

## **CHAPTER III**

### **RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

This chapter explains the methodology used in the research that comprises of four sections; research design, research site and participant, data collection and data analysis. Those aspects were employed in order to answer these three questions: 1) What are teachers' corrective feedback strategies used to correct students' oral production in EFL classrooms? 2) For what reason, do teachers use those corrective feedback strategies in their classrooms? 3) What are students' perceptions of teachers' corrective feedback strategies used in the classrooms?

#### **3.1 Research Design**

This research employed a descriptive qualitative case study in which case study is another type of qualitative research addressing to a contemporary phenomenon (event, situation, program, or activity) within a natural context bounded by space and time (Hancock & Algozzine, 2006; Merriam, 1998). Case study research design is divided into exploratory, explanatory, and descriptive design (Yin, 2003) and a descriptive design was chosen since it "attempts to present a complete description of a phenomenon within its context" (Hancock & Algozzine, 2006, p. 33).

A descriptive qualitative case study was selected for this research since it was intended to investigate teachers' corrective feedback within its natural context. This research focused on one program, namely English for Teenagers Program which adapted Communicative Language Teaching in a top Language Center in Bandung, which was considered appropriate to provide the data needed for this research. Moreover, a case study as a qualitative design is "oriented to a unique set of contexts" (Stake, 2010, p. 15) and this research has uniqueness in which there were two English teachers assigned for each classroom.

This research obtained the data through classroom observation and interview (Heigham & Croker, 2009). Classroom observation was carried out to

collect the data regarding teacher's corrective feedback strategies used to correct students' oral production in EFL classrooms followed by learner uptake. In order

to provide a comprehensive result, some quantitative measurement was also conducted to show the number, percentage, and distribution of teachers' corrective feedback strategies and learner uptake. Nunan and Bailey (2009, p. 414) state that "all qualitative data can be quantified in some way. In other words, things can be counted in quantitative data. In fact, there is almost no limit to the things that can be counted in qualitative data sets". Moreover, Duff (2008) mentions that in conducting case study, the data can be triangulated by mixing qualitative and quantitative design to provide a complete view in understanding the case.

In addition, interviews were carried out for the teacher and the students, as well as the coordinator of the English program as supporting data. For the teacher, the interviews were carried out mainly to find out teachers' consideration in providing corrective feedback to the students and confirm or contradict certain information collected during the observation. The interview was also conducted to obtain the data about students' perceptions of teachers' corrective feedback strategies. While the interview for the coordinator mainly focused on the English for Teenagers course provided in the English course.

### **3.2 Research Site and Participant**

This research was conducted in an English course in Bandung. This site was chosen because of two reasons. First, the English program in this course provides English for Teenagers course which basically implements Communicative Approach in their classrooms. Hence, it is expected that this site can provide rich information on the teacher's corrective feedback during communicative activities which are designed especially for adolescents. Second, the research site was fully accessible and the research was permitted to be conducted by the coordinator of the program and the teachers as well.

There were two classes observed in this research, which involved the 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> grade students. The first class is at the level of Pre-Intermediate 1 with 7 students involved while the second class is at the level of Pre-Intermediate 2 with

5 students involved and there were two teachers assigned to teach in turn for each class. The coordinator of the program mentioned that two teachers were assigned to teach in each class just because of the technical issue concerning the teachers' schedule (see Appendix 1). In total, there were four English teachers, namely Ms Riana, Ms Yanti, Ms Diah, and Mr Arya as well as 12 students, namely Ami, Desi, Geri, Rahma, Vina, Wulan, and Zaki from the first class and Bunga, Cika, Rina, Sarah, and Ulfah from the second class took part as the participants in this research who were written under pseudonyms.

The students were chosen since they were around 13 years old who have reached "The Formal-operational stage" in which "abstract thinking develops and the child is now able to generalize beyond his/her immediate context from the instance to general" (Nunan, 2011, p. 6). Hence, the students at this level were considered appropriate for this research as they have already reached cognitive development and are capable enough to learn language forms which are usually highlighted in corrective feedback.

### **3.3 Data Collection**

A case study relies on multiple resources to collect evidence, commonly known as triangulation (Malik & Hamied, 2014). In order to collect sufficient data for answering the research questions, two data collection techniques were employed namely observations and interviews. The results obtained from those techniques were analyzed to collect related information on the teachers' corrective feedback strategies along with the reasoning for their choices and students' perceptions of teachers' corrective feedback strategies.

#### **3.3.1 Observation**

The classroom observation was conducted mainly to capture teachers' corrective feedback strategies in the classroom. The observation was done in six weeks with 14 meetings (100 minutes per meeting). The schedule of the observation is displayed as follows.

Table 3.1 Classroom Observation Schedule

Meeting	Pre-Intermediate 1		Pre-Intermediate 2	
	Ms Riana	Ms Yanti	Ms Diah	Mr Arya
1	Wed, May 18 <sup>th</sup>		Tue, May 24 <sup>th</sup>	
2		Fri, May 20 <sup>th</sup>		Fri, May 27 <sup>th</sup>
3	Wed, June 1 <sup>st</sup>		Tue, May 31 <sup>st</sup>	
4	Wed, June 8 <sup>th</sup>			Fri, June 3 <sup>rd</sup>
5		Fri, June 10 <sup>th</sup>		Fri, June 17 <sup>th</sup>
6	Wed, June 15 <sup>th</sup>		Tue, June 21 <sup>st</sup>	
7		Wed, June 22 <sup>nd</sup>		Fri, June 24 <sup>th</sup>

In order to collect the data from observation, video recording, audio recording, and field note were used as the instruments. Video recording was employed as Nunan (1992) states that different aspect as well as some significant point can be reanalyzed more by viewing the recordings after the event. Hence, video recording was used to collect information about teacher's corrective feedback strategies used in the classroom. However, video recordings were only employed in Mr Arya's classroom since based on the teachers' concern, it was considered to be too obstructive to be used in the other classroom sessions. As Bogdan and Biklen (1992) suggest that a smaller number of subjects is likely to be more obstructive. In addition, audio recordings were used in all classes to capture teacher and students' turns during the meetings.

The data collected from the video and audio recording were also supported by the data from field notes. The field note was designed to record teacher and students' behavior during the meeting. As Creswell (2008) mentions that field note was taken to record behaviors and activities in the research site. The data

recorded is expected to add beneficial information that cannot be captured by video and audio recordings (see Appendix 2).

Table 3.2 Field Note

Time	What T says/does	What Ss say/do

During the classroom observation, the researcher took part as a non-participant observer as she did not take part in teaching and learning process. As Malik and Hamied (2014) stated that non-participant observation lets the researcher not to be emotionally involved with the participants in the field. The researcher only recorded the classroom activities and filled the field notes as a process of collecting the data.

### 3.3.2 Interview

Following the result from classroom observation, interviews were conducted for the coordinator of the course program, the teachers and the students. Semi-structured interview was chosen as it is mainly suitable to ask determined but flexible questions which allow the participants to answer freely from their own perspective (Hancock & Algozzine, 2006).

The interview with the coordinator of the program was carried out mainly to find out the general information about the English course program which focused on adolescents, namely English for Teenagers (EFT) course. The interview covered several questions concerning the description of the program, the main

objectives, the levels available, the learning objectives for each level, and also the process of materials development. The collected information hopefully can provide a general portrayal of the classrooms situations observed in this research.

The interviews conducted for the teacher were mainly aimed at figuring out the teachers' reasons for providing oral corrective feedback on students' oral production. It was also employed to confirm or contradict the data findings from the observation. The starting questions from the first to the seventh were intended to find out the general situations of the classroom, mainly about the learners from the teachers' point of view. The next six questions concerned with the teachers' view on learner errors and teachers' reaction on them. The next four questions led the teachers to focus on the corrective feedback strategies. They concerned with the teachers' reasons for using certain corrective feedback strategies. In this part, teachers were shown the eight corrective feedback strategies along with its definition and example to provide sufficient information for the teachers in answering the questions. The last three questions were intended to find out the effect of corrective feedback on students' learning from the teachers' perspective.

While for the students, the interview was carried out to reveal their perceptions of teacher's oral corrective feedback strategies. Perception is related to someone's belief and attitude which is related to one's feeling, attitude, drive, and goal (Sperling, 1982). Perception also involves individual sensation and interpretation of one's prior experience. The first six questions were the starting questions related to their goals and experience on learning. The next three questions concerned with the teachers' corrective feedback used during the learning. The last five questions related to their attitude, feelings, and beliefs on the teachers' corrective feedback strategies.

The interviews for both the teachers and students were conducted in Bahasa Indonesia to get a clear understanding of their utterances. The interview results then were transcribed and translated into English to be presented and discussed in the Chapter 4.

### 3.4 Data Analysis

In this research, the data analysis focused on the data found from the video recordings, audio recordings, field notes, and interview. The results of the video and audio recordings were transcribed, coded, categorized, and analyzed. In addition, the interview result was transcribed and analyzed to support the findings from the observation. The data from field note were also used to support the information found from video and audio recordings. After that, the data collected was analyzed and discussed to answer the research questions.

First of all, the data from video and audio recordings were transcribed, coded, categorized, and analyzed to reveal the different strategies of teacher's oral corrective feedback and learner uptake as supporting data. The first process was transcribing the data by adapting the transcription conventions from Ellis and Duff (cited in Nunan & Bailey, 2009, pp. 348–349) with the following conventions:

- a. T = Teacher, Ss refers to more than one students while each student is coded by their initials of their pseudonyms.
- 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 students' pronunciations different from the teacher's, to highlight teacher's corrective feedback, and when it is not possible to identify the English word used by the students.
- e. ... indicates incomplete utterances
- f. Italic is used to distinguish L1 and L2 utterances.
- g. Period (.) is or terminal falling intonation, coma (,) is for rising continuing intonation and question mark (?) is for high rising intonation.

The transcription mainly recorded the teachers' corrective feedback moves to be coded and categorized. In addition, the coding and categorization of learner uptake were also included as it is closely related to the effectiveness of corrective feedback. The categorization follows Lyster and Ranta's (1997) theories which



divide uptake into repair and needs repair. The repair category comprises four moves, namely repetition (RP), incorporation (IN), self-repair (SR), and peer-repair (PR). While the needs repair category includes acknowledgment (AC), same error (SE), different error (DE), hesitation (HE), off target (OT), and partial repair (PA). When teachers' corrective feedback is followed by topic continuation, there will be no uptake (NU) on the error treatment cycle. The following table was used to reveal the number of teachers' corrective feedback strategies followed by learner uptake.

Table 3.3 Table Design for the Distribution of Teacher’s Corrective Feedback and Learner Uptake

No	Time	Corrective Feedback Episode	Corrective Feedback Strategy										Uptake								NU
													Repair				Need Repair				
			RC	TR	EC	CR	M	EL	RP	PS	RP	IN	SR	PR	AC	SE	DE	OT	HE	PA	
<b>TOTAL</b>																					

After the transcription process was done, the data were coded and categorized based on the categorization of teacher's corrective feedback strategies from Lyster and Ranta (1997), Panova and Lyster (2002), and Ellis (2009) comprising recast (RC), translation (TR), explicit correction (EC), clarification request (CR), metalinguistic feedback (MF), elicitation (EL), repetition (RP), and paralinguistic signal (PS) to answer the first research question regarding teachers' corrective feedback strategies in EFL classrooms. After the coding and categorizing session, the findings of teacher's corrective feedback strategies were quantified to reveal its number, percentage, as well as distribution and displayed in the table shown below.

Table 3.4 Table Design for the Distribution of Teachers' Corrective Feedback Strategies

Feedback Strategy	Number of Turns				TOTAL	
	Ms Riana	Ms Yanti	Ms Diah	Mr Arya	F	%
RC						
TR						
EC						
CR						
MF						
EL						
RP						
PS						
<b>TOTAL</b>						

Based on the result of the coding and categorizing session, each oral corrective feedback strategy was shown by providing examples, describing the context, and interpreting the occurrences of feedback during the classroom interaction.

The data from the interview both for teacher and students were transcribed and analyzed. In the data analysis process of the interview result, first the data was transcribed. Then, the transcribed data were coded by categorizing the data based on the responses given by the teacher and the students. Lastly, the result was analyzed whether it confirmed or contradicted the data collected on the observation.

The results found in the interviews were analyzed to confirm findings obtained from observation as well as to reveal the teachers' reasons for providing corrective feedback to the learners. The data was supported by the findings from the observation concerning the distribution of learner uptake considering that it may reveal how teachers' choices of corrective feedback strategies engage students' interaction which promotes learning. This aspect should be taken into consideration as acquisitions take place during interaction (Ellis, 2009). The distribution of learner uptake in general will be displayed by using the table shown below.

Table 3.5 Table Design for the Distribution of Learner Uptake

Feedback Strategy	Uptake		Total Uptake	No Uptake	<b>TOTAL</b>
	Repair	Needs Repair			
RC					
TR					
EC					
CR					
MF					
EL					
RP					
PS					
<b>TOTAL</b>					

There were four teachers involved in this research. In this case, further analysis was needed to provide data in a detail and comprehensive way for each teacher. Hence, a further breakdown of the data display involved repetition (RP), incorporation (IN), self-repair (SR), and peer-repair (PR) as repair and acknowledgment (AC), same error (SE), different error (DE), hesitation (HE), off target (OT), and partial repair (PA) categorized as needs repair. The data will be displayed by following the table as follows.

Table 3.6 Table Design for the Distribution of Teacher's Corrective Feedback Strategies and Learner Uptake in Each Classroom

Feedback Strategies	Total	Uptake											Total Uptake	NU	
		Repair					Needs Repair								
		RP	IN	SR	PR	Tot	AC	SE	DE	HE	OT	PA			Tot
RC															
TR															
EC															
CR															
MF															
EL															
RP															
PS															

In addition, the other results revealed in the semi-structured interview with the twelve students were analyzed to reveal their perceptions of teachers' corrective feedback strategies provided during the classroom interaction. It is also expected that the findings can be a consideration for teachers in providing corrective feedback in their classroom.

### 3.5 Concluding Remarks

This chapter presents the information related to the research methodology employed in this research. There are four major parts that can be highlighted from the elaboration above. First, a qualitative case study was employed as the research design of the research. Second, the research was conducted in two English

classrooms by involving four teachers and twelve students in an English course in an EFL setting. Third, the data were collected through observation and interview that were triangulated by mixing qualitative and quantitative design to provide a complete view in understanding the case. Last, the collected data were analyzed mainly based on the categorization of corrective feedback strategies proposed by Lyster and Ranta (1997), Panova and Lyster (2002), and Ellis (2009). The data on teachers' reasons for using certain corrective feedback strategies and students' perception of them were also analyzed based on the relevant theories. Further analysis and discussion will be presented in the following chapter.