CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This chapter explicates the methodology used to answer three research questions: 1) what oral errors do the learners make? 2) what types of corrective feedback do the teachers give to address the errors? and 3) what are the teachers' considerations in giving the corrective feedback? This chapter is comprised of four sections, namely research design, research site and participant, data collection, and data analysis.

3.1 Research Design

This research employed descriptive qualitative case study. According to Hancock and Algozzine (2006), descriptive qualitative case study is a type of qualitative research commonly employed to address contemporary phenomena (event, situation, program, or activity) in a natural context constrained by space and time. Rather than to other categories of case study research design, which are exploratory, explanatory, and descriptive design (Yin, 2003), this research belongs to a descriptive qualitative study as it aimed to investigate teachers' corrective feedback in its natural context.

This research primarily aims to reveal types of feedback given by teachers and the consideration behind the choices. It attempts to probe deeply into the research setting to obtain in-depth understanding of what oral errors learners committed and what types of feedback are used to treat the errors. The research is conducted in English for Young Learners' program in a notable Language Center which applied Communicative Language Teaching in Bandung. As this research focused on speaking activities, specifically oral correction activities, the site is considered rich in the data needed for this research. Moreover, the principle of case study which is orientation to a unique set of contexts (Stake, 2010) is also served by the research site as the teachers assigned vary in educational background and teaching methods.

The data in this research were obtained from observation and interview. In the first stage of data collection, the classroom observation is conducted to collect the data pertained to learners' oral errors in speaking and teachers' corrective feedback to address the errors. The oral errors were categorized based on Lyster and Ranta (1997) and Yang (2016), while teachers' corrective strategies were categorized based on classification proposed by some experts, namely Ellis (2009), Lyster and Ranta (1997), and Panova and Lyster, (2002). To get more comprehensive results, learners' oral errors and teachers' corrective feedback strategies were then measured quantitatively to reveal the number, percentage, and distribution of learners' oral errors and teachers' corrective feedback. Although this research belongs to qualitative study, a part of quantitative design can be used to triangulate the qualitative data and provide more holistic view to comprehend the case deeply (Duff, 2008). Moreover, Nunan and Bailey (2009) assert that employing qualitative design does not mean limiting data sets that be counted, as "all qualitative data can be quantified in some ways (Nunan & Bailey, 2009, p.414).

In the second stage of data collection, interviews and member checking were conducted to teachers. The main objective of the interview is to reveal teachers' view about oral correction process in the class and the consideration behind the choosing of corrective feedback strategies to address learners' errors. Member checking is employed to gain confirmation or rejection from teachers regarding data collection process during the observation periods.

3.2 Research Site and Participant

This research is conducted in three classes of English for young learners program in one notable English Language Center Bandung. The research site is purposively selected as it is considered able to provide the date needed (Auerbach & Silverstein, 2003). First, the students learned in the class are young learners aged 7-12 years old which scarcely become the subject of oral corrective feedback research. Therefore, taking them as participants might generate new data that could fill the gap and enrich the theories of oral corrective feedback. Second, the research site applies Communicative approach to the class and makes speaking as one the main activities. The syllabus of pre-intermediate level observed in this research can be seen in the appendix. Additionally, unlike general English classes

which are large in size, the class in this program is small and the number of students in is strictly limited into only a few. The minimum number of students enrolled in the class observed is two, and the maximum number is six. Hence, teachers can allocate more time for speaking activities and give much concern to students' oral productions. This situation is ideal for this research since it can encourage more oral error correction processes which are needed as the data. Third, this site employs qualified teachers which may have background knowledge of the subject matters and become role-model for oral error correction strategies. The site applies strict regulation about teachers' quality standard. Sources, training, and peer-observation are provided regularly to maintain the teaching quality of the teachers. Given the stated quality of the teachers, corrective feedback which hardly becomes primary concern in English education research might be generated more frequently in the class.

The participants of this research are three teachers assigned to English for young learners' class. The participants are selected purposively as they are considered able to generate the data needed in this research (Auerbach & Silverstein, 2003). Moreover, the teachers also possess particular characteristics which can orient the conduct of a case study research (Stake, 2010), namely educational background and teaching experiences. The first teacher has bachelor of education degree and been teaching English for young learners for three years, the second teacher is pursuing master of humanism degree and been teaching English for young learners for four years, and the third teacher has bachelor of education degree and been teaching English only for six months. Despite having the shortest teaching experiences, the third teacher has been entitled the best English for young learners' teacher of the term January to July 2017, thus the teacher is considered having unique characteristic to be included as participant in a case study research. Written under pseudonyms, the teachers involved as participants in this research are Ms. Rini, Mr. Ardi, and Ms. Dwinda.

The students involved in this research were assigned by the coordinator to three different classes within the same group of proficiency level. The students were grouped in the different classes since they chose different schedule. The students vary in ages and come from different schools. Hence, the class tends to be more heterogeneous, encouraging teachers to consider a range of conditions when using corrective feedback strategies to address students' oral errors. Moreover, written under pseudonyms, the students in Ms. Rini's class are Rudi and Yadi. The students in Mr. Adi's class are Sandi, Adi, Reza, Maudi, and Mira and the students in Ms. Dwinda's class are Doni, Dika, Luki, Marlina, and Nolita.

3.3 Data Collection

Multiple resources data collection, commonly known as triangulation, is employed in a case study research (Malik & Hamied, 2014). In the case of this research, in order to collect reliable and adequate data for answering the research questions, triangulation is conducted by employing two different data collection techniques, namely interviews and observations. The data collected from those techniques were coded, and the findings were analyzed to reveal the information regarding students' oral errors, teachers' corrective feedback strategies, and the reasons behind the selection of particular strategies.

3.3.1 Observation

The classroom observation was conducted to serve two purposes, namely collecting data regarding students' oral errors and teachers' corrective feedback strategies to address the errors. The main focuses of the observation were students' oral erroneous utterances, teachers' corrective feedback, and uptakes following the corrective feedback. Other forms of interaction and utterances unrelated to the three aspects mentioned were not noted. Each class was observed for four times, and each meeting lasted for 100 minutes. However, due to schedule availability, Mr. Ardi's class was only observed three times. Hence, totally the observation was conducted for 11 times or 1100 minutes.

The instruments used to collect the data from the observation were video recording, audio recording, and field note. Nunan (1992) put forward that various aspects and significant points might be ignored during the real-time observation process, thus reanalyzing the process after the events by the help of video recording would be helpful to gain more accurate data. Hence, obstructiveness of

smaller number of participants when unfamiliar objects exist in class, video recording was applied in all observed meetings under the teachers' consent.

To support the data collected from the video and audio recordings, field note was also used to gather the data in this research. According to Gay, Mills, and Airasian (2009), field note is effective to record real-time behaviors and activities which could only be taken accurately on site. Hence, the type of information that the field note capture can be crucial and supportive since it cannot be acquired video or audio taping.

Table 3.1 Field Note

Time	What T says/does	What Ss say/do		

In order to gain more valid and reliable data, the researcher was not involved in the teaching and learning process. The researcher acted as a non-participant observer which Malik and Hamied (2014) explain as someone who is not emotionally engaged with the participants in the research site. The researcher main conducts were only recording the classroom activities by audio-taping, video-taping, and field-note taking the process. The following is the table used to note down and code the students' oral errors and teachers' corrective feedback strategies.

Table 3.2 Table Design for Counting the Frequency of Students' Oral Errors and Teachers' Corrective Feedback

Date/Meeting :

Teacher :

Class/level :

No. of students :

				3440000004000	Uptake			
No	Time	Erroneous Utterances	Type of Error	Corrective Feedback Strategy	Repair	Needs Repair	No Uptake	
Aud	lio							
1.								
2.								
3.								

3.3.2 Interview

After the data gathered from classroom observations had been analyzed, interviews for the teachers were conducted. Semi-structured interview was employed as according to Hancock and Algozzine (2006), this type of interview provides the participants with flexibility to answer the questions, thus wider range of answers and deeper understanding of the subject matter could be gained.

The interviews were conducted primarily to confirm or contradict the data from the observations and to reveal the teachers' considerations in using particular corrective feedback strategies. Some sets of questions were prepared to guide the interview process. However, the questions might be adapted accordingly depending on the teachers' answers. The first sets of questions were asked to reveal the general portrayal of the class, especially in terms of learning objectives, general activities, and students' characteristics. Then, the next set of questions were addressed to reveal what the teachers know about error and corrective lhsan Nur Iman Faris, 2018

68

feedback, and how the practices of the notions are in the classroom. Finally, the last set of questions were asked to unearth the reasons behind the selection of corrective feedback strategies. Before the teachers answered the final set of questions, the framework of corrective feedback types used in this research was shown along with the findings from the observation. Hence, the teachers could recall the classroom contexts they were in and provide contextual information regarding the corrective feedback strategies they used at that time.

Bahasa Indonesia was used in the interview under the consideration that it could help the teachers and researcher to gain more accurate and deep explanation unobstructed by language barriers. However, the transcriptions of the interview were translated into English for presentation and discussion purpose in chapter 4.

3.4 Data Analysis

The data analysis process was conducted to interpret sets of data obtained from the classroom observations and interviews. The video and audio recordings used as the instrument to collect the data from the observation were transcribed and then analyzed to answer the research questions regarding students' oral errors and teachers' corrective feedback strategies to address the errors. In order to unearth the data to answer the research questions, the transcription convention from Ellis and Duff (cited in Nunan & Bailey, 2009, pp.348-349) was used. The conventions are as follows:

- a. T = teacher, Ss meas more than one students acting together while the students acting individually are coded by their pseudonyms initials.
- b. Each utterance is numbered to ease the referencing.
- c. XXX indicates unrecognizable or indecipherable utterances.
- d. Phonetic transcription is provided when students' pronunciations are inaccurate or different from the teachers', teachers use corrective feedback, and when students' utterances are unidentifiable.
- e. ... means that the utterances are incomplete.
- f. *Italic* is used to differentiate L1 and L2 utterances.

g. Period (.) indicates terminal falling intonation, coma (,) indicates continual rising intonation, and question mark (?) indicates high rising intonation.

Although the audio and video taping recorded the entire classroom activities, the transcription and analysis processes only focused on coding an categorizing students' oral errors and teachers' corrective feedback strategies. Additionally, students' uptakes were also included in the analysis as the data can indicate the efficacy of the corrective feedback and may pertain to teachers' consideration in the employment of the corrective feedback strategies.

The students' oral errors' categorization is based on Lyster and Ranta (1997) and Yang (2016) who classify errors into pronunciation errors, grammar errors, vocabulary errors, and use of L1 errors. The corrective feedback strategies used by teachers were categorized primarily based on Lyster and Ranta' (1997) with some additional categories from Ellis (2009) Panova and Lyster (2002). The experts categorized corrective feedback strategies into recast, explicit correction, translation, clarification request, metalinguistic feedback, elicitation, repetition, and paralinguistic signals. After the coding and categorization processes had been conducted, the findings of students' oral errors and teachers' corrective feedback strategies were measured quantitatively and displayed in terms of frequency of occurrences and percentages. The following is the table displaying the students' oral errors.

Table 3.3 Table Design for the Distribution of Students' Oral Errors

Types of	Number of Occurrences in			TOTAL	
Errors					
_	Ms.	Mr.	Ms.	F	%
	Rini'	Adi	Dwinda		
Pronunciation					
Grammar					
Vocabulary					
Use of L1					
TOTAL					

For the teachers' use of corrective feedback strategies, the distributions are displayed as follows.

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

Feedback strategy	Ms.	Mr.	Ms.	ТОТ	AL
	Rini	Adi	Dwinda —	F	%
Recast					
Elicitation					
Explicit					
correction					
Translation					
Metalinguistic					
feedback					
Repetition					
Paralinguistic					
signal					
Clarification					
request					
TOTAL					

For the total uptakes following the giving of corrective feedback from the teachers, the distributions are displayed in the table as follows.

Table 3.5 Table Design for The Rate of Uptake following Teachers' Corrective Feedback Strategies

Feedback Strategy	Total Occurrence	Total Uptake
Recast		
Elicitation		
Translation		
Explicit correction		
Repetition		
Metalinguistic feedback		
Paralinguistic signal		
Clarification request		
TOTAL		

The interview conducted to the teachers were fully transcribed and analyzed. The transcribed responses given by the teachers were analyzed to confirm or contradict the data collected from the observation. Moreover, the responses were scrutinized and the conclusions were drawn to formulate answers for the questions aim to reveal the teachers' consideration behind the selection of corrective feedback strategies used to address the students' errors. The answers were then compared with the relevant theories and research reports.

3.5 Concluding Remarks

This chapter explicates the information pertained to the research methodology employed in this study. There are four main points that need to be highlighted from this section. First, this research attempts to gain in-depths insight regarding a particular phenomenon, thus case study is employed as the research design. Second, the research site selected is an English for Young Learner program in notable Language center in Bandung which applies communicative

approach. Furthermore, the participants involved in this research are 3 English for young learners' teachers having distinctive characteristics and 11 students from 3 different classes. Third, classroom observations were conducted to collect the data regarding students' oral errors and teachers' corrective feedback strategies, while interviews were employed to reveal the considerations behind the selection of the strategies. Quantitative calculation is used to accompany the qualitative analysis in order to gain more holistic view of the case studied. Last, the data regarding students' oral errors were categorized and analyzed based on Lyster and Ranta (1997) and Yang (2016), teachers' corrective feedback strategies were categorized and analyzed based on Ellis (2009), Lyster and Ranta (1997), and Panova and Lyster (2002). Moreover, teachers' considerations for using particular corrective feedback strategies were compared with several relevant theories and research reports.