CHAPTER III
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Chapter III elaborates the methodology employed in this study. The chapter covers the research design, site and participants of the study, data collection, and data analysis techniques. The research design discusses the design and approach used in this study. The research site exposes about where the study was conducted and the participants involved. The data collection presents the data type and the data collection technique. The data analysis elaborates the procedure of analyzing the data.

3.1 Research Design

The study used a descriptive qualitative method which help the writer to collect, examine, analyze, describe and categorize textual data using interpretative analysis in order to identify how the schematic structure, purpose and linguistic features within students' expositions (Heigham & Crocker, 2009; Creswell, 2012). In addition, the employment of qualitative method allows the writer to conduct the study with a small number of participants as the issues of generalization are less concerned (Mackey & Gass, 2005). Furthermore, the research was conducted in a case-study design which tends to provide detailed description of a defined individual or entity such as student, program, school or institution (Mackey & Gass, 2005; Merriam in Heigham & Crocker, 2009).

In the analysis of schematic structure, SFL can describe the specialized nature of the genre in terms of the way texts are organized and the way grammatical and lexical pattern distinguish it from other genre (Coffin, 2006, p.14; Martin & Rose, 2008). Moreover, the schematic structure analysis is used to

reveal to what extent students' writing fulfilled the steps to reach the social purpose of analytical exposition text (Christie, 2005; Martin & Rose, 2008). Meanwhile, the Transitivity System analysis is used to reveal the overall grammatical resources for construing goings on in students' texts (Martin, Matthiessen & Painter, 1997; Emilia, 2005, p.94; Eggins, 2004, p.249; Emilia, 2014, p.149). The analysis of schematic structure and linguistic features (especially Transitivity system) are derived from the aspect of context (Register and Genre) as one of SFL notions which have been elaborated in Chapter 2. To sum up, SFL allows us to investigate the schematic structures and linguistic features of students' writing of analytical exposition text.

3.2 Research Site

3.2.1 Setting

The study was conducted in a public senior high school in Cimahi, West Java. The school was chosen for several reasons. First, the school was chosen for its ease of access from the aspect of distance and bureaucracy. Second, the study chose senior high school because the Indonesian senior high school curriculum, since 2004 until 2013, contains the learning of analytical exposition text which is the focus of the study. The school that is involved in the study still uses 2006 curriculum for the eleventh grader. In addition, as stated in the Standard Competence and Basic Competence of 2006 senior high school curriculum, students are expected to be able to write analytical exposition text in order to be successful in academic and social (Depdiknas, 2006).

3.2.2 Participants

The study involved 30 eleventh-graders from one class. However, there are only six students' texts were analyzed in detail. Those participants were chosen by

purposeful sampling based on some particular criteria to help the researcher understands the central phenomenon which is to what extent students' analytical expositions of a public school in Cimahi fulfill the criteria of analytical exposition text (Creswell, 2012). Furthermore, the type of purposeful sampling employed was maximum variation sampling, since the writer was trying to present multiple perspectives to represent complexity.

The researcher further classified the students into three levels of achievement which are: low, middle and high achievers. The classification was based on their average grade from two daily tests which are in form of multiple choices and writing a description text. In detail, low achievers students were those with the score from 77 - 80, middle achievers students were those with score from 80 - 90, and high achievers students were those with the score above 90. The range of low achievers' score was based on the minimum passing grade of English subject of the school.

3.3 Data Collection

The data collection of this study was conducted in two steps; the collection of students' analytical expositions and interview with students to validate the evidence or data. The detail procedure of data collection will be elaborated below.

3.3.1 Collecting Students' Writings

The data used in this study were first draft of analytical exposition texts written by eleven grader students. Actually, the students learned analytical exposition texts in the previous semester, thus the researcher gave a brief review of exposition text. The review covers generic structure, linguistic features and exposure to examples of exposition text.

Afterwards, the students were assigned to write and they were free to choose any topic. The freedom in the choice of topic is intended to attain students' optimal language production according to the effort they gave to the subject they are excited with (Harmer, 2011, p.252). Moreover, they were assigned only to write the first draft. The students were given one day to write the exposition text. The results of students' writing were collected as the main data of the study. Furthermore, six students' analytical expositions were chosen to be analyzed in detail in terms of schematic structure and linguistic features.

However, the data collection process is one of the limitation of the study because students should have been given more time to develop their writing by writing several drafts of analytical exposition texts. Moreover, feedback is also essential in the process of writing. Thus, the results of students' texts analysis presented in Chapter 4 were affected by the limitation of data collection.

3.3.2 Interview

The students were also interviewed as additional data source. The data from interview was used as a tool for validation to the main data being analyzed – students' texts (Creswell, 2012). Yin (2003) added that using multiple sources of data and maintain the chain among them will reinforce and increase quality of the study. The study also requires the information regarding students' knowledge of analytical exposition writing which can be observed when they write.

This study used an one-on-one interview to gather detailed answer from each participant. The interview contains several questions related to students' knowledge on the analytical exposition text which are: (1) general information; (2) grasp on schematic structure and linguistic features; (3) further understanding which seen from the perspective toward difficulty(s) and benefit(s) from learning and writing analytical exposition text.

The interview was done to six students who wrote the texts being analyzed. The interview was conducted in Bahasa Indonesia to attain the comfort zone and avoid misunderstanding from both writer and participant. The interview session was recorded so it can be transcribed to achieve detail information.

3.4 Data Analysis

The data analysis in this study was divided into two category: analysis of students' texts and analysis of data from interview. The analysis of students' texts covers the schematic structure and linguistic features of students' analytical expositions. Moreover, the analysis of linguistic features also includes the Transitivity system analysis. The detail procedure of data analysis will be elaborated below.

3.4.1 Analysis of Schematic Structure

In this step, the analysis focuses on overall meaning construed and schematic structure found in the students' exposition writing in order to check the fulfillment of social purpose. Students' exposition texts were analyzed into clauses and segmented into structure of exposition text; Thesis, Arguments and Conclusion or Reiteration as can be seen in Table 2 below.

Afterwards, the texts were further analyzed in terms of schematic struture by referring to the frameworks proposed by several linguists such as Derewianka (1990), Gerot & Wignell (1994), Anderson & Anderson (1997), Emilia (2005), Knapp & Watkins (2005), Martin & Rose (2008), Christie & Derewianka (2008), and Emilia (2012). Table 2 below shows the example of schematic structure analysis of Text 3 written by a middle-achiever student.

Table 1

Schematic Structure Analysis on Text 3

Internet

Thesis
1. Who don't(doesn't) know internet?
2. People today always use internet for they work, task and even for refreshing.

Arguments
3. Firstly, we know that Internet [[is very usefull(useful)]]a [[like doing homework for a student.]]b
4. As a student, we need more information for our task
5. and we like [[to get it fast.]]a
6. So, internet is the best way for student [[to get information for task.]]a
7. Next, for businessman, they can sell their product online.
8. With this application, consumens(consumers) doesn't need [[to go to market anymore,]]a
9. they can buy anything on the internet now.
10. Last, we are all connected [[because of internet.]]
11. For example Facebook and Twitter.
12. It makes people all around the world connected.
13. If you want [[to meet your old friend,]]a maybe you [[meet them here.]]b

Conclusion or Reiteration
14. So, internet is very usefull(useful) for our daily activities.

3.4.2 Analysis of Linguistic Features

After the analysis of schematic structure on students' exposition writing, the analysis moves to the analysis of the linguistic features by identifying the Transitivity system within the text. Transitivity system analysis is used to investigate the interpretation of meaning from the processes, participants and circumstances within students' exposition writing (Christie, 2005). The result of the analysis were then related to the criteria of analytical exposition linguistic features which is derived from Derewianka (1990), Halliday (1994), Lock (1996), Martin, Matthiessen and Painter (1997), Halliday and Matthiessen (2004), Bloor

and Bloor (2004), Eggins (2004), Knapp and Watkins (2005) and Emilia (2005; 2014). The following is an example of Transitivity system analysis on Text 4.

Thesis

1.	Science	is developing	from year to year.
	Actor	Pr : Mat	Extent

2.	Science	makes	technology	develops.
	Agent	Pr : Attr : caus	Carr	Attribute

3.	Science	has made	us	[[to be	in the modern era.]]a
	Agent	Pr : Attr : caus	Carr	Pr : Attr : Int	Attribute

4.	And with science too,	people	can harm	other people or their world	by killing, contaminating, etc.
	Circ : Manner	Actor	Pr : Mat	G	Circ : Manner

5.	So,	is	science	a threat	to(for) human?
		Pr : Attr : int	Carr	Attribute	Circ : Cause

6.	No of course.

7.	But	human	can be	that threat
		Carr	Pr : Attr : Int	Attribute

Arguments

8.	First,	science	is not	good and not evil.
		Carr	Pr : Attr : Int	Attribute

9.	But	science	is	neutral
		Carr	Pr : Attr : Int	Attribute

10.	But	we humans	are not	neutral
		Carr	Pr : Attr : Int	Attribute

11.	We	can be	good,
	Carr	Pr : Attr : Int	Attribute

12.	and	we	can be	bad.
		Carr	Pr : Attr : Int	Attribute

13.	Even	[[the bombing	in Hiroshima and Nagasaki]]a	would not happen(happened)	if people did not do it.
		Pr : Mat	Circ : Loc	Pr : Mat	Circ : Cont
	G			Pr : Mat	

14.	Or	Saddam Hussein	which(who) killed	many people	in Kurdistan	by chemical bombs in 1988.
		Actor	Pr : Mat	G	Circ : Loc	Circ : Manner

15.	Because	weapon	do not kill	people.
		Actor	Pr : Mat	G

16.	Science,	do not kill	people.
	Actor	Pr : Mat	G

17.	But	people	kill	people.
		Actor	Pr : Mat	G

18.	So	which one	is	the real threat?
		Carr	Pr : Attr : Int	Attribute

19.	Second,	science	is(is) also help	human.
		Actor	Pr : Mat	G

20.	Because	it	is	how	we	[[keep	our food	fresh,]]
		Carr	Pr : Attr : Int		Actor	Pr : Mat	G	Circ: Manner
				Attribute				

	even solution	for things like global warming.
		Circ : Cause

21.	Because	science	don't make	pollution.
		Actor	Pr : Mat	G

22.	And now,	there are	many disease	that curable	because of the develops of health science.
	Circ : Loc	Pr : Exist	Existent	Circ : Manner	Circ : Cause

23.	And third,	if we	say	science	[[is	a threat,]]a
		Sayer	Pr : Vb	Carr	Pr : Attr : Int	Attribute
				Vg		

24.	So that	Everyone who	[[learn	Science]]a	will be	a threat.
		Senser	Pr : Ment : Cog	Ph	Pr : Attr: Int	attribute
		Carr				

25.	There	are	billions of schools	in this world.
		Pr : Exist	Existent	Circ : Loc

26.	And	if we	say	science	[[is	a threat.]]a
		Sayer	Pr : Verb	Carr	Pr : attr: Int	attribute
				Vg		

27.	so	all the student	will be	a threat.
		Carr	Pr : Attr : Int	Attribute

Conclusion or Reiteration

28.	So from all of that,	we	know	that science	[[never harm	Human]]a	But [[helping]]b
	Circ : Cont	Senser	Pr : Ment : Cog	Actor	Pr : Mat	G	Pr : Mat
				Ph			

29.	Science	is not	a threat	to human,
	Carr	Pr : Attr : Int	Attribute	Circ : Cause

30.	but	human	that can be	the threat	because of the science.

		Carr	Pr : Attr : Int	Attribute	Circ : Cause

3.4.3   Analysis of Data from Interview

The study, as stated in previous section, also use data from interview to reinforce and increase quality of the findings (Yin, 2003). The data from interview is gathered by transcribing the recording of the interview. Afterwards, the transcriptions were categorized into the theme to answer the designed research question. Finally, the data were presented in a condensed form based on the three categories of tables. The analysis of data from interview is presented in Chapter 4.

3.5 Concluding Remark

This chapter has discussed the methodological aspects applied in this study covering the research design, research site and participants, data collection, and data analysis. In the next chapter, the findings and discussions of the study will be discussed.