

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This chapter covers the methodology of this study. It consists of research design, sites and respondents, data collection instruments, data collection procedure, data analysis, validity and reliability, and concluding remark. Each of these points is explained in the following sections.

3.1 Research Design

This study attempted to portray a phenomenon relating to teacher written feedback on EFL students' writing. Therefore, the investigation was conducted under qualitative design in which "it presents a natural and 'holistic' picture of the phenomena being studied" (Malik & Hamied, 2016, p. 177). This type of research is used to describe and interpret the data being studied, as well as gain more depth understanding about the concerned issues. In addition, this study is included as a descriptive research since it is significant as surveys abound in educational research and are utilized by many researchers as an investigative tool to collect data in order to address educational questions (Gay et al., 2006). In this regard, this study intended to analyze about written feedback focus and strategies used by teachers on the students' writing, the students' preferences toward teacher written feedback in terms of focus and strategy in their writings, as well as how the EFL students perceived the teacher written feedback in their writings. Thus, it was expected that this study could give description and interpretation about the data being studied, and also more depth understanding about the concerned issues.

3.2 Sites and Respondents

Since the population is too big and homogenous, it is necessary to limit the sample. Moreover, a qualitative research purposively selects the respondents since it is considered sufficient to provide important information in answering the research questions (Maxwell, 1996; Malik & Hamied, 2016). There were two

English teachers (Teacher A and Teacher B) participated in this study. These numbers were gotten after conducting a small preliminary research in several public senior high schools in Pekanbaru. Among five senior high schools, there were two EFL teachers (from two schools) that regularly gave the written feedback in the students' writing. It was found that other teachers seemed to not frequently provide written feedback. Additionally, there would be also two classes of second grade students (Class A and Class B) that were taught by each teacher. The rationale for selecting second grade students was mainly on the grounds that the previous studies mostly involved university students as their respondents. Thus, this study wanted to carry out how the implementation of teacher written feedback in different level of education, especially second grade of senior high school. Also, this level was considered had adequate knowledge, experiences, as well as a good sense about how to write a good writing.

In addition, the other reason for choosing the sites and respondents because it is necessary to ensure that the access is not only permitted, but also practicable (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2007). So, it was important to make sure that the permission and access for collecting the data was available.

3.3 Data Collection Instruments

In collecting the data, the current study used three kinds of instruments, namely document analysis, questionnaire, and interview.

3.3.1 Document Analysis

The first instrumentation of this study was document analysis. It was used to answer the first and second research questions of this study, which related to teachers' focus and strategy in providing the written feedback. Document analysis "uses technique for making inferences by systematically and objectively identifying special characteristics of messages" (Holsri, cited in Berg, 2001, p. 240).

The data for document analysis were taken from the students' writing of Narrative text. They were informed by the teacher that their writing would be

counted as one of their assignments. Each student was required to write a narrative text that consisted of 150-250 words on the topic “Personal Experience in Learning English”. The selection of the topic was under the discussion with the teachers. The reason for choosing the topic was because it related to the students’ background knowledge and daily activity, so they could engage with topic easier. In addition, narrative text was one of the genres that the students learnt in the school.

3.3.2 Questionnaire

The second instrument used was questionnaire which was designed to investigate students’ preferences and perceptions toward teacher written feedback. “Questionnaire is a written collection of self-report questions to be answered by a selected group of research participants” (Malik & Hamied, 2016, p. 196). The questionnaire was distributed on August 9, 2017 for Class A and July 24, 2017 for Class B. Before distributing the questionnaire to the respondents, this instrument was piloted first to the other respondents with the same level to validate the questionnaire item on July 17, 2017.

The students’ questionnaire was divided into 3 parts, which was aimed to answer the third and fourth research questions of this study. It deal with students’ preferences toward the teacher written feedback in terms of focus and strategy in their writing, as well as the students’ perception toward the teacher written feedback in their writing.

As it has been mentioned before, this instrument was divided into 3 parts which covered 45 statements in total. Each student was required to rate each statement based on a four-scale (Likert scale) ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree). Part A contained 20 statements that related to students’ preferences towards focus of teacher written feedback. These statements were formulated based on Hedgcock and Lefkowitz’s (1994), in which it is stated that the focus of teacher written feedback can be divided into *organization, content, grammar, vocabulary, and mechanics*. In this case, four statements were designed to represent each part of this focus. Additionally, in order to prevent leading the

respondents to certain direction or response, the statements were randomly arranged.

Meanwhile, part B consisted of 10 statements that were designed to find out students' preferences about the strategy used in providing the written feedback. These statements were formulated based on Ferri's (2003), in which it is stated that there are two main kinds of strategies used in providing written feedback called as direct (*deletion, insertion, substitution, and reformulation*) and indirect feedback (*symbol, code, and comment*). In this case, five statements were designed to represent each direct and indirect strategy. In addition, the statements were also randomly arranged to keep the data more valid.

Lastly, part C contained 15 statements as it was created to investigate the students' perception on whether teacher written feedback affect their writing improvement in terms of cognitive, affective, and behavior aspects. For statements no. 1-5, they deal with cognitive aspect which were designed based on Krathwohl's taxonomy theory (2002) that cover *Remembering, Understanding, Applying, Analyzing, Evaluating, and Creating*. Nevertheless, it appeared that *Understanding, Applying, Analyzing, Evaluating, and Creating* points as the most relatable competencies with this study. Moreover, statements no. 6-10 referred to affective aspect theory which are designed based on Krathwohl's (1964), and statements no. 11-15 were formulated based on behavior aspect theory by Simpson's (1966).

3.3.3 Interviews

The last instrument was interviews with teachers and students, in which their responses were audio-taped. By using interview, the writer is able to know specific information which can be compared and contrasted with information gained in other interviews (Dawson, 2007). Interview session was conducted after distributing the questionnaire to the students. The collected data from interviews was used to support and validate the collected data from other instruments, which were document analysis and questionnaire.

Furthermore, semi-structured interviews were implemented in this study. It allows the teacher and students to respond to the focus of the study in their own

ways (Kvale, 1996). Further, Silverman (cited in Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2007) adds that interviews in qualitative research are useful for: gathering facts; accessing beliefs about facts; identifying feelings and motives; commenting on the standards of actions (what would be done about situations); exploring present or previous behavior; eliciting reasons and explanations.

Total questions for teachers and students were different. Overall, there were 14 questions for the teachers that were categorized into two parts. Initially, the teachers were asked about the general information that related to her background education and general views about written feedback. After that, 10 questions were asked to the teachers in order to find out their focus and strategy in providing the written feedback on the students' writing.

Meanwhile, there were 25 questions in total that were asked to students. The first three questions related to general information about students' view regarding English writing. Then, it was followed by 7 questions that asked the students about their preference on written feedback focus. Besides, another 4 questions were asked to students to gain information about their preference in term of written feedback strategy. Subsequently, the last 11 questions were asked to students in order to collect the data about their perception toward written feedback in term of three aspects, namely cognitive, affective, and behavior.

3.4 Data Collection Procedure

In this study, the writer collected the data through several phases. To begin with, the students were required to write a narrative text. Then, the teacher checked the students' works by providing written feedback as they always did. Thus, the results would be genuine and more natural. After that, the writings would be given back to students, so that they could review their works.

Accordingly, after the students were done at writing the essays, the questionnaire was distributed to the EFL students in order to collect the data relating to their preferences toward teacher written feedback in terms of focus and strategy in their writing, as well as their perception toward the teacher written feedback in their writing. Each respondent needed to circle the answer which utilized a Likert scale (1 = *strongly disagree* to 4 = *strongly agree*) for each of the

20 items in the Part A, 10 items in Part B, and 15 items in Part C. In order to make sure the students understood each statement in the questionnaire, it would be explained by the writer before hand. Additionally, the writer also told the students that their responses would not affect their scores of the subject, solely for research purposes only, and it would be treated confidentially.

To make the collected data more valid, this study also conducted interviews for both teachers and students. It was used to support the data gained from the document analysis and questionnaire. The interview session would be done after the students finished filling in the questionnaire.

3.5 Data Analysis

Current study was aimed to investigate several points, which covered teacher written feedback focus in the students' writing, teacher written feedback strategy in the students' writing, the students' preferences in terms of focus and strategy used in their writing, and their perception toward teacher written feedback. In order to answer these concerned issues, the collected data would be analyzed according to the following steps.

3.5.1 Data from Document Analysis

In addressing to answer the first and second research questions, the teacher written feedback were analyzed and classified into its categories in terms of the focus and strategies used. The numbers of the written feedback were calculated to find out the total usage in the students' writing. The framework for the analysis of the feedback focus was designed based on Hedgcock and Lekowitz (1994) and for the feedback strategy was designed based on Ferris (2003) (See Table 3.1). By doing this, it was easier for the writer to analyze and make conclusion about what kind of focus that the teacher emphasized on, as well as what kind of strategy that the teacher constantly used in giving the written feedback. After the feedback on the students' writing was analyzed according to its classification, then the students' draft would be given back to the students so that they could review their writings.

Table 3.1 A Framework for the Analysis of Teacher's Focus and Strategy in Providing Written Feedback

No.	Feedback Focus	Example from students' texts	Feedback Strategy
1.			
2.			
3.			
4.			
5.			

Table 3.2 The Calculation of Teacher's Focus in Providing the Written Feedback

Written Feedback Focus	Frequency	%
Content-focused feedback:		
Organization		
Information/Ideas		
Form-focused feedback:		
Grammar		
Vocabulary		
Mechanics		
Total		

Table 3.3 The Calculation of Teacher's Strategy in Providing the Written Feedback

Written Feedback Strategy	Frequency	%
Indirect Feedback:		
Symbol		
Code		
Comment/Endnote		
Direct Feedback:		
Insertion		
Substitution		
Deletion		
Reformulation		
Total		

3.5.2 Data from Questionnaire

In order to answer the third research question, part A and part B of the questionnaire was used after they wrote a narrative text. The students were asked to respond the statements in the questionnaire according to their own preferences of what kind of focus and strategy that they preferred in receiving the teacher written feedback. After that, the students' responses were evaluated with the purpose of exploring their views regarding the focus and strategy used. At this point, there would be a picture about what kind of expectation that they had toward the teacher written feedback. Similarly, the fourth research question would be answered by the responses that the students gave in the questionnaire (Part C). In this regard, the writer would analyze their perception toward teacher written feedback in three aspects namely cognitive, affective, and behavior. Analyzing this data could give a picture of how the students perceived the written feedback that also showed their beliefs, attitudes, emotional responses, and motivation in relation with learning writing. With the intention to give a clearer view about the data analysis from questionnaire, the example of each table analysis is served in the following tables.

a. Part A – Written Feedback Focus

Table 3.4 Class X's Preferences toward the Written Feedback Focus

Written Feedback Focus	Mean
1. Grammar	
2. Vocabulary	
3. Mechanics	
4. Information/Ideas	
5. Organization	

b. Part B – Written Feedback Strategy

Table 3.5 Class X's Preferences toward the Written Feedback Strategy

Written Feedback Strategy	Mean
1. Direct Feedback	
2. Indirect Feedback	

c. Part C – Perception toward Written Feedback

Table 3.6 Mean Scores of Class X' Perception on Teacher Written Feedback

Novia Tri Febriani, 2018

AN ANALYSIS OF TEACHER WRITTEN FEEDBACK ON EFL STUDENTS' WRITING

Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia | repository.upi.edu | perpustakaan.upi.edu

Aspects of Perception	Mean
1. Cognitive	
2. Affective	
3. Behavior	

3.5.3 Data from Interviews

In analyzing the data from interviews, this study was employed several stages purposed by Cohen, Manion, and Morrison (2007). The first stage is generating natural units of meaning. In this regard, the audio-taped of conversation were transcribed in order to give easier access in analyzing the data, by seeing plausibility of the collected data. In the second stage, the transcription were categorized according its classification, in which related to the research question. It was aimed to elaborate the findings by matching the data obtained from the respondents with the results from other instruments. The third stage is interpreting the data with aim to describe the interview contents. At this point, the collected data was analyzed qualitatively in order to get a better understanding about the findings. Thus, from this data, the writer could gain more related information regarding written feedback from both teachers and students' point of view.

3.6 Validity and Reliability

The description of validity and reliability of instrument as well as validity and reliability of data are portrayed below.

1.6.1 Data Collection Instrument

1.6.1.1 Questionnaire

In order to test the validity of the questionnaire, this instrument was validated by one of English lecturers of Postgraduate Study on June 16, 2017. Afterwards, it was pilot tested to 10 similar samples on July 20, 2017. Additionally, The Cronbach technique was used to measure the reliability of the questionnaire. The result of the reliability can be seen in the following table.

Table 3.7 Reliability Statistic of questionnaire

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.878	45

Table 3.7 showed that questionnaire's Cronbach Alpha is .878 while r-table of Cronbach Alpha of N = 10 is .632. It can be concluded from the data that Cronbach Alpha is > r table (.878 > .632) with P = 5% indicating the items in the questionnaire can be regarded as reliable.

1.6.1.2 Interviews

Before the interviews were conducted, the items of the guidelines were validated by one of English lectures of Postgraduate Study on June 16, 2017. Then, it was shown to supervisor for last proofreading.

1.6.2 Data Analysis

This study validated the data through triangulation technique. "Triangulation may be defined as the use of two or more methods of data collection in the study of some aspect of human behavior" (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2007, p. 141). Moreover, Malik and Hamied (2016) explain that "the purpose of triangulation design is to obtain different but complementary data on the same topic to best understand a research problem" (p. 250). "By analogy, triangular techniques in the social sciences attempt to map out, or explain more fully, the richness and complexity of human behavior by studying it from more than one standpoint" (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2007, p. 141).

The collected data for triangulation was obtained from document analysis, students' questionnaire, and semi-structured interviews. In particular, the data obtained from semi-structured interviews were collected from both teachers and students' answers in the interviews. Systematically, the collected data from document analysis (teachers' focus and strategy in providing written feedback) and questionnaire (students' preferences and perceptions toward teacher written feedback) were triangulated by the results from teachers and students' interview in order to gain consistency of the research findings.

Novia Tri Febriani, 2018

AN ANALYSIS OF TEACHER WRITTEN FEEDBACK ON EFL STUDENTS' WRITING

Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia | repository.upi.edu | perpustakaan.upi.edu

3.7 Concluding Remark

This chapter has discussed about the methodology of the research, which covers the research design, number of sites and respondents, as well as how this study was carried out and analyzed. Furthermore, the finding and discussion of the collected data were presented in the following chapter.