

## **CHAPTER II**

### **THEORETICAL BACKGROUND**

This chapter explains theories related to the problems that will be discussed. It discusses about Web 2.0, Facebook, Behaviorism Learning Theory, and its connection with language learning.

#### **A. WEB 2.0**

Web 2.0 is a term used to label second generation of World Wide Web which focused on the ability for people to collaborate and share information online via social media, blogging and Web-based communities, and it gives user more interactive and dynamic web experience. As Harris & Rea (2009) had explained the definition of Web 2.0 that is second generation of web which facilitate communication, sharing information, user-generated content, user collaboration and discussion. Considering the characteristic of Web 2.0 that allow more interaction between students and teachers, it is necessary to look into such interactions and their effect on learning outcomes.

This is interesting to seek what could Web 2.0 give to students, specifically in educational field. Meyer as cited in Yu et al., (2012) mentioned “With all of the attention paid to Web 2.0 tools these days, it is important to both explore their uses and evaluate their effectiveness in supporting student learning”. In spite of the fact that new technologies could create opportunities for learning, is questionable whether this would result in the abatement or development of different types of digital divide (Yu et al., 2012). In short,

Web 2.0 could give both advantages and disadvantages in the class (Harris & Rea, 2009). Some of the advantages are:

- 1). Students become part of the lesson;
- 2). The world becomes the classroom;
- 3). Collaboration and competition increases learning;
- 4). The classroom are available 24/7.

Then, these are the disadvantages:

- 1). Computing resources must be available;
- 2). Web resources can be vandalized or sabotaged;
- 3). Plagiarism;
- 4). Level of openness.

(Harris & Rea, p.141-142, 2009)

## **B. Facebook for Language Learning Purpose**

Along with the development of web 2.0, Social Networking Site (SNS) began to be considered as a platform that could support learning. Facebook as a popular social networking platform is quickly coming up as a new educational environment despite its efficiency still questionabled (Aydin, 2012). Facebook allows users to create and upgrade personal profiles, add friends, messaging and chat online. Facebook also gives opportunities to organize users into groups related to personal and professional 'affiliations', which might include educational 'affiliations' (such as schools), workplaces, interests, hobbies, and politic and religion (Aydin, 2012). Furthermore,

college students were found as substantial users of the Internet, websites, and search engines (Rhoades et al., 2008), and most of them frequently use Facebook in higher education institute (Hoover, 2008 in Aydin, 2012, p. 1094).

This is questionable, why do people prefer utilized Facebook rather than other SNS as a learning platform. Due to Facebook becomes the center of communication and interaction among users, that is why people use it (Aydin, 2012). There are also other important reasons behind the use of Facebook especially as an educational environment, which are mentioned below:

- 1) Communicative interaction way among students, family members, teachers (Aydin, 2012);
- 2) Form new relationships (Berg et al., 2007) and maintain existing relationships (Brown et al., 2009);
- 3) As a means to self-represent and self-promote (Smith et al., 2012);
- 4) Facebook is seen as an online knowledge-sharing network (Davis, 2010); and
- 5) Support academic purposes, and follow up on specific agendas (Mazman and Usluel 2011).

During the implementation of Facebook in English classes, other aspects such as the impacts (negative and positive) also have been considered. Alm (2015) found that SNS had the potential to support engagement in the

target language (L2). Another interesting finding by Alm (2015) was that advanced language learners were more likely utilizing the SNS in their target language as well as be part of a Facebook L2 group. In particular, the learners thought that they felt less anxiety, felt comfort and fun way to communicate in the target language through the use of Facebook (Alm, 2015; & Shih, 2011). These result shows that language learners may utilize Facebook outside the classroom as a media of authentic communication with others in the target language (Dizon, 2018).

In addition, Mitchell (2010) found that the SNS boosted the ESL college students in her study to communicate with their Facebook friends in English, thereby enhancing their input as well as output in the target language. However, negative impacts were mentioned by the learners as well, namely, Facebook could lead users into bad habits due to an over-reliance on online correction tools (in writing case) and has potential as a distraction (Dizon, 2018). Similarly, Kabilan et al. (2010) also had a few negative findings regarding Facebook. Some of the learners thought that the SNS was not a appropriate environment for studying English. Moreover, a few of them indicated that they could not improve their English skills through Facebook because it is only a social platform to share stories and information with friends (Dizon, 2018).

## **C. Behaviorism Theory “Skinner’s Operant Conditioning”**

### **1. Behaviorism**

Learning was understood as a process that created changes in behavior as a result of experience. Someone is considered to have learned something if he or she can show changes in behavior (Budiman, 2017). For example, the lecturer asks his students to upload English conversations video every week on Facebook, as a result students are familiar to speak in English. In short, Behaviorism Learning Theory is a theory of learning that emphasizes human behavior as a result of the interaction between stimulus and response. It is supported by Thorndike (1913) & Pavlov (1927) cited in Wu (2012) which explains that Behaviorism grew out of the premise that learning is a process influenced by changes in the environment (stimulus) and resulting in changes in behavior as the response. Therefore, Behaviorism Learning Theory emphasizes three assumptions : (1) learning is represented by a change in behavior, (2) environment shapes behavior, and (3) intercourse and reinforcement are central to explaining the learning process (Grippin & Peters, 1983; Shlechter, 1991; Watson, 1997 cited in Wu, 2012 p. 1154).

Behaviorism theory is essential in foreign language learning. This approach has several implications for language learning especially in regard to learn complex and hidden elements of language such as culture and communication styles. Byram as cited in Moriyama (2019) proposed a

form of ethnographic learning which involved students immersing themselves in a language community in order to develop a set of skills or culturally appropriate behaviors to accompany language proficiency. This required that learners not only mimic target culture behavior but also try to understand through observation and exploration. Furthermore, the influence of this theory can be seen from its implementation of several teaching-learning methods; Grammar Translation Method (GTM), Direct Method (DM), Situational Language Teaching (SLT) and closely related to Audiolingual Method (ALM). Furthermore, Fauziati as cite in Budiman (2017) explained some of the application of the concept of Behaviorism in ALM are as follows: (1) the behavior as verbal behavior, (2) the stimulus as what is delivered from the foreign language, and (3) learners' reaction to the stimulus as the response. In addition, Budiman (2017) found the characteristics that emerge from the relationship between behaviorism theory and Audiolingual Method, those are: (1) habit construction through frequent repetition, (2) avoiding errors, (3) using mimicry, memorization, and pattern drills techniques, and (4) reduce the use of mother tongue in the classroom.

Previous research on behaviorist learning focused on animals conditioning variations in behavior by eliciting responses to controlled stimulus in a closed environment. Later research and experimentation began to look at human learning to determine whether the same theories could be applied. Notable researchers in developing behaviorist learning

theories include Ivan Pavlov (Classical Conditioning), John Watson (Conditioning Theory), E.L. Thorndike (Theory of Connectivism) and B. F. Skinner (Operant Conditioning). Those theories generally similar, so this research just took Skinner's Operant Conditioning to explain how students' behavior were shaping where 'reinforcement' given.

## **2. Operant Conditioning**

Generally, Operant Conditioning emphasizes on 'operant' or intentional actions that have an effect on the surrounding environment. The operant comes out in the form of reinforcement that focuses on environmental factors that assist to shape behaviors. Reinforcement defined as consequence which will strengthen someone's upcoming behavior whenever that behavior predated by a particular earlier stimulus (Troussas, 2017). This strengthening effect may be measured as an intense frequency of behavior, longer duration, significant magnitude, or shorter latency. In addition, this reinforcement divided into two types; positive and negative.

Schultz as cited in Troussas (2017) mentioned that positive reinforcer give a desirable stimulus (contain reward) related to the things that respondent 'want', 'like', or 'love' (desire, pleasure, respectively) and appetitive behavior. Nevertheless, there was also negative reinforcement where undesirable stimulus is removed. Furthermore, Troussas (2017) also explained various patterns (schedules) of reinforcement which may affect

speed and strength of response since its determined by when and how often a behavior is being reinforced. There are two types of schedules reinforcement namely Continuous Reinforcement and Intermitten Reinforcement. Continuous reinforcement was positively reinforced each and every time desired behavior occurs. Once the rewards were revoked, the desired behavior will disappear, thus continuous reinforcement will not produce long-lasting behavior changes. Intermittent reinforcement was reinforced once in a while when desired behavior occurs. In this intermitent reinforcement, behaviors gained more gradually, yet the behaviors were more long-lasting. Intermittent schedules are based on time (interval schedules) where a desired behavior reinforced after period of time, and frequency (ratio schedules) where a desired behavior reinforced after a number of occurrences. Thus, Intermittent schedule divided into four types, namely :

- a) fixed interval schedules. Reinforement delivered after a specified interval of time has passed. Reinforcement is given in fixed interval time even only one behaviour occurs.
- b) variable interval schedules. Reinforcement delivered after an unpredictable amount of time has passed either shorter or longer, determined from the total of interval time.
- c) fixed ratio schedule. Reinforcement delivered after behaviour occurs in a specified number in interval time. A reinforcement is given after every responses (e.g., every 5th response).

d) variable ratio schedules. Reinforcement delivered after behaviour occurs in an unpredictable number in interval time. A reinforcement is given after responses occurs randomly.

**(Troussas, p.3-4, 2017)**