

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHOD

Chapter II has discussed the literature related to the present study. In this chapter, detailed information on the methodology of this study is presented. The discussion starts with the statement of the purpose of the study, and proceeds with the research design, setting and participants, variables, data collection procedures, and data analysis procedures.

3.1 Purpose of the Study

Chapter I presented the purposes of the present study, which become the basis for the development of the research methodology. This study seeks (1) to find whether or not process approach affects the students' ability in writing narrative texts, (2) to see the students' attitude towards the use of the process approach in teaching how to write narrative texts.

3.2 Research Design

The present study used a mixed method employing both the quantitative and qualitative procedures. To explore the first research question, a quasi-experimental design was applied, in which two groups of students were involved, as presented in Table 3.1 below.

Table 3. 1
Experimental design of the present study

Groups	Pretest	Treatment	Posttest
--------	---------	-----------	----------

Experimental	T1 _E	X _E	T2 _E
Control	T1 _C	X _C	T2 _C

E : Experimental

C : Control

T1 : Writing Achievement Pretest

T2 : Writing Achievement Posttest

X_E : Process Approach

X_C : Placebo Treatment

In a quasi-experiment the participants are not randomly assigned due to the nature of human, such as language learning and language behavior (Hatch and Farhady, 1982). In this study, due to school requirements, the students could not be assigned to random sampling technique. Only two classes were assigned to be the participants of the present study.

To answer the second research question, the qualitative design was applied, especially to examine the development of the students' drafts across the stages of the process approach. Finally, the third research question was dealt with by employing a descriptive-quantitative procedure to examine the responses to the questionnaire.

3.3 Setting and Participants

The present study was undertaken at a junior high school in Bandung Barat district, West Java, Indonesia. The school organized three grades, including the seventh grade, eighth grade, and ninth grade. Each grade included more than one class or group. The present study was conducted in the eighth grade, which had four classes with different number of students in every class. Two classes that were chosen as the sample of this study, based on some considerations, had 25 students each.

English is one of the compulsory subjects at junior high schools in Indonesia. English is taught in all semesters. For eighth graders, English has been taught for about four semesters, two semesters in the seventh grade and two semesters in the eighth grade. In a week English is taught in four credit hours, and each lasts for 40 minutes, in accordance with the Regulation of the Minister of National Education No.22 dated 23 March 2006 (cited in

UNESCO-IBE 2011). As stated in the curriculum, narrative texts become one of texts taught to the eighth graders.

The school was chosen because it was possible to conduct a quasi-experiment there since the school organized more than one class or group of the eighth graders. The permission was obtained after intensive communication with the school management and the English teacher. In this case, it is important that feasibility of a study becomes one of the factors to be considered (Mackey & Gass, 2005, p. 19).

3.4 Data Collection

The data of the present study included the students' test scores (pretest and posttest), the students' drafts, and the students' responses to the questionnaire. The students' test scores were gained by conducting a pretest prior to the implementation of the process approach and a posttest after the implementation of the process approach. The students' drafts were gained during the implementation of the process approach. Finally, the questionnaire was distributed after the implementation of the process approach.

The implementation of the process approach at the school started at the end of September to November 2015. The teaching program was run twice a week for both the experimental and control groups. It was held every Monday and Tuesday, according to the normal schedule of the two classes that had been provided by the school.

The experimental group of this study participated in teaching processes which was organized based on the stages of the process approach. Meanwhile, the control group learnt to write narrative texts with the usual strategies normally applied by the English teacher in the school (called as placebo treatment, see Hatch and Farhady, 1982). The materials used in the present study involved syllabus, lesson plans, worksheets, charts, and some written as well as oral instructions to help the students of the groups learn how to write a personal narrative text (see appendix 2). According to the lesson plans, the groups had five sessions, each of which lasting 40 to 80 minutes or one to two meetings. In short, this study took around ten meetings for teaching program. One meeting was conducted earlier as pilot study, two other meetings for pretest (before the teaching program) and posttest (after the program), and another

meeting for administering questionnaires (see table 4.14: Schedule of Program Implementation).

3.4.1 Instruments

As mentioned above, the data of the present study were collected by conducting a pretest and a posttest in order to find the differences before and after the treatment was given. In addition, the students' portfolios (writing drafts) were also analyzed in order to see the students' development through the stages of the process approach. Meanwhile, a questionnaire was distributed to the participants in order to gain the data regarding their perspectives towards the use of the process approach during main phase of experiment of this study.

3.4.1.1 Tests

The tests in this study were used to answer the research question number 1 which tries to figure out the effectiveness of process approach to improve the students' writing ability in writing narrative texts. The test instruments, including those of the pretest and posttest, directed the students to write their own narrative texts. The instructions for the pretest and posttest were identical. In the tests, the students were given a piece of paper which directed them to write an experience they had in the past in narrative form (see appendix A). An additional spoken explanation was given to ensure that they did the test as expected. After having the test, the students' works were scored based on a rating scale adapted from ProQuest Information and Learning Company (2015), which scores five areas of the structure of personal narrative texts. The scale includes introduction (10 points), body (organizes idea 10 points, descriptive details 10 points, first-person point of view 10 points), and conclusion (note/value 10 points).

The students' narrative texts were scored by two raters. Rater 1 and rater 2 were trained to assess narrative texts by using Cohen's Kappa. It was done due to the importance of having reliable scores from both raters, whether or not by using the same criteria of scoring, the two raters shared typical scores for each of the students' texts (Heaton, 1990).

3.4.1.2 Students' Portfolios

The students' portfolios which consisted of all of their worksheets, were used to answer the first research question of the present study in qualitative way. It focuses on how the process approach contributes to the students' development in writing narrative texts. The collection of students' portfolios in the form of students' worksheets and drafts of narrative texts were collected during the implementation of the process approach. A number of meetings were conducted to apply the treatment, in which the students were taught to write a personal narrative text by using the process approach. Data from this instrument were collected in ten meetings (main phase/ teaching-learning activities) excluding pretest and posttest. In other words, around thirteen meetings were carried out in this study, excluding pilot test and adaptation sessions (see Chapter IV: Teaching Program Implementation). Preliminary study was also conducted to support the validity of the study. During preliminary phase, instruments were organized, lesson plans and all of the learning aids as the components of materials were prepared, the assignment of groups (control group and experimental group) were conducted, and pretest was administered in this phase, too. In the main phase, the treatment was applied to the experimental group. Meanwhile, posttest and questionnaire belong to closing phase of this study.

3.4.1.3 Questionnaire

A questionnaire was used to find out the attitude of the students toward the use of process approach as formulated in the second research question of the present study. The questionnaire were formulated into 47 close-ended items in the form of Likert-type scale, which omitted "neutral" in its option (see Oskamp & Schultz, 2005, p.51). The 47 items of the questionnaire were developed from the underlying theories of this study, mostly from the theory of process approach in teaching writing. In addition, the items of the questionnaire were classified into three elements of attitude as proposed by Oskamp & Schultz (2005) namely affective, behavioral, and cognitive. Furthermore, the validity of the items were tested through expert judgment. The statements of the items were provided in *Bahasa Indonesia* to

help the students understand the content fully. The provided options were labelled as SS (*Sangat setuju*) if they strongly agree, S (*Setuju*) if they agree, TS (*Tidak setuju*) if they disagree, and STS (*Sangat tidak setuju*) if they strongly disagree (see appendix 12: Questionnaire).

3.4.2 Data Collection Procedures

3.4.2.1 The Preliminary Phase

This part elaborates the stage of preparation of the study before collecting the data. In this phase, instruments (test items both for pretest and posttest) were organized, lesson plans were created to be a guidance during the application of the treatment, materials were prepared to support the treatment, and the students were assigned to the control group and experimental groups.

3.4.2.1.1 Preparing the research instruments

As mentioned above, pretest and posttest are part of the instruments of the present study. The test items were therefore prepared with reference to the research problems. Since they were in form of writing test, in which students were asked to write a composition in form of personal narrative text, the test items included a brief and detailed instruction that was stated descriptively in written form. According to Heaton (1988), this kind of instruction will result in more realistic and natural writing, and it makes the task more meaningful and purposeful (pp.138-143). Thus, it is very important to have a clear and detailed writing instruction in the instruments.

3.4.2.1.2 Preparing lesson plans and materials

The next step was arranging lesson plans for both the control class and experimental class. Five lesson plans were prepared for each group as there were five sessions of teaching for

each group (giving experimental treatment to the experimental group and placebo treatment to the control group). The lesson plans were prepared with reference to the current regulation, especially with regard to the format.

Not only lesson plans but also learning materials were also prepared to support the teaching-learning processes. They included handouts, special written instructions, narrative model text to be acknowledged while they were learning the structure of personal narrative texts, and charts for the ice breaking stage in the teaching process to help the students focus on the topic to be introduced (lesson plans and materials are attached in appendix 2- 6). These materials were developed in accordance with the nature of the process approach (for the experimental group) and the teaching strategies that were usually applied by the school teacher (for the control group).

3.4.2.1.3 Assigning students to the control and experimental groups

Students, as the participants of the sample of the study, were treated differently according to which group they belonged to. The student grouping was organized by considering what was going on in the school academic environment. The school principal and the English teacher of the eighth-grade students assigned two classes out of three classes to be involved in this study. The choice of the two groups was based mainly on the learning schedule of those two groups so that the learning environment was not interrupted in terms of schedule. One of the two learning groups were later assigned as the experimental group and the other as the control group.

3.4.2.1.4 Administering the pretest

In this phase, the two groups were directed to have the pretest. The test was a writing test containing a clear and detailed instruction in form of description of what the student have to write. Heaton (1988) believes that giving meaningful situation in form of brief description of a real-life situation in composition test should be done (p.137). In contrast, giving students a no guidance instruction of a test item should be avoided whenever possible. In addition a brief

oral explanation was delivered before the students took the test to ensure that they understood what to do in the test.

3.4.2.2 The Main Phase

Teaching personal narrative by using students' personal experience was the main phase of this study. In other words, the main phase of this present study is the process of giving the treatment by using the process approach. According to the plan, there were ten sessions for each group in this phase. Every session lasted for 2x40 minutes (see appendix 2: lesson plan).

3.4.2.3 The Closing Phase

After the two groups of students were involved in the teaching-learning processes, they were directed to have a posttest in which its item was the one that had been used for the pretest. It was the same test item. The purpose of doing this is to measure the achievement of the students, i.e. whether or not there was a progress in the students' ability after being taught to write personal narrative texts by using their personal experience. During this closing phase, a questionnaire was also distributed to the participants in order to gain the data regarding the perspectives of the students about the treatment which had been given in this study. After all of the data were obtained, the next step was analyzing the data, as discussed in Section 3.5 that follows.

3.5 Data Analysis

As discussed in the previous section, the data of the present study include test results, the students' portfolios, and the students' responses to the questionnaire. The data were analyzed in different ways according to the nature of each type of the data. The test results were analyzed through statistical examination. The students' portfolios were examined qualitatively

to see the progress in the students' work. Finally, responses to the questionnaire were analyzed through descriptive quantification to see trends in the students' responses concerning their opinion about the application of process approach in the teaching-learning processes.

3.5.1 Test Results

The data gained through the pretest and posttest (i.e. test scores) were analyzed quantitatively through statistical examination. First, some steps were taken to arrive at the final score of each student since the present study employed two raters to examine the quality of the students' writing. The students' texts were measured by the two raters by using a rubric, which involved five aspects (see figure 2: Writing Rubric for Narrative Text). After the students' scores from both the pretest and posttest of the two groups were scored by each rater, the agreement between the two raters was analyzed through the examination of interrater reliability.

After that, some quantitative measures were taken leading to the use of a t-test to examine the effectiveness of process approach in improving the students' writing skill. These include the tests of normality and the homogeneity of variance. These tests were necessary to decide on the analysis procedures to be applied, i.e. whether it should be parametric or nonparametric. It was found that the scores were normally distributed and homogeneous and therefore a parametric procedure was used, i.e. a t test. The t-test was employed to find out the difference between two groups of scores. The t-test results were used to draw a conclusion on the effectiveness of process approach in improving the students' writing ability. The t-test computation was carried out using SPSS 20 software application.

3.5.2 Students' Portfolios

Documentation of the students' portfolios included their personal narrative texts and some supporting works were used to examine the students' writing development during program. This analysis explored the development of students during the implementation of the program. The analysis focused on six students' texts representing high achievers, moderate achievers, and low achievers. Each of the categories included two students' sample texts. The analysis

was conducted qualitatively focusing on the generic structure and lexico-grammatical features of the texts in relation to the stages of the process approach.

3.5.3 Questionnaire

At the end of the teaching program, a questionnaire was distributed to all of the participants in experimental group, who had been treated using process approach, with the intention of soliciting their attitude toward the implementation of the process approach. The data which were obtained from this questionnaire were analyzed mainly by using descriptive quantification to see trends in the students' responses concerning their opinion about the application of process approach in the teaching-learning processes.

The questionnaire consists of 47 close-ended items in form of Likert's-type scale (see Oskamp & Schultz, 2005, p.51). The areas of concern raised in the questionnaire included the process approach itself, the teaching of writing, the narrative texts, and the general account of writing. Each statement in the questionnaire was to be rated by the students with regard to the following values: 4=strongly agree, 3=agree, 2=disagree, 1=strongly disagree. The statements were grouped into three components of attitude as proposed by Oskamp & Schultz (2005), which included cognitive (c), behavior (b), and affective (a) aspects, as presented in Table 3.2 as follows.

Table 3.2
Questionnaire Themes

AREAS	ITEM'S NUMBER				
Process Approach in Teaching Writing	Stages of Process Approach				
	Prewriting	Drafting	Revising	Editing	Submitting
	17a, 18c	21b,22a	23a,27b	28a,29c	44c,45a
	Implementation of Process Approach in Writing: 9a, 40b				
	Roles of Teacher in Writing Process: 8a, 26c				
Teaching Writing	Aspects of Writing				
	Content	Organization	Vocabulary	Lang Use	Mechanics
	42b, 43c	13a, 14c	30a, 31c	32c, 38b	33b, 34c
	Students' Needs on Learning Writing				

	Information	Language	Ideas	Patterns and Schemes
	15b, 16c	35b, 36c	19a, 20c	10a, 11c
Narrative Text	Social Function: 4c, 7a			
	Generic Structure: 5c, 6a, 12b			
	Grammatical Features: 37b, 39c			
General Inquiries	Writing in General: 1a, 2b, 3c			
	Writing Personal Narrative: 46a, 47b			

The responses to the items of the questionnaire were coded into Microsoft Excel for statistical analysis to solicit its descriptive statistics. Minimum score along with maximum score were put into continuum ranging from 25 to 100 in accordance with the total number of respondents (N=25, lowest value=1, highest value=4) thereafter. As of minimum score and maximum score, mid score was set to be 62.5 (mid value=2.5). The higher score of students' responses on each item, the more positive their attitudes toward process approach. The scores were transformed into mean scores related back to the values.