CHAPTER III
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

Chapter two has explained the literature of this study, including the nature of critical literacy, basic principles of critical literacy, models of critical literacy, and the benefit as well as challenges in implementing critical literacy approach. This chapter provides a detailed explanation of the research methodology. The discussion is begun with the research questions and followed by an explication of the research design, setting, participants, data collections and analysis.

This study was aimed at identifying and describing the impact of a critical literacy teaching program through narrative text towards students' critical literacy ability. Besides, it is also aimed to find benefits as well as challenges during the implementation of critical literacy teaching program. Based on the purposes of this study, the study addresses the following research questions:

1. How does the teacher assist junior high school students to be critically literate through the teaching of narrative text?
2. What are the benefits and challenges found in promoting critical literacy through narrative text based on teacher and students' perspectives?

3.2 Research Design

Relevant to the research questions above, the present study employed a qualitative design. The study also aims to answer the questions 'how' or 'what' and involve several words instead of a number, as data for analysis (Patton & Cochran, 2002). Regarding this, the study focused on investigating one case focusing on the integration of critical literacy in one class of one junior high school. In this research, students' critical literacy abilities are taken as a point of departure with

Hikmah Nur Insani , **2013** **PROMOTING STUDENTS' CRITICAL LITERACY THROUGH NARRATIVE TEXT**
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia | repository.upi.edu |

perpustakaan.upi.edu

23

regards to their position in relation to the 2013 curriculum which encourage learners to be critical thinkers.

Moreover, the present research is also characterized as practitioner research, a branch of action research methodologies which is commonly used in educational context (Menter, Elliot, Hulme, Lewin, Lowden, 2011). Practitioner research is defined as a research such as evaluation performed by individuals who also work in a professional field as full-time academic researcher (Campbell, 2011). It is further stated that this study was called as practitioner research because the researcher in this study played her role as a teacher who taught the teaching program for seven meetings through four resources model (Luke & Freebody, 1999; Fraenkel and Wallen, 2008).

Furthermore, practitioner research involves two main procedures which consist of examination and reflection (Carmichael & Miller, 2006). Those main procedures encourage the students or learners to be familiar with the concept of this study so that the students can accomplish the examination process through several learning activities and help the researcher to elaborate the data in reflection phase. It is supported by Campbell (2013) who stated that practitioner research provides a dynamic interaction in the classroom between teachers and students. It is believed that practitioner research becomes the most appropriate approach during this study.

3.3 Research Site

In order to gather the expected data, this study was conducted at a private junior high school located in Bandung, West Java Province. The selection of this school was based on three reasons. Firstly, a junior high school was selected because, in Indonesian junior high school, critical literacy has not been widely implemented in the teaching and learning process. While in fact, critical literacy is known as a proper approach to be implemented in a junior high school level (Bobkina & Stefanova, 2016). The implementation of critical in junior high school has been conducted in many countries such as Korea (Shin & Crookes, 2009), Africa (Prinsloo & Janks, 2002), Greece (Papadopoulos & Griva, 2017), Chinese (Liu, 2017) and Hongkong (Wong et al., 2006). Secondly, this school is selected by

considering the feasibility factors (McMillan & Schumacher, 2001). The schools and participants were accessible which give benefits for the researcher in managing the effectiveness of the present study including some factors such as time, financial, and energy invested. Third, this school is selected since the school belong to one of favourite private schools which potentially to have students who are more competitive, have better English proficiency, and critical literacy teaching can be implemented. By looking to those reasons, it is assumed that this school enables the teaching and learning process which is more focus on promoting students' critical literacy capacity through narrative text.

3.4 Research Participants

Moreover, the participants of this study are eight graders class with 18 students in the private school in Bandung. Students in grade eight of junior high school students were chosen since they have learned more genre texts than seventh-grade students. However, this study only focused on six participants to get in depth observation and data which consist of three male students and three female students. Based on the preliminary study, the participants in this study fulfilled the criteria and standards of the research. It is supported by Fraenkel and Wallen (2008) who stated that a researcher may choose participants through her personal judgment.

Therefore, there are two reasons why sort participants are chosen. The first reason is that the students are encouraged to develop their critical thinking towards their environment in this age (Freire, 2005). It means that they were able to share several responses related to the topic of narrative texts in this study. Moreover, they were selected purposively by the assumption that they are 'rich of information', especially related to critical literacy (Cresswell, 2012). The second reason is related to significance of the study where critical literacy practices are expected to develop students' critical literacy ability through narrative texts. By looking into the aforementioned reasons, year 8 provided more possibilities to explore and research the incorporation of critical literacy into the English teaching program.

In terms of writing style, this study uses pronoun "I" since the writer also acted as the teacher during the classroom observation. It is believed that academic writing can be the representative of the writer in the data gained (Hyland, 2002).

3.5 Data Collection

In order to investigate how students, respond critically to the selected narrative text, this research applied four resources models of critical literacy that proposed by Luke and Freebody (1999). In collecting the data, the study used techniques: classroom observations which will be converted to video recording transcription, focus group interview, students' reflective learning journal, teacher's field notes, and students' critical responses. Each of technique is explained below:

3.5.1 Classroom Observation

To understand how the teacher, assist junior high school student in promoting their critical literacy ability through narrative text, the classroom observation was considered became one such prominent process to gain 'holistic description' (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2008). It is supported by Cohen (2007) who stated that the classroom observations provide the researcher to gain direct and 'live' data naturally. In addition, the observations also covered students' behaviour, actions, and communication patterns (Hamied, 2017). It was conducted to help the researcher to gain appropriate data regarding particular elements of critical literacy that implemented in this study.

The classroom observations in this study involved video recording and field notes during the teaching and learning process. To answer the research questions, the classroom observation was conducted in seven meetings, 70 minutes for each. Furthermore, the classroom observations implemented four resources models that proposed by Luke and Freebody (1999) which consists of code breaker, meaning maker/text participant, text user, and text analyst. The time schedule of classroom observation is explained in the table below.

Table 3.1
Classroom observation's schedules

Meetings	Date	Topic lessons	Instruments
1	23rd July 2018	A narrative text entitled "The Rabbit and the Turtle" Topic: Don't be arrogant	
2	25th July 2018	Continued: The rabbit and the Turtle Topic: Don't be arrogant	
3	26th July 2018	A narrative text entitled "The Bear and the Two Friends" Topic: friendship	
4	27th July 2018	A narrative text entitled "Two Cats and the Monkey" Topic: Friendship	Video recording, teacher field notes, students' critical responses, and students' reflective learning journal.
5	30th July 2018	A narrative text entitled "The Ugly Duckling" Topic: Be confident!	
6	1st August 2018	Continued: The Ugly Duckling Topic: Be confident!	
7	2nd August 2018	A narrative text entitled "The Father, the Son, and the Donkey. Topic: We cannot satisfy everyone.	
8	8 3rd August 2018	Interview	Focus group interview

3.5.2 Students' Reflective Learning Journal

The second instrument used in this study was students' reflective learning journal. A reflective journal is known as a good writing practice (Harmer, 2007) and a way to promote critical consciousness (Ghahremani-ghajar & Mirhosseini, 2005). The reflective journal also encourages students' interest and difficulties in learning critical literacy (Emilia, 2005). The use of reflective journals in this study was meant to explore students' critical reflections towards the teaching and learning process (Izadinia & Abednia, 2010). In the teaching and learning activities, I asked the participants to write reflective journals at the end of the lesson in each meeting. It is also indicated as an essential form of data for assessing students' responses to the implementation of critical literacy approach. Furthermore, reflective journal in this study also used to find out students' opinion towards the critical literacy learning process. It also gained information about students' feeling and opinion to what they know, what they have learned, and what they want to know after the lesson.

3.5.3 Students' Critical Responses

The third data gained from students' critical responses. During the observations, the students submitted three individual responses and two group responses that are related with critical literacy learning process through narrative text. Those critical responses encouraged students to answer and give their critical responses by answering open-ended questions individually and write a new version of story. The individual responses covered students' critical view through a series of open-ended questions after they read and discuss the narrative stories. Those individual responses employed three narrative stories involving The Rabbit and the Turtle, The Two Friends and the Bear, and The Ugly Duckling. Whereas the group responses encouraged students to acquire the structure of narrative text and have critical stance by writing a new version of narrative story. The group responses covered two narrative stories such as The Two Cats and the Monkey and The Father, the Son, and the Donkey. Moreover, the aim of students' critical responses related to the research questions where critical literacy is believed as a

way to promote students' critical literacy ability. It is also aimed to explore the benefits and challenges that is gained by students during the teaching and learning process.

3.5.4 Focus Group Interview

Focus group interview was the last data technique of data collection in this study. Focus group interview was conducted to gain further information besides classroom observation and document analysis (Creswell, 2009). Moreover, focus group interview was used as a follow up data collection and conducted to get more information related to the development of students' critical literacy ability towards the selected narrative texts. It is further stated that focus group interview let the interviewer interview more than one interviewee (James et al., 2008). The focus group interview was conducted in two sessions, each session involving two-three interviewees.

In conducting the focus group interview, the participants were informed that their voice will be recorded and transcribed. Thus, the questions delivered were dominated by open ended questions such as 1) students' understanding towards the learning process, 2) the benefits and challenges gained by students, 3) students' understanding towards the text, and 4) discussing the four resources model of critical literacy. Moreover, it was delivered in Indonesian language to gain students' responds and opinion as well as their critical voice without underestimating their English proficiency.

3.6 Data Analysis

In analyzing the data, Miles and Huberman (1994, in Hamied, 2017) propose three main components of the qualitative data analysis. First, data reduction which occurs continually along with the data collection. The researcher edits, segments and summarizes the data to find out the patterns. Second, data display where the researcher organizes compares and assembles information from seven meetings. Third, the researcher draws and verifies conclusion. Data analyses were conducted over the course of the study and after the completion of the overall program that

was based on each session of classroom observations, focus group interview, students' reflective journal, and document of students' critical responses.

3.6.1 Analysis from Classroom Observation

The data from classroom observations including video recording and teacher's field notes were analysed based on the four resources model of critical literacy. First, the videos recording was played back then transcribed, codified, interpreted, and analysed by using theoretical four resources model of critical literacy approach. Second, the video recording transcription and teacher's field notes were interpreted into categories to identify students' responses towards the implementation critical literacy approach through narrative texts, students' critical capacity and participation, to address the research questions, and to identify the steps of four resources model of critical literacy.

The categorization and interpretation of data were based on the theories that have been explained in chapter two. In order to gain students' critical capacities, the data from classroom observation focused on critical literacy model which consist of coding practices, text participating, text using, and text analysing that can be seen in Chapter II (Luke & Freebody, 1999).

3.6.2 Analysis from Students' Reflective Learning Journals

The second document of this present study was students' reflective learning journals. The reflective learning journal was given in every meeting which aimed to support the main data sources in order to answer the research questions. Additionally, this data was used to identify students' responses about the benefits and challenges of the incorporation of four resources model of critical literacy in the teaching and learning process. The data from students' reflective learning journals were analysed by using theoretical framework of four resources model of critical literacy by Luke and Freebody (1999).

3.6.3 Analysis from Students' Critical Responses

As stated in the beginning, a model proposed by Luke and Freebody (1999) namely four resources model of critical literacy was used as grounded principles

in analysing students' critical responses. The model consists of four roles which indicate students' roles as critical readers: code breaker, meaning maker/text participant, text user and text analyst. Moreover, students' critical responses, including individual and groups, were classified accordingly before the process of analysis started in order to support more detailed discussion. In this case, students' critical responses were coded, categorized, and assessed. Judgement and assessment became to be the next step of analysing. By evaluating and analysing the data from students' critical responses, the researcher can identify that what has been taught and what students did were integrated each other. Furthermore, since this study also employed narrative text, it provided another writing element, such as structure, organization and purposes (Emilia, 2005).

3.6.4 Analysis from Focus Group Interview

From the interview, the data were transcribed, categorized, and interpreted by using the four resources model of critical literacy by Luke and Freebody (1999). First, the interview session was recorded and transcribed which aimed to gain an accurate data from the interviewees, in this case, students in junior high school. Second, the result of transcription will be categorized to obtain students' responses towards some benefits and challenges in the implementation of the critical literacy program.

Furthermore, the data gained from those instruments were cross-checked using triangulation to enhance research reliability and validity (Vidovich, 2003). The triangulation was used to overcome the intrinsic bias that comes from single-methods, single observer, and single-theory-studies. Last, the data in the interview were interpreted and integrated with the theories that have been presented in the Chapter II.

3.7 Concluding Remarks.

This third chapter has highlighted the research methodology used which involved the formulation of the problems, the research design, research procedure, the process of data collection, and the techniques in analysing the data gained during the observations. The Chapter IV, will provide the interpretation of data

collections based on the methodology and framework used in this study. Those data interpretation also integrated with the literature review that has been explained in Chapter II.