CHAPTER III
RESEARCH METHOD

A. Research Design

This study was conducted by qualitative research to find out students’ errors in using cohesive devices in writing narrative text and to identify the types of errors. Moleong defines qualitative research as a research that used natural setting to interpret a particular phenomenon and done using various method.\(^{29}\)

This research was conducted by descriptive approach. It focused on finding the fact and information about students’ errors in using cohesive devices in writing narrative text and the types of errors in their writing. The data was collected after conducting analysis on students’ work of narrative writing. Then, the results would be described in form of paper. Therefore, this research conducted descriptive research.

Saifudin Azwar defines descriptive research as doing an analysis on description standard, it analyzes and presents the fact systematically, so it can be understood and concluded easily. Most of the processing data is based on the percentage and trend analysis.\(^{30}\) It focuses on the finding of information about the state of phenomenon being observed originally and accurately.

\(^{29}\) Lexy J Moleong, *Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif edisi revisi*, (Bandung: Rosda Karya, 2005), 5
\(^{30}\) Saifudin Azwar MA, 2003, metode penelitian. Pustaka pelajar : yogyakarta. 6
B. Preliminary Study

Preliminary study is important to do before conducting research. The purpose of this study was to find out the information about the condition of the issue in the field. The preliminary study was conducted on April 30, 2014 in H class of second year at SMPN 5 Surabaya.

To find out the information, the researcher interviewed some students about narrative text and their difficulties in learning English. Most of them were familiar with narrative text, and they considered this text easy than others. Then, the researcher specified the questions about cohesive devices, and tried to examine their understanding in using cohesive devices in writing narrative text. The results showed that although the students had learnt narrative text and produced some works of narrative text, and they were difficult in using cohesive devices and they still made errors in their writing. Therefore, the researcher was interested in conducting research about error analysis in using cohesive devices in writing narrative text.

C. Setting of the Study

This study was conducted at SMPN 5 Surabaya. It is located at Jl. Rajawali No. 57 Ds. Krembangan Selatan Kec. Krembangan Surabaya. The researcher was the main instrument in the research which, identified students’ error in using cohesive devices in writing narrative text. In identifying the errors, the researcher used document of students’ narrative text. Then, it
would be analyzed using table of errors and calculated to identify the dominant errors that occurred in their texts.

D. The Subject of the Study

The subjects of the study were the H class of second year students at SMPN 5 Surabaya in the academic year of 2013/2014. It consisted of 39 students (31 females and 8 males). The reason supported the writer conducted the study in H class was because it classified as excellent class. There were two-placement tests to classify students’ ability. The students who had high score in both placement test would study in H class or excellent class. Moreover, they were not only excellent in English subject, but also in science and math.

Moreover, in second year class, the students had already learnt narrative text, and they had already produced writing product of narrative text. However, they still had difficulty in using cohesive devices. Therefore, there were some errors in using cohesive devices found in their writing narrative text. The name of students participated in this research were shown in table. (See table 3.1)

E. Data and Source of Data

Data were the most important thing in conducting research. It contained of many information which were necessary. In conducting research of
students’ error in using cohesive devices in writing narrative text, the data of this research were some error sentences occurred in narrative text in context of cohesive devices. Moreover, the sources of the data were taken from students’ work of narrative text.

F. Research Instrument

The researcher used document as the instrument of this research. The document was the data in which the writer got the information about the students’ errors in using cohesive devices in writing narrative text. The students had already written narrative text during second year for about three times. The researcher would take the students’ first narrative text because it was the original product of students’ writing before being revised by the teacher.

G. Technique of Data Collection

There were several techniques in collecting the data including interview, questionnaire, observation, documentation, and Focus Group Discussion (FGD). In this research, the researcher conducted documentation. According to Arikunto, document is to look for the data about things or variables in the form of notes, transcripts, books, newspapers, magazines, and

---

inscription. Agenda for information embodies data relating to clients under investigation\textsuperscript{32}.

Documentation is a technique of data collection, which involved a record of events in the past in forms of handwriting, pictures, or even literature works is used\textsuperscript{33}. It was used to get the data of students’ writing product of narrative text. The document itself was used to analyze students’ errors in using cohesive devices in writing narrative text. After getting the data, it would be analyzed using table of classification errors and calculated to identify the dominant errors of their writing.

\section*{H. Research Procedure}

The analysis in this research concerned with cohesive devices errors, which were found in the students’ narrative text. The analysis was based Ellis theory about the steps in analyzing errors. To guide analyzing obtained documents the researcher reads students’ writing in narrative text. The researcher made guidance as follows:

1. Read the students’ writing many times to identify cohesive devices error (identifying error).

\textsuperscript{32} Suharsimi arikunto, \textit{prosedur penelitian: suatu pendekatan praktek} (Jakarta: pt rineka cipta, 2002), 124

\textsuperscript{33} Sugiyono. \textit{Metode Penelitian Pendidikan Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R & D}. (Bandung: Alfabet, 2006), 329
2. Analyzed the cohesive devices error and classified the errors based on surface strategy taxonomy and comparative taxonomy (describing error).

3. Calculation

Calculated the frequency and the percentage of errors in writing narrative text.

4. Discussion

The researcher made a description of analyzing result on the cohesive errors and the types of errors in the form of a brief description. (Explaining errors)

5. Drawing a conclusion

The writer made a valid conclusion in the form of a brief description of cohesive errors, the types of error in using cohesive devices in writing narrative text.

I. Data Analysis

Data analysis was used to analyze the result of students’ error in using cohesive devices and the types of error in using cohesive devices in writing narrative text. To analyze the data, the researcher used a table of classification errors to display each error made by students (see table 3.2). Then, the errors would be classified into its errors based on surface strategy taxonomy and comparative taxonomy. At last, the researcher would calculate the frequency
and the percentage of errors to identify the dominant errors. The formula is offered by Anas.\textsuperscript{34}

### Table 3.2
Table of Classification Error

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>SENTENCES</th>
<th>TYPES OF ERROR</th>
<th>SST</th>
<th>CT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OMM</td>
<td>ADD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:

- **Surface Strategy Taxonomy (SST)**
- **Comparative Taxonomy (CT)**
- OMM: Omission
- DO: Developmental Error
- ADD: Addition
- IE: Interlingual Error
- MF: Misformation
- MO: Misordering

### Table 4.1
Table of Dominant of Errors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO.</th>
<th>TYPES OF ERRORS</th>
<th>NUMBER OF ERRORS</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Omission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Addition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Misformation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Misordering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Developmental Error</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Interlingua Error</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL ERRORS**

Formula:

\[ P = \frac{F \times 100}{N} \]

Note:

- \( P \) = Percents
- \( F \) = Frequency of Errors
- \( N \) = Total Number of the Whole Errors evaluation

\textsuperscript{34}Sudijo Anas. *Pengantar Statistik Pendidikan.* (Jakarta: PT. Raja Grafindo Persada), 40