CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This chapter describes the selected methodologies applied in this study. It consists of several sections including the explanation of the research design, the site and participants, data collection technique, pedagogical procedures, and the process of data analysis.

3.1 Research Design

This study has two-fold aims, i.e., (1) to provide insightful findings of dialogic feedback practice as a pedagogical approach to support students' ability in constructing engagement in their argumentative writing and (2) to identify the influence of such approach to the establishment of engagement features in students' writing. To achieve those objectives, this study was conducted by employing qualitative research method specifically case study research. The reasons for selecting qualitative case study as the research design were based on some considerations.

First, this study primarily focuses on exploring the real practice of dialogic feedback approach and how it contributes to students' construction of engagement. Particularly, it involves teachers and students in their real educational setting, exploring how they interact within the process of conducting the approach. Such research agenda is in line with the soul of qualitative case study that is a process of searching for discovery and understanding the people's practice as well as the dynamic of the practice from the perspective of those being investigated (Hamied, 2017; Hatch, 2002; Merriam, 2009). It commonly deals with investigating a contemporary phenomenon in their real setting and how they interact in the setting (Anderson and Herri, 2009; Hatch, 2002; Licthman, 2006; Yin, 2003). Even though the pedagogical intervention of this study was conducted in online mode, but it is still considered a real educational setting, since it is as a part of an existing educational course, which in this case is in the context of teaching writing for general communication. Thus, the teaching objectives, process, and interaction were still able to be captured (Noroozi et al., 2016).

Secondly, this study relates with the characteristic of case study research since it aims to provide detail, rich, and in-depth explanations (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2018; Creswell, 2012) of how the participating students developed their ability in creating engagement. Although case study restricts the researcher from making any generalization of the findings (Gomm, Hammersley, & Foster, 2000), the depth and richness of data procured from a case study enable the researcher to reveal the complexity of the interaction processes during the implementation of dialogic feedback approach. Hence, employing case study research provides a greater chance to make the readers understand the issue more clearly (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2018).

Furthermore, the other reason for selecting case study was the fact that this study involves multiple data sources and analytical framework as the way to enhance the validity of the findings. According to Hamied (2017) and Yin (2003), the strength of case study is the opportunity to use many different sources of evidence which could help to deal with the problems of establishing the construct validity and reliability of the research.

Considering the role of the researcher, this study also translated the feature of qualitative research since the researcher of this study took a dual role of both researching and teaching. As stated by Merriam (2009), qualitative study points out a researcher as a central instrument who interact with the subjects or phenomena being studied. The logic behind the researchers as the central instrument is because their capacities to directly participate in the interaction could give them more abilities in interpreting and evaluating the actions, the intentions, and the data being gathered (Hatch, 2002). In other words, the dual role of the researcher could enhance the validity of the research because it allows the data analysis and interpretation through a first-hand account (Burnaford, Fischer, & Hobson, 1996 in Jou, 2019). Despite the fact that there might be a huge chance of subjectivity in the process of collecting and interpreting data, the employment of data triangulation was able to minimize the potential biases in the research (Yin, 2003). For example, the data from interview and students' text could help the researcher of this study to

verify her prejudice or expectation gained from the record of teaching process and thus avoid being bias.

Lastly, to emphasize the clarification for selecting the research design, some of previous researches on creating engagement, especially those which are mediated by certain pedagogical intervention, also employ case study researches. Those case studies which commonly involve small-scale subjects show that a small sample could still provide a rich exploration and discussion of Engagement meanings. For instance, Jou (2019) analyzes the development of students' metacognitive awareness of engagement resources in an English for Academic Purpose course comprising only nine students. Similarly, a case study conducted by McCambridge (2019) also focuses only on four students' writing. Cheung & Low (2017) argue that small-scale study allows more in-depth analysis, so that, it is more appropriate for the examination of a few key lexico-grammatical items across many texts. Zacharias (2018) adds that through focusing on a certain individual, voice-related researches can offer more detailed discussion of pedagogical activities that may support student writers in finding, improving, or modifying their existing voices to meet the requirements of an academic genre.

3.2 Site and Participants

The study involved 37 first-year students of a private university located in West Java Province, Indonesia. They are all majoring in English Education in the Faculty of Language and Arts Education and taking a course in Writing for General Communication (EGC). This course is a mandatory course for acquiring bachelor's degree from the university. Due to Covid-19 Pandemic, the course has been facilitated in a full online mode.

However, prior to the institutional policy to work from home, the researcher conducted an on-site pre-observation, within which, she asked the students to compose an argumentative writing under a topic "Social Media Brings More Harm than Good". To gain more detail, in-depth, and richness of the data being analyzed (Ajjawi & Boud, 2015), after analyzing the students' argumentative writing, only five students were purposefully chosen to participate in the project (Patton, 2002).

The reasons for selecting the five participants were due to several considerations. The first reason was about the accessibility and availability of the participants. The five students were the ones who was eager and voluntarily agreed to join the whole sessions of the project. In qualitative study, the issue of access and willingness of the participants is important to be addressed to ensure the feasibility of the data collection process (Hatch, 2002; Merriam, 2009). The second consideration was related to the appearance of engagement resources in their writing. The five participants were considered representing the 37 students in terms of their ability in writing argumentative text and in construing engagement in the texts. Hence, purposive sampling was applied because the researcher selects the sample on the basis of her judgment of typicality or possession at the particular characteristics being sought (Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2018; Merriam, 2009).

Moreover, before the study was conducted, the researcher of this study had previously asked for the university's informed consent to carry out this project and she has further received approval from the head of English Education Study program for conducting this project. For achieving ethical clearance, the participating students were asked to filling out a written informed consent. In accordance with ethical guidelines, the identities of the university and students in this study are kept strictly confidential, henceforth, to preserve anonymity, pseudonyms were labeled to all the five participants when referring to them in the study.

Table 3.1

Background information of the Participants

Name (pseudonym)	Age	Gender	Temporary GPA
Student 1	20	Male	3.64
Student 2	19	Female	3.75
Student 3	19	Female	3.72
Student 4	19	Female	3.91
Student 5	19	Female	3.44

3.3 Data Collection Technique

In collecting the data, the researcher used triangulation method which drew on several types of instruments; (1) pre-observation, (2) the records of dialogic feedback process, (3) students' argumentative texts, and (4) interview with the students.

3.3.1 Pre-Observation

Although this study was conducted online because of the university policy of work from home, the researcher had previously done a pre- direct observation before the classroom turned to be fully online course. Pre-observation was purposefully conducted in this study in order to have preliminary data related to students' form of engagement in writing and the other supported elements such as their participation or engagement with the course. Hamied (2016) argued that observation is a mean of collecting data by observing behaviors, actions, or communication patterns. In the observation, the researcher played a role as a teacher-researcher in which she firstly introduced in a glance what argumentative writing is and further asked the students to write an argumentative text with the topic that has been chosen. The observation was documented through audio recording which was also accompanied by field notes from the course instructor.

3.3.2 The Records of Dialogic Feedback Process

The process of dialogic feedback was conducted by means of WhatsApp group application. The data were gathered over a month and consisted of seven sessions of online discussion with the participants. Those data were in the form of text-based (chatting) and audio records (voice note) which contain the flow of the dialogic feedback process, or specifically, the turn-taking between the researcher and the students during the dialogic feedback process.

3.3.3 Students' Argumentative Texts

Students' argumentative writings were analyzed to identify the contribution of dialogic feedback on students' writing. They served as primary data which aimed

to gain information about the degree of students' construction of engagement in their writing. The students' text consisted of four drafts that each of the five students wrote during the project was being done and thus resulting in twenty texts in total. The first draft was collected in the pre-observation and it became the baseline data for selecting the participants and for choosing the appropriate course material. Meanwhile, the second until the final drafts were collected after each dialogic feedback episode was carried out.

3.3.4 Interview

Yin (2003) stated that interview is an essential source in conducting a case study research, thus, to address the validity of the data being collected, semi-structured interviews toward the students were applied in this study. The interview session was conducted twice, before and after the project study. Questions for the interview were adopted from Lancaster (2014) and McCambridge (2019), which focus on digging information related to the process of dialogic feedback and the ability in constructing engagement in writing. Specifically, it concerned the students' general comments on the writing project, their experiences with writing argumentative text during the project, their intentions and own impressions of their writing, their perceptions of teachers' expectations and treatment, and their reactions to the teachers' feedback and grades. They were also asked to elaborate on any issues that they may find during the project such as related to technical issue that happened in the online platform. Due to pandemic situation that urges people to do physical distancing, the interviews with all the participants were conducted by phone through WhatsApp voice call. The researcher used Indonesian language in interviewing the students in order to address the clarity of the data given by them. The conversations were audio-recorded and further translated and compiled into English.

3.4 Data Collection Procedures

As stated at the previous chapter, the initial procedure of dialogic feedback applied in this study was mainly adopted from Ajjawi and Boud (2015), who designed the concept of dialogic feedback into several steps as illustrated at the figure 2.1. Due

to pandemic, the implementation of dialogic feedback practice was conducted in online mode. To assist the process of dialogic interaction between the teacher and the participants, WhatsApp group was utilized as the online platform. As the dominant messaging application that was commonly used in educational context (Hamad, 2017), WhatsApp group was selected because it was considered the most accessible platform for the students which could provide complete feature of both synchronous and asynchronous, such as video conferencing, video/audio record, chatting, sending file/material, etc.

In starting the project, the teacher firstly created a WhatsApp group and invited the five participants to join. She further explained the objectives of the project and elaborated the role of each participant in the study. The interaction in the WhatsApp group consisted of formal and informal interaction. Formal interaction consisted of the dialogic interaction within the step of dialogic feedback which occurred twice a week over the period of four weeks. Out of the formal meeting session with confirmed time and date, the instructor allowed the participants to have informal interaction, for example, if they wanted to ask questions, share knowledge, or even greet each other. The examples of formal discussion session in the WhatsApp group could be seen in the appendix.

Moreover, for the sake of reaching its objectives, this study conducted three episodes of dialogic feedback which consisted of seven online meeting sessions. Each of the episodes was deliberately designed to follow the phase of dialogic feedback proposed by Ajjawi & Boud (2015), i.e., (1) instruction and assignment, (2) feedback construction on the assignment, (3) students' reflection on the feedback, and (4) discussing the issue on the feedback. The length of each episode was varied, but most of them consisted of two online meeting sessions with one and half hour time allocation. The time allocation was excluded from the informal interaction between the researcher and students, as the students were in some occasion delivering questions out of the schedule of online dialogic feedback.

The course materials were in the form of model texts and PowerPoint slides. In the time which had been decided by all of the participants, the instructor firstly sent the file which contained learning materials, sample essay and exercise of the

material to the WhatsApp group. She further invited the participants to virtually discuss the material she has sent.

Furthermore, adopting pedagogical intervention from Jou's (2019) study, who explicitly used engagement pedagogical scheme to scaffold students' awareness of engagement resources, this study divided the course material into three episodes; (1) first episode focusing on the structure of argumentation; (2) the second episode concerning on understanding neutral and evaluative engagement and how to use it in establishing thesis or claim; and (3) the third episode concerning on the linguistic realization of engagement resources in argumentative writing.

Table 3.2

Online Sessions Topics and Assignment

Online meeting sessions	Topic	Assignments
Episode 1	Structure of argumentative text	First revision
Episode 2	Establishing claim/thesis through understanding Neutral and evaluative engagement	Second revision
Episode 3	Contractive and Expansive engagement	Final text

In the second phase, after the course material and assignment had been delivered, the teacher then constructed feedback based on the learning objectives of each episode as confirmed in table 3.2. The feedback for each individual students was provided in detail, focusing on four points; (1) general feedback covering the main problems that the students had during each episode, (2) the strength of the writing since the teacher did not want to only highlight the mistakes but also the strong points that the students had been able to achieve, (3) the points to be considered which consisted of the revision or suggestion for the mistakes that students created, and (4) grammatical errors for the sake of students awareness of

grammatical accuracy in writing. The feedback was administered in the form of Microsoft Word and was given to the students before the upcoming episode began.

The next step was the students' reflection on the feedback. Through the online group platform, the teacher initiated dialogic discussion with the students regarding the feedback. Thirty minutes before the online meeting session started, the teacher firstly sent the file of the feedback to the WhatsApp group. She asked all the students to read the feedback of their own text as well as their friends. Further, when the meeting session began, she urged the student to give responses to the feedback. She informed them that it could be in the form of comments on the feedback or question for certain points that they still feel doubt about.

Within the process of reflecting the feedback, there were also dialogic activities among the teacher and the students concerning the point of the feedback. The teacher empowered all the students to always directly ask if there were certain points that they did not understand. The discussion was supplemented by the course materials consisting of those related to argumentative text structure and a sample of argumentative essays. The students then responded to the teacher by questioning some important questions while the teacher tried to build dialogic discussion to solve the problem.

The last agenda of the data collection process was interview sessions. After the three episodes had been conducted, all the participants of this study were further invited into interviews. The researcher did the interview through phone calls and she interviewed each of the participants in the time that had been confirmed.

3.5 Data Analysis

3.5.1 Analyzing Data from WhatsApp Group Interaction

The data from WhatsApp group conversations were rather complex because those contain several sets of data such as teacher feedback, course material, and the conversation among the teacher and the students which in the form of texting (chatting) and audio recording (voice note). Dealing with the data, the researcher firstly transcribed the dialogues and further translated them into English because

some of the conversations were conducted in Indonesian language. The dialogues which were transcribed were only based on the formal interaction session which conducted seven times during the project. The transcript was then classified or categorized into the theme which is relevant to the objectives of this study.

3.5.2 Analyzing Data from Interview

The process of analyzing data from interviews began by translating and transcribing the data into English. The data were further coded by adopting inductive analysis method which was proposed by Hatch (2002). Inductive data analysis is "a search for patterns of meaning in data so that general statements about phenomena under investigation can be made" (Hatch, 2002). Particularly, the data were synthesized with the other data sources and were later classified based on the theme which become the concern of this study which is the contribution of dialogic feedback toward the students' ability in constructing engagement resources.

3.5.3 Analyzing Students' Argumentative Writings

The text analysis began by identifying and categorizing the emergence of engagement resources in students' text. The theory of engagement system (Martin & White, 2005) was utilized as the analytical framework to identify the students' voice construction in their argumentative text. Within the proses of analysis, the researcher firstly parsed the texts into clauses and all of the clauses were coded with reference to the engagement framework, i.e., Monoglossia, Disclaim: deny, Disclaim: counter, Proclaim: pronounce, Proclaim: concur, Proclaim: endorse, Proclaim: justify, Entertain and Attribute. Moreover, to help the process of coding the texts, the researcher used a corpus device named UAM Corpus Tool. This corpus device was developed by O'Donnell (2008) and has been occupied by several researchers (Chunyu Hu & Tan, 2017; Lam & Crosthwaite, 2018) for the annotation of text corpora. It is a software application which allows segments to be annotated with more than one feature, thus it is suitable for dealing with the overlapping categories of the engagement system. The results of the coding were furthered quantified and presented in the form of table frequency and later be

discussed to answer the second research question which is the degree of students' construction of engagement in their argumentative writing.

3.6 Concluding Remarks

This chapter has discussed the points related to the methodologies applied in this study including the design, data gathering method, and procedures as well as the method of data analysis. Further, in the next chapter, the result of the analysis would be presented, elaborated, and discussed, to answer the research questions which has been formulated in the previous chapter.