	66.53	41.552	.463	.886
17	**VAR0017**	**66.67**	**44.952**	**.111**	**.898**
18	VAR0018	66.93	41.210	.486	.886
19	VAR0019	66.33	42.381	.584	.883
20	VAR0020	66.27	40.210	.754	.877

The next step was to contact the students from Kalimantan and asked them to give the questionnaire to their parents to fill out.To ensure good return rate, the writer used the online questionnaire and called the participants by phone because

she was worried that not all the parents could use computer and do online questionnaire.

After the data were collected, the writer analyzed them using SPSS 16.0.So the writer got the results in numeric form. Finally, the writer interpreted the data.

3.1.4 Method of Data Analysis

The data from questionnaire was analyzed using SPSS 16.0 to find out the means. The score for Strongly Agree was four, Agree was three, Disagree was two, and Strongly Disagree was one. Moreover the score for Very often was four, Often was three, Rare was two, and Very Rare was one. The data was analyzed by using descriptive statistic. The writer interpreted it for the statements number 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 10 if the mean was less than two, it meantthat the respondents had negative attitudes towards heritage language maintenance. On the contrary, if the mean was more than two, it meantthat the respondents had positive attitudes towards maintenance heritage language. For number 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, if the mean was lower than two, it meantthat the respondents did not do any efforts to maintain heritage language. Otherwise, if the mean was more than three, it meant that the respondents showed efforts to maintain heritage language.