

## **CHAPTER III RESEARCH METHOD**

This chapter elaborates a set of methodology including research design, research site and participants, data collection and data analysis. Each will be explained as follows.

### **3.1 Research Design**

This study aims to investigate the implementation of Reading to Learn (R2L) in the teaching writing of hortatory exposition text and to identify the improvements as a result of the process. Thus, this study does not much depend on pre-test and post-test result rather it inquires how the program is implemented and what improvements can be identified. To accomplish the purposes, a qualitative method was applied. This study can be characterized as a qualitative since the researcher focuses on the process or implementation of a program (Hamied, 2017) and has face-to-face interaction, often over time (Creswell, 2014). In addition, the research questions of this study are accentuated in the form of open-ended as suggested by Ohman (2005) that in qualitative study, the questions are open-ended leading “informants to tell their stories”.

This study also has similar features to a case study. First, case study is suitable when research questions attempt to explain some current circumstance (e.g. how or why some social phenomenon works) (Yin, 2014). Like a case study, the research question addressed in this study is how R2L is implemented as choice of research methodology is determined by the kind of research question that a study tries to address (Shavelton and Towne, 2002).

Second, case study as defined by Yin (2009) is “empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon or a case set within its real life context”. Its focus is on “one particular instance of educational experience or practice” (Freebody, 2003) such as the teaching program, in which “the researcher acted as teacher” (Stake, 1995).

Third, case study suggests multiple data by employing multiple data collection methods, “such data are collected in real life setting” (Yin, 1993; Hamied, 2017). Relevant with a case study, this study does not rely on single source of data, rather it applies multiple data collection technique including teaching observations, documents of the students’ hortatory exposition texts to enhance the construct validity of the study (Yin, 1993, p. 39-40).

### **3.2 Research Site**

The study was conducted in one of state senior high school in Cimahi. Concerning previous related studies, several of which focused on the implementation of R2L in Indonesia were carried out in the context of higher and vocational school level. Thus, to fill the gap, this study was undertaken in the scope of middle school to teach hortatory exposition text.

Furthermore, since R2L to some degrees has proved effective in improving students’ literacy from disadvantaged and at risk schools (McRae et al, 2000), the selection of research site was targeted to a school whose academic achievements was deemed low to moderate level. The selected school in this study has admitted that they have less numbers of students passing SNMPTN (State University National Entrance Selection) each year compared with other state schools in Cimahi. This SNMPTN much depends on students’ academic achievement indicating that the school has yet to generate students’ successful academic output. Therefore, it is intriguing to conduct R2L program in that school to obviously identify the students’ enhancements in writing of hortatory exposition text.

### **3.3 Participant**

#### **3.3.1 Participant Observer**

One of common sources of evidence in doing case study is participant observations (e.g. sharing activities) (Hamied, 2017) in which “observation role secondary to participant role” (Creswell, 2014). Duff (2008) claimed that “in participant observation, the researcher plays another social role for instance as

student, teacher, or co-worker, a co-participant within the local culture”. In this study, participant observation was executed with the researcher’s role as the teacher. Since R2L was implemented in a natural class setting, participant observation was deemed appropriate in this study to gather data on interactions through the recording of behavior, conversation, and experience (Van Maneen, 1995).

Although the researcher is not the school teacher, she has worked in a private educational institution, in which many students from the selected school participated, for about 4 years. Thus, it is considered sufficient for her to have some knowledge about the students’ ability, background, and characteristic to more easily arrange the program properly.

The researcher obtained her bachelor degree majoring English Literature and is currently completing a master’s degree on English Education Department at Indonesian University of Education. Previously, she has learned about Systemic Functional Linguistics in Functional Grammar subject she took as theoretical foundation in this study.

### **3.3.2 Student Participants**

The participants of this study were a class of eleventh grade students. The selection of the class is to do with two considerations. First, the class was recommended to be sample because of the students’ achievement. This class was considered less excellent by the school teacher. Second, the class was deemed the most appropriate sampling due to time feasibility. Furthermore, sampling itself is defined as a group of individuals who are able to conveniently participate in the study (Fraenkel and Wallen, 2007).

Within the class, there were focus participants consisted of six students who represented low, middle, and high achieved learners. They were chosen based on their writing abilities in diagnostic test and their focused participations in the program compared with the other students. The names of the students mentioned in this study are pseudonym. They are Yanuar and Adi from low group, Zahrani and Dewi from middle group as well as Salsa and Wenty from high group. The class was also studying hortatory exposition at that time, yet the learning process

has just been held once, so that was the right time to implement Reading to Learn to identify their improvements in learning and writing the text.

### **3.4 Data Collection Techniques**

The process of collecting data in this study was conducted through teaching observation, collecting the students' writing of hortatory exposition texts, and interview.

#### **3.4.1 Teaching Observation**

The implementation of Reading to Learn in the teaching hortatory exposition text was carried out started from February 28<sup>th</sup> until March 15<sup>th</sup> 2018. There are nine sessions held in five meeting. To begin with, a questionnaire was distributed and a diagnostic test was arranged to obtain information on how far students could write the text in proper and their familiarity toward hortatory exposition text as the genre focus in this study.

There are four stages in which each contains some strategies embodied in this program. The first stage is called Preparing for Reading whose purpose is to read a source text to give background information about an issue. The strategies employed include reading source text paragraph by paragraph, highlighting and discussing key information, and making notes. However, to make the teaching more attractive, the source text was replaced into some funny videos about the issue discussed as the teaching media.

The second stage, Detailed Reading is set to enable the students to read the text with complete understanding and to recognize evaluative language patterns. The strategies conducted were understanding paragraph from model argument and highlighting evaluative language pattern. Meanwhile, the third stage namely Joint Rewriting aims to practice writing evaluative language to persuade the readers. The strategy was that the students tried to make their argument related to the issue using the elaboration of words or paraphrased sentences.

The final stage is Joint Construction aimed to write well organized, persuasive text. The students were supposed to write hortatory exposition text according to what have been executed in the previous stages. After this session, observation field notes were written. This notes contained all interactions happened during the learning activities and were related to interaction move types promoted in R2L (Rose, 2016d; p.4). Those are:

- Query : teacher asks a question without preparing (or students ask question)
- Prepare : teacher provides information to enable successful responses.
- Identify : students identify element in a text.
- Select : students select elements from experience.
- Affirm : teacher affirms students' responses.
- Reject : teacher rejects response by negating, ignoring or qualifying it.
- Elaborate : define new terms, explain new concepts or relate to experience (by the teacher or through discussion with students).
- Instruct : teacher directs an activity.

The summary of teaching observation activities is shown in the following table.

Table 3.1  
Summary of Teaching Observation

No.	Date and Time Allocation	Stages of R2L	Activities
1.	February 28 <sup>th</sup> ; 90 minutes	Diagnostic Test	The students were required to complete a questionnaire and to write a hortatory exposition text with the topic chosen namely social media.
2.	March 4 <sup>th</sup> ; 45 minutes	Preparing for Reading	I distributed a worksheet and provided some videos related to the issue. The students watched the videos.

3.	March 4 <sup>th</sup> ; 45 minutes	Preparing for Reading	The students and I discussed the issue promoted in the videos guided by the worksheet on hand.
4.	March 11 <sup>th</sup> ; 45 minutes	Detailed Reading	The students were given an example model of hortatory exposition text. The students read paragraph by paragraph while I supported them by describing the field of each paragraph. I then explained lexico-grammatical features of the text.
5.	March 11 <sup>th</sup> ; 45 minutes	Detailed Reading	The students recognized and highlighted the language features of the text. Both I and the students discussed the result.
6.	March 14 <sup>th</sup> ; 45 minutes	Joint Rewriting	The students practice to make their own argument sentences about social media using the rephrasing words.
7.	March 14 <sup>th</sup> ; 45 minutes	Joint Rewriting	I supported the students to make argument through rephrased sentence
8.	March 15 <sup>th</sup> ; 45 minutes	Joint Construction	The students wrote a well-organized hortatory exposition with the topic given
9.	March 15 <sup>th</sup> ; 45 minutes	Interview	-

### 3.4.2 Students' Hortatory Exposition Texts

This data collection aims to reveal whether the implementation of Reading to Learn could fill the gap among the low, middle and high achieved students (Rose, 2016a). The students' texts were submitted twice in which before and after implementing the program. The first collection functions as diagnostic test to measure how well the students write the texts and to identify the major problems encountered by them in writing the texts. On the contrary, the second one served as the output after undertaking the teaching program. In the final stage, all students were required to write hortatory exposition text with the topic provided.

### 3.4.3 Interview

The last data collection technique applied in this study was semi-structured interview. It was arranged to ensure subjective responses from people concerning certain situation or phenomenon they have experienced (McIntosh & Morse, 2015). The interview was scheduled after the students finished their writing in the last stage. Only were six focus students interviewed to find out their opinions about the implementation of Reading to Learn in the teaching writing of hortatory exposition texts particularly about the improvements they had as a result of participating the program. The interview was conducted in the form of open-ended questions using Bahasa as the language instruction to allow them express what they thought in more free way. As warned by Morse and Field (1996) that the researchers undertaking a research interview should not focus their role with that of talk show host, instead they should think of the interview as “an intimate and personal sharing of a confidence with a trusted friend.”

### **3.5 Data Analysis Techniques**

Data gained from the data collection techniques were identified to answer the research questions using framework underlying this study. Data analysis for each source of data will be elaborated as follows.

#### **3.5.1 Analysis of Teaching Observation**

Data from the R2L stages were analyzed to answer the first research question. Relying on audio and video recording, the data were transcribed, coded, categorized and interpreted based on R2L framework. The data were coded using R2L type of interaction moves as formerly explained, were categorized based on the R2L stages, and were interpreted according to R2L strategies (Rose, 2016a; 2016b, 2016d). Therefore, it is assumed that the result of this data analysis was able to answer the question of how is R2L implemented in the teaching of hortatory exposition text in the context of Indonesian middle school.

#### **3.5.2 Analysis of Students' Hortatory Exposition Texts**

To answer the second research question, these data were identified based on the theory of R2L and SFL. The data were sought to trace the students' improvements before and after implementing the program. These students' writing was particularly assessed using R2L assessment criteria for argumentative genre comprised of context, discourse, grammar, and graphic features (Rose, 2016c). Accordingly, the criteria enabled the researcher to find the students' weakness and strength in writing hortatory exposition text.

### **3.5.3 Analysis of Interview**

This data analysis was used to answer the first and the second research question. The data recorded were then transcribed, categorized, and interpreted to support the prior data from teaching observation and students' writing exemplars. The analysis result showed the students' perception both in participating this program and toward their developments in writing hortatory exposition text.