

CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This chapter concerns the methodology of the present study. As presented in Chapter 1, this study is carried out on the basis of two research problems, i.e. (1) how the teacher provides feedback on the students' writing, and (2) how the students respond to the teacher feedback on their writing. To attend to these research problems, this chapter discusses the research design, research site and participants, data collection, data analysis as well as validity and reliability of the study. Each will be explained in Sections 3.1 through 3.5.

3.1 Research Design

This study was largely qualitative. The qualitative research is used to collect in-depth information about a social or human phenomenon in a natural setting (Creswell, 2009). In accordance with Creswell, Alwasilah (2000) also points out that the qualitative research is used as a concept where the qualitative data are used to interpret a given case from the perspective of respondents involved. Based on these two definitions, in the present study, qualitative research was employed to discover, describe, and analyze the phenomena of teacher feedback on the students' writing and students' responses to the teacher feedback on their writing.

Furthermore, this study specifically used a case study design. The case study design was considered suitable because of four reasons. The first reason is that this study was carried out to explore the case within its real-life contexts in a small scale (Creswell, 2009; Stake, 1995), which the teacher's ways of giving feedback on the students' writing and the students' responses to feedback provided by the teacher on their writing in this study were the main focus. The second reason is that this study naturally occurred over a sustained period of time in the sense that it was not manipulated as in an experiment (Yin, 2003). The third reason, which constitutes the important aspect of case study design, is that this study collected

the data using the multiple forms of data collection to do triangulation of findings, enhance the construct validity, and go for more in-depth study (Stake, 1995; Yin, 2003). In other words, this ensures that the case is not explored through one lens but rather a variety of lenses, which allows for multiple facets of the phenomena to be revealed and understood. The four reason is that this study employed document analysis, which is another method used in the qualitative case study research (Ary, Jacobs, & Sorensen, 2010; Freebody, 2003).

In more detail, the method used in this study was a descriptive case study in which it set to describe the way the natural phenomena were (Yin, 2003). For this reason, the goals set by the researcher were to carefully scrutinize and articulate the data as they occurred at the outset and the researcher had no control over the variable that was being researched.

3.2 Research Site and Participants

The present study was undertaken at a private senior high school in Bandung. This research site was chosen since the researcher is currently teaching in this school, then it was hoped that the researcher would get an access to conduct the study easier in order to increase the feasibility of the study. Additionally, the familiarity with the situation in the research site as well as with the teacher and students as the participants was expected to have a more natural research. This reason was aimed at avoiding the teacher and students' unnatural behavior or performance during the teaching-learning processes.

The participants of this study were a teacher and a class with 24 eleventh-grade students. The teacher who was willing to be the participant had more than 10 years' experience in EFL teaching English in the secondary school. She had a bachelor degree in English Education from a state university in Bandung. In addition, the selection of the students was deemed appropriate because they were required to write such genres; one of them was an exposition text (e.g. hortatory exposition text). They also had learned English more than three years with the

assumption that they enabled to prewrite, draft, revise, edit, and publish their own writing.

3.3 Data Collection

In order to answer the main research questions, classroom observations, written documents, and interviews were used in this study. The data from all sources were triangulated to reach the depth and richness of the data as well as to produce the accurate results for certainty in data collection (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2007; Silverman, 2005). In addition, using triangulation is also expected that the data were stable, consistent, comprehensive, and credible to provide a more detailed picture of the case (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2007; Silverman, 2005). Each data collection will be described in Sections 3.3.1 through 3.3.3.

3.3.1 Classroom Observations

Classroom observations were used to observe the interactions between the teacher and students in writing conference. To collect the data by employing classroom observations, in the present study, the classroom observations were recorded. A video recording was chosen for the reason given by Smith (1981) that the use of mechanical recording device gives greater flexibility than observations done by hand. Van-Lier (1988) adds that the video recording is not only as a means for description in a research, it is also useful as a strong device to capture the real situation with detachment.

Besides, the video recording was supplemented by brief handwritten notes to document descriptively the activities being observed in the form of field notes (Bogdan & Biklen, 2003; Lodico, Spaulding, & Voegtler, 2010). This study used two types of field notes during and/or after each observation, namely descriptive and reflective field notes, hence the memory of the observations was still fresh (Van-Lier, 1988). As stated by Bogdan and Biklen (2003) and Lodico, Spaulding, and Voegtler (2010), descriptive field notes specifically record the details of what have occurred in the classroom, including the time, date, location, and length of

observations; list of participants (total participants); detailed descriptions of persons (participants), settings, activities, and interactions; as well as verbatim conversations and direct quotes. Meanwhile, reflective field notes contain the researcher's feelings and thoughts about what he/she has observed. It means that the researcher is allowed to reflect on his/her own feelings, values, and thoughts in order to increase his/her awareness of how these notes might influence his/her observations. The framework of the field notes used in this study is presented in Table 3.1.

Table 3.1 Field Notes

- Date of observation :
 Time of observation :
 Setting :
 Participant(s) :
 Sub-questions :
- Did the students consult their revised writing with the teacher in writing conference?
 - If yes, what kinds of questions did the students ask in writing conference?

No.	Students' Questions	Teacher feedback	Observer's Comments
-----	---------------------	------------------	---------------------

The observer's Reflections:

The type of classroom observations used in this study was non-participant observation where the researcher sat on the sideline and observed the teaching-learning processes without actively participating (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2000). It is different from participant-observation in which the researcher takes part in the classroom activities while at the same time trying to keep track of what is going on in the classroom (Jorgensen, 1989). In other words, the participant observation

serves as the primary instrument for observing and collecting the data (Creswell, 2009).

In conclusion, the classroom observations were conducted 10 times in order to obtain the data needed, and each meeting took 90 minutes. The classroom observations were recorded so that the researcher would not miss any utterance or a certain kind of action, as mentioned above.

3.3.2 Written Documents

Qualitative researchers may use written documents to collect the data about the phenomena under study (Ary, Jacobs, & Sorensen, 2010; Freebody, 2003). For this reason, this study employed the written documents in the form of students' writing to reveal the practice of teacher feedback.

To begin with, the students were asked to write a hortatory exposition text in the multiple drafts at the ICOT stage of teaching-learning processes. As Ferris (1995) sees this, it makes sense that the students' attention regarding the teacher feedback will differ in a pedagogical setting in which multiple drafting is required. When the students have to revise their drafts, they will pay more attention to the teacher feedback they get. Following Ferris (1995), Freebody (2003) stresses the fact that writing in the multiple drafts will help the students to produce a much-improved piece of writing since it provides them the opportunity to hone their writing skills beyond the level of mere proficiency (see also Lamb & Simpson, 2011; Othman & Mohamad, 2009; Wasoh, 2013). Figure 3.1 illustrates the steps of writing and providing feedback at the ICOT stage. A brief description about them will also be presented.

Figure 3.1 Steps of Writing and Providing Feedback



The first drafts were submitted to the teacher. She then commented on them and returned them back to the students. In the next meeting, the students rewrote and resubmitted their second drafts along with the corrections they had made in response to feedback provided by the teacher on their first drafts. After that, the teacher commented again on the second drafts and returned them back to the students. The students finally handed in their third drafts as the final version of their writing accompanied by the corrections made in response to feedback given on the second drafts. At this time, the teacher still made some comments that she thought fit on the third drafts and graded them. In particular, each draft was evaluated using the error analysis worksheet (see Tables 3.4 and 3.5) to answer the first research problem.

The topic selection was under the teacher's guideline in which she provided the students with the controversial issues (i.e. the issues which caused a lot of argument or disagreement). The students chose one topic which was familiar and interesting to them in order to motivate them to write. Additionally, the length of students' writing was not limited by the teacher. They were free to develop their writing based on the topic they had chosen.

3.3.3 Interviews

The next source of data was interviews with the teacher and students. An interview has been defined an interaction between interviewer and interviewee, and reciprocally influencing each other (Kvale, 1996). The reason of employing interviews is to check the accuracy of impressions that has been gained through

other research methods (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2000). Seidman (2006) then proposes that the interviews provide even more opportunities for the interviewee to raise their own issues and concerns. Based on these reasons, the interviews were used in this present study to reveal the students' responses to the teacher feedback on their writing, which was the second research problem.

In more detail, the guided or semi-structured interviews were implemented to allow the teacher and students to respond to the focus of the study in their own ways (Kvale, 1996). Both of the teacher and nine students (i.e. three each from the high, middle, and low achievers) were individually interviewed at the end of teaching-learning processes. At the same time, the researcher had an access to ask them to clarify what they had said, request further reasons for their conclusions, and ask specific questions about what might have influenced their thinking (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2007).

The interviews consisted of several open-ended questions to make the teacher's answers and students' answers in line with the focus of the study. As being proposed by Cohen, Manion, and Morrison (2007), this type of questions helps the researcher to conduct the interviews since the sequence of questions have been made before to avoid problems during the interviews, such as forgetting the questions and overtime. To deliver the questions, Indonesian language was used as a medium of interactions due to the naturalness issue and accuracy of data. The interviews were conducted in a quiet classroom to allow the teacher and students to concentrate on the questions asked and enable the researcher to obtain the clear recordings. For Cohen, Manion, and Morrison (2007), this kind of atmosphere makes them feel secure to talk freely.

Moreover, each interview lasted at least 10 - 15 minutes. The interviews were recorded and later transcribed in order to review the results of interviews during the data analysis. This is in agreement with Yin (2003) that the functions of recording the interviews are purposely to provide a more accurate rendition of the interviews, make the researcher easy to go over the interviewing process, and

avoid the missing information. The following tables display the list of questions to ask the teacher and students during the interviews.

Table 3.2 Teacher’s Interview Questions

Area/Subarea	Questions
a. General	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Do you always provide feedback on the students’ writing? Why? 2. How important is it for you to provide feedback on the students’ writing? 3. How helpful do you think the teacher feedback for developing the students’ writing skills? 4. What do you think about the teacher’s role in responding to the students’ writing?
b. Teacher’s attitudes to the practice of providing feedback	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. How much time approximately did you spend on providing feedback on the students’ writing? 6. What factors did influence you to provide feedback on the students’ writing? 7. What were the common concerns or problems you noticed or had when it came to providing feedback? 8. If the students overlooked your feedback, what were the possible reasons for the students’ disregard of your feedback? What would you do to make them consider it?
c. Focus of teacher feedback	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 9. What aspects of students’ writing did you provide feedback? 10. How did you provide feedback on those aspects of writing (form and content)? 11. Which aspect of writing did you provide the most feedback on the student’ writing? 12. Where did you provide feedback on the

	aspects of students' writing, starting from the earlier drafts or on the final drafts only?
	13. Which aspect of writing do you think the student need to improve on?
d. Kinds of teacher feedback	14. How did you indicate the students' errors on their writing?
	15. Which way did you frequently use to indicate the students' errors on their writing?
	16. Where did you usually provide feedback on the students' writing?

Teacher's Interview Questions

Area/Subarea	Questions
	17. Which part of students' writing did you provide feedback more often?
	18. Did they still make the same errors after getting feedback on their writing?
d. Writing conference	19. Did you think the feedback given orally in writing conference or while walking around the class, was more or less helpful than written feedback or were they about as helpful as each other? Why?
e. Teacher's expectations and strategies to the students' next writing assignments	20. Did you think that the students showed improvement in writing skills after they got feedback? What kind of improvement did the student make on their writing?
	21. What do you expect the students to do on the next writing assignments after getting your feedback?
	22. What strategies of providing feedback will you use on the students' next writing assignments?

Table 3.3 Students' Interview Questions

Area/Subarea	Questions
a. General	1. Are you familiar with the term 'feedback'?
	2. Do you always receive feedback on your writing? If yes, how often does the teacher

	provide feedback on your writing?
	3. How important is it to you for your teacher to give feedback on your writing?
b. Students' responses to their revision	4. Did you feel satisfied with your revision?
	5. What did you do when you revised your drafts? For example, did you read feedback given by the teacher first or did you directly correct the errors based on the teacher feedback?
	6. Do you think you will make the same errors again on the next writing assignments?

Students' Interview Questions

Area/Subarea	Questions
c. Students' responses to the focus of teacher feedback	7. What aspects of writing did the teacher provide feedback on your writing?
	8. Which aspect of writing did the teacher provide the most feedback on your writing?
	9. How did you feel when the teacher provided feedback on the aspects of your writing?
	10. What aspects of writing did you pay great attention on your writing?
	11. Which aspect of writing did you feel that it needed to get the most feedback?
	12. Did you think feedback you currently received on the aspects of writing easy to understand?
d. Students' responses to the kinds of teacher feedback	13. How were the errors indicated by the teacher on your writing?
	14. Which way of indicating the errors did the teacher give you more often on your writing? How did you feel when the teacher indicated your errors in that way?
	15. Which way of indicating the errors would you like to receive more or less on your writing?
	16. Where did the teacher provide feedback on your writing in the margins or between the words or sentences of the text or at the ends of the text?

	17. Which part of your writing did the teacher provide the most feedback?
	18. Which part of your writing do you prefer to receive feedback?
e. Students' strategies in handling the teacher feedback	19. What did you do after you read the teacher feedback on your writing?
	20. Was there any feedback difficult to understand? If yes, what did you do to interpret it?
	21. Was there any feedback that you thought you understood it but were not sure what to do with? If yes, what did you do to interpret it?

Students' Interview Questions

Area/Subarea	Questions
f. Students' responses to the teacher feedback in writing conference	22. Did you think the feedback given orally in writing conference or while walking around the class, was more or less helpful than written feedback or were they about as helpful as each other? Why?
g. Students' responses to their final draft or completed writing	23. Did you feel satisfied with your completed writing?
	24. Did you still get feedback on your completed writing? If yes, what aspects of writing did the teacher emphasize on your completed writing? How did the teacher indicate your errors?
	25. Did you think that you made improvement in writing after getting feedback from the teacher? What kind of improvement did you make on your writing?
	26. Are you becoming more aware of your errors after the teacher gave feedback on your writing? If yes, has this awareness changed your writing strategies in any way, and how?
	27. Do you feel more confident for the next writing assignments? What do you expect to improve on the next writing assignments?
	28. What aspects of writing would you like the

teacher to focus on more or less on the next writing assignments?

29. What ways of indicating the errors would you like to receive more or less on the next writing assignments?

30. Did you think that the feedback you currently received matches your expectations and needs in writing? How so?

3.4 Data Analysis

The next step after conducting the research methods of collecting qualitative data was data analysis. The explanation of data analysis from each method is presented as follows.

Written documents, which were the students' writing, were first analyzed in steps by employing the frameworks of Fathman and Whalley (1990), Ferris (2002; 2003), and Ferris and Hedgcock (1998). The first thing to do was collecting each student's draft which had been provided feedback by the teacher. That feedback was then categorized and interpreted in order to uncover the focus of teacher feedback (using Table 3.4) and kinds of teacher feedback on the students' writing (using Table 3.5).

The classroom observations and field notes were also analyzed. The data from both of them were noted to get the picture of the practice of teacher feedback in writing conference. Likewise, the data from the students' interviews were transcribed, categorized, and interpreted to uncover the students' responses after they got feedback from the teacher. During the transcription stage, pseudonyms (replacing the students' names with not real names) were allocated due to the ethic of research (Silverman, 2005). After the transcription process finished, the results of transcription were sent back to the students in order to make sure that it was

exactly what they said and meant (Kvale, 1996; Taft, 1989, as cited in Emilia, 2005).

Table 3.4 Error Analysis Worksheet on Focus of Teacher Feedback

Draft :

Ss	Teacher's Corrections	Form-Focused Feedback																Details		
		SVA	IV	LP	LG	IP	MP	LPV	UW	LN	LD	MA	INE	LTI	MC	MV	WWC		WWO	AST

SVA	: Lack of Subject-Verb Agreement	WWC	: Wrong Word Choice
IV	: Incorrect Verb	WWO	: Wrong Word Order
LP	: Lack of Pronoun	AST	: Awkward Sentence Structure
LG	: Lack of Gerund	IC	: Incorrect Capitalization
IP	: Incorrect Preposition	MP	: Missing Punctuation
MP	: Missing Preposition	MIS	: Misspelling
LPV	: Lack of Passive Voice		
UW	: Unnecessary Word		
LN	: Lack of Noun		
LD	: Lack of Determiner		
MA	: Missing Adjective		
INE	: Incorrect Noun Ending		
LTI	: Lack of To-Infinitive		
MC	: Missing Conjunction		
MV	: Missing Verb		

Ss	Teacher's Corrections	Content-Focused Feedback				
		VTS	LIG	LR	MCS	UM

VTS : Vague Thesis Statements
 LIG : Lack of Idea Generation/Arguments
 LR : Lack of Recommendations
 MCS : Missing Concluding Sentences
 UM : Unclear Meaning

Table 3.5 Error Analysis Worksheet on Kinds of Teacher Feedback

Ss	Teacher's Corrections	Direct Feedback				Indirect Feedback			Marginal Feedback		Endnote Feedback
		Del	Ins	Sub	Ref	Cod	Uncod	Com	Wor	Mar	

Del : Deletion
 Ins : Insertion
 Sub : Substitution
 Ref : Reformulation
 Cod : Coded Feedback
 Uncod : Uncoded Feedback
 Com : Commentary
 Wor : Between Words or Sentences of the Text
 Mar : Margins of the Text

3.5 Validity and Reliability of the Study

The trustworthiness of a qualitative research can be set up by promoting validity and reliability of the study (Golafshani, 2003; Guba, 1981, as cited in Shenton, 2004; Merriam, 1995; Noble & Smith, 2015).

There are several ways to promote the validity of the study. The first effort is the data source triangulation (Shenton, 2004; Stake, 1995), which is the most desired pattern for dealing with the qualitative data (Yin, 2003). As already shown in Sections 3.2 and 3.3, the reason for using this triangulation was to make a contrast and comparison of all the data obtained from the different sources (Freebody, 2003), which in this study include the classroom observations, written documents, and interviews. This also aims to enhance the validity of conclusion in the present study (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2007; Freebody, 2003; Silverman, 2005; Stake, 1995; Yin, 2003).

The next effort is the member check, known as the informant feedback or respondent validation. In this study, the transcription of data taken from interviews, and the researchers' interpretations of those data were reviewed by the students to avoid misinterpretation (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Shenton, 2004). The use of member check is not only to promote the validity of the study; it is also used as a media to promote reliability of the study. The aim is to avoid mistaken when transcribing the data (Creswell, 2009). Besides, the researcher also double-checked the transcripts of classroom observations and interviews in order to avoid the obvious mistakes during the process of transcription (Davidson, 2009; Shenton, 2004).

3.6 Concluding Remarks

This chapter has presented a description of methodology-related aspects of the study, including research design, research site and participants, data collection, data analysis as well as validity and reliability of the study. Furthermore, the data gathered will be analyzed and discussed in the next chapter