

## CHAPTER III

### RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

#### **A. The Research Design**

Concerning with the statements of problems and the objectives of this study. The design of this study was descriptive research design. According to Saifudin Azwar MA descriptive research is doing an analysis on description standart, it analyzes and presents the fact systematically, so it can be understood and concluded easily, and most of the processing data is based on the precentage and trend analysis<sup>1</sup>.

This research described the grammatical errors in the students' writing of Hortatory exposition text for the final test made by the students of the eleven grades of SMAN 1 Baureno Bojonegoro. It was also designed to provide the description of phenomenon that happened in the students' writing. Then it used statistic description in order to interpret the result of the research to make the thesis more significant.

#### **B. The Subject of the Study**

The subject of the study of this research was the students of the eleven grades of SMAN 1 Baureno Bojonegoro. As the sample the researcher took the students of XI-IA 3 class that consisted of 17 students as the main focus, because it was known as the special class which the students had the higher score in every subject than

---

<sup>1</sup> Azwar, Saifudin MA. 2003. *Metode penelitian* .pustaka pelajar :yogjakarta. page 6

other classes and they also had studied all English language features on Hortatory exposition text.

One of the considerations why the researcher chose the students of XI-IA 3 class was based on the researcher's pre-liminary research on this school, the English teacher on this class applied the assignment of making Hortatory exposition writing on the final test on the second semester of the students of the eleven grades of SMAN 1 Baureno Bojonegoro, so the students had the assignment of final test project.

### **C. Source of Data**

The source of data in this study was the document that written by IA 3 class of the students on the eleven grades of SMAN 1 Baureno Bojonegoro, the document I meant was the Hortatory exposition writing. Therefore the data of this study was the Hortatory eposition text in the form of writing that was produced by the students on the final test and the checklist as the result of the classifying and analysing of the writing product.

### **D. Research Instrument**

Research instrument is a tool to collect the data, and the instrument used by the researcher was checklist. The checklist (see on appendix A1) was very necessary for classifying the types of errors produced by the students in their Hortatory exposition writing and identifying the causes of errors they also produced, and this checklist

was also used to answer the first and the second question on the research problems because it had contained the classification of errors' types and errors' causes that had produced based on the theory used.

### **E. Technique of Data Collection**

The data were taken from the students' writings of IX – IA 3 SMAN 1 Baureno Bojonegoro in Hortatory exposition tex. The technique of data collection in this study was through the documentation technique, then in the process of documenting the data the researcher asked the permission to the English teacher of IX–IA 3 class at SMAN 1 Baureno Bojonegoro for copying the result of Hortatory exposition writing.

So after collecting the copies of students' Hortatory exposition writing, the researcher identified and analyzed them, and the researcher found the data of the errors in the students' writing composition of Hortatory exposition text, then the students' errors and the causes of the errors they made were presented by using checklist.

### **F. Procedure of Data Analysis**

In analysing the data, the researcher used some steps in order to analyse the data easily. The steps were as followings:

1. Identification of errors

The researcher read and detected the errors intensively. It was done by analysing all sentences of Hortatory exposition writing for finding the errors that were produced by the students.

## 2. Classification of Errors

The researcher grouped the grammatical errors that had been found as what the researcher had been classified them into some categorizes which consider that the researcher chose them because they were used and occurred commonly in the students' writing of hortatory exposition text, they were:

- a. Simple present tense
- b. Article
- c. Conjunction
- d. Preposition
- e. Singular and plural, and
- f. Passive verb form
- g. sentence structure

The researcher found the errors in these descriptions categorizes, for example the category of error on the simple present tense on the sentence; "I studies English in University of IAIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya". That sentence should be "I study English in University of IAIN Sunan Ampel ". The tense in that sentence used the simple present tense, and the faulty generalization was on the verb "study", so the kind of error on that sentence was named by simple present tense. And the other categorizes depended on the grammar concept of each category itself. Then the

researcher arranged the errors finding based on some categorizes above into some types of error.

And then the classification of error types was based on surface strategy taxonomy and comparative taxonomy which had been explained clearly in the review of literature.

### 3. Tabulation of Errors

After the writer classified and found the errors of student's writing of Hortatory eposition text, then the writer counted and made the tabulation of the errors frequencis that were occurred on each type of errors. In this case the writer presented it in the form of percentage to know how many percentages of the students' errors made in each type of errors. The calculation of errors were done by using the formula proposed by Arikunto<sup>2</sup> as follow:

$$\frac{f}{N} \times 100 \%$$

N

$f$  : The total of errors of each type

N : The total of occurances of errors.

For example; the researcher found  $f=259$  and  $N=290$ , so the solution of that finding was:

$$\frac{259}{290} \times 100 \% = 89.3 \%$$

290

---

<sup>2</sup> Suharsimi arikunto.procedure penelitian. Suatu pendekatan praktek.jakarta:rieneka cipta.2006,p.195-196

#### 4. Errors Evaluation

The factors which caused the errors made by the students could be interpreted, and the factors were categorized into 2 parts as follows:

- a. Interlingua factors were caused by the students' native language interference
- b. Intralingua factors were reflected by the ignorance or incomplete knowledge of the target language that was studied by the students, and it was caused by the general characteristics of the rule learning as overgeneralization, ignorance of the rule restrictions, incomplete application of rules and false concept hypothesized which also had been explained by the writer in the review of related literature.

#### 5. Discussion

In this case, the researcher made a description of analyzing result on the types of error and the causes of error in the form of a brief description and explanation.

#### 6. Drawing a conclusion

The last step was drawing a conclusion based on the result of analyzing. In this step the writer had to make a valid conclusion in the form of a brief description of the types and the causes of errors.