PAPER NAME	**AUTHOR**
A QUASI EXPEREIMENTAL STUDY ON THE LEARNING OF DISCOURSE.pdf	Hery Yufrizal

WORD COUNT	**CHARACTER COUNT**
2433 Words	13334 Characters

PAGE COUNT	**FILE SIZE**
3 Pages	262.1KB

SUBMISSION DATE	**REPORT DATE**
Sep 1, 2022 10:12 AM GMT+7	Sep 1, 2022 10:13 AM GMT+7

● **16% Overall Similarity**

The combined total of all matches, including overlapping sources, for each database.

- 14% Internet database
- Crossref database
- 12% Submitted Works database
- 8% Publications database
- Crossref Posted Content database

● **Excluded from Similarity Report**

- Bibliographic material
- Manually excluded text blocks
- Manually excluded sources

RESEARCH ARTICLE

A QUASI EXPEREIMENTAL STUDY ON THE LEARNING OF DISCOURSE ANALYSIS FOR UNIVERSITY STUDENTS

*Hery Yufrizal, M.A., Ph.D.

Universitas Lampung, Indonesia

ABSTRACT

The objective of this research is to find out whether there is any significant diiference in the students' mastery of discourse analysis taught by three kinds of challenge based appraoch at higher level of education. The sample of the research are the third year students of the English Study Program at the University of Lampung The students are both as the population and sample of the research. The results showed that there is a significant difference of students' achievement in three challenge based learning activities. RWP (read, write, and present) challenge produced better result of learning compared to RRP (read, relate, present) challenge. There is no significant dieffrence between RRP challenge and RIPA (read, illustrate, present, and argue) challenge, while there there is a signiicant difference of achievement between RWP challlenge and RIPA challenge.

INTRODUCTION

Discourse Analysis is one of the subjects taught at the undergraduate level the English Study Program. This subject aims at examining how contexts and functions of use influence linguistic form.According to Griffin, G. (2013), discourse analysis is concerned with the investigation of language, both written and oral, as it is actually used (as opposed to an abstract system or structure of language). It is different from textual analysis in that it assumes from the outset that language is *invested*, meaning that language is not a neutral tool for transmitting a message but rather, that all 'communicative events' (van Dijk 2001: 98) – whether these be, for instance, readings of novels, plays, poetry, a notice on a billboard, a conversation, or an interview – constitute 'a particular way of talking about. Discourse analysis, or discourse studies, is a general term for a number of approaches to analyze written, vocal, or sign language use, or any significant semiotic event.

The objects of discourse analysis (discourse, writing, conversation, communicative event) are variously defined in terms of coherent sequences of sentences, propositions, speech, or turns-at-talk. Contrary to much of traditional linguistics, discourse analysts not only study language use 'beyond the sentence boundary' but also prefer to analyze 'naturally occurring' language use, not invented examples. Text linguistics is a closely related field. The essential difference between discourse analysis and text linguistics is that discourse analysis aims at revealing socio-psychological characteristics of a person/persons rather than text structure (Gee and Green, 1998). This study explores the teaching of discourse analysis for udergraduate students at the University of Lampung. It sought the teaching of Discourse analysis through the application of challenge based learning.

Frame of theories: Challenge based learning (CBL) was founded by Apple Company. It is a frame of thinking that combines learning activities while solving a real challenge. CBL is a frame of learning while solving a real challenge.. CBS is almost similar to place based aducation and project

based learning as a tool and medium of learning(Johnson and Adams, 2011). The Challenge Based Learningcomprises three interconnected phases: Engage, Investigate and Act. Witin each phase there are activities that prepare students to move to the next phase. Within each of the phases there are opportunities for mini-investigation cycles and if necessary a return to an earlier phase.

Engage: In the Engage Phase, Learners shifted their attention from an abstract big idea to a concrete and actionable challenge using the Essential Questioning process. The goal is to personally connect with academic content through the identification, development, and ownership of a compelling challenge.

Investigate: Building from the Challenge Learners develop contextualized learning experiences and conduct rigorous, content and concept-based research to create a foundation for actionable and sustainable solutions.

Act: In the Act Phase evidence-based solutions are developed and implemented with an authentic audience and the results evaluated. The Learners combine a desire to make a difference with a demonstration of content mastery.

THE RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study employed a quasi experimental research design. A quasi-experimentis simply defined as not a true experiment. Since the main component of a true experiment is randomly assigned groups, this means a quasi-experiment does not have randomly assigned groups. In this quasi experimental research, subjects were assigned three learning packages of challenge based learning design. The learning packages are challenge based package 1 where the students were given topics to be analyzed, write the report of the discussion and present the report to the class. Challenge 1 is coded as read, write, present; (RWP). In challenge 2, the students were given the topic, then they relate to current event, write a report on the topic and discuss the contents. Challenge 2 is coded as read, relate, present (RRP). In challenge 3 the students were given the topic Challenge 3 then is called read, illustrate, present, and argue (RIPA) challenge. There is a test in every stesp of the appllication. Test 1 was given after the implementation of RWP step. Test 2 was given after the implementation of RRP step, and Test 3 was given after the implementation of RIPA step.The comparisons were executed based on the students' performance in each step. A series of paired sample t-test was administered to see the students' performance in every sets of treatment. Moreover, in order to see if the is any difference in students' performance, two sets of t-test were administered to see the influence of gender and students' aim of study.

RESULTS OF STUDY

In its application, the students were devided into presenter group and challenging groups. The presenter group prepared complete writing of the topic they are assigned, for instance in the first meeting, they discussed within their group and prepared the paper for presentation. The other group challenged the presentation by asking unclear point, by exposing challenge to the ideas. This process goes on untill the class got clear point of presentation. Challenge 1 is coded as read, write, present;

(RWP) challenge 2 was then called read, relate, presentn (RRP) challenge, and challenge 3 was then called read, illustrate, present, and argue (RIPA) challenge.The following is complete descriptive statistics for students' acievement in each challenge phase.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics of the applications of Challenge Based activities

Descriptive Statistics					
	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
RWP	25	65,00	89,00	74,8000	6,11010
RRP	25	46,00	66,00	60,8000	6,13732
RIPA	25	63,00	87,00	74,4800	6,83813
Valid N (listwise)	25				

The application of Challenge Based activities: The descrptive statistics shows the result tests from the application of three challenge based activities. (RWP) challenge 2 was then called read, relate, presentn (RRP) challenge, and challenge 3 was then called read, illustrate, present, and argue (RIPA) challenge. The descriptive statistics shows that the mean score of RWP challenge was 74,8, standard deviation of 6,1. In RRP challenge, the mean scoore was 60,0 standard deviation of 6,13. While for RIPA challenge, the means score was 74,4 with a standar deviation of 6,8.

Table 2. Paired Samples Test

		Paired Differences			T	Df
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean		
Pair 1	RWP - RRP	14,00000	7,54983	1,50997	9,272	24
Pair 2	RWP – RIPA	,32000	5,20993	1,04199	,307	24
Pair 3	RWP – RIPA	-13,68000	6,10137	1,22027	-11,211	24

The following table shows multiple comparisons among students' oral performances in three sets of tests. Table 2 reveals that there is a signifigant diffference in the students' performances between students' oral performances in RWP challenge and RRPchallenge with the t-value of 9,27. There is no significant difference between students' oral performanced in test 1 and test. The data also showed that there is asignificant difference between students' oral performances in RWP challenge and RIPA challeng with the total value of 11,2.

Table 3. ANOVA of gender on three challenge based activities

		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
RWP	Between Groups	295,627	1	295,627	11,325	,003
	Within Groups	600,373	23	26,103		
	Total	896,000	24			
RRP	Between Groups	92,571	1	92,571	2,624	,119
	Within Groups	811,429	23	35,280		
	Total	904,000	24			
RIPA	Between Groups	159,581	1	159,581	3,813	,063
	Within Groups	962,659	23	41,855		
	Total	1122,240	24			

The effect of Gender on the three challenge based activities: The research also studies the effect of gender on students' performanes in three challenge based activities. The table reveals that in RWP challenge there is a significant correlation between the students' performance and gender with an F value of 11,32 . Test 3 and gender differ significantly with F value of 0,063.

Table 4. ANOVA of reasons for learning and challeng based learning

		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
RWP	Between Groups	54,000	1	54,000	1,475	,237
	Within Groups	842,000	23	36,609		
	Total	896,000	24			
RRP	Between Groups	112,667	1	112,667	3,275	,083
	Within Groups	791,333	23	34,406		
	Total	904,000	24			
RIPA	Between Groups	269,340	1	269,340	7,263	,013
	Within Groups	852,900	23	37,083		
	Total	1122,240	24			

The Effect of Reasons for learning English and challenge based activities: Table 4 below reveals the result of statistical calculation on the effect of reasons for learning English and the students' performance on challenge based learning activities. The table reveals that there is a significant correlation between RIPA cchallenge and the reason for learning English wih an F value of .013. There is no significant correlation between gender and RWP challenge and RRP challenge.

DISCUSSION

They began to get confused when they faced the second challenge where they have to relate the content of the subject matter to the real world. Their performances in RWP challenge where students only face the obstacle from their own ability superseeded the challenge to read and relate to the real world. RWP challenge did not show significant difference with RIPA challenge and RRP challenge differed significantlly from RIPA challenge. The challlenge works applied in this research is a simple form of learning at the university level. The challenge designed for this study was in the form of challenging students to comprehend the concept of 'discourse analysis by applying three different challenges.

The results showed that students perform high capability when they are assigned task that require simple activities, they perform worse result whan they are assigned a new challenge but their performance get better performance when the students get used to the challenging activities. Moreover, Nichols, *et al*. (2016) stated: "A challenge is immediate and actionable. Choosing and setting up the challenge is crucial. If it is interesting and sufficiently close to home, students will derive personal meaning and feel a sense of accomplishment upon proposing and implementing a solution". The challenge designed for the study has shown that studdents could respond to the challenge assigned as expected. Challenge assigned to routine job will result in better result than new jobs..

Conclusions and Recommendation

The conclusions that can be drawn from this study are:

- There is a significant different in students' performance applying three learnig c challenges. There is a significant difference of students' achievement in three challenge based learning activities.

There is a significant difference between the students' achievement in learning three challenge based learning activities. Students' achievement in RWP challenge differed significantly with students' achievement in RRP challenge. There is no significant difference in students' achievement in RRP challenge and RIPA challenge, but there is signficant difference in students' achievement through RWP challenge and RIPA challenge. This result shows different performances the students reveal in accomplishing the challenges.

- There is a significant correlation between the students' performance and gender with an F value of 11,32 and Test 3 gender with F value of 0,063.
- There is a significant effect of reasons for learning English and the students' performance on challenge based learning activities. The table reveals that there is a significant correlation between RIPA challenge and the reason for learning English with an F value of .013. There is no significant correlation between gender and RWP challenge and RPP challenge.

REFERENCES

Apple, Inc. 2008. Apple Classrooms of Tomorrow—Today Learning in the 21st Century. Cupertino, California: Apple, Inc.

Anderson, L. W., & Krathwohl, D.R. (Eds). 2001. *A taxonomy for learning, teaching,and assessing: A revision of Bloom's taxonomy of educational objectives.* New York:Longman.

Gee, J. P. 1999. *An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method.* New York: Routledge.

Gee, J.P and Green, J.L. *Review of Research in Education*, Vol. 23 (1998), pp. 119-169

Johnson, L. and Adams, S. 2011. Challenge Based Learning: The Report from the Implementation Project.

Nichols, M., Cator, K., Torres, M. and Henderson, D. 2016. Challenge Based Learner User Guide. Redwood City, CA: Digital Promise.

Nichols, Mark H., Cator, Karen 2009. Challenge Based Learning White Paper. Cupertino, California: Apple, Inc.

O'Mahony, T.K. , Vye, N.J., Bransford, J.D., Sanders, E.A., Stevens, R., Stephens, R.D., Richey, M.C., Lin, K.Y., Soleiman, M.K. 2012. A Comparison of Lecture-Based and Challenge-Based Learning in a Workplace Setting: Course Design.

Nordquist, Richard. "Language and Gender Studies." *ThoughtCo*, Feb. 11, 2020, thoughtco.com/language-and-gender-studies-1691095

Phillips, N. & Hardy, C. 2002. *Discourse analysis: Investigating processes of social construction.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Stoller, F. 2006. Establishing a theoretical foundation for projectbased learning in second and foreign language contexts. In *Projectbased second and foreign language education: Past, present, and future,* ed. G.H. Beckett and P.C. Miller, 19–40. Greenwich, CT: Information Age.

****

● **16% Overall Similarity**

Top sources found in the following databases:

- 14% Internet database
- Crossref database
- 12% Submitted Works database

- 8% Publications database
- Crossref Posted Content database

TOP SOURCES

The sources with the highest number of matches within the submission. Overlapping sources will not be displayed.

1	ict.fte.kmutnb.ac.th Internet	2%
2	mail.journalcra.com Internet	2%
3	repository.unair.ac.id Internet	2%
4	coursehero.com Internet	2%
5	Landmark University on 2021-10-10 Submitted works	1%
6	challengebasedlearning.com Internet	1%
7	Palmer, Chad. "Effects of a Supplemental Strength Training Interventio... Publication	<1%
8	University of Nottingham on 2022-01-13 Submitted works	<1%

● **Excluded from Similarity Report**

- Bibliographic material
- Manually excluded sources
- Manually excluded text blocks

EXCLUDED SOURCES

rsisinternational.org
Internet
26%

---

asian-efl-journal.com
Internet
6%

---

journalcra.com
Internet
6%

---

journalcra.com
Internet
5%

CVC Nigeria Consortium on 2021-09-13
Submitted works
3%

---

pt.scribd.com
Internet
2%

---

docplayer.net
Internet
2%

EXCLUDED TEXT BLOCKS

ABSTRACTThe objective of this research is to find out whether there is any signific...
repository.lppm.unila.ac.id

Discourseanalysis, or discourse
www.rsisinternational.org

teaching

www.rsisinternational.org

Challenge 1

www.rsisinternational.org

Challenge 3 then

www.rsisinternational.org

In its application, the students were

www.rsisinternational.org

Challenge 1

www.rsisinternational.org

challenge 2 was

www.rsisinternational.org

three interconnected phases: Engage, Investigate and Act

www.challengebasedlearning.com

from an abstract big idea to a concrete and actionable challengeusing the Essenti...

www.challengebasedlearning.com

A QUASI EXPEREIMENTAL STUDY ON THE LEARNING OF DISCOURSEANALYSIS F...

mail.journalcra.com

Act: In the Act Phase evidence-based solutions are developedand implemented wi...

cbl.digitalpromise.org

discourse analysis is concerned with the investigation oflanguage, both written an...

Www.jstor.org