

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This chapter deals with some important aspects related to the methodology of the study covering research setting, participants, research design, data collection techniques, and data analysis.

3.1 Setting

This study was conducted in one of department in a polytechnique in Bandung. There were several reasons in choosing the site as the research site. Firstly, the department has given greater attention to English proficiency in its curriculum. It was indicated by the inclusion of English course in each semester. Besides, some activities in the classroom focused more on improving students speaking skills, such as role play, presentation, and interviewing. These activities fit with the researcher's intention to investigate the occurrence of oral corrective feedback.

Another reason was related to access. The research site was fully accessible. The researcher was fully supported and permitted by either head of the program or teacher to conduct the observation in the classroom. The other department, especially the teacher, was reluctant to take a part of the research since they view it as a threat.

3.2 Participants

Participants of the study were an English teacher and thirty six first year students. The teacher was an English teacher who had more than five years teaching experience. She was consistent in using English as the language instruction in the classroom. She also used to give the correction or feedback for the students. Thus, this teacher was relevant to the purpose of this study which aimed to investigate the use of oral corrective feedback in the classroom activity.

The selection of the first year students is based on the fact that they actively engaged in the classroom interaction. Moreover, they were heterogeneous in term of English proficiency levels. Based on the rubric scored by the teacher, there were 11 students categorized as low proficiency, 21 as mid proficiency, and 4 as high proficiency. The heterogeneous level of students' proficiency was put into consideration to support the investigation of the use oral corrective feedback for students of different proficiency levels.

3.3 Research Design

This study was designed as a qualitative case study. A qualitative approach was appropriate to be employed since this study took transcript of lesson to find the use of oral corrective feedback for students of different proficiency levels (Nunan and Bailey, 2009, p. 413). To make a clear description, some qualitative data were quantified to show the number, percentage, and distribution of oral corrective feedback for students of different proficiency levels. Regarding this, Nunan and Bailey state:

All qualitative data can be quantified in some ways. In other words, thing can be quantified in qualitative data. In fact, there is almost no limits to the things that can be counted in qualitative data sets..... (Nunan and Bailey, 2009, p.414)

Meanwhile, a case study design has been chosen for four reasons. Firstly, this study was conducted in naturally occurred situation and context without manipulating variables (Nunan and Bailey, 2009). Secondly, this study treated oral corrective feedback as single case that is investigated (Heighman and Croker, 2009; Stake in Creswell, 2009; and Yin in Emilia, 2008). Thirdly, the case in this study has physical boundary (this study was conducted only in one department), temporal boundary (this study investigated several lesson session which had beginning and an end) and bounded instance (this study focused on one classroom with a teacher and her students) (Nunan and bailey, 2009, p 162). Lastly, the study used more than one data collection techniques (classroom observation, interview, and rubric) (Heighman and Croker, 2009 and Stake in Creswell, 2009). To

investigate the teacher's oral corrective feedback strategy for the students of different proficiency levels, three data collection techniques (classroom observation, rubric, and interview) were used. To discover the types of corrective feedback that contribute to more uptake, the data were obtained from classroom observation and rubric. Meanwhile, to draw a picture of students' attitude to the teacher's corrective feedback, the data were gained through observation and interview which will be discussed subsequently.

3.4 Data Collection Techniques

This section describes the procedure utilized to collect the data. There were two data collection techniques employed in this study: Observation and interview. By using these two data collection techniques, this study was expected to provide triangulated findings and analysis.

3.4.1 Observation

The purpose of observation was to record the use of oral corrective feedback that a teacher provided for low, mid, and high levels students. It was also used to record the students' uptake in response to the teacher's oral corrective feedback. Moreover, it was also utilized to record the students' actual behavior, thought, and feeling.

To achieve these three purposes, the classroom interaction was observed. The observation was conducted three times. It was conducted from October to November, 2013 with each meeting lasting in 150 minutes. In observing the classroom interaction, video recording was used (the transcribing result can be seen in Appendix 1). The use of video recording was not hidden. In this case, the place where the video recording put was highly considered in order to anticipate the unclear view or voice. The researcher was also presented in the classroom to make sure that the recorder worked well.

During the classroom observation, the researcher also filled the observation sheet which was prepared before. The observation sheet was developed based on the categorization of oral corrective feedback proposed by Lyster and Ranta (1997), Lyster and Panova (2002), and Ellis (2009). The data from the observation sheet was used to support the data gained from the video recording. Besides, the researcher also wrote some important things on the field note as suggested by McMillan and Schumacher (2001). This note was aimed to record unspoken thought, feeling, or behavior. The description of observation sheet and field note can be seen in Appendix 4.

In addition, the researcher also gave a rubric for the teacher to be scored. The rubric was used to capture the information of students' oral proficiency level in English. The rubric was adapted from Rost's (2005) speaking rubric. The rubric used 4-point scale. The students who get score 4 - 8 were categorized as low achievers, 9 - 13 as middle achievers, and 14 - 16 as high achievers. The description of speaking rubric can be found in the Appendix 2.

3.4.2 Interview

The interview was second data collection used in this study. A semi-structured interview was chosen due to its flexibility to confirm the respondents' answers. In a semi structured interview, the researcher's question did not exactly follow the interview guideline which was made before, but it was developed based on the respondents' answers (Merriam, 1998). Through this, it was expected that the data findings could deepen and enrich.

The interview was employed for both teacher and students. For the teacher, it was employed to reveal the teacher's opinion on corrective feedback used for low, mid, and high proficiency students. It also employed to reveal the teacher's choices on applying certain type of corrective feedback for low, mid, and high proficiency students. Besides, it was employed to confirm the data findings obtained from observation.

For the teacher, the interview's questions were divided into three parts. (see Appendix 5). First was grand tour question that involved four questions. The first four questions were intended as the starting question that led the teacher to focus on her oral corrective feedback. Second part was related to the teacher's choice to employ certain types of oral corrective feedback for low, mid, and high achievement students. Third part was related to the other factors which might influence the use of corrective feedback in the classroom.

Meanwhile, the interview with the students was employed to reveal their attitude to the teacher's oral corrective feedback. According to Muller (1996) and Azwar (1997), interview can be used to measure attitude since it can directly asked what people think or how they feel. As a result, greater depth and detail of response would be got. Besides, interview with the students also employed to confirm the data obtained from observation. Only nine students are chosen as the interviewees. They are chosen based on their proficiency levels, especially speaking skill: three students from lowest level, three from the middle level, and the other three from the cleverest level.

For the students, the questions of the interview were developed based on the component of attitude proposed by Oskamp and Schultz (2005), which were cognitive, affective, and behavioral component. The question were divided into four parts (see Appendix 6). First part was related to the implementation of teacher's oral corrective feedback. Second part was related to the students' belief of oral corrective feedback. Third part was consisted of several questions which asked their feeling after they received oral corrective feedback from the teacher. The last part asked the students' behavior after getting the correction from the teacher.

The interview was recorded to get the verbatim data (Alwasillah, 2010). The interview was conducted in the classroom at the end of the lesson. The interview lasted for about 5-10 minutes for each participant. The interview was conducted in Bahasa Indonesia to get clear understanding of what the

researcher and participants uttered. The interview was later transcribed and translated into English. The data from interview will be presented and discussed in Chapter 4.

3.5 Data Analysis

This section discussed the data analysis of this study. The analysis contained three data collection techniques used: classroom observation and interview. The following part explains the analysis of each collected data.

3.5.1 Analyzing the Data from Video Recording

The process of analysis started from the transcribing the data gained through video recording. The transcription was focused on oral production. Lesson opening and closing were also included in transcription since on the opening and closing the teacher gave the opportunity for the students to speak up.

The strategy of transcribing video recording was adapted from Ellis's transcription system (In Nunan and Bailey, 2009) below:

1. Teacher and students are designated by initials. T = Teacher, S= students, Ss= more than one students.
2. Pause is indicated in parentheses with one or more periods. For instance (.) indicates pause of second or shorter.
3. XXX is used to indicate speech that could not be deciphered.
4. Phonetic transcription is used when the students' pronunciation is markedly different from the teacher's pronunciation and also when it was not possible to identify the English word the students were using.
5. ... Indicates an incomplete utterance.
6. Italics is used to distinguished L1 and L2 utterance

After the transcription process was finished, the data were coded and classified based on the categorization of oral corrective feedback from Lyster and Ranta (1999), Lyster and Panova (2002), and Ellis (2009). There were eight types of corrective feedback namely recast, explicit correction, elicitation, metalinguistic feedback, clarification request, repetition, translation, and paralinguistic sign.

Afterward, the categorization of students' proficiency levels was done. As previously mentioned, the categorization of students' proficiency levels was based on the Rost's (2005) speaking rubric which was scored by the teacher, in which there were 11 students categorized as low achievers, 21 students as middle achievers, and 4 students as high achievers.

The categorization of teacher's oral corrective feedback was then distributed based on students' proficiency levels. For instance, which types of corrective feedback was given to low, mid, and high proficiency students. The number and percentage of teacher's oral corrective feedback were put in the table as shown below:

Table 3.1

Types of oral corrective feedback	Students' proficiency levels					
	Low		Mid		High	
	No	%	No	%	No	%
Recast						
Explicit correction						
Elicitation						
Metalinguistic feedback						

Categorization of Corrective Feedback based on Lyster and Ranta (1997), Lyster and Panova (2002), and Ellis (2009)

Clarification request						
Repetition						
Translation						
Paralinguistic signal						
Total						

The result of categorizing and distribution will be discussed in Chapter 4. The discussion will be divided into eight parts, based on the types of corrective feedback. In the discussion, the researcher will describe the types of oral corrective feedback given by the teacher by explaining the distribution, providing the example, describing the context, and interpreting their occurrences to answer the first research question of the study.

To investigate the types of corrective feedback contribute to more uptake, the data were coded and classified based on the categorization of uptake from Lyster and Ranta (1997). There were two types of uptake, namely repair and need repair. Repair consisted of four types of uptake, which are repetition, incorporation, self- and peer-correction. Meanwhile, need repair consisted of six forms of uptake, which are acknowledgement, same error, different error, partial error, off target, and hesitation. The number and percentage of uptake in each student's proficiency level were put in the Table as can be seen below:

Table 3.2 Categorization of Uptake by Lyster and Ranta (1997)

Types of Corrective Feedback	UPTAKE										Total Uptake	NO UPTAKE
	Repair				Need Repair							
	R	I	SC	PC	AC	SE	DE	OT	H	PR		
Recast												
Explicit correction												
Elicitation												

Metalinguistic feedback												
Clarification request												
Repetition												
Translation												
Paralinguistic signal												

R=repetition; I=incorporation; SC= self-correction; PR=peer correction; AC=acknowledgement; SE= same error; DE= different error; OT =off target; H=hesitation; PR=partial correction

The result of categorizing and distribution will be discussed in Chapter 4. The discussion will be divided into three parts, based on the students' proficiency levels. In the discussion, the researcher will describe the percentage of uptake and interpreted their occurrences to answer the second research question of the study.

3.5.2 Analyzing the Data from Interview

The interview data were analyzed to confirm the findings obtained from the observation. In analyzing the interview data, the researcher did several steps. First, the interview data were transcribed. Second, the transcribed data were categorized based on the response given by a teacher and students. Third, the result of categorization was discussed and used to contradict or confirm the findings from observation. The discussion of the students' interview, particularly, will be based on the component of attitude proposed by Oskamp and Schultz (2009) in order to answer the third research question of the study.

3.6 Concluding Remarks

This chapter provides the information on research methodology used in this study. There are three important points reviewed in this chapter. First, this study was qualitative case study. Second, the data were collected from two sources including classroom observation and interview. Third, the data analysis was conducted based on the categorization of oral corrective feedback from Lyster and

Ranta (1997), Panova and Lyster (2002), and Ellis (2009); categorization of uptake from Lyster and Ranta (1997); and attitude component by Oskamp and Schultz (2005). Further, the data analysis and interpretation will be presented in the next chapter.