CHAPTER III
METHODODOLOGY

This part will discuss the methodology of this study involving research design, research site, participants, as well as data collection. The last part of this section will present data analysis of this study.

3.1. Research Design

As has been stated previously in chapter 1, this study is designed to uncover the effectiveness of comprehensible input, explicit teaching and corrective feedback in students’ speaking in hortatory exposition. In addition, this study aims to investigate how effective comprehensible input, explicit teaching and corrective feedback develop students’ speaking in hortatory exposition.

To achieve the purposes of this study, the research design uses both qualitative and quantitative methods (Creswell, 2010). More specifically, the researcher acts as a participant-observer (see Chapelle & Duff, 2003 as cited in Heigham & Crooker, 2009) in which in this case, the researcher acts as the teacher who implements the teaching program. In this study, the researcher acted as the teacher applying the concepts of comprehensible input, explicit teaching, and corrective feedback in Genre Based Approach in the teaching of speaking in hortatory exposition.

Regarding those concepts as the main concern, the researcher has not applied those three concepts in the teaching program. She only learnt those concepts from some courses; Second Language Acquisition and Functional Grammar. However, she has conducted a research concerning the use of corrective feedback in a speaking classroom which is beneficial for her present study.

Furthermore, this study is categorized as a case study because of the following characteristics. First, this study took place in a natural setting in which the data were collected based on what happened in real situations (see Creswell, 2010). Second, the data were analyzed under a descriptive approach, which is in line with Grimes & Shchulz (2002) explaining that a descriptive study is concerned with a description of
existing variables without regarding the causal relationships among those variables. Third, this study was undertaken in a small scale with a single case (Bogdan & Biklen, 1992; Nunan, 1992; Creswell, 2010). This is showed by the implementation of this study which took place in a particular classroom using one single focus; that is, the role of comprehensible input, explicit teaching, and corrective feedback in the teaching of speaking in hortatory exposition. The last one, this study utilized multiple methods in collecting data; such as, observations and document analyses (Creswell, 2010). The explanation of multiple data sources used in this study will be presented in detail in section 3.4.

Considering those characteristics of a case study above, this study is not designed to draw a generalisations beyond the case (see Hood, 2009)

3.2. Research Site
In collecting data, one of State Senior High Schools in Garut was chosen as the research site based on some considerations. First, this school is one of exemplary schools in Garut, which has been selected to implement the latest curriculum, the 2013 curriculum, by the government since the academic periods of 2013-2014. Second, this school consists of students who come from various sociocultural background. This attention to students’ socio economic background is given to avoid bias in drawing findings from the collected and analyzed data. Third, this school has been the site in which the researcher conducted a pilot study implementing the concepts of corrective feedback.

3.3. Participants
In this study, forty students in one class of the eleventh grade served as participants. The eleventh grade is chosen since hortatory exposition genre is taught with reference to the 2013 curriculum.

Of the forty students, six students served as the focus participants. They were purposively chosen based on the level of achievement from the diagnostic test and the recommendation from the English teacher who was teaching them. Therefore, two high achievers are represented by female students; they are IN and SI, two
medium achievers are from female ones; AU and AS; whereas, two low achievers consist of a male student (AW) and a female student (MF).

Regarding the profiles of the participants, the focus students come from low and middle socio-economic family background having the same cultural background; that is, they use the same mother tongue and second language. Additionally, they have the same interest to learn English since the study took place in an elective class of English. However, there is a difference among the focus students in which IN, SI, AU, and AS were included into active students participating in the English class; whereas, AW and MF were silent students who were seldom to be active during the English class.

In other words, of the fourty students participating in this study to answer the first research question, six purposive students served as the focus participants contributing to work on the second research question.

3.4. Data Collection

This study employed two types of instruments involving observations, and document analysis. Those instruments are selected to be utilized in this study since multiple instruments are used to achieve the validity and truthworthiness of the study (Gall & Borg, 2003). Each type of instrument is presented in details in the following section.

3.4.1 Classroom Observations

Classroom observations in this study are aimed at figuring out how effective comprehensible input, explicit teaching and corrective feedback develop, students’ speaking skills in hortatory exposition. Three-month observations were conducted.

Those observations were conducted during the teaching of spoken hortatory exposition by the researcher. Because of the role of the researcher as participant-observer, a colleague was needed to record all activities taking place during the teaching and learning process (Shimara, 1998; Vanlier, 1996) as in Emilia (2005).

In teaching and learning process, Genre Based Approach in the teaching and learning cycle of spoken expository text is selected. The cycle consists of four
stages; Building Knowledge of Field, Modelling of the Text, Joint Construction of the Text, and Independent Construction of the Text (Gibbons, 2002; Derewianka, 2004; Emilia, 2011). In the stage of Building Knowledge of Field, the teacher together with the students discussed the context of hortatory exposition through some pictures and videos. Additionally, the teacher also guided students to understand cross-cultural similarities and differences between the target context and the context in students’ home culture (Hyland, 2004; Feez, 1998a). In this cycle, the teacher also highlighted some characteristics of spoken language as suggested by Halliday (1985b). All activities conducted in this cycle are relevant to the aim of this stage, that is, students are expected to explore the social function as well as the general cultural context of hortatory exposition (Hyland, 2004; Feez, 1998a).

In the second stage, Modelling Of the Text, the teacher gave live-monologue speaking of hortatory exposition text. After that, the teacher opened a discussion with the students to discuss structural patterns as well as lexicogrammatical features of hortatory exposition from a sample text. Additionally, the teacher gave some other texts to be discussed and some exercises to help students understand the concept of hortatory exposition. Those activities are in line with the core aim of this stage, that is, to introduce the purpose and the characteristics of hortatory exposition by giving modelling texts (Derewianka, 1990; Gibbons, 2002).

In the third stage, Joint Construction Of Field, two main activities were conducted; scribing and constructing a text in small groups. In the first activity, the teacher acted as the scribe who wrote the students’ ideas in to be a hortatory exposition in the whiteboard. After that, the teacher gave some feedback including positive feedback and corrections. In the second activity, the teacher led students to construct a spoken hortatory exposition in groups. In this stage, the teacher gave students an outline sheet helping them organize the text. Additionally, the teacher also checked the students’ work by posing some questions as well as gave feedback to their work. At the final session in this stage, every group sent two members as the representatives to do monologue speaking of the text constructed. Meanwhile, other groups gave a peer-assessment using the format given by the teacher. These activities are in line with Gibbons (2002), Emilia (2011) and Derewianka & Jones.
(2012), that is, teachers’ tasks in Joint ontruction of the Text stage is to guide students construct the text in groups.

Moving to the last stage, Independent Construction Of the Text, the teacher asked every student to construct a spoken text in live monologue form with a free topic. In this stage, the teacher controlled students’ work by giving them feedback and asked students to do revision of their work. After that, the teacher invited each student to do monologue speaking. Those activities are intended to keep with the aim of this stage, that is, to apply what students have learnt in previous stages to construct the text independently (Derewianka, 1990; Gibbons, 2002).

Additionally, the data gained in this stage were also collected by using field-notes which are in line with Mc. Milan & Schumacher (1989) and Bogdan & Biklen (1992), that is, the process of collecting and reflecting data in qualitative design can be showed by written records, which consist of what a researcher mentally views by using the sense of seeing, looking, and experiencing the actual events in a natural setting; namely field-notes.

To conclude, the data of observations were collected through a video recording and field notes during the process of teaching was going on.

1.4.2. The Collections of Students’ Spoken Texts

In this study, the documentation of the students’ spoken texts are collected. The texts were gathered from the diagnostic test before conducting the teaching program and from the final test in the step of Independent Construction of the Text. Therefore, there are forty pieces of the students’ work in each test analyzed using the rubric from SOLOM for general aspects of speaking and the rubric adapted from Butt, Fahey, Feez, spinks, and Yallop (2000), Emilia (2011) for the genre assessment. Moreover, to answer the second research questions, there are only six pieces of students’ work from the focus students in each test which will be analyzed in details.

3.4.3 Dependent t-test

To confirm the development of students’ speaking skills in advance, dependent t-test was conducted. The type of T-tests used is paired t-test functioning to find out

\[
\begin{align*}
T_1 & = \text{The Pretest} \\
X & = \text{the treatment} \\
T_2 & = \text{The Posttest}
\end{align*}
\]
the difference of Means between the pre-test and the post-test (Hatch, E & Hossein, F, 1982). The design of this test is described as below.

The first test (pre-test) was undertaken in order to figure out the students’ speaking skills before the teaching and learning process was conducted. The results of this test were also used to determine focus students as participants in this study from various levels of achievements: high achievers, mid-achievers, as well as low achievers.

Meanwhile, the post-test was undertaken in the last stage of teaching of spoken hortatory exposition; independent construction of the text. In this phase, the teacher collected the text from each student whose results of this test were used to check the development of students’ speaking skill of hortatory exposition.

3.4.4 Visualization of Data Collection Technique
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3.5. Data Analysis

As this study uses qualitative research design, data analysis in this study was undertaken descriptively based on the data from observations, interviews, and
students’ spoken texts. Each stage of analysis of three sources of the data will be presented in following sections.

3.5.1 Classroom Observations

Data from observations were analyzed based on the implementation of teaching process using Genre Based Approach in spoken which focuses on the use of comprehensible input, explicit teaching and corrective feedback. The data analysis was conducted in following stages. First, the data from video were organized into file folders. Second, the data were transcribed after watching the video types and reading the notes of classroom observations. Third, the data from video were converted into texts. Forth, the data from video as well as fieldnotes were classified into three major focuses on this study; comprehensible input, explicit teaching, and corrective feedback. In the last stage, the data were described then interpreted. The interpretation of the findings will be presented in the following chapter.

3.5.2 Students’ Spoken Hortatory Exposition Texts

The results of students’ spoken hortatory exposition in diagnostic test as well as in achievement test were analyzed by using the rubric of speaking adapted from Student Oral Language Observation Matrix (SOLOM) and a rubric adapted from Butt, Fahey, Feez, spinks, and Yallop (2000), Emilia (2011).

Table 3a
Scoring Rubric for Speaking Adapted from SOLOM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Comprehension</td>
<td>Can not understand what is said, even in little conversation.</td>
<td>Needs frequent repetitions to follow what is said.</td>
<td>Can follow what is said only in slow rate of speech.</td>
<td>Understands what is said in normal speed of speech. Sometimes, repetition may be needed.</td>
<td>Understands daily conversation without any difficulty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Fluency</td>
<td>A lot of halting and fragmented</td>
<td>Hesitate to make a speech</td>
<td>Any disruption to search better expression</td>
<td>a little disruption to search</td>
<td>Effortless to make a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Speech

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>c. Vocabulary</th>
<th>Very Limited vocabulary makes difficult speak.</th>
<th>Can not use words appropriately and has limited vocabulary.</th>
<th>Frequently uses inappropriate words because of insufficient vocabulary.</th>
<th>Occasionally uses inappropriately terms or needs to rephrase those ideas.</th>
<th>Uses correct words approximate that of native speaker.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Pronunciation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>d. Pronunciation</th>
<th>Pronunciation problem makes an unintelligible speech.</th>
<th>A lot of wrong pronunciation makes the speech hard to be understood.</th>
<th>Pronunciation problems disturb listeners and lead to misunderstanding.</th>
<th>Almost words are pronounced correctly in spite of some inappropriate intonation patterns.</th>
<th>Always pronounces words correctly and the speech is easily understood.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Grammar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>e. Grammar</th>
<th>All sentences are grammatically incorrect.</th>
<th>Many errors on grammar and word order that make speech difficult to be understood.</th>
<th>Errors on grammar occasionally obscure meaning.</th>
<th>Occasionally makes grammatically incorrect words without altering meaning.</th>
<th>Almost all word order and grammatical usage are correct.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Makes point and elaborates argument | Evaluating statement  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Argument 2</td>
<td>Passive voice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes point and elaborates argument</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argument 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes point and elaborates argument</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggestions as the reinforcement of statement of position</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>