CHAPTER III
RESEARCH METHOD

This chapter discusses aspects related to the methods of the study. It consists of eight sections. The first section reviews the research purposes and research questions. Next section presents the research design, the third relates to the population and sample, followed by the explanation of the instruments, elaborations of the techniques of collecting data, and the research procedure. The next section tells about techniques of analyzing data and the last is a concluding remark.

3.1. Research Purpose and Research Questions
As mentioned in chapter one, this study aims to, firstly, investigate on how the teaching by using genre based approach (GBA) can be applicable in teaching speaking especially in recount texts. Secondly, this study aims to find out the students’ responses towards the implementation of the genre based approach in speaking class. Thus to meet these two purposes, two research questions are proposed:

3.1.1 Can the genre-based approach (GBA) help develop students’ spoken language ability?

3.1.2 What are the students’ responses towards the implementation of the genre based approach (GBA)?
3.2. Research Design

This study employs action research. The reason for choosing action research as a method in this study was based on the definition of action research itself as ‘self-reflective enquiry’ (Carr and Kemmis 1986 as cited in Burns, 2010: 5). This study is also concerned with reflective inquiry to some extents, because teacher as researcher looks and learns the teaching-learning process and then tries to make it better from cycle to cycle. Furthermore, in action research a teacher can see gaps between what is actually happening in teaching situation and what would ideally like to see happening (Burns, 2010: 2).

Basic assumption that underlies action research is that those who do action research assume that those involved, either singly or groups, are informed individuals who are capable of identifying problems that need to be solved and of determining how to go about solving them (Fraenkel and Wallen, 2007: 567).

In line with the main aim of action research that is to identify a ‘problematic’ situation or issue of the participants involved – who may include teachers, students, or even parents (Burns, 2010: 44), this action research involved another English teacher to be co-researcher to work collaboratively with the researcher. The collaboration involved an English teacher who came into the classroom to collect data.
on researcher behalf and then provided a complementary perspective for sharing ideas (Burns, 2010: 44; Baumfield et al, 2009: 10).

The process of action research can be described as a continuous cycle of planning, action and review of the action (Cherry, 1999: 1). Actually there are some theories illustrate similar things about the process of action research as purposed by Koshy (2005); Whitehead and McNiff (2006); Fraenkel and Wallen (2007: 570-573); Baumfield et.al. (2008); Norton (2009); Burns (2010); (Stringer et al, 2010); Alwasilah (2011: 85). This study specifically followed theory illustrated by Stringer et al. (2010) because it was the most suitable one for this study.

Steps in this action research require three broad phases in a cycle of research namely: Look, Think, and Act (Stringer et al, 2010: 1).

Figure 3.1 Action research cycles (From Stringer et al, 2010: 12)
The figure above illustrates the model of action research that shows its iterative or recursive nature. The cyclical Look–Think–Act steps of action research are incorporated into phase of lesson planning and preparation, instruction and assessment and evaluation. Furthermore, Stringer et.al. (2010) explain the steps as summarized below.

- **Phase 1—Lesson planning and preparation** is the phase to review information and resources (Look); select, sort, and organize information (Think); and formulate lesson plan (Act).

- **Phase 2—Instruction** is the phase for initiating activity and observing student responses (Look); reflecting on their learning processes and performances (Think); providing feedback and information (Act).

- **Phase 3—Assessment and Evaluation** is the phase where researcher can review lesson outcomes, review student performance (Look); identify successes and strengths; identify weaknesses and gaps (Think); Plan remedial actions; plan ways of improving instruction and learning (Act).

### 3.3. Site and Participants

This study was conducted in a state senior high school in Subang West Java. Reasons that underlie the choosing of the site are because; it was chosen because of its feasibility. The site was placed in a feasible area that can help the researcher to get easy access. Another reason was that because the researcher is one of English
teachers there; hence it helps the researcher to learn students’ prior ability in speaking.

Students participating in this study were students of a first grade in a state senior high school in Subang. The students involved in this study were chosen by using convenience sampling. A convenience sample is a group of individuals who (conveniently) are available for study (Fraenkel and wallen, 2007: 100). There were three reasons for choosing the students by using convenience sampling. First, the students involved in this study were available for this study whether in a matter of time and their willingness to be involved in this study. Second, the participants in this study represent mostly students’ speaking ability in this research site that varies from poor, medium and good. The categorization of the students’ ability were based on their speaking scores in Pretest. And another reason relates to material suggested in the curriculum in this grade, since this study was focused on the recount genre, then it was appropriate with what should they learn in this grade. Furthermore, the study involved 38 students of the 1st grade students. Officially there were 42 students in this class. But there were only 38 to 40 students that often attended the class. Hence this study just focused on the 38 students as the participants for gaining the complete and comprehensive data from the participants.
The researcher, as a main instrument in this study, acted as a teacher in teaching-learning process. There was also a co-researcher that helped especially in observing whether the students and also the teacher in the teaching-learning process.

3.4. The Techniques of Collecting Data

There were three data collection techniques used in the study. These include:

3.4.1. Oral Test

The students had Pretest and Posttest in speaking related to recount text (see Appendix 9, 10 and 11). The tests were recorded then scored by considering the test scoring categories for speaking such as; fluency, pronunciation, grammar and comprehension as what has been categorized by Brown (2001: 406-407) and also by considering scoring rubric for recount text proposed by Hyland (2004: 174) such as: content, structure, and language. Since the scoring criteria for speaking can be modified depending on the expected performance criteria (Brown, 2004: 157), hence the tests were scored by considering fluency; how the spoken language flows, pronunciation; whether any errors or not in pronunciation, grammar; how the control of grammar is, and comprehension; accomplishing objective of elicited task.

The data were collected by gaining the pretest posttest scores in each cycle. The pretest and posttest were conducted to investigate the students’ spoken language
ability, and it is in a kind of students’ speaking scores (see Appendix 9, 10 and 11 for the Pretest, Test 1 and Posttest Scores). The scores were gained by following the speaking test criteria.

3.4.2. Classroom Observation

Observation was conducted in this study to encourage phases for reflection of this action research. It was to obtain data on the teaching practices and the students’ learning activities. The students’ responses towards the teaching-learning process also can be seen in the classroom observation. How they got involved in the activities and how they reacted during the teaching learning process (see Appendix 3, 4 and 5).

Observation as the conscious noticing and detailed examinations of participants’ behavior in natural setting (Cowie as in Croker and Heigham, 2009: 166) was done both by the researcher and the co-researcher. Acting as “participant observer”, the researcher participated in the teaching situation or setting in the classroom. While teaching, the researcher was also observing and immediately doing field note after the teaching ended. “Field note was done to record teaching practical details, methodological issues, students’ thoughts, and preliminary analyses” (Dawson, 2009:112). The observation was done in each teaching practice by the researcher. So, while experiencing what was going on in a research site, “researcher also observed and made detailed notes about the people and the interactions that occur”
Observation was also done by the co-researcher to obtain data in instruction phase. “The co-researcher as nonparticipant observer did not participate in the activity being observed” (Fraenkel and Wallen, 2007: 450) he just observed the teaching practices such teaching steps, teaching cycles, teacher’s performance in teaching, and students’ learning process in the classroom such as; students’ activities and involvement in learning process. This was conducted once in each cycle to obtain data that could support the reflection in Think phase.

3.4.3. Questionnaire

Lists of questions were given to the students to gain data of their response with the implementation of genre-based teaching. This helped to find out the finding of the study, whether the stages succeeded or not in achieving the goal. Type of questions in the questionnaire was in closed questions. It means the actual answer categories are provided to the respondents, and the respondent is expected to choose the answer category which comes closest to or best represents his feelings, beliefs, attitudes, opinions, behavior, or knowledge of a situation (Labaw, 1980: 131). Closed questions were used in this study to have some measurable count of respondents’ behavior, it is
in line with what Norton (2009: 93) explains. These types of questions were used also for helping the students in answering the questions.

The questions were divided into three main categories; each represents students’ interest, ability and difficulties. The questionnaire consisted of 10 questions; three questions related to students’ interest in the teaching-learning process, six questions were about students’ ability, and one was about students’ difficulty. The reasons for focusing on students’ interest, ability and difficulties were actually for affirming about their responses whether what they had done so far in the teaching-learning process with the genre-based approach were in line with their interest, ability and difficulties they found.

3.5. Instruments

3.5.1. Spoken Test Instruments
A pretest and posttest were conducted orally in a structured interview to test the subjects’ spoken language ability. The tests were done by asking the students to tell about past events (Recount texts). In the pretest, the teacher asked the students to tell about their past activities. In the speaking test of Cycle One, the students were asked to tell about procedural recount “How to get to One Place”. And in the posttest they must tell about their activities in holiday. The tests were in oral tests and they were recorded. Then the results were scored by considering the oral proficiency test
scoring categories adapted from Brown (2001: 406-407) that consists of grammar, fluency, pronunciation and comprehension (See Appendix 7); and recount scoring rubric adapted from Hyland (2004: 174) that consist of content, structure and language (See Appendix 8).

Pictures and maps were used as instruments in this study. Those were initially taken into account as main instruments in teaching-learning process. Since the study was focused on the steps in Genre-Based Approach in speaking class, hence the pictures were used as the instruments that support this study especially in the step of Building Knowledge of Field. It means the pictures helped the students to construct their background knowledge to learn further in teaching-learning process.

3.5.2. Observation Sheet
The observation done by the co-researcher as well as the researcher was crucial in action research (Baumfield et.al., 2009: 107). The observations done by the co-researcher were led by the observation sheets (see Appendix 3 and 4). The observation sheets contained a list of activities done by each student in teaching learning process and also a list of teacher’s practices in teaching. Observation sheet for students’ activities contained students’ attendance, students’ involvement in asking question, answering question, working in group, doing task, and paying attention to the teacher’s explanation. The observation sheet for teacher’s
performance in teaching contained lists of activities for seeking on how teacher opened the class, followed the stage in teaching such as in building knowledge of field, modeling of text, joint construction of text and independent construction of text, and how teacher used teaching media in the classroom.

3.5.3. Questionnaire Instrument

Questionnaire in this study was used to see the students’ responses by writing them in a space that is provided (Croker and Heigham, 2009: 201) related to the implementation of genre-base teaching. This study was applied to investigate the students’ speaking development and also their responses with the genre-based teaching. Students’ responses were reflected by answering the questionnaire. The questions provided in the questionnaire were in closed questions. Closed questions were used in this study to have some measurable count of respondents’ behavior (Norton, 2009: 93). The questionnaire consisted of 10 questions; three questions related to students’ interest in the teaching-learning process, six questions were about students’ ability, and one was about students’ difficulties (See Appendix 6).

The questions in the questionnaire were proposed to gain the data related to the research question, especially about the students’ responses towards the implementation of the genre-based approach. Hence the data obtained through questionnaire was actually parallel with the data obtained through pretest and posttest
related to the students’ speaking ability. In other words, the questionnaire was used to gain and complete data.

3.6. The Action Research Cycles

The study was aimed at investigating the students’ development in their speaking ability through genre-based teaching and the students’ responses of the implementation of genre-based approach speaking class. The study was divided into two cycles with five teaching sessions in each cycle. Each session provided 90 minutes in classroom teaching.

3.6.1. Research Cycle One

3.6.1.1. Phase 1: Look

In this phase the researcher focused on lesson planning by following an action research Look–Think–Act routine to prepare lessons of study (Stringer et.al, 2010: 31). Thus researcher first reviewed instructional elements—student prior knowledge, student characteristics, community context, state standards (Look). Researcher then selected and organized appropriate instructional components (Think) and then constructed lesson plan (Act).
3.6.1.2. **Phase 2: Think**

Researcher in this phase was still assisted by the Look–Think–Act action research routine to assist teacher to keep track of the complex processes of instruction (Stringer et.al., 2010: 63). It was comprised of *observing* student activities and performance—observing and talking (Look), *checking* student activities and performance—analyzing and assessing (Think) and *affirming* or *remediating* student learning through reinforcing comments, repeating instructions and demonstrations, and celebrating success (Act).

3.6.1.3. **Phase 3: Act**

In this phase researcher did action by giving the students treatments and evaluated activities done in instruction. The evaluation was done by looking at the work that had been done (Look), thinking about the quality of the work—what was right with it, what needed improving or correcting (Think), and implementing solution to correct or improve their performance (Act) (Stringer, 2010: 134). Furthermore, in this phase the researcher did reflection to be suggested in the next cycle, especially in planning for the next cycle.
3.6.2. Research Cycle Two

3.6.2.1. Phase 1: Look

In the second cycle, this phase was used for preparation for what should be done and what to do in the second cycle based on the result of the Act Phase in Cycle One. The results of previous cycle were from the students’ speaking scores and also from the observation on lesson plans and instruments, and also from teaching learning process.

Planning in the second cycle still provided preparation on lesson plans and instruments (Stringer et al, 2010: 31). Researcher identified students’ learning ability in the classroom, to see whether there was improvement in their learning process especially in their speaking ability and what strategies could be used to enhance students’ learning. This phase was also still considering the Look-Think-Act framework as in the first cycle.

3.6.2.2. Phase 2: Think

In the second cycle, this phase still followed what was done in Cycle one where the detailed description will be provided in Chapter IV. Think Phase in Cycle Two should take into account the results gained in the first Cycle, whether the students’ speaking scores and the data from observation.
3.6.2.3. Phase 3: Act

In this phase, the treatments were done by considering the data found in Cycle One. The students still practiced in groups especially when they practiced in joint construction stage, although at last they should perform their speaking ability individually in independent construction. The Look-Think-Act framework was still guided this phase as in the first cycle.

Assessment and evaluation phase in this cycle also considered what Stringer (2010: 134) proposed. The posttest in cycle two was conducted to find whether there is any improvement or not in students speaking ability. Reflection was done to investigate the data obtained.

3.7. The Techniques of Data Analysis

The obtained data then were analyzed in certain process by arranging the sequence of data, organizing them into a certain pattern, category and certain sequence (Patton cited in Moeleong, 2004: 103). The data gained were from oral speaking tests, observations, and also from the questionnaire distributed to the students. Each data was analyzed to fulfill the aim of this study.
3.7.1 Analyzing the Students’ Speaking Tests

First of all, the data of students’ speaking ability were collected by conducting the oral pretest and posttest for each student. Then the tests were recorded and scored following the criteria adapted from Brown (2001: 406-407) and also criteria for recount text proposed by Hyland (2004: 174).

The tests were recorded and then scored by considering several aspects such as; fluency, pronunciation, grammar and comprehension as what has been categorized by Brown (2001: 406-407). Since the scoring criteria can be modified depending on the expected performance criteria (Brown, 2004: 157), hence the tests were scored by considering fluency; how the spoken language flows, pronunciation; whether any errors or not in pronunciation, grammar; how the control of grammar is, and comprehension; accomplishing objective of elicited task. Meanwhile the aspects of recount genre were scored by considering the content, structure and language features of recount genre (Hyland, 2004: 174).

The test scoring categories for speaking adapted from Brown (2001: 406-407) as what can be seen as follows:
Table 3.1.

THE TEST SCORING CATEGORIES FOR SPEAKING

(Brown, 2001: 406-407)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scores</th>
<th>Fluency</th>
<th>Pronunciation</th>
<th>Grammar</th>
<th>Comprehension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(No Specific fluency description. Refer to other to four language areas for implied level of fluency.)</td>
<td>Errors in pronunciation are frequent, but can be understood by a native speaker, used to dealing with for engineers attempting to speak his language.</td>
<td>Errors in grammar are frequent, but speaker can be understood by a native speaker used to dealing with foreigners attempting to speak his language.</td>
<td>Within the scope of his very limited language experience, can understand simple questions and statements if delivered with slowed speech, replication, or paraphrase.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Can handle with confidence but not with facility most social situations, including introductions and casual conversations about current events, as well as work, family, and autobiographical information.</td>
<td>Accent is intelligible though often faulty.</td>
<td>Can usually handle elementary constructions quite accurately but does not have thorough or confident control of the grammar.</td>
<td>Can get the gist of most conversations of non-technical subjects (i.e., topics that require no specialized knowledge).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Can discuss particular interests of competence with reasonable ease. Rarely has to grope for words.</td>
<td>Errors never interfere with understanding and rarely disturb the native speaker. Accent may be obviously foreign.</td>
<td>Control of grammar is good. Able to speak the language with sufficient structural accuracy to participate effectively in most formal and informal conversations on practical, social, and professional topics.</td>
<td>Comprehension is quite complete at a normal rate of speech.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Able to use language fluently on all levels normally pertinent to professional needs. Can participate in any conversation within the range of his experience with a high degree of fluency.</td>
<td>Errors in pronunciation are quite rare.</td>
<td>Able to use the language accurately on all levels normally pertinent to professional needs. Errors in grammar are quite rare.</td>
<td>Can understand any conversation within the range of his experience.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Has complete fluency in the language such that his speech is fully accepted by educated native speakers.

Equivalent to and fully accepted by educated native speakers.

Equivalent to that of an educated native speaker.

Equivalent to that of an educated native speaker.

The total score of speaking for each student was counted by summing up the four aspects of speaking (fluency, pronunciation, grammar & comprehension). And then the total score was multiplied by 3. Hence if a student has a total score 20 (5 for each aspect), then the students’ score for speaking aspect is 60 (for 20 was multiplied by 3).

The data of speaking test were also scored by considering the categories for scoring recount genre proposed by Hyland (2007:174). The categories are as follows:

**Table 3.2.**

**SCORING RUBRIC FOR RECOUNT GENRE**

*(Hyland, 2004: 174)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scores</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 31–40  | • Even explicitly stated  
|        | • Clearly documents events  
|        | • Evaluates their significance  
|        | • Personal comment on events  | • Orientation gives all essential information  
|        | | • All necessary background provided  
|        | | • Account in chronological/other order Reiteration “round off” sequence  | • Excellent control of language  
|        | | | • Excellent use of vocabulary  
|        | | | • Excellent choice of grammar  
|        | | | • Appropriate tone and style  |
| 21–30  | • Even fairly clearly stated  
|        | • Includes most events  
|        | • Some evaluation of events  
|        | • Some personal comment  | • Fairly well developed orientation  
|        | | • Most actors and events mentioned  
|        | | • Largely chronological and  | • Good control of language  
|        | | | • Adequate vocabulary choices  
|        | | | • Varied choice of  |
The score for recount text was also calculated by following the criteria mentioned above. It means if a student has a total score for recount in 40. Then the total score for students would be derived from both speaking and recount criteria. It was gained by summing up the score of speaking (the total is 60) and the score of recount (the total is 40). Hence the maximum score would be 100 for both speaking ability and recount genre.

After all of the students’ speaking tests were scored by considering the criteria for assessing speaking and also recount genre, then scores of all students were summed up, whether the Pretest, the test in Cycle One and Posttest scores. The scores were calculated by using SPSS 17.00. Firstly the students’ scores in each pretest, test in Cycle One and posttest were tested to know whether the data were normally distributed or not. Since the data found was normally distributed, the data was
computed through the paired-sample significant test (Hatch and Farhady, 1982; Sugiono, 2007). The paired-sample significant test was done both for the pretest and the 1st test in cycle one and also for the pretest and posttest in Cycle Two. Then the result of both test were compared.

3.7.2. Analyzing the Data from Classroom Observations

Observations in this study was conducted to encourage phases for reflection of this action research. It was to obtain data on the teaching practices and the students’ learning activities.

The researcher as participant observer participated in the teaching situation or setting in the classroom (Fraenkel and Wallen, 2007: 450) in doing field note immediately after the teaching-learning process. It was done to record practical details, methodological issues, personal thoughts, preliminary analyses and working hypotheses (Dawson, 2009:112). Observations were also done by the co-researcher to obtain data in instruction phase. The co-researcher as nonparticipant observer did not participate in the activity being observed (Fraenkel and Wallen, 2007: 450), he just observed the teaching practices such as teaching steps, teaching cycles, teacher’s performance in teaching, and students’ learning process in the classroom such as; students’ activities and involvement in learning process. This was conducted once in each cycle to obtain data that could support the reflection in Think phase.
All the data gained whether from researcher’s field note and also from the co-researcher’s observation were analyzed to fulfill the triangulation (Fraenkel and Wallen, 2007: 443) of this study.

3.7.3. Analyzing the Data from Questionnaire

The questionnaire consisted of 10 questions; three questions related to the students’ interest in the teaching-learning process, six questions were about students’ ability and understanding of the recount text, and one question was about students’ difficulties speaking class. The result of questionnaire is described by calculating it into the following formula:

Table 3.3.

The Formula of Percentage

\[ P = \frac{F \times 100}{N} \]

- \( P \) = Number of Percentage
- \( F \) = Frequency
- \( R \) = Rank
After collecting all data, students’ recorded speaking tests, field notes from observations, and also the result of questionnaire, then they were analyzed by arranging, organizing, breaking into manageable units, synthesizing, searching for patterns, discovering what was important and what was to be learned.

3.8. Concluding Remarks

This chapter has outlined the methodology of the study. It has discussed how this study was conducted. This includes the research questions, the selection of site and participant, research procedure, the techniques of collecting data, instruments, the cycles of the research and the techniques of data analysis. The data presentation and discussion will be delineated in Chapter Four.