

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This part focuses on the process of conducting the research. These include research design, data collection, and data analysis.

3.1 . Research Design

This part discusses the research methodology to investigate the answers of all research questions. The research questions consisted of 1) how does a lecturer portray her perceived TWSE?; 2) how is her actual teaching writing performance?; 3) are there any discrepancy between the lecturer's perceived TWSE and her actual teaching performance; and 4) what are the causes of discrepancy between the lecturer's perceived TWSE and her actual teaching performance?

The case study design employed for this research. A case study is a variation of an ethnography in that the researcher provides an in-depth exploration of a bounded system (e.g., an activity, an event, a process, or an individual) based on extensive data collection (Cresswell, 2007). This design also allows the researcher to concentrate on a single group of subjects and the use of multi-method data collection strategies to identify the extent of which a teacher's writing self-efficacy is different with her teaching performance. This design is an appropriate way to illustrate those phenomena which are not very well understood and need to be examined very closely and also has the potential to provide an in-depth understanding of process rather than outcome (Creswell, 2003).

To ensure the internal validity in the research design, several methods of data collection should be used for triangulation purposes (Yin, 2003). In this research, some instruments were used to collect the data, i.e., questionnaire,

interviews, classroom observations, and documents analysis. The questionnaire was for collecting the data on the level of the lecturer's TWSE. The interviews were conducted to verify the data from the questionnaire and involving both the lecturer and her students. The classroom observations were to obtain the data on the actual teaching writing performance of the lecturer. The last was the documents analysis. The documents used in this research were the students' writings. Using a writing rubric, the students' writings were scored and analyzed to see their writing skill progress.

3.2 . Data Collection

This section discusses the data collecting techniques in conducting this study including research site, participants, and research instruments. Each division is explained below.

3.2.1. Research Site

The research was conducted in an English Education study program in a private university in Cianjur. It is a newly opened study program. It started two years ago. The first batch students are at their third semester and the newest batch are at their first. There are two classes in each year.

Since it is a new study program, the demand for conducting research on various aspects related to EFL teaching is very high. That research is very crucial in order to improve the quality of the study program and all related elements such as the lecturers' teaching quality as well as the students' achievement. This present research specifically contributed to the development of the teaching of writing that covering the lecturer's competence in teaching writing and also the students' writing performance.

The other reason is a technical consideration which is its easy access. It means the researcher finds easy to get data since the university is located where the researcher works.

3.2.2. Participants

Nia Kurniawati, 2014

Perceived self efficacy vs actual teaching performance : A case in teaching writing

Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia | repository.upi.edu | perpustakaan.upi.edu

In a qualitative inquiry, the intent is not to generalize the findings, but to develop an in-depth exploration of a central phenomenon. Thus, to best understand the phenomenon, the researcher purposefully or intentionally selects individuals and site. Cresswell (2008) states that the research term used for qualitative sampling is purposeful sampling. In purposeful sampling a researcher intentionally select individuals and sites to learn or understand the central phenomenon. The standard used in choosing participants and sites is whether they are “information rich” (Patton, 1990. p. 169).

As it has been discussed earlier that the research was to find out a novice lecturer’ self-efficacy in teaching writing and her actual teaching writing performance, the discrepancy, and the causes of the discrepancy between those two variables. Based on those considerations, the researcher selected the participants for the present study. The participants of the research included a writing lecturer and her writing class students. The class consists of 48 students taking writing for general communication course. The instructor is a novice lecturer. She graduated from a school of post graduate majoring English education. She has eight years experience in teaching English at junior high school but she has no experience in teaching writing at university level. The students are at their third semester and new to a writing course in their study at a university level. Most of them come from rural areas around Cianjur and have limited English ability.

Regarding the data collected from the questionnaire, the lecturer was given the questionnaire to see her academic and personal background, and to find out her level in TWSE as well as the reasons of her level in the ten items of TWSE asked in the questionnaire. After filling out the questionnaire, the respondent was interviewed to clarify and get deeper understanding to all the answers in the questionnaire.

Meanwhile, in the non-participant observations, the lecturer and all of the students in her class were involved. By considering the students characteristics in the

classrooms, six students who were active in the classrooms during the classroom observations were chosen purposively to be interviewed. They were interviewed to find out their opinions about the teaching performance of the lecturer.

The students were also asked to compose two texts in the first and in the last classroom observations. This was to find out their writing performance in average and also the common problems they faced in writing.

3.2.3. Research Instruments

This study collected data from different instruments, namely questionnaires, nonparticipant classroom observations, semi-structure interviews and documents analysis. Each technique is elaborated below.

3.2.3.1. Questionnaire

Brown (2001: 6 cited from Dornyei, 2003: 6) states that questionnaires are any written instruments that present respondents with a series of questions or statements to which they are to react either by writing out their answers or by selecting from among existing answers. Meanwhile, Thomas (2003: 66) argues that questionnaire is typically used in a very general sense to mean any printed set of questions that participants in a survey are asked to answer, either by checking one choice from among several possible answers listed beneath a question or by writing out an answer.

The questionnaire in this current study was adapted from the Teaching Writing Self-Efficacy Scale (Hughey, 2010). Originally, it consisted of thirty five items and used Likert scale. But after it was tried out to five English instructors, they found that some items were unclear, and some were not suitable for the present research context. The unclear and unsuitable items were deleted. Finally, for the purpose of this research, the rest of ten items were modified into an open-ended form (Fowler, 2002). To gain personal and academic information about the

subject, the questionnaire was modified into two parts. Part 1 is about the personal and academic information of the sample, and part 2 is about the respondent's teaching writing self-efficacy (Appendix I). In the first part, the respondent answered some questions about her personal and academic background such as gender, age, educational background, writing habit, and teaching writing experience. In the second part, there were ten items exploring the respondent's TWSE. Each item provided three options that the respondent might choose, i.e, most confident, less confident and unconfident. After choosing the level of her TWSE, the respondent wrote the reasons of her choice in each item. The theoretical basis for the instrument was to measure the lecturer's self-efficacy of a teacher's ability to teach writing to students; specifically the teacher's beliefs about her ability to teach specific writing skills and tasks.

3.2.3.2. Classroom Observations

Thomas (2003: 60) argues that gathering information by means of observation involves watching and or listening to events, then recording what occurred. Regarding this, after obtaining data by distributing questionnaires, the next data was collected by conducting non-participant classroom observations. According to Cresswell (2008) nonparticipant observer is an observational role adopted by researchers when they visit a site and record notes without becoming involved in the activities of the participants. In this case, the researcher positioned herself not as a teacher. It means that the researcher only noted what is going on during the teaching writing process conducted by the respondent. The researcher did not also interact to participate during the teaching-learning process. As collecting data of the questionnaires, the classroom observations were conducted to investigate the first research questions.

This instrument was used in answering the second research question about the actual teaching performance of the respondent. The classroom

observations were conducted six times, at which the researcher wrote down the activities done by the teacher and the students in the interaction setting in the classroom as suggested by Morrison (1993, cited in Emilia et al, 2008). Besides, the researcher made the observation notes as soon as after each session of the observations finished when the memory of the observations was still fresh as proposed by Van Lier (1988: 241). Moreover, to ensure the construct validity for the observations, a colleague of the researcher was invited to record all activities during the processes of the classroom observations. It is intended to enable the researcher to watch the classroom observations repeatedly when it is necessary (Van Lier, 1988).

3.2.3.3. Interviews

According to Thomas (2003: 63), interviews usually involve a researcher orally asking questions for individuals to answer orally. Meanwhile, Kvale (1996: 14) states that individual interview is an interchange of views between an interviewer and the interviewee by talking about a theme of mutual interest. Moreover, Dawson (2010: 28) argues that an interview aims to know specific information that can be compared and contrasted with the information gained from other data collecting techniques. For the reasons, this study employed semi structured interviews that could support the findings of the data gained from the questionnaires and the classroom observations.

In the interviews, the researcher interviewed both the teacher and the students. This instrument is to gain deeper information about the teacher's self-efficacy and her students' perception. The interviews with the lecturer were conducted twice. The first interview was conducted after the lecturer completed the questionnaire on October 9, 2013, and the second interview was conducted

after the the fourth meeting on November 7, 2013. In the first interview, there were twenty five questions. As in the second interview, the researcher posed fifty seven questions. The respondent was asked about her experiences, difficulties, and beliefs in teaching writing. Since the respondent has a good command in English, the interview was conducted in English. In the first interview, there were twenty five questions (see Appendix VI).

While for the students' interview, only six students who were actively involved in the activities during classrooms observatio were involved. They were asked to cross check the teacher perceieved self-efficacy in teaching writing self-efficacy with the students' perception on the teachers actual performance in teaching writing. The interviews were semi-guided and the type of interview questions were open-ended questions. As for the students' interview, it was a group intervei. The group interview was conducted to lead to spontaneous and emotional statements about the topic being discussed, and also to reduce the interviewer's control of the interview situation (Kvale, 1996: 101). Even the students are the English education study program's studens, the interview was conducted in their first language, in this case Bahasa Indonesia. It was intended to get natural and real answers to the questions. There were twenty six questions in the interview. The questions were based on the ten items in the questionnaire, exploring the students' opinion on the lecturer's actual teaching writing performance in the classroom (see Appendix VI).

3.2.3.4. Documents Analysis

In the qualitative research, documents consist of public and private records that qualitative researchers can obtain aout a site or participants in a study, such as newspaper, minutes of meetings, personal journal, or diaries (Cresswell, 2008). The documents used in this present study were the students' writings from two writing assignments. Those writing assignments were used to evaluate the teaching writing performance, whether or not the teacher had successfully delivered the materials in her teaching to the students.

There were two assignments tests given to the students. Writing assignment 1 was given by the lecturer at the beginning of the semester, and writing assignment 2 was given by the lecturer after five meetings. In assignment 1, the students were given a topic and they have to develop a descriptive text based on the topic within 45 minutes. While in assignment 2, the students were given a topic from a video and they were asked to write a procedural text based on the video for thirty minutes. Their writings were scored based on an analytic scoring rubric addapted from Weir's (1990 cited in Weigle, 2009). The scoring criteria covers the writing microskills that have been taught by the teachers within six meetings (see Appendix V).

3.3 Data Analysis

Data analysis consists of examining, categorizing, tabulating, testing, or otherwise recombining both quantitative and qualitative evidence to address the initial propositions of a study. Analyzing case study evidence is especially difficult because the strategies and technique have not been well defined (Yin, 2003). Further, Yin (2008) also suggested that the main point of data analysis in a case study is defining priorities for what to analyze and why. In a qualitative study a researcher needs to analyze the data to form answers to the research questions. This process involves examining the data in detail to describe what the researcher learned, and developing themes or broad categories of ideas from the data (Cresswell, 2008). Describing and developing themes from the data consists of answering the major research questions and forming an in-depth understanding of the central phenomenon through description and thematic development (Cresswell, 2008).

In the present study, the data analyses were conducted to answer four research questions. The data obtained from closed-ended and open-ended questionnaires, non-participant classroom observations, semi-structured interviews, and writing assignments were analyzed, categorized, and then interpreted into two themes based on the research questions.

The TWSE questionnaire was analyzed to answer the first research question concerning a lecturer's perceived English teachers' self efficacy in teaching writing. The data was analyzed in some of the following analytic strategy offered by Bagdan and Biklen (1992) in Creswell (1998). Step 1 was reading the respondent' answers. Step 2 was writing memos and comment. Step 3 was trying out themes on subjects. Step 4 was playing with concept. Step 5 was developing coding strategies. Step 6 was sorting material into categories.

As discussed in the previous section, the data gained from classroom observations were analyzed to answer the second research and the third research questions about the actual teaching writing performance of the respondent and also to see the discrepancy between the respondent's perceived TWSE and her actual teaching writing performance. In a qualitative analysis, the data analysis was conducted in the followings. Step 1 was transferring the data from the memory card into the computer file. Step 2 was transcribing data. It was conducted by listening and watching the videotapes, reading the notes of the classroom observations, and then converting data from videotapes into text data. Step 3 was marking the text data by hand and dividing them into three parts based on the themes of the research questions (hand analysis). The themes are the English lecturer's TWSE and its' discrepancy on her teaching performance. Step 4 was describing data. In this , the researcher described and developed the data consisting in answering the research questions and forming deep understanding of the phenomenon through the description and the thematic development. The 5 was reporting and interpreting the findings. The steps explained above are relevant to the statement suggested by Creswell (2008: 245-257; see also Powell and Renner, 2003).

After completing the field note and classifying the records from the classroom observation, the raw data then be classified to a teaching performance assessment. This step is to see if the respondent has been at which level, i.e., not satisfactory, standard, satisfactory and exceed satisfactory.

Meanwhile, the data from the interviews was analyzed to answer the four research questions in this study by following these steps. Step 1 was converting the data from oral language to written language. The interview transcripts were read many times to look for the statements representing the perspective mainly related to the research questions. Step 2 was coding the data. The codes were later used as categories to organize the data based on the research questions. Step 3 was interpreting and concluding the data into the findings as a descriptive report representing point of views within interpretative orientation. The stages of the data analysis conformed to the statement proposed by Kvale (1996).

Lastly, the data from the students' writings were analyzed using writing rubric adapted from Jacobs et al.'s (1981 cited in Weigle, 2009). This data was to enhance the findings on the effect of the actual teaching writing performance of the respondent to her students. The rubric covered five categories of microskills in writing including relevance and adequacy content, compositional organization, adequacy vocabulary, grammar, and mechanical accuracy (punctuation). Each category was graded into 4 levels with similar score to each level and each level has its own descriptors (see Appendix VII). The maximum score based on the rubric is twenty and it is multiplied by five to get 100 as the final score. The results of the students' writings in assignment 1 and assignment 2 were compared to get the average score. Besides looking at the average, the researcher also noted the most common problems occurred in the students writings (see Appendix VIII). Finally, the average score and the students' most commonly occurring problems in their writing were compared to results of the teacher's TWSE and also the interviews.

3.5. Data Validation

In doing a case study report, the third procedure to be followed is related to the overall quality of the study (Yin, 2003). In other words, the researcher should make sure that the findings and interpretations are accurate throughout the process of data collection and analysis. According to Cresswell (2008) validating findings

means that the researcher determines the accuracy or credibility of the findings through strategies such as member checking or triangulation.

There are varied terms that qualitative researchers use to describe this accuracy or credibility and the strategies used to validate qualitative accounts vary in number (Cresswell&Miller, 2000). Among others, Cresswell (2008) mentioned three primary strategies typically used by qualitative researchers to validate the findings : triangulation, member checking, and auditing.

The present study followed two strategies to validate the accuracy of the findings. To triangulate the data, the researcher relied on several instruments in gaining the data such as a questionnaire, classroom observations, interviews and documents analysis. The questionnaire, and the lecturer's interviews were intended to answer the first research question about the respondent's perceived TWSE. As for the second research questions, the instrument used were classroom observations, the students' interviews, and the students' writings.

The second strategy applied to ensure the validity of the present research was member checking. In this strategy, the researcher checked the findings with the participant in the study to determine if the findings were accurate. After completing the TWSE questionnaire, the respondent was given the opportunity to clarify every answer she wrote in the TWSE and also the activities she run in the classroom observations, as it can be found in the second interview (see Appendix VI).

3.6. Concluding Remark

This part outlined the research methodology, and also the approaches to data collection, data analysis and data validation. Multi-methods of data collection were chosen to provide the researcher with information that would enrich the answer to the research questions. This approach provides a greater chance for evaluating the results of the study.

Nia Kurniawati, 2014

Perceived self efficacy vs actual teaching performance : A case in teaching writing

Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia | repository.upi.edu | perpustakaan.upi.edu