

## **CHAPTER III**

### **RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

This chapter discusses the method of this study. It presents the site and respondents, research design, clarification of terms, data collection, instruments, data analysis, and research procedures.

#### **3.1 Site and Respondents**

The participants of this study were fifteen XI grade students in a public senior high school in Bandung. They were chosen as their writing skills are in need to improve.

The study took fifteen students as the participant, thus their written works were analyzed. The students were chosen from higher achiever students, middle achiever students, and low achiever students. They were categorized based on their writing scores administered at the beginning of their class session.

#### **3.2 Research Design**

This study examined the quality of relationship between the implementation of Task-Based Language Teaching and students' improvement in writing ability. Therefore, case study was used as the research design in this study. The reason of using this method was based on the research questions and the purpose of this study that is to get an in-depth understanding of how Task-Based Language Teaching impacts students' writing ability through the analysis of the classroom benefits, writing aspects benefits, and writing strategy benefits, and also to reveal their responses during the writing learning with this approach.

A case study is used to examine a single instance, a phenomenon, or a single unit of human activity (Merriam, 1998, p. 27; Gillham, 2000, p. 1) which has boundaries (Stake, 1995, p. 2) that exists in particular place and time (Gillham, 2000, p. 1). Moreover, Gillham (2000, p. 1-2) suggests that a case study is used to investigate the phenomenon to answer specific research questions that seeks different kinds of evidence in order to get the best possible answer of the research questions. Different kinds of evidence are collected aims to get a sufficient valid data collections (ibid).

In the present study, it is a research design used to examine the benefits gained through the use of task-based language teaching in teaching writing hortatory exposition text at one formal high school in Bandung by taking fifteen students as the participants. Moreover, it also examines the students' responses toward the implementation of task-based language teaching in students' writing process and products.

### **3.3 Clarification of Terms**

To avoid misunderstanding on this study, some terms need to be described:

1. *Task* according to the Merriam-Webster dictionary, task is a piece of work given for someone. In the other side, task is defined as activity carried out in the classroom which has particular goals (Van den Branden, 2006, p. 4; Ellis, 2003, p. 3; Nunan, 2004, p. 4), for meaning-focused rather than form-focused (Ellis, 2003, p. 3; Nunan, 2004, p. 4), and every task should be independent and integrated for each other (Nunan, 2004, p. 4). However, in terms of this study, tasks refer to the sequence of tasks in the form of classroom activity accomplished by the students in order to attain the goal which is to write the hortatory exposition text.

2. *Task-Based Language Teaching* is a teaching approach in which communication is involved in the pedagogical task brought to the class (Nunan, 2004). In this study, Task-Based Language Teaching refers to the approach in the teaching writing hortatory exposition text in which task is used as the main unit in the teaching and learning session.
3. *Hortatory exposition text*. As elaborated before in chapter II, the topic of hortatory exposition text in this study comes up from students in which the teacher stimulates the students by giving some examples and exercises in the form of task.

### **3.4 Data Collection Method**

The data were collected through three instruments; observation, written documents, and interviews. The written documents consist of lesson plans, students' writing works, and writing assessment.

The research was conducted along the regular schedule in the school. The data were collected in three weeks, from 15<sup>th</sup> May 2013 to 29<sup>th</sup> May 2013. During the research, the researcher acted as the teacher. Table 3.1 shows the schedule of the research.

Table 3.1 The Schedule of the Research

No.	Activities	Week			
		1	2	3	4
1.	Preliminary observation	√			
2.	Meeting one (Pre-writing)		√		
3.	Meeting two (Pre-writing)		√		
4.	Meeting third (Draft 1)			√	
5.	Meeting four (Draft 2)			√	
6.	Interviews				√

The instruments used for the data collection are described below:

#### 3.4.1 Classroom Observation

In this study, a classroom observation was carried out to find out the phenomena happened during the implementation of Task-Based Language Teaching approach in the writing class of hortatory exposition text.

Classroom observation was used because the data gained from observation is descriptive rather than evaluative, focuses on behavior rather than on the person, emphasizes sharing information rather than giving advice (Bergquist and Phillip, 1981) which suits the aims of this study. It was carried out in two stages: preliminary observation and participant observation during the

research. Preliminary observation was conducted to gain data about the difficulties faced by the students in learning writing and the method of writing they used to get. Thus, the data was used as the guideline to develop the use of Task-Based Language Teaching in teaching writing hortatory exposition text. The second type of observation during the study is participant observation by directly taking part in the research. Those observation were attained using observation sheets to observe writing situations as presented below

Table 3.2. Observed Writing Situations

	ACTIVITIES	YES	NO
<b>PRE-WRITING</b>	The students were engaged in the activity.		
	The students participated actively in the activity.		
	The students understood and use the target language with ease.		
<b>WRITING</b>	The students understood the writing instruction.		
	The students faced some difficulties on accomplishing the task.		
	The students solved the problem.		
	The students were able to work in group or in pair.		
<b>POST-WRITING</b>	The students comprehended the material.		
	The students are able to transfer the material.		
	The students shared their writings to others.		

Besides observation sheets, teacher field notes were also used during participant observation. These observation instruments presented real-life teaching situations and reflections. Furthermore, students' responses were also observed during the observation. It was analyzed by categorizing the observation sheet and teacher field notes (see Appendix C) into codes. The observation of students' response sheet (see Appendix E) was used to present the data. The sheet includes the detail explanation of activities, tasks, and students' responses. Each response from the students was presented by evidence happened in the class. The categorization of students' responses was based on following criteria (see Appendix E).

Table 3.3. Observed Students' Responses

Writing Progress Procedure	Students' Responses
Prewriting	Enth = Enthusiastic Att = Attractive Re = Reluctant
Writing	Dis = Distracted Sile = Silent
Post-writing	Conf = Confused (+) AS = Longer Attention Span (-) AS = Shorter Attention Span

### 3.4.2 Written Documents



Written document is also one of the instruments which were used to gather the data in order to answer the research questions. The written documents are in the forms of (1) lesson plans and tasks implemented in the activity, (2) observation sheets and teacher's field notes, and (3) students' writing works and the assessment.

The lesson plans and tasks which are implemented during the program (see Appendix A) were analyzed to further determine the class activities during the observation. Observation sheets were analyzed to see the students' responses during the learning session, while the teacher field notes (see Appendix C) were also analyzed to see teacher's perception toward the lesson in the class. The field notes are very useful on qualitative research (Patton, 1990) to comprehend the content analysis from the study of implementing Task-Based Language Teaching approach in teaching writing hortatory exposition text. Lastly, students' writing works and its assessment (see Appendix D) were used to see how the tasks developed their writing.

### **3.4.3 Interviews**

The interview was administered to get deeper information about the implication of task during the writing process. The group interview was conducted to gain more insight from the students. Group interview gives a convenient situation to the students as well as to accumulate the individual knowledge (Brown et al, 1989, p. 40 as cited in Patton, 1990). Therefore, the group interview is more beneficial for the study to get more information regarding the personal experience from the participants

The interview was applied to all participants by using the interview guidelines which consists of ten open questions (see Appendix B). The interview was conducted in Bahasa Indonesia to make them easier to answer the question and to avoid the misconception and misunderstanding. The interview was done in

an informal situation to make the students comfortable to answer the questions. Patton (1990) suggests that informal conversational interview as the most open-ended approach to interviewing since it is highly responsive to individual differences and situational changes.

### **3.5 Data Analysis**

The data from observation, interview, and written documents then were analyzed. The analysis of each instrument will be presented in a form of descriptive explanation. The data gained from the three instruments were cross-checked using triangulation to enhance research reliability and validity (Vidovich, 2003). In line with the statement, Denzin (1970) in Patton (1990) suggests that triangulation is useful to overcome the intrinsic bias that comes from single-method, single-observe, and single-theory studies.

#### **3.5.1 Observation**

In analyzing the data, videos were used to get deeper comprehension of the class activities, especially the writing activities. It was also used to capture the real situation in the class, and to support the data from observation sheets and teacher field notes. Then, the video was played back for times. Some notes were written based on the students' behavior (see Appendix C). After that, those notes were interpreted into categories (see Appendix E) to address the research questions. The results of analysis will be described comprehensively with the literature in Chapter 4.

#### **3.5.2 Written Documents**



To fully understand the situation from any aspects, lesson plans and tasks implemented (Appendix A), observation sheets and teacher field notes (Appendix C), and students' writing works and its assessment (Appendix D) were used to get richer data.

In analyzing the lesson plan, the lesson activities were the basis to see the sequences between each activity to support students' writing process. By doing this, it can be seen how the effect of task implemented in students' writing process of hortatory exposition text was.

Teacher field notes were very useful to acquire teacher's standpoint in carrying out the lesson plan. Moreover, teacher field notes also acquire what should be evaluated and improved from the lesson. To fully understand the field notes, having read for several times, it was categorized into several aspects related to the research question (see Appendix E). Then the findings were paired with relevant theories.

The last written document was students' writing works. It was analyze to grasp how well the tasks developed students' writing works. After that, the analysis of students' works was written and assessed based on criteria from writing assessment rubric adapted from Jacob (1981 as cited in Weigle 2002). The rubric contains five aspects of writing; content, organization, language use, vocabulary, and mechanics.

The data gained from this instrument is very informative to support the data from the group interview. As a final point, those data were associated with appropriate literature which is presented in the next chapter.

### **3.5.3 Data Analysis of Interviews**

The interview was analyzed using transcript-based analysis which was analyzed alongside the field notes made by the interviewer (Onwuegbuzie et al,

2009). The data gained from the group interview were recorded using voice-recorder. To analyze the data, firstly, the interview was transcribed. After that, the data was interpreted into some main issues based on the research questions: the use of tasks and students' responses. The final step was by linking those data to proper literature, which is presented in the next chapter.

Furthermore, there is no framework to analyze the group interview data (Onwuegbuzie et al, 2009). Therefore, this study used classical content analysis technique to analyze the data more deeply. This technique lets the data to be divided into several chunks, coded, then grouped into each topic (Onwuegbuzie et al, 2009). In addition, if there were any imitative response during the interview, the amounts of verbal or nonverbal response from the students related to the interview were counted and noted.

The results of data analysis from observation, written documents, and interview were triangulated. Those data then were compared and were matched to see the relationships. By triangulating the data, the events or facts of case study have been supported by more than single source of evidence (Yin, 2003). Triangulation strengthens the reliability and the internal validity especially in terms of using multiple methods of data collection and analysis (Merriam, 1998).

### **3.6 Research Procedures**

The explanation of how the implementation of the task-based language teaching during the program is explained below.

#### **3.6.1 Teacher's Activity before the Program**

Before the research was begun, the researcher, the teacher prepared the lesson by following points proposed by Paul (2003):

*a) The core targets for the lesson*

The general target of the lesson was to provide the students with a writing space that they can express their ideas through written products in English. Furthermore, it was intended to give stimulus to the students in order to keep them engaged in the writing activity conducted. At the end of the program, the teacher would like to find out the students' development in following writing aspects: content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanics; and how the tasks given influenced their writing process.

*b) The equipment and lesson material that will be needed*

Since the main equipment of the lesson was task, the teacher provided various kinds of tasks in order to achieve the lesson objectives. The forms of tasks depending on the topic that was given in each meeting and the lesson objectives (see Appendix A). The tasks were usually in the form of worksheet and games.

Regarding the materials and tasks, the researcher chose the materials that were closely related to students' daily life. Moreover, the chosen tasks were conducted by considering the lesson objectives and the practicality in terms of time. After choosing the materials and deciding the tasks would be given, the researcher started to design the lesson plan (see Appendix A) and prepared the teaching media (tasks) which was made based on the lesson plan (also see Appendix A).

In the classroom activities, the teacher also used another media such as Power Point slides show and pictures to support the activity.

*c) The activities that will be used*

In general, the technique used in the teaching activity was three-phase technique, namely pre-activity, main activity, and post-activity. Specifically in writing teaching technique, the activity phases were based on the line: prewriting, writing, post-writing. Those phases used tasks as the main unit in the activity. The activity was begun with a review activity presented in the form of writing task to

refresh the students' mind and to show them that the lesson related to the previous one.

In every meeting, the teacher conducted the prewriting, writing, and post-writing activities. The post-writing activity was conducted to see the students' comprehension about each meeting's material. Journal books were provided by the teacher for students to write their works which further became students' writing documentation. Students' works were compiled in order to see their development in writing by each meeting during the program.

### **3.6.2 Teacher and Students' Activities: Implementing the Lesson**

In implementing the lesson, the teacher used stages of writing proposed by Gebhard (1983 as cited in O'Malley and Pierce, 1996) as follows. These stages were implemented to the all meetings, which falls into the following stages:

1. *Prewriting* includes motivation, discussion, and concept development. Firstly, the teacher started the lesson by telling the students what they were going to learn as well as the goals of the lesson of each meeting. After that, the teacher provided games in order to raise students' enthusiasm. The games also were provided to introduce the students with the vocabularies they were going to find on the text, so they could comprehend the text well and would be at ease in the writing activity. The tasks provided in this stage were mostly ice breaking tasks or reviewing tasks. It was to give motivation and develop students' comprehension.
2. *Writing* includes the writing activity in classroom. The teacher did not provide writing activity at home to prevent the possibility of copying friend's work. This stage required the students to rewrite a text given and write freely about particular thing they were interested in. The topic of the texts written by the students mostly related to their daily life such as 'The Negative Effects of Smoking for Students', 'The Negative Effects of Having Girlfriend', etc.

3. *Post-writing* includes activity when the students shared their writing with others and told to the class about the lesson's conclusion. This session was used usually for discussing and telling to the class about the lesson. It was to make sure that the students comprehended the materials well. Moreover, if there was still much time left, this session was used by some students to share their writing to their classmates.

The following is the summary table of the lesson conducted during the observations:

Table 4.1 Lesson Summary

Meeting	Topic	Lesson Objective	Task
1	Welcome to the house of hortatory exposition!	to write a hortatory exposition text (first writing) by choosing one out of three topics provided	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Game namely "Run for You Life in Clockwise.</li><li>• Two worksheets were provided.</li></ul>
2	Let's build the foundation!	to write an outline (1 <sup>st</sup> draft) with particular topic that they decide and choose by themselves	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Pictures were used in the first task.</li><li>• Three worksheets were provided as the follow up of the previous task.</li></ul>
3	Let's start building the house!	to write the 2 <sup>nd</sup> draft of their writing that is to elaborate the outline they made in the previous meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Pictures were used in the first task.</li><li>• A worksheet followed as the next activity.</li></ul>



4	Welcome to our new house!	to write the final writing of hortatory exposition text	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Game namely “Snatch and Get a Heart”.</li> <li>• A worksheet followed as the final activity.</li> </ul>
<b>Note :</b> The tasks implemented were based on the lesson objectives. See Appendix A for further details.			

The tasks implemented in the teaching writing were interdependence to each other. It was conducted based on the following steps (Nunan, 2004, p. 126):

*a) Processing (comprehension)*

This step was carried out in the first meeting. The teacher introduced the material that was hortatory exposition text in the form of chained tasks. The initial task focused its purposes as the ice-breaking and motivated tasks. The teacher managed the task as kinesthetic task to keep the students feeling fresh since the class was conducted in afternoon.

This step focused on the comprehension achievement. It also used top-down method. Firstly, the teacher introduced the vocabularies that the students might find in the text provided for the first meeting. In this task, the students showed their enthusiasm and they became very attractive to know what they would get afterwards. After that, the students worked in pair to answer questions regarding the text in the form of worksheet. An analogy of house was used to ease the students comprehend the concept of hortatory exposition well (see Appendix A).

*b) Productive*



The tasks focused its purpose to facilitate students' needs to express their ideas through writing. The use of tasks was also to help students reach their learning goals and achievements specifically to be able to write hortatory exposition text. This step was also delivered to the students in the first meeting.

*c) Interactive*

In this step, the students started to write freely. They shared information about some problems that closely related to their life in small groups and some were in pairs (see Appendix A). They brainstormed the ideas by listing the problems and the causes why it happened (also see Appendix A). The teacher put the role as a facilitator and actively gave feedback to the students' works.

In the present study, the development of the task was based on Nunan's (2004) framework while in implementing the lesson; Gebhard's (1983) framework of writing stages was used.