

### **III. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

#### **3.1 Research Design**

It is a qualitative descriptive research. It means that the writer tried to describe the process of implementation of peer editing in the writing class and the students' perception toward peer editing. Therefore, the writer used descriptive method in order that the data would be readable than countable. The use of the design was in line with Best (1981: 25) who says that descriptive research involves the description, recording, analysis, and interpretation of conditions that exist. Besides, descriptive research studies are non-experimental and only concerns with the events or conditions that have already occurred or existed (Best, 1981: 106).

To make the data more valid, the writer used three methods in the research, they are observation, interview, and questionnaire. The writer intended to make notes of situation in the teaching learning process and tried to figure out how the teacher implemented peer editing and the students' response toward peer editing. Furthermore, the writer distributed questionnaire to the students to find out their perception toward peer editing. Next, the students were interviewed by using informal conversational interview.

#### **3.2 Subjects**

The subjects of this study were the teacher and the second year students of SMPN 3 Pekalongan in odd semester of 2011/2012 academic years. The class chosen was VIII.1 which consisted of 30 students. There were several reasons why they were chosen as the subjects. The first reason was because the English teacher of second year students of SMPN 3 Pekalongan has already implemented peer editing in correcting the students work. But usually, the teacher only instructed the students to correct the students work in a sentences form. He had not tried to make the students worked in a text form. Therefore, the writer was interested to get the students' perception in doing peer editing while editing a text of their friends.

The second reason was because this school curriculum is based on KTSP which the students have to learn the four skills. Writing is one of the skills that to be mastered by the students. In learning writing, the students are taught by using text. A text to be mastered by the students is descriptive text. Based on the syllabus, the second grade students would learn descriptive text by the end of the first semester. Based on these reasons, the writer used class VIII.1 as the subject of this research.

### **3.3 Research Instrument**

The instruments used in the study were:

#### **1. Observation**

In this technique of collecting data, the writer observed directly what was occurring in the teaching and learning process. The observation used was non-participant observer because in doing it, the writer did not join the class activities. She just took notes on the process of teacher's technique in implementing peer editing and the students' responses toward the peer

editing activities in learning writing. The observation sheet was modified from the approaches from Brown (2001: 335), the techniques from Littauer (1996), and the stages from Zeng (2006). **Teacher's observation** sheet was used to investigate whether the teacher did a certain activity or not. The detail of observation sheet could be seen in the following table of specification:

**Table 3.1. Teacher Observation Sheet**

No	Class activity	Teacher Activity	Checklist	Description
<b>1</b>	Pre-activity	a. Open the class by greeting		Check whether the students were ready to learn or not
		b. Give brainstorming by asking a question related to the material		Stimulate the students schemata
		c. Explain the material		Give new knowledge to the students
		d. Ask another example from the students		Check if there was some students still confuse about the material given
		e. Invite the students to ask question related to the material		
		f. Give an instruction to do the task		Give a task to the students, to check whether they understand the material or not
<b>2</b>	While-activity	g. Encouraging the students to write		Encourage the students to do the task
		h. Help the students when it is necessary		Help the students in doing the task if they found any difficulties to do it
		i. Monitor and control the students for doing peer editing correctly		Make the students did the task properly, not chatting or doing anything else
<b>3.</b>	Post-activity	j. Give a reflection to the peer editing activity		Give an understanding to the student about what they have done and what mistake they did
		k. Invite the students to ask if they find any difficulties		Check the students understanding about the activity they have done
		l. Summarize what the students have learnt		Explain the material learnt by the students

Student's observation sheet was used to get data from the students whether the students followed the certain activity or not. The detail of **students'** observation sheet could be seen in the following table.

**Table 3.2. Students Observation Sheet**

No	Class activity	Students Activity	checklist	description
<b>1</b>	Pre-activity	a. Answer the greeting		Show that the students ready to learn
		b. Responded to the question from the teacher		Show that they follow the teacher' brainstorming
		c. Pay attention to teacher's explanation		Show that they interesting in the teacher's explanation
		d. Give another example of descriptive text		Show that they understand the material given
		e. Ask a question to the teacher related to the material		Show that they have curiosity to the material
		f. Able to understand the task they have to do		Show that they understand how to do the task
	While-activity	g. Encourage to write the task		Show that they have a willingness to write
		h. Able to brainstorming the topic to be selected in prewriting stage		Show that they can interact with the other students
		i. Write the text well in drafting stage		Show that they can do the task
		j. Want to exchange the work with their peer group		Show that they want to exchange their work
		k. Able to understand what is written by the other friend		Show that they can do editing their friends' work
		l. Respond the other friends' work by editing or revising their work		
		m. Give positive respond to the other friends' work		Show that they can give positive response to their friends' work
<b>3.</b>	Post-activity	n. Able to make the 2 <sup>nd</sup> draft based on the other friends review		Show that they accept their friends' suggestion
		o. Pay attention to the reflection		Show that they are interesting in the teacher's correction
		p. Ask question if they find any difficulties in peer editing activity		Show that they still curiosity to the recent activity
		q. Able to summarize what they have learn		Show that they understand and get the point of the recent activity
		r. Collect the final draft		Show that they follow the peer

		for publication stage		editing activity
--	--	-----------------------	--	------------------

## 2. Interview

Fraenkel and Wallen (1993) describe interviewing as the most important data collection technique that is possessed by a qualitative researcher.

From the statement above, the writer tried to reveal as much information as possible from the students through interviews.

The writer used structured interview in which the same questions were asked of all students. By using structured interview, the writer could control over the topics and the format of the interview. This was because a detailed interview guide was used. Consequently, there was a common format, which makes it easier to analyze, code and compare data. The details of guiding question in the interview were described as followed:

**Table 3.3. Point of Interview**

No	Aspect	Example of question	Answer		
			yes	doubt	no
I.	feeling	1. What do you think about peer editing in your class?	The students enjoy editing <b>their friends'</b> work. They believe that they got advantageous from it	The students did not seriously editing their <b>friends' work</b>	The students did not enjoy editing their <b>friends' work</b> . They believe that they did not get any advantageous from it.
		2. What do you feel when editing your <b>friend's draft</b> ?	The students felt happy while their work were edited by their friends	The students did not pay much attention in editing their friends work. Therefore, they did not know the advantageous or disadvantages they would be received	The students felt unhappy while their work were edited by their friends

		3. What do you feel when your draft is being edited by your friend?	They believe peer editing brought some advantageous. It meant that they response peer editing positively	The students did not care about their work were edited. Therefore, they did not know the advantageous or disadvantages they would be receive	They did not believe that peer editing would bring some advantageous. Therefore, they response it negatively
II.	opinion	4. What is the advantage and disadvantage of peer editing for you?	The students mentioned some advantageous of peer editing they believed	The students could not decide what advantageous and disadvantageous that they got from peer editing	The student believe that peer editing brought some disadvantageous for them.

Interviewing the students was used to find out the students' perception of peer editing in learning writing, because sometimes the students were disingenuous in giving their answer in a questionnaire. Moreover, through interviewing the students, the writer could get deep information since the writer could paraphrase some questions that might be not clear/ could not be understood by the participant. The data of students' interview was used to support the data of questionnaire to answer research question number two.

### 3. Questionnaires

To know the students' perception about the value of peer editing conducted in the writing class: Roni's questionnaire (2001: 61) was used as the instrument. It was used to get the majority of the students' opinions whether or not peer editing in writing is valuable. In this case, only some questions related to the statements of problem were used.

1. Revision plays an important role in the process of writing.
2. Doing peer correction helps me look at my own writing more critically before I rewrite it .
3. Looking at my peer's careless mistakes in writing makes me promise to myself not to make such mistakes next time .
4. When I read my peer's first draft, I become aware that there are many different ways of saying things.
5. Peer correction makes me more active in writing class.
6. Peer correction encourages me to write more communicative essays.

Based on the explanations above, the writer tried to modify the questions from Roni and the approaches from Brown (2001: 335). The statements selected by the writer were used to underline the questionnaire. The statements were mentioned and the share of them can be seen as follows:

**Table 4.3. Table Specification of Questionnaire**

No	Item number	Kinds of questionnaire	Score			
			Strongly agree	agree	disagree	Strongly disagree
I.		The importance of peer editing in writing				
	1.	Editing plays an important role in writing process	4	3	2	1
II		Students' opinions toward peer editing				
	2.	Peer editing is conducive to give a lot of inputs and feedback from both teacher and peers	4	3	2	1

3.	Doing peer editing helps the students more critical toward their writings before editing them	4	3	2	1
4.	Peer editing makes the students aware of careless mistakes or errors, and try to avoid them in the following writing products	4	3	2	1
5.	The students realize that there are many different ways to explain the same ideas	4	3	2	1
6.	Peer editing helps student writers to understand their own composing process	4	3	2	1
7.	Peer editing makes the students more active in interacting among them and with the teacher during the writing process	4	3	2	1
8.	Peer editing helps the students to raise their self-confidences to write	4	3	2	1
9.	Peer editing activates the students to review their writing works and revise the writing problems by themselves	4	3	2	1
10.	Peer editing encourages the students to write good writing	4	3	2	1

### 3.4 Validity and Reliability

A valid instrument is an instrument that measures the object that should be measured, and suitable with the criteria. The research used triangulation in order to make the data more valid. Triangulation is a manner of collecting data by combining two or more methods in order to enrich the data and to have accurate conclusion (Setiyadi, 2006:246).

Furthermore, Bogdan and Biklen (1982:74) say that successful outcome of a



participant observation study is particular, but other forms of qualitative research as well, relies on detailed, accurate, and extensive field notes. The data are considered to be field notes; this term refers to all the data collected including field notes, interview transcript, official documents, and other materials. In this case, the writer used some methods which were observation, questionnaires, and interview in getting the data.

In addition, reliability can refer to stability of measurement over time, an approach which was not suited to the current investigation. In assessing internal consistency, the Cronbrach's Alpha reliability is the most appropriate reliability index to be used on continuous data, such as that produced by a Likert-type scale.. It would be counted based on the questions and range of 0 to 1. It was used to analyze the instrument from ordinal data. According to Setiyadi, (2006: 190-191), the higher alpha is the more reliable the questionnaire will be.

The following was the calculation of Cronbach' Alpha reliability. Further detail could be seen in appendix 6:

$$k = 10$$

$$\sum \sigma_b^2 = 3.98$$

$$\sigma_b^2 = 10.57$$

$$r = \left[ \frac{k}{(k-1)} \right] \left[ 1 - \frac{\sum \sigma_b^2}{\sigma_b^2} \right]$$

$$r = \left[ \frac{1}{(1-1)} \right] \left[ 1 - \frac{3.98}{10.57} \right]$$

$$r = 0.7$$

According to Setiyadi (2006: 190-191), the higher alpha is the more reliable the questionnaire will be. Since the  $r$  score was 0.7. It meant that the questionarie had already measured what should be measured even in different condition. Moreover,

it could be said that the data from the questionnaire had already shown the reality in the observation field.

### **3.5 Data Collection**

The data of the study was collected from 14<sup>th</sup>-28<sup>th</sup>, 2011 in four class- meetings/ eight class-periods. The first, second, and third class meetings was used to do the observation. During the observation, the writer took notes on the students' attitude in writing class and the way of the teacher guiding the students in doing peer editing.

The fourth meeting was used for giving the questionnaires to the students and asking them to answer the questions by putting a check (✓) on one of the answers based on their own opinion. The interview was also used to gather the data from the students. Besides that, it was used to find out their perception about the value of peer editing. The interview used was directional interview in which the writer prepared some questions directly relating to the data she wants to gain. Finally, the collected data would be analyzed.

### **3.6 Data Analysis**

After collecting the data from the observation and students' questionnaires, the next stage required was analyzing them. The first step was collecting the questionnaires from the students and checking whether they have answered all the questions. The second was classifying the data from the observation whether it belongs to the writer's comment about the students or the comment about the teacher. The next was classifying the data into two sub-topics based on the

research problems: the implementation of peer editing, the students' response, and the students' perception about the value of peer editing. After that, it was time to analyze the questionnaire data using a formula to find out the percentages and present them in form of table. After getting the result of the analysis using the formula, the next step was relating the observation data and the interview data. And the last step was drawing conclusion.

The formula used is  $P = \frac{f}{N} \times 100\%$

(Note: P = percentage, f = frequency, and N = number of respondents/students).

The formula is the most commonly used in descriptive qualitative research.