

## **CHAPTER III**

### **METHODOLOGY**

This chapter presents specific information in relating to how this study can be conducted. It entails research design, setting and context, participant of the study, instrument of the study, data collection and data analysis.

#### **3.1. Research Design**

The design of this study is mixed method the collaborative of qualitative and quantitative. Mixed method is used to complement quantitative research results that are enriched with qualitative data or vice versa. In this way, researcher get more comprehensive data. Mixed method research can be applied in RND (research and development) and Action Research (Cresswell, 2014). Cresswell (2014) divided three kinds of mixed method research they are Concurrent triangulation design (application of quantitative and qualitative methods together in one stage with two balanced method weights), Concurrent embedded design (application of quantitative and qualitative methods together in one stage with both different method weights) and Concurrent transformative design (the application of quantitative and qualitative methods together in one stage with balanced data weights or not).

In this case, the researcher applies the Concurrent transformative design to the Classroom Action Research in collaboration with three teachers as observers. It is called collaborative CAR because the researcher directly works together with

the English teacher at the school to conduct the research as well as to cope with the student's problems concerning their speaking that they encountered in the class. This action is done in a real situation and it is intended to solve a practical problem. In this study, one group pre-test and post-test design was used to collect the data.

This study was measured by pre-test before giving the treatment and post-test after giving the treatment. Evelyn (2016) proposes the procedure used in one group pre-test-post-test design should select the participation before pre-test, giving the treatments after pre-test (before post-test) and researcher could give the post-test after them.

### **3.2. Settings and context**

This study conducted at XI IPA I of MAN 1 Konawe in academic year 2020/2021. This research begins by doing some observation that observed by three observers from researcher's team under the agreement of headmaster and also the English mandatory teacher. This observes the state of learning in the class which seems to be lacking in activity. Students are just focus on reading the textbook and answering questions in the book. Students who attempted to read these paragraphs do not sound fluent and do not match the pronunciation.

There are only about one to two people who try to communicate in English with modest vocabulary. Then, researcher selected six students from 23 students

to be interviewed as the first data for knowing the problems that the students faced in learning. The selection was based on three students with the lowest score and three students with the highest score of previous semester examination. In addition to interviewing them, a pre-test will be held at the beginning of the meeting which will show students' speaking abilities as a benchmark of research.

### **3.3. Participant of the study**

Participants of this study explored by Class XI IPA 1 MAN 1 Konawe for the 2020/2021 period which totals 23 students in the class. What stands out from this class is that some students whose English knowledge is very low compared to the level of senior high school students should at least be able to introduce themselves and mention their address. This must be resolved soon, moreover they will soon face the level where an English role will be needed to continue to college. Even though there are only a few who have low ability, the researcher still focuses on all students in the class and see the progress of each individual.

### **3.4. Instrument of the Study**

In order to get the appropriate data, researcher needs the instruments to collect the data. The instruments that used by the researcher are interview, observation in the process of teaching and learning and tests for students.

#### **3.4.1. Interview**

The researcher did an interview to the students and teacher before observe the classroom. The structure used in this interview is structured

interview according to Roulston (2010) in which the questions have been prepared by the researcher. The purpose of the interview is to know more about the quality of student's English skills at the school and the problems that occur in the school, especially in speaking.

#### 3.4.2. Classroom Observation

Observations are carried out to record data that includes the process and results of the implementation of activities to gather evidence of the actions to be evaluated and it is used as the basis in solving the problems. The researcher conducted this technique in each cycle.

#### 3.4.3. Students' Test

This test conducted at the beginning of the meeting. Using the form of questions such as pop question those are posed by the teacher, researcher can provoke a conversation in order to know the students' speaking abilities.

### **3.5. Data Collection and Procedure**

The data for the study were collected using interview, observation and students' test. To get more specific information about what will be studied, researcher used interview that is collected in structured way which all questions have been prepared by researcher. Observation used as a way for researcher to measure the attitudes of respondents and can be used to record various phenomena that occur. In this research, observation used since the researcher participates in teaching and learning process and cooperates as the collaboration, this observation



is intended to know the students' participation.

To get the benchmarks, researcher collected data passing tests to students at the beginning and the last of meeting. The tests were given to the students in order to know their speaking ability especially in telling story. In this research, test is divided into two categories; pretest and posttest. The aim of pretest is to find out the students' ability toward their speaking skill before treatment. On the other hand, posttest is to find out whether their speaking skill improve or not after giving treatment. The researcher can collect scores from this test to get results and other information.

The Storytelling procedure that they got in class is started by introducing themselves and telling each other briefly about themselves. At the onset, students can tell stories by combining English and Indonesian. This becomes an approach between the teacher and other students where they always be asked to talk about themselves and their daily activities. The provision of new vocabulary is always interspersed when the teaching-learning process takes place. Classroom management used a group system where later they would be asked to discuss to each other and presented their discussion in front of the class. Finally, they asked to tell at length about their lives or other interesting things in front of their friends as if they were professional storytellers.

### 3.6. Treatment

#### 3.6.1. First meeting (January 13<sup>th</sup>, 2020)

The first meeting was the initial data collection of researcher at the research site. The researcher observed the class to find information related to her research, problems and problem solving. The researcher is given the opportunity to directly observe the class to be studied, at that time the lesson is in progress and the researcher looks directly at the method the teacher uses in her teaching. Researcher take notes from the teacher's teaching observations in class and their students' responses as well as reviewing student activity in class as a research consideration later. After observing the class, the researcher asked permission to interview six students from the class to get deeper information.

Not only that, the researcher also interviewed the teacher who taught in the class. Next, the researcher was given permission to do a pre-test again for students in class XI IPA1. The exam that given by researcher in the form of telling their experiences or things about themselves. With this, the researcher gets their initial grades which some of them have basic in speaking skills and some are still low in speaking. Taking values based on the adaptation rubric taken by researcher.

#### 3.6.2. First cycle (January 21<sup>st</sup>, 24<sup>th</sup> & 28<sup>th</sup>, 2020)

In the first cycle, there were three meetings where the material was

based on the syllabus from school. The first meeting discussed personal letters, students told their loved ones they would later send letters. Students told the researcher one by one in turn for the application of the Storytelling technique in this material. Simultaneously the researcher gave them feedback about past tense and future tense as their help in composing sentences. In addition, at the beginning of the lesson the researcher gave new vocabulary that students could use in making sentences.

The second meeting was still discussing personal letters. This time they exchanged letters and read letters made by their friends. After that, the researcher asked each student to retell the contents of the letter that their friends made. The third meeting discussed about procedure text. In the application of Storytelling techniques, researcher shared them a picture of food then they are tasked to describe how to make food to his friends. This system is in the form of discussion groups, they are made into four groups and they will take turns explaining to each other in their groups the making of the food. At the end of the class, each group must choose one food from their friends that they can practice.

### 3.6.3. Second cycle (February, 4<sup>th</sup>, 8<sup>th</sup> & 11<sup>th</sup>, 2020)

The second cycle also consisted of three follow-up meetings from previous meetings. The fourth meeting still discussed the procedure of the food they made, but this time they presented the results of their cooking, other groups are welcome to give comments and questions to the groups that

take turns presenting. The fifth meeting discussed about cause and effect. This time the researcher again shared a picture of a narrative story from which there was a moral message that caused cause and effect. Students will briefly tell the story from the picture and then mention the causes and effects of the incident. This material lasted until the sixth meeting.

#### 3.6.4. Evaluation (Post-test) (February, 25<sup>th</sup> 2020)

In the post-test, the researcher tested the students with pop-up stories such as precious or worthless things, best or bad experience, interesting things about their selves and someone they love or hate, where they had to pull out the lot containing the title of the story they would tell one by one in front of the examiner. In this session, three class observers from the teacher at the school also observed the testing process. The assessment is still based on the adaptation rubric that adapted from Dick, Gall and Borg (2003) taken by the researcher.

### **3.7. Data Analysis**

The data analyzed in descriptive quantitative and qualitative by identifying students speaking skills development through Storytelling. In this case the researcher analyzed the development during the process start until the end of the research process. The data took by interviewing, observation and also evaluation of the students at the end of the class using pre-post test. The researcher classified the answers from the teacher and student interviews to be more directed and



detailed in the subject matter. Through observation the data analyzed on a case-by-case basis to better understand in depth a problem that occurs at the research site. Observation data analyzed by formula from Suen & Ary (2014) that is:

$$P = \frac{F}{N} \times 100$$

**Remarks: P = Percentage**

**F = Frequency of the respondents**

**N = Number of sample**

**100 = Constant value**

Meanwhile, the evaluation aimed to know the student development during the teaching learning process. As a basis for measuring test scores, the researcher used a rubric adapted from Dick, Gall and Borg (2003). The rubric analyzes four assessment indicators in the speaking test, namely vocabulary, pronunciation, accuracy and fluency. These four indicators will be seen directly in each student and see which overall indicators increase the most after giving the Storytelling technique treatment. The results of the pretest that were studied based on these four indicators will be analyzed immediately to see which indicators need more treatment to produce improvements. After that, the second test was carried out as a posttest. From the results that come out, the two final test scores will be tested.

From the results of student tests, it sorted the students who are included in the basic, intermediate and advanced groups. The theory of pre-test and post-test

by Gass (1982), the data analyzed using the picture to create the student imagination and tell about the picture. The writer used the normality test statistical formula to find out the result using T-test (Paired sample test) by Sudjana (2008).

### 3.7.1. Normality test

Normality test is used to test whether a variable is normal distribution or not. Normal here means if the data have a normal distribution. The main reason of conducting normality testing is that it is necessary for the researcher to know whether the population or data involved in the research is in normal distribution. To test the normality, the researcher used the One Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov test with the provision that if Asymp. Sig.  $>0,05$ , the data were normally distributed (Sugiyono, 2011). In this research, the normality test using SPSS V.26 for windows.

### 3.7.2. Paired Sample Test

In this analyzing there are some requirements. If the significant level is greater than the table (0.05%), the alternative hypothesis ( $H_a$ ) is accepted and the null hypothesis ( $H_0$ ) is rejected. This means that there are different grades for students before being taught by listening to songs and after being taught by listening to songs. The difference shows that there is significant. If the significant level is more than 0.05, the null hypothesis ( $H_0$ ) is accepted and the alternative hypothesis ( $H_a$ ) is rejected. This means that there are no different scores from students before being taught using listening songs and

after being taught using listening songs. To find out whether the significance level is greater or smaller than the T-table, the researcher analyzed the data using SPSS V.26.

