CHAPTER III
METHODOLOGY

This chapter describes the methodology used to collect and analyze data in this study. There are six sections in this chapter. In the first section, aims of the study are displayed in the introduction section to show readers the research problems addressed in this study. Second, research design is discussed to inform research method and approach applied in this study. Next, data collection is described to show research site, subjects of study, steps of data collection and techniques used in collecting the data. Finally, data analysis is explained to report how the collected data are analyzed step by step to answer research questions.

3.1 Introduction

It was acknowledged in chapter one that this research mainly aims to report various types of oral corrective feedback in relation to learner uptake. To fulfill the aim, two research questions are proposed: The first deals with types of oral corrective feedback and their distribution in a young learner EFL classroom, the second copes with types of learners’ uptake and their distribution following different types of oral corrective feedback. The following sections elaborate the methodology used in collecting and analyzing the data to answer the proposed research questions.

3.2 Research Design

Based on the categorization of research design from Nunan and Bailey (2009), this study can be classified as a case study research because the case in this study has physical boundary (this study was conducted in a certain English course in Bandung), temporal boundary (this study investigated several lesson sessions which had a beginning and an end) and bounded instance (this study focused on one classroom with a teacher and her students). This study was also conducted in
naturally occurring situation and context without manipulating variables (p.162). Hence, the result is centered on description, inference, and interpretation.

This study applied a qualitative approach by taking transcripts of lessons and interview to find the teacher’s strategies of oral corrective feedback and learner uptake in classroom interaction. To make the description clearer, some qualitative data were quantified to show the number, percentage and distribution of corrective feedback strategies and learner uptakes. In this case, Nunan and Bailey (2009) state:

All qualitative data can be quantified in some way. In other words, things can be counted in qualitative data. In fact, there is almost no limit to the things that can be counted in qualitative data sets. Consider a lesson transcript…(Nunan & Bailey, 2009, p.414)

In addition, stimulated recall responses from the teacher were also analyzed to look for parallel and connected comments that confirm or contradict the findings from observation data. The description of research design and data analysis hopefully can give a clear picture on how this study was carried out to answer the three research questions mentioned above.

3.3 Data Collection
This part answers who were taken as subjects of study and where, when and how the data were collected:

3.3.1 Research Site
This study was conducted in a young learner English Classroom in an English course in Bandung. The course was designed for young learners to learn English as foreign language (EFL). There were six levels of classes: Gogo 1, Gogo 2, Gogo 3, Gogo 4, Gogo 5, and Gogo 6 (The levels of class followed the levels of English book Gogo series published by Longman). Each level was designed for a semester.
This course was chosen as research site for several reasons. The first reason was the English course serves as a typical case (Nunan & Bailey, 2009) to find out information from a specific case to fill in the gap of previous research. In this case, the site fit with the researcher’s intention to investigate the occurrence of oral corrective feedback in a young learner English class in English course. The programs in this English course were targeted for young learners. With more than a hundred and fifty young learners learning English at the course, classroom research is important to conduct in order to improve teaching and learning quality there.

The second reason was the researcher’s convenience (Patton, 1980, in Alwasilah, 2002) to conduct research in chosen research site due to its support and accessibility. The research was fully supported by the owner, the manager, and the teachers since this research was expected to help teachers in improving the quality of language instruction in the classroom. In addition, the research site was fully accessible. In this case, the researcher was fully permitted and supported to conduct observation in the classroom.

3.3.2 Subjects of the Study
After several considerations, a class of Gogo 4 was chosen. This class was taken due to several reasons. The class was more homogenous in terms of age comparing to other classes. The students were 9-10 years old and most of them were in grade four. Homogenous age was put into consideration to avoid multiple variables in the research since age may influence the way teacher corrects students’ errors. The students in the class were also considered as active students who usually take part in oral interaction.

There were seven students in the class. Most of them came from family with high socioeconomic status. The students in this study had learned formal English for three semesters in the English course. Their first language was Sundanese and Indonesian. Therefore, English was considered as foreign language for them.
Since there were only seven students in the class, it was easier for the teacher to identify the students’ proficiency and personality. The teacher identified her seven students this way:

1) B (Female)

B is a competent student. Her ability in four basic English skills is sufficient. She is able to receive new input, especially new vocabularies, very well. However, in writing, she sometimes makes unnecessary mistakes, due to her carelessness. Considering personality, she is often whiny, and also negotiates a lot.

2) M (Female)

M finds it difficult to understand new materials all at once. Since she still has problem with spelling, writing is her biggest challenge. She also still has to practice more on her reading, speaking, and listening because all skills are related one to another, for example in dictation. Regarding personality, she often feels unconfident when practicing her English because she realizes her weaknesses.

3) H (Male)

For proficiency, H is similar to B. However, he is often uncertain when practicing his English, for example when speaking; he speaks in low volume because he is afraid that he pronounces the vocabularies wrong. About personality, he is a nice student. He is submissive yet still cheerful.

4) I (Female)

I is a bright student, the four basic English skills are mastered quite well. However, the patterns (grammar) given sometimes limit her creativity in using her
English that she tends to play safe. For example when being asked to make sentences; she chooses to make simple sentences as long as the pattern is correct. She gets anxious easily; and her anxiety often influences her learning mood. She is a good student, though.

5) A (Female)

A’s attention span is probably the biggest concern. Although her English competence is basically adequate, she is very easily distracted and that definitely has impacts in her learning process. Her attention is usually maintained by asking her questions regarding the materials being learnt and involving her actively in class activities. However, her eagerness to learn is very helpful. About her personality, A is a very cheerful student. She is also physically active.

6) Ay (Female)

Since Ay is a new student, she needs to catch up what she has missed. This might has resulted unconfident use of English. Speaking is probably her biggest challenge, specifically pronunciation; that’s why she speaks in a very low volume. Concerning personality Ay is an easygoing student. She can mingle with the other students well.

7) F (Female)

It is no problem for F to receive new inputs. She is very smart. Her background knowledge also helps her a lot in her learning process, like a support-system. She knows many vocabularies, and she is brave in using them when writing and speaking. For her personality, F realizes that she is smart that she often underestimates the materials; unfortunately that results in unnecessary mistakes.

The teacher was an English teacher with more than five years teaching experience in different levels (young and teenager). She was a teacher who was considered as having potential to be a model teacher. The institution had chosen
her as one of curriculum team and sent her to teacher trainings. In that case, she was often assigned to share the result of trainings. The evaluation of teacher’s performance also revealed that she was more consistent in using English as language instruction in the class comparing to other teachers. Furthermore, she wrote articles in English for a reputable airline in Indonesia. With the qualifications mentioned above, the teacher was expected to be a good teacher model in employing corrective feedback strategies in the classroom. More importantly, she volunteered herself to be observed for research and improvement.

Classroom interaction usually lasted in 90 minutes. However, the interaction that was transcribed only covered speaking sessions, especially those that focused on oral oriented skill. The steps of classroom activities were designed in line with the syllabus and the book that had been provided by Longman. Each lesson unit had a topic with several learning activities: conversation, vocabulary, practice 1, practice 2, song, activity 1, activity 2, and sounds & words.

3.3.3 Steps of Data Collection

Prior to this study, a preliminary study had been conducted in different research site. The preliminary study was conducted in a first grade of an elementary school in Bandung Barat. The stated purpose of the preliminary study was to describe the occurrence of teacher’s feedback (Maolida, 2012). The study revealed that the corrective feedback utilized by the teacher was used to negotiate meaning and form in classroom interaction. It was also used to expand conversation and scaffold learning. By conducting the preliminary study, the researcher also practiced coding process by using Lyster and Ranta’s categorization (1997) and learnt how the context contributed a lot to the result of study.

Data collection for the present study was conducted in five weeks. The following table is the schedule of data collection for this study:

Table 3.1 Schedule of Data Collection
Observation in the class was conducted for three weeks that involved six meetings. Those six meetings covered two unit lessons. The stimulated recall interview was conducted one week after all observations were carried out.

3.3.4 Data Collection Techniques

This section describes the procedures utilized to collect the data. There were two data collection techniques employed in this study: Observation and stimulated recall interview. The two techniques were used to corroborate the findings to answer the research questions. By employing two different techniques, this study is expected to provide triangulated findings and analysis on the teacher’s strategies on employing oral corrective feedback and the learner uptake following different types of feedback.

3.3.4.1 Observation (Audio and Video Recording)

This technique was employed for three purposes. First, it was utilized to investigate the teacher’s oral corrective feedback strategies to correct young learners’ erroneous spoken utterances. Second, it was utilized to investigate the learner uptake as a response to the oral corrective feedback. Third, it was utilized to see the context of how the teacher and students naturally interacted in the learning process, especially in the feedback episodes.
To achieve those three purposes, the classroom interaction was observed electronically by recording the interaction using audio and video recording (Nunan & Bailey, 2009). Besides, the researcher presented there to make sure the recorders worked well and jot down some important things regarding the focus of this study. In the process of observation, the researcher tried to set up the recorders and located herself so the students did not feel disrupted. The following picture shows the typical seat arrangement during the observation and the location of recorders to record the interaction.

![Figure 3.1 Typical Seat Arrangements in the Classroom during Observation](image)

Five hundred and forty minutes of lesson were recorded using a video camera and a digital audio recorder that involved six sessions (90 minutes per meeting). The video camera of Samsung Camcorder F70 series was used to record the
interaction. Before the students entered the class, the camera was turned on and put on a bookcase behind the students. To make sure the voice could be well recorded; an audio recorder (Blackberry Curve 9930) was turned on and put on teacher’s table in front of the class. By setting up a camera at the back side and an audio recorder in the front side of the classroom, it was hoped that all interactions were well documented.

In observing classroom interaction, the researcher took a role as a non-participant observer. The researcher did not take a part in planning the lesson nor in teaching and learning process. She only put the video and audio recorder in a hidden place in the classroom and sat on a chair with a computer in order to avoid possible distraction to the students. The teacher was informed that the researcher was going to record the classroom interaction without specifically mentioning what features of interaction were going to be investigated.

3.3.4.2 Stimulated Recall Interview

This technique of data collection was applied for three purposes. First, it was employed to reveal the teacher’s comments on employing different types of corrective feedback. Second, it was employed to reveal the teacher’s comments on her intentions on applying different types of oral corrective feedback in connection with the learner uptake. Third, it was employed to confirm the data findings obtained from observation. By conducting this technique, the teacher’s comments, opinions, justifications, and decision making process in employing different types of oral corrective feedback in connection with the learners’ uptake were revealed.

The application of this technique followed the definition of stimulated recall from Nunan and Bailey (2009):

Stimulated recall, as the name suggests, is a procedure by which a researcher stimulates the recollection of a participant in an event by having that person reviews data collected during the event. The data used in stimulated recall usually consist of videotape or audiotape recordings, or transcripts made from
such recordings, though some researchers have also used field notes (Nunan & Bailey, 2009, p. 259).

The researcher showed the transcript to the teacher, especially specific parts of transcript which contained oral corrective feedback episode. Then, the researcher asked the teacher to comment on what happened during the feedback episodes and the decision making process she had at that time. For some parts, the video recording was shown and paused at specific part of interaction. By doing this, the teacher reflected on the cognitive process of decision making she made in employing different types of corrective feedback.

The questions in the interview were divided into three parts. First were grand tour questions that involved six questions. The first six questions were intended as starting questions that introduced the teacher to the core questions that would be given later. These questions were also intended to lead the teacher to focus on her corrective strategies that were shown in the transcript and video later. Second were stimulated recall interview that involved seven main questions regarding the teacher’s choice to employ different types of feedback. In this case, transcript and some parts of video recording were shown to recall the teacher’s cognitive process at that time. Third was stimulated recall closing that involved five questions regarding the teacher’s opinion on the findings that were based on the transcript and recordings.

Stimulated recall interview was chosen due to its appropriateness to use in this study and several advantages (Nunan & Bailey, 2009, p. 259). First, by doing stimulated recall interview, the researcher did not need to interrupt classroom interaction. It was mentioned earlier that the teacher was aware that her interaction with the students was observed but she did not know that the focus of the observation was on corrective feedback and learners’ uptake. By delaying the interview until all observations were finished, it was hoped that the natural interaction could be maintained. It was also expected that the teacher was not distracted in interacting with her students. Second, by using stimulated recall...
interview, it was hoped that the researcher could get better data than simply asking the teacher to remember the lesson without supporting data. By doing this, the researcher could get teacher’s response without pushing her to answer certain questions while in the same time the teacher could comment freely on what she did and how she decided to do that.

3.4 Data analysis

Data analysis in this study focused on data collected above: data from the recordings and data from interview. The recording results were transcribed, coded, categorized and analyzed. Meanwhile, the result of interview was coded and analyzed. Then, the analysis of each data collection was synthesized and discussed to answer the research questions. The following parts explain the process of analysis of each collected data to fulfill the aims of study.

3.4.1 Analyzing the Data from Audio and Video Recording

The data from audio and video recording were transcribed, coded, categorized, described and analyzed to reveal the different types of oral corrective feedback and learner uptake following different types of oral corrective feedback. From the total recordings of six lesson events, only the interactions in oral production–oriented sessions were transcribed. In this case, lesson opening and closing were also included in transcription, since the opening and closing were always done orally and targeted to provide opportunities for students to ‘speak up’ and review the previous topics.

The process of analysis started with transcribing the data. In this case, the transcription strategy adapted the transcription conventions from Ellis and Duff (in Nunan&Bailey, 2009, pp.348-349), with the following conventions:

a. T=teacher; students are designated by their initials; Ss is used to refer to more than one students.

b. Each utterance is numbered for ease of reference.
c. XXX is used to indicate speech that could not be deciphered.
d. Phonetic transcription is used when the student’s pronunciation is markedly different from the teacher’s pronunciation and also when it was not possible to identify the English word the pupils were using.
e. …indicates an incomplete utterance.
f. A limited amount of contextual information is given in brackets ( ).
g. Italics is used to distinguished L1 and L2 utterance.
h. Period (.) is for terminal falling intonation, coma (,) is for rising continuing intonation and question mark (?) is for high rising intonation.

The result of transcribed recording was read and confirmed by the observed teacher. To be noted, the transcription process did not wait until all recordings finished. Every time a recording was conducted, it was immediately transcribed and confirmed. Different from recording data that were transcribed in detail by following the convention mentioned above, interview data were not transcribed in a detailed way. In other words, the data from interview were transcribed to reveal the ideas from the teacher, excluded the linguistic form used by the teacher in answering the questions.

After the transcription process was finished, the result of transcription was shown to the observed teacher for clarification. In that case, the observed teacher gave some clarifications on some utterances she and her students produced, especially in corrective feedback episodes.

After the recordings of interaction in speaking sessions were transcribed, the data were coded and categorized by adapting the categorization of oral corrective feedback from Lyster&Ranta (1997) and Ellis (2009) to answer the first research question regarding the various types of oral corrective feedback and their distribution in the classroom interaction.

Table 3.2 Categorization of Oral Corrective Feedback (Lyster and Ranta, 1997)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Reformulation of all or part of a learner’s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Recast</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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erroneous utterance without changing its original meaning.

2 Explicit correction Provision of the correct form with a clear indication of what is being corrected.

3 Elicitation Techniques to elicit the correct form from the students without providing the correct form in the form of elicitation completion, elicitative question and reformulation request.

4 Metalinguistic feedback Metalinguistic information regarding the student’s erroneous utterance.

5 Clarification request Moves that indicate learners that their utterances were either not understood or were ill-formed.

6 Repetition A repetition of the student’s erroneous utterance.

7 Paralinguistic signal The use of gesture or facial expression to indicate the error has taken place

(The last category was taken from Ellis (2009))

The process of coding the data to answer the first research question was done simultaneously with the coding of data to answer the second research question (see appendix). To answer the second research question, the categorization of uptake from Lyster and Ranta (1997) was used in the coding process.

Table 3.3 Categorization of Uptake (Lyster and Ranta, 1997)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Repair</td>
<td>Uptake that leads to the correct reformulation of an error as a response to feedback.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need repair</td>
<td>Uptake that does not entail the correct form.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic Continuation</td>
<td>When the student does not provide any response to</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the teacher feedback and carries on topic continuation.

As a result, the types of corrective feedback and uptake were revealed. To maintain the validity and reliability of data codification, the coding process was also coded by a partner (see validity and reliability in the next part).

After oral corrective feedback strategies and learner uptakes were coded and categorized, they were quantified to look at their distribution in the interaction. Then, the numbers and percentage of oral corrective feedback were put in the table, as shown below:

Table 3.4 Table Design for the Distribution of Feedback Types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback Types</th>
<th>Number of Turns with Corrective Feedback</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recast</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elicitation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metalinguistic Feedback</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explicit Correction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarification Request</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paralinguistic Signal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repetition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Adapted from Lyster&Ranta, 2007; Panova & Lyster, 2002; Khaerunisa, 2002; Choi and Li, 2012)

Regarding the second research question, the different types of learners’ uptake following different types of oral corrective feedback were distributed to look at the potential influence of oral corrective feedback to the learner uptake.
Table 3.5 Table Design for the Distribution of Learner Uptake

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback Types</th>
<th>Repair</th>
<th>Needs Repair</th>
<th>No Uptake</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RP</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>DE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recast</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elicitation</td>
<td>SR</td>
<td>DE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metalinguistic</td>
<td>PR</td>
<td>OT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarification</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>HE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request</td>
<td></td>
<td>PE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explicit</td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paralinguistic</td>
<td>RP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repetition</td>
<td>SR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Adapted from Lyster & Ranta, 2007; Panova & Lyster, 2002; Khaerunisa, 2002; Choi and Li, 2012)

Based on the result of coding and distribution, the researcher described each type of oral corrective feedback given by the teacher by providing examples, describing the context, explaining the distribution in the interaction and interpreting the occurrence of feedback in the interaction to answer the first research question. In answering the second research question, the researcher described each type of learner uptake, describing the context and explaining the distribution for each type of oral corrective feedback and interpreting on the potential influence of corrective feedback to learner uptake.

3.4.2 Analyzing the Data from Stimulated Recall Interview

The data from stimulated recall interview were transcribed and analyzed qualitatively. The interview data were analyzed to confirm the findings obtained
from observation in answering the first and second research questions. In analyzing the data, the researcher carried out several steps. First, data from stimulated recall interview were transcribed. Second, the transcribed data were coded by following Alwasilah’s coding strategy (2002, p.232) by categorizing the data based on the responses given by the teacher. Third, the result of coding was condensed to confirm or contradict the findings obtained from observation.

In supporting the findings from observation, the findings from stimulated recall interview were cited in the analysis following Creswell’s (2003, p.197) suggestion to use the wordings from participants to give a detailed descriptive portrait. The wordings from interview were also compared and contrasted with the data from observation, theories and previous studies on oral corrective feedback and uptakes.

3.5 Validity and Reliability

In maintaining validity, the researcher did several things:

a. Methods Triangulation: Multiple methods were used in collecting the data including audio recording, video recording and stimulated recall interview.

b. Theory triangulation: Various theories were brought to bear in this study including interaction, output and noticing theories.

c. Member Validation/member checking: It involved asking the teacher to review the data and the interpretation to provide the researcher with feedback.

In maintaining reliability of this study, the researcher applied intercoding process, following Nunan & Bailey (2009) who suggest researchers to conduct intercoder agreement with the following steps:

One way to sort out this problem is to determine intercoder agreement—an index of the consistency with which different people categorize the same data. A simple percentage is calculated by dividing the number of items upon which coders agree by the total number of items that were coded.
The general rule of thumb is that intercoder agreement should be at least 85% for readers to have confidence in the reported findings (Nunan & Bailey, 2009, p. 428).

In applying intercoder agreement, the researcher carried out several steps. First, a partner was purposively chosen as an intercoder. She was chosen due to the researcher’s assumption of her linguistic sensitivity. Second, the partner was trained to code the data base on detail descriptors. Third, the researcher and the intercoder coded 10% of data together as an internalization of agreement toward the descriptor. Fourth, the researcher asked a partner to code 90% of data (see Sheen, 2004) and looked at the result whether agreement reached more or less than 85%. After the coding process was finished, the results were compared to look at the level of agreement. As a result, the agreement for learners’ uptake codification reached 91% while the agreement for oral corrective feedback codification reached 87%. The differences were resolved by discussion and modification of descriptor.