

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This chapter provides a detailed description of some important aspects related to the methodology of the current study. It has six sections; the first section is research questions aimed to be explored in the study. The next section is research design followed by the description of the site and participants. The fourth section describes the techniques of data collection followed by data analysis that briefly explains of how the data were analyzed. The last section is concluding remark.

3.1 Research Question

The major goal of the current study is to investigate teachers' preferences as well as adult EFL students' attitudes in relation to the use of oral corrective feedback in the speaking classroom. Accordingly, this study sets out to address the following questions:

1. What are teachers' corrective feedback strategies used to correct students' oral errors in the teaching and learning process?
2. What are teachers' preferences in employing oral corrective feedback strategies in EFL speaking classroom?
3. What are students' attitudes to the use of oral corrective feedback in EFL speaking classroom?

3.2 Research Design

The current study aims at investigating the use of oral corrective feedback in Indonesian EFL classroom context specifically in the speaking class. Further, the study examines the range and types of oral corrective feedback used by the teachers in correcting students' oral error, their preferences for the types of oral corrective feedback, and students' attitudes toward the use of oral corrective feedback in correcting their erroneous utterances. With respect to these aims, the present study

intends to find out whether or not teachers' actual practice was similar to their preferences in using oral corrective feedback and the reasons for such preferences so that the logical background of the classroom practice can be understood.

Accordingly, the present study employed a qualitative research design since it seeks to discover the subjective meanings that motivate individual and group behavior in a given context (Kettley, 2010, as cited in Malik & Hamied, 2014). Qualitative case study is an intensive, holistic description and analysis of a single entity, phenomenon, or social unit (Merriam, 1988; Nunan, 1992; Creswell, 2012) that were also suitable for describing the use of oral corrective feedback in an adult EFL speaking classroom. To make a clear description, some descriptive quantification data is utilized to show the number, percentage, and distribution of oral corrective feedback and students' attitudes toward oral corrective feedback. In this case, it tried to discover teachers and students individual motive in their context so that the use of qualitative research design is considered very useful since it allows the researcher to identify issues from the perspective of participants and understand the meanings and interpretations that they give to behavior, events or objects (Malik & Hamied, 2014).

In addition, the case study was used as the present study involved a particular group of teachers and their students and focused on a single phenomenon that is the use of oral corrective feedback in its real life context, EFL speaking classroom (Frankel, Wallen & Hyun, 2012). Besides, the present study aims at investigating an issue in depth and provides an explanation that can cope with the complexity and subtlety of classroom context. Therefore, the case study approach is considered to work best and has been aligned with the qualitative research (Denscombe, 2010). Thus, this present study is expected to give an intensive, holistic description and complex understanding of teacher's preference and practice of oral corrective feedback in an adult EFL classroom context, rather than a generalization to other geographical areas or population.

3.3 Site and Participant

The site and the participant for the current study were chosen by purposive sampling technique (Malik & Hamied, 2014; Gay, Mills, & Airasian, 2009). They are purposively selected for the objectives of the study (Creswell, 2008) that is considered best to help the researcher understand the problem and research questions.

Accordingly, the present study is conducted in State University in Bandung for two reasons. Firstly, it was relevant to the context in which the research was conducted. Since the study intends to investigate EFL students' attitudes towards the use of oral corrective feedback, classes were selected where students have relatively more opportunity to interact with each other. Moreover, the selected language classes focus on improving students' oral conversation skills by involving them in interactive activities where the teacher's feedbacks possibly occur. Thus, this class is relevant to the purpose of this study, which aims at investigating the use of oral corrective feedback in the speaking classroom. The second reason, the researcher has possible access to the site so that she can easily conduct the research.

Further, the current study involves undergraduate students who were in their second semester majoring English Education. At the time of study, these students were mostly around the age of 20 and considered as adult learner. There were three classes of speaking classroom namely English for Interaction Course. However, only one class (class A) was selected and involved in the study based on teacher's recommendation due to their active engagement in the classroom activity. The class had 33 students and all of them were involved as participants of the study. This class was chosen because the students in that class were considered potential to produce the most valuable data (Dencombe, 2010) that is oral performance activity.

In addition, two teachers, male and female, participated in this study. The teachers were selected because of their willingness to have their lessons observed and video-recorded and their frequent use of oral corrective feedback during their

teaching. Moreover, these teachers were also selected based on their experiences and expertise to provide quality of information and valuable insights on the research topic (Denscombe, 2010).

3.4 Data Collection

This study uses more than one data collection techniques in order to triangulate the result of analysis. The data in this study were collected through three data collection techniques, namely observation, interview, and questionnaire. These techniques were considered the most suitable to assist in answering the research questions.

Data collection for this study was conducted from March 31st to May 25th. It took quite long because there was only one meeting in a week for each teacher. There were four meetings for Teacher 1 and three meetings for Teacher 2. Since the class were assigned in three credit hours course, each meeting lasted about 150 minutes and the total of the meeting being observed was approximately 810 minutes audio and video recording. The observation was followed by the interview with the teachers and several selected students (two female students and two male students). There is no specific criterion in selecting the students for doing an interview. The selected students were chosen merely based on their gender. Finally, the students' questionnaire were distributed in the last day of data collection phase. The detailed information of data collection schedule is presented in the table below:

Table 3.1 Data Collection Schedule

Participants	Observation	Interview	Questionnaire
Teacher 1	1. March, 31 2016 2. April, 11 2016 3. April, 14 2016 4. April, 21 2016	May, 12 2016	-
Teacher 2	1. April, 14 2016 2. April, 21 2016 3. May, 12 2016	May, 12 2016	-
Students	-	May, 25 2016	May, 23 2016

3.4.1 Observation

Observation was conducted in which the researcher takes field notes on the behavior and activities of individuals at the research site (Creswell, 2008). The observation is in the form of nonparticipant observation (Fraenkel et al., 2012) in which the instrument is the researcher herself. In this study, the role of the researcher is as a complete observer in which the researcher observes without participating in the activity (Fraenkel et al., 2012) in order to get a clear picture of how teachers' practice in correcting students' errors.

The observation took place in a class of 33 students. The classroom interactions were video-recorded and then transcribed. There were seven meetings with 150 minutes each that were observed to find out some common patterns of error treatment during oral classroom work. Specifically, it involved the most frequently used types of corrective techniques as well as specific types of error that teachers frequently focused on. The researcher also took a field notes (see appendices) in order to capture both the teacher's and the students' utterances.

3.4.2 Interview

The semi-structured interview was employed by involving the English teachers to enrich and to check the accuracy of the data gained through observation. Specifically, it was used to gather detail information about teachers' preferences toward types of oral corrective feedback and their reasons for such preferences. The interview utilized the interview guidelines (see appendices), which consist of a series of questions designed to elicit specific answers from the respondent. The interview was recorded and then transcribed and the researcher did note taking of what the respondents stated. The interview was conducted in the end of the study so that the data can later be compared, contrasted and linked to the observational data.

3.4.3 Questionnaires

The questionnaires were distributed to 33 students with the main focus to elicit information on students' attitudes towards teachers' oral corrective feedback. The questionnaires combine 5-point scales in the Likert format with open-ended questions. The questionnaire is adapted from Katayama (2007) and Pandu (2014) by using Lyster and Ranta (1997) categorization of oral corrective feedback and error types (see appendices).

Furthermore, the questionnaire is divided into three sections. The first section asked the students' general responses about the correction of oral errors in the speaking classroom. It contains the following four statements: whether or not student errors should be corrected; when student's errors should be corrected (constantly or selectively), and who should correct errors (teacher or peer). The students were asked to indicate their degree of agreement and disagreement with these four statements. The response options were coded to 5-point scales ranging from 1-5 representing *strongly agree* to *strongly disagree*. They also asked to give their reasons and explanations for their rating in order to provide a useful qualitative data.

The second section asks students' preferences for classroom error corrections of different types of oral errors (Lexical errors, phonological errors, syntactic errors, interpretative errors and pragmatic errors) and also their preferences for particular types of oral corrective feedback (Explicit, recast, clarification request, metalinguistic feedback, elicitation and repetition). In this section, the students were asked how often they wanted to be corrected according to the types of errors mentioned above as well as the types of oral corrective feedback. They were asked to rate each item on a 5-point scale rate ranging from 1 to 5 representing never to always with respect to frequency of correction. At the end of this part, the students were also asked to provide the reason related to their choices in order to get a clear picture of their opinion.

The last section contains six open-ended questions, which tried to find out students' attitudes toward teachers' oral corrective feedback based on their learning experience. The questions are developed based on the three components of attitude, those are, cognitive, affective and behavioral (Oskamp & Schults, 2005). The first two items were related to the students' belief of oral corrective feedback. The following two items were related to their feelings after they received oral corrective feedback from the teacher. The last two items were related to their behavior after receiving teacher's oral corrective feedback.

3.5 Data Analysis

After all of the data were collected, the researcher analyzed the data that were gained through three data collection techniques, namely observation, interview and questionnaires. The collected data were analyzed using the flow data analysis model purposed by Miles and Huberman (1994), which include data collection, data reduction, data display, and conclusion drawing. In the data collection phase, several techniques were employed in order to collect the data needed to answer research questions. Data reduction is the process of selecting, reducing, and organizing the important and relevant information taken from the research site. The selected and

synthesized data were then displayed in the form of words description, tables, and figures. Lastly, conclusion was drawn as the result of comparing, contrasting and connecting the data obtained from observation, interview, and questionnaires. In other words, the data were crosschecked through triangulation method that is methodological triangulation within methods, consisting of observation, interview, and questionnaires (Alwasilah, 2012)

3.5.1 Observation

The data that were gained from the observation were transcribed and coded. The transcription of observation data was categorized according to the types of corrective feedback and students' error types occurred in the classroom interaction. In the context of the present study, the categorization used to code the data were adapted from the error treatment sequence delineated in Lyster and Ranta's (1997) model.

The main unit analysis was the types of oral corrective feedback provided by teachers in responding to students' utterances that contain an error. The occurrences of particular types of oral corrective feedback were counted based on the most frequent occurrence. Students' utterances containing error were also counted even though they were not the main focus in this study. It was coded following Lyster and Ranta's (1997) categorization. The classification of the type of corrective feedback is as follows:

1. Explicit: The explicit provision of the correct form
2. Recast: The teacher's reformulation of all part of a student's utterance, minus the error
3. Clarification request: It indicates either student's utterance has been misunderstood by the teacher or that the utterance is ill-formed in some way and that a repetition of reformulation is required.

4. Metalinguistic feedback: It contains either comments, information, or questions related to the well-formedness of the students' utterance, without explicitly providing the correct form.
5. Elicitation: It refers to at least three techniques that teachers use to directly elicit the correct form from the student.
6. Repetition: It refers to the teacher's repetition, in isolation, of the student's errors utterances.

The classification of the types of errors follows Lyster and Ranta's (1997) categories that have been classified into five categories, they are:

1. Lexical Errors: It relates to the student's misuse of vocabulary.
2. Phonological Errors: It is mispronunciation of the sounds or mispronunciation due to L1 interference.
3. Syntactic Error-Grammar: Errors in word order, subject-verb agreement etc.
4. Interpretative Errors: It is the students' misunderstanding of a speaker's intention or meaning.
5. Pragmatic error: It is the error in the use of the rules of conversation.

Further, the example of the data analysis from classroom observation is as follow:

Classroom Observation Sheet Teacher #1 (2nd meeting)

Oral Corrective Feedback in an Adult Speaking Classroom: Teachers' Preferences
and Students' Attitudes

Date : April 11, 2016
 Course : English for Social Interaction
 Semester : 2 (two)
 Media : Power points slide
 Credit point : Three credit points
 Time : 135 minutes

NO	Classroom dialogue (teacher-student)	Error type	Corrective Feedback type
1	S: I like her because she can make people laugh with her idea /aɪ'də/ T: Idea /aɪ'dɪə/	Phonological	Recast
2	S: he is a clever person /'pɜː.sən/ T : Person /'pɜː.sən/	phonological	Recast
3	S: he always optimist T: optimistic S: he always optimistic	Grammar	Recast

3.5.2 Interview

The interview data were analyzed to confirm the findings obtained from the observation. The data collected through interview were transcribed and described. The transcribed data were categorized based on the responses given by teachers and students. In this study, the data from interview were displayed in the written form or word-based form by describing the practice of how teachers provide oral corrective feedback and their actual preferences toward oral corrective feedback as well as their reasons for such preferences. Meanwhile, the result of students' interview data was

discussed and used to confirm the findings from questionnaires. Below is an example of interview data analysis:

Table 3.2 – Example of Interview Data Analysis

No	Questions	Teacher responses		Notes
		Teacher #1	Teacher #2	
1	<i>Dari 5 jenis kesalahan dalam berbicara, kesalahan jenis mana yang paling bapak/ibu suka/sering untuk dikoreksi? Mengapa?</i>	<i>Kalo saya phonological hubungannya mispronounce, karena ketika tidak dikoreksi, yang sering diucapkan dan salah terus itu pasti saya koreksi,</i>	<i>Yang terlihat langsung itu disitu, terlihat langsung secara kasat mata antara mereka mengucapkan kalimat dengan struktur yang masih salah dan pengucapannya masih salah,</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teacher #1 prefers phonological error • Teacher #2 prefers grammatical error

3.5.3 Questionnaire

Questionnaires were distributed to students to elicit the information related to their attitudes toward the use of oral corrective feedback in the classroom interaction. The data that were collected were coded and classified related to students' general responses about the correction of oral errors in the speaking classroom, students' preferences for classroom error corrections of different types of oral errors, and their preferences for particular types of oral corrective feedback. The frequency distribution was calculated to analyze the Likert-scale responses for 1) general responses toward classroom error correction, 2) general preferences for correction of different types of errors, and 3) general preferences for particular types of oral corrective feedback. The calculated data were displayed in the form of table and figure to show the frequency and distribution for each type of oral corrective feedback.

Subsequently, the last part of the questionnaires was categorized based on three components of attitude proposed by Oskamp and Schultz (2005): cognitive,

affective, and behavioral. The data were also displayed in the written form or word based form. The data of the students' attitudes were compared to the data of the teacher's practice in providing oral corrective feedback whether or not the practice meets students' expectation. The table below is the example of questionnaire data analysis:

Table 3.3 Example of Questionnaire Data Analysis

Item	N	SD		UD		A		SA		Note
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
I want lecturers to correct my errors in speaking English.	33				9	24				Positive attitude
					27,27%	72,72%				
Lecturers should correct all errors that students make in speaking English.	33									
Lecturers should correct only the errors that interfere with communication.	33									
I want my classmates to correct my oral errors in speaking English.	33									

3.6 Concluding Remark

This chapter has presented a detailed description on the methodology used in the present study. It has elaborated the research design, the research site and participants, the data collection techniques and followed by the data analysis. The findings and discussions of this present study are presented in the next chapter.