

## **CHAPTER III**

### **METHODOLOGY**

The pervious chapter has elaborated theories relevant to the study. This chapter focuses on an elaboration of methodology conducted in this study. It covers *Research Design, Site and Participant, Data collection, and Data Analysis*. First, Research design discusses the method employed in this study. It includes the method's principles and method's characteristics. Second, Site and Participant elaborates the place where the study was conducted and the participants involved in the study. Third, Data Collection emphasizes on the technique used in collecting the data. Last, Data analysis explains the procedure of analyzing the data.

#### **1.1. Research Design**

The method employed in this study is the descriptive qualitative research, which is case study approach. The case study, according to Burns (1994, see Cohen & Manion, 1994), involves an observation of individual unit, e.g. a student, a delinquent clique, a family group, a class, a school, a community, an event, or even an entire culture. In addition, the major characteristic of case study is that it concerns on a particular incident in which it evolves in-depth study of a single event (Hitchcock & Huges, 1995). Since the study analyzes students' exposition text in terms of cohesion, the case study approach is appropriate for this study because of two reasons:

First, this study observes small number of students' exposition text and it was conducted in a state of senior high school in Bandung. It is because, according to Graham & David's (1995), The 'case' in case study work is paramount and it offers an investigation of an important way forward in terms of both design and form of writing, then, the only way to conduct such enquires, namely, via representative samples.

Second, the study aims at investigating, categorizing, analyzing, and interpreting how cohesive devices and theme progression pattern occurred in students' exposition text suit for the schematic structure and linguistic features of

exposition text. Hence, it was suitable to the purpose of the case study in which it investigates deeply and analyzes intensively multifarious phenomena that constitute a life cycle of unit (Burn, 1994; Cohen&Manion,1994,p.106-107). In the sense that, in this study, the researcher attempts to interpret the data by creating interference and drawing conclusion (Hatch, 2002) toward the analysis of cohesive devices' choice and theme progression pattern. In a brief, the case study approach allows researcher to retain the holistic and meaningful characteristics of real-life events—such as individual life cycle (Burns, 1994; Yin,2003; Yin, 2011).

## **1.2. Site and Participant**

This section would elaborate setting of the study and participant of the study. Detail description would be elaborated as follow.

### **1.2.1. Setting**

The study was conducted in one of a state Senior High School in Bandung. This school was chosen for several reasons. First, the school was near to the place where the researcher stayed, so it allowed the researcher to get access there easily. Besides, since the case study observed an individual unit, e.g. a school (Cohen & Manion, 1994), a Senior High School in Bandung was appropriate site to conduct the study. Second, as mentioned earlier in the first chapter, senior high school students hopefully could write a hortatory text, as stated in Standard Competence and Basic Competence of 2006 senior high school curriculum, in order to be successful in academic and social participation. Thus, the senior high school students' awareness to create such text is essential.

### **1.2.2. Participant**

The participants of the study were six senior high school students or eleven-grade students. They were chosen because the needs of learning exposition text was endorsed in grade eleven' Standard Competence (*Standar Kompetensi*) and Basic Competence (*Kompetensi Dasar*) which stated that eleven grade student should comprehend social purpose, schematic structure, and linguistic features of hortatory exposition text in their daily context (*K.D. 12.2*).

In addition, in order to develop in depth understanding of the study, the six students of eleven grades considered as relevant participant to the design of study,

in which in qualitative study, the quality of the sample was more concerned than number of sample ( De Paulo, 2000). In other words, it was typical in qualitative study to investigate few individual because the overall ability of the researcher was to provide an in depth instance of phenomenon (Creswell: 2012), which was in its natural context and from the perspective of the participants involved in the phenomenon (Gall at al, 2003; cited in Duff, 2008).

Those six students were categorized into three achievement categories which were determined by score of the student's writing. Therefore, there were three categories; low achiever, middle achiever, and high achiever. Students who got 30-50 in the writing was categorized into low achiever, students who got 60-79 was categorized into middle achiever, and students who got 80-90 in writing was categorized into high achiever. By categorizing students into three achievements' categories in analyzing exposition text in terms of cohesive devices and theme progression pattern choice, it would give several advantages; it was easier the researcher to obtain more useful data and it would give greater understanding of the context based on prior knowledge (Duff, 2008,p. 116)

### **1.3. Data Collection**

Data, which was collected, was students' exposition text. The collection of the data was conducted in several steps. First, the students were given four topics of exposition text; *the importance of doing exercise, the dangerous of fast food, playing games in spare time, the importance of wearing helmet and saving money from the early age*. Those topics were chosen because these topics were common issues that students encountered in their daily life.

Second, the students should choose one of the topics provided. They had to write a hortatory text based on the topics they had chosen. In this case, before students constructed a piece of hortatory writing, they had been taught and learnt about what the hortatory exposition was, exposition's schematic structure and its language features. In addition, the students had practiced constructing a hortatory text in pairs with different topics.

Finally, the students' text would be classified based on score of the writing, in which students who got 30-50 in the writing was categorized into low achiever,

students who got 60-79 was categorized into middle achiever, and students who got 80-90 in writing was categorized into high achiever . However only six students' text were considered as data of the study in which two students were regarded as representative of each students' categories. Here is, table 3.1 shows the detail of topic chosen by each category of students to their hortatory writing:

**Table 3. 1 Topics Chosen by Students**

<b>Categories of achievement</b>	<b>Text</b>	<b>Topic</b>
Low achiever	Text 6	The dangerous of fast food
	Text 5	Playing video games in spare time
Middle achiever	Text 4	Learn to save money from early age
	Text 3	The importance of wearing helmet
High achiever	Text 2	The importance of doing exercise
	Text 1	The dangerous of fast food

By categorizing the students' text based on student's achievement was easier the researcher to analyzing the exposition text. In addition, it would give clear description of students' texts' cohesion based on each level of students' achievement.

#### **1.4. Data Analysis**

The six of the students' texts considered as study's data were analyzed at four stages: identification schematic structure and linguistic features of exposition text, identification of each cohesive device, identification of Theme progression patterns, and determination of cohesive devices and thematic progression pattern consistency. Each stage will be elaborated as follow.

##### **1.4.1. Identification of Exposition's Schematic Structure and Linguistic**

###### **Features**

In order to reveal the extent to which students' text fulfill the exposition's schematic structure, the identification of exposition's schematic structure should be conducted. The students' texts were broke down into numbers of clauses and

were analyzed whether they consist of thesis, arguments, and conclusion or recommendation. The analysis of this identification would follow Derewianka (1990), Gerot & Wignell (1994), Anderson & Anderson (1997), Emilia (2005), Knapp & Watkins (2005), Martin & Rose (2008), Christie & Derewianka (2008), and Emilia (2012). Table 3.2 is the example of schematic structure's identification of exposition text taken from Text 3:

**Table 3. 2 Schematic Structure of Text 3**

---

**Thesis**

1. One of the important thing(s) [[when riding motorcycle]] is wearing helmet
2. Helmet has function(s) [[to protect your head [[when (you) have an accident]]]b. and for (to) protect your face from dust and wind ]]a.
3. But many people ignore the safety without [[wearing helmet]]

**Arguments**

4. The reason people using (use) helmet
5. because they are afraid getting a ticket from police
6. But in a secure area from the police, They riding (ride) motorcycle without [[wearing helmet]]
7. Beside of that, we often see the passenger [[who is) not wearing a helmet]]
8. But actually, there are not difference(s) between rider and passenger
9. All of them must wearing (wear) helmet

**Conclusion reinforces the author's point of view**

10. So we must follow the rules
  11. Wearing helmet
  12. When riding motorcycle
  13. Although the destination is not far away
  14. (it is) because safety is more important than anything
- 

Then, the identification of exposition linguistic features in students' texts was based on features, which created cohesion of exposition genre. Those cohesion linguistic features would be matched to Derewianka (1990), Anderson & Anderson, and Knapp & Watkins (2005) theory of exposition linguistic features. It aimed at revealing the extent to which students' texts complied with the exposition's linguistic features in terms of cohesion. The analysis of identification of exposition's linguistic features would be the same as the analysis of identification of cohesive devices which would be presented subsequently.

### 1.4.2. Identification of Cohesive Devices

Six students' texts collected were broken down into clauses one by one. After that, each cohesive devices, reference, ellipsis and substitution, lexical cohesion, and conjunction, were identified based on Halliday & Hasan (1976), Gerot & Wignell (1994), Halliday (2000), Halliday & Matthiesen (2004), and Eggins (2004). An analysis of identification each cohesive device will be exemplified below through its chains:

- Reference chain  
e.g. (6) *learn save money*—(7) *it (A)*—(10) *the best way (A)*—(11) *this way (A)*—(15) *this method (A)* (text 4), in which numbers in parentheses indicated clause number, followed by participants, and then followed by types of endaphoric reference coded by A for anaphoric, C for Cataphoric, and E for Eshporic in parentheses.
- Lexical cohesion
  - repetition chain, e.g. (1) *fast foods*—(2) *fast food*—(5) *fast food*—(6) *fast food*—(7) *fast food*—(8) *fast food*—(9) *fast food*—(13) *fast food*—(17) *fast food*—(18) *fast food* (text 1), in which numbers in parentheses indicate clause number.
  - Synonym chain, e.g. (3) *wearing*—(4) *use* (text 3)
  - Antonym chain, e.g. (1) *importance*—(2) *damage* (text 2)
  - Hyponymy chain, e.g. (3) *Video game* — (3) *action game* (text 5)
  - Co-hyponymy, e.g. (6) *cancer* — (6) *Disease* (text 6)
  - Meronymy, e.g. (9) *body*—(10) *digestive*—(12) *immune*—(15) *brain* (text 1)
  - Co-meronymy, e.g. (10) *digestive*—(10) *body* (text 1)
- Conjunction—was identified by underlining and italic each conjunction found in the text. e.g. *But* fast food is rich of sodium *and* **the harmful additive** (text1)
- Ellipsis—was identified by marking single asterisk (\*), e.g. *Why?*\* (Text 4)

The identification of cohesive devices aimed at investigating the realization of cohesive devices in students' text and at exploring how those cohesive devices affect the students' exposition texts.

### 1.4.3. Identification of Theme Progression Pattern

After identifying the cohesive devices, the Theme Progression Pattern was identified. The identification of theme progression pattern based on Eggins (2004) and Bloor & Bloor (2005) aimed at finding out how students organize their idea in a sense that how they elaborate information and relate them to support evidences made in exposition text.

Eggins proposes three theme progression patterns: zigzag pattern, reiteration pattern, and multiple theme pattern. An analysis of each pattern would be exemplified as follow which was taken from the students' text.

#### *Zigzag Pattern*

Text 3

(1) (One of the important thing(s) [[when riding motorcycle]] is wearing helmet

(2) Helmet has function(s) [[to protect your head [[when (you) have an accident]]b. and for (to) protect your face from dust and wind ]]a.

#### *Reiteration pattern*

Text 1

(6) First, fast food makes obesity

(7) Fast food almost contains 'zero' nutrition value

(8) But fast food is rich of sodium and the harmful additive

#### *Multiple Theme Pattern*

Text 1

(5) However, eating fast foods has (have) negative effects

(6) First, .....

(9) Second, .....

(13) Third, .....

#### **1.4.4. Determination of Cohesive Devices and Theme Progression Pattern**

##### **Consistency**

All of cohesive devices and theme progression patterns occurred in students' texts were summed up after identifying cohesive devices and theme progression patterns. It was conducted to see the cohesive devices and the theme progression patterns that mostly occur in the students' exposition text. This information became a basic parameter to determine student's text consistency in terms of cohesion.

#### **1.5. Concluding Remark**

This chapter has presented and discussed the methodology used in conducting the study including research design, site and participant of the study, data collection, and data analysis.