CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This chapter presents the methodology used in the present study. It elaborates the research design, the research site and participants, the data collection instruments, the data collection procedures and the data analysis.

3.1 Research Design

The study used a case study research design to reach the aims of the study which were to investigate how an English teacher provided written feedback on their students' writing assignment through Google Classroom and the types of the feedback the teacher used. Additionally, this type of research design tends to focus on small groups or individuals based on their own real experience in a specific setting in which the data will be collected through different multiple sources and perspectives (Lodico et. al., 2006). Furthermore, this research design is commonly used when the types of "what" and "how" questions are being posted for individual, group, organization, society, political environment, and related phenomena (Yin, 2002). As mentioned in Chapter I, this study aimed to answer the following questions:

1. How does the English teacher provide written feedback on their students' writing assignment through Google Classroom as LMS?

2. What types of written feedback does the teacher give on the students' writing?

The questions were considered as types of questions that need more explanation for explaining in depth the issues that are being stated. In addition, the issues discussed in this study might be still relevant over the years. Thus, the study was needed to give a comprehensible description of the latest situation in the field.

3.2 Research Site and Participants

This study was conducted in one junior high school in Bandung. The decision for choosing the school as the setting of the study was because the researcher considered conducting a study under the place where it provided teaching English subjects with all the integrative skills which included teaching writing skill and giving writing assignments to the students. Furthermore, regarding the concept of convenience sampling, the researcher

considered the place was suitable for conducting the research since the site was accessible and the participants involved were willing to participate in this research by providing time and information needed for the study. The researcher was able to visit the site without facing an significant difficulties and the researcher was also familiar with the site itself. Thus, the school was the perfect setting for conducting the research.

To complete this study, an English teacher and three eighth grade students from the school were chosen to participate in this study. The consideration for choosing the teacher was based on the years of experiences in teaching English that the teacher has. With the experience of teaching for more than 10 years, the teacher was expected to have the capability of holding the class while adapting Google Classroom to give the feedback on the students' writing assignment.

As for the students who participated, the researcher chose the students with the help of the teacher. Thus, the researcher gave the authority to the teacher to choose the three students. Alongside with the criteria for the teacher, the students who became the participants were chosen based on the category of low (with English writing score range 30-50), mid (60-70), and high achievers (80-100) that is being categorized by teacher (Emilia, Habibi, & Bangga, 2018). All participants in this study were voluntary. However, regarding the research ethic, the research site and participants were concealed.

The type of text used in this study was recount text. The reasons for choosing this text were because the text was a part of a lesson delivered to the eighth graders. In addition, this text was considered to be less complex compared than other texts and related to the students' personal experiences. Furthermore, the researcher would also like to observe how the teacher provided the understandable written feedback to the junior high school students who had different levels of English knowledge than students in the higher education level.

3.3 Data Collection Instruments

The data were collected by gathering three different data collection instruments: classroom observations, text analysis, and interviews. These instruments were used to gain information to answer the research questions that were being addressed. The explanation of the data collection instruments can be seen as follows.

Classroom observations were chosen as one of the ways to gather the data, because the process of observation would provide the researcher a chance to get the data directly from the site as the events happen naturally there (Wellington, 2015, as cited in Cohen et al., 2018).

Collecting the data through observation might offer valid and authentic data due to it could provide rich contextual information from first-hand sources while observing the entire participants' activities whether they are in the form of physical, verbal, or non-verbal interactions (Clark et al., 2009). In this study, the researcher conducted observations twice because of the pandemic as mentioned in Chapter I page 3.

Observations could be the form of facts, events, and behaviours (Cohen et al., 2018). For example, the number of students in one class can be categorized as fact, the ways the teacher explains the learning materials and gives feedback on the students' tasks can be categorized as events, while the teacher's methods in interacting with students can be one example of behaviour in the classroom. Observations could lead the researcher to gain information interactions in a social context and to record the whole activities in many different kinds of forms (Simpson and Tuson, 2003), including the physical setting (the physical condition of the environment observed by the researcher), the human setting (participants included in the study that being observed), the interactional setting (the interactions between participants during the events that being monitored), and the programme setting (including resources and the organization structures being used in the research site) (Morrison, 1993, p. 80, as cited in Cohen et al., 2018). In this study, the researcher used non-participant observations, which means the researcher did not actively participate in the learning activities during the class and only became an observer.

After finishing the process of classroom observations, the second data was collected through the text analysis. The text which was analyzed were the students' writing assignment that was collected by the researcher with the help of the teacher. These texts were needed in order to identify types of feedback that the teachers gave after the students submitted the assignment. The texts were gathered and analyzed based on Ferris (2006) and Irwin (2018) regarding strategies in providing feedback and categories of teacher's written feedback.

The last instrument in collecting the data was semi-structured interviews which were conducted to both the teacher and the students. The semi-structured interview for the teacher was conducted in order to dig more explanation of the method the teacher used in giving the feedback during the feedback process during the offline and online learning, while the interview posted for the students aimed to confirm whether the feedback provided by the

teacher was accepted by students and could be considered as helpful in improving their writing skills or not.

A semi-structured interview itself can be defined as a loose-structured interview which consists of open-ended questions that point to explore the area that will be investigated, in which the interviewer or interviewees may develop either the questions or the answers in order to get the more detailed information (Britten, 1995). Once the interview has been successfully conducted, the data from the interview will be analyzed through the coding process based on the major themes.

However, in conducting an interview, there could be several limitations that the interviewer should pay attention to (Flinders, 1997, as cited in Griffee, 2005). The interviewees can get excuses for not being open during answering the questions of the interviewer. They have the privilege of not being fully honest during the interview process if they neither feel comfortable nor want to discuss the issue. This situation did not happen in this study during the interview process and all the participants were willing to answer all the questions given.

3.4   Data Collection Procedures

As mentioned above, the data was collected in three steps: classroom observation, text analysis, and interview. The stages of data collection procedures were done as follows.

1) The researcher observed the teaching and learning process in the class, including the process where the teacher delivered the learning material, gave the writing assignment and provided the feedback afterwards. This stage of observation was needed to figure out the method used by the teacher in providing the feedback. All the activities from the beginning until the end of the class were recorded in a form of video recordings and the data from the observations were analyzed using the rubric that can be seen in the Appendix 1 page 58.

2) The researcher collected the students' writing assignment that had been valued by the teacher. This stage of the procedure attempted to investigate types of written feedback the teacher mostly used and the aspects of the students' writing that became the teacher's main focus to be valued. Due to some circumstances, the students were required to write the final draft directly without creating several drafts first. This condition led to the writing and feedback process becoming ineffective. The full description for this condition will be explained further in Chapter IV.

3) The researcher analyzed what type of feedback that was provided by the teacher on the students' writing assignment using the rubrics from Ferris (2006) and Irwin (2018). The

researcher served the data following the criteria in the rubrics to get the brief picture of the type of written feedback used by the teacher. The analysis of the teacher's written feedback on the students' writing assignment will be explained in Chapter IV.

4) The researcher conducted interviews with the teacher and the students at different times after finishing all the text analysis process. Both interviews aimed to match the data from the observations and the students' writing assignment with the teacher's and students' experiences, also to investigate whether the teacher and students faced difficulties in providing and understanding the feedback or not. The interviews were held for no longer than an hour with ten questions for the teacher and each student.

5) After all the data from the interviews were gathered, the answers from the participants were broken down into several categories based on the major themes. The interview's questions and answers can be seen in Appendix 2 page 65.

3.5 Data Analysis

In analyzing the data from classroom observations, after recording the data using a video recorder, the researcher used rubric provided by Washburn (2015). The rubric can be seen in the Appendix 1 page 58. As for the students' writing assignment, the researcher adapted rubrics and criteria provided by Ferris (2006: 85) and Irwin (2018: 40-41) regarding strategies in giving written feedback and categories of teacher's written feedback with some modification following the aspects highlighted by the teacher when the student made errors. The rubrics to analyze the teacher's written feedback used by the researcher can be seen as follows. For more detailed samples of the feedback, see Chapter IV.

Table 3.1 Teacher's written feedback analysis rubric

Error type	Description
Verb tense	The errors made by students in choosing the tense when they write the text (e.g. writing recount text using simple past tense). Example: Students write '*buy*' instead of '*bought*' in their recount text.
Articles	The errors made by students in using articles (e.g. misplacement of 'the', cannot differentiate 'a' and 'an', etc.) Example: Students write '*food*' instead of '*the food*'.

Singular-plural	The errors made by students when they write singular or plural nouns (e.g. do not add the 's' at the end of a plural noun). Example: Students write '*2 day*' instead of '*2 days*'.
Pronouns	The errors made by students in using pronouns, including the subject pronouns, the object pronouns, the possessive pronouns, etc. Example: Students write '*I and my brother*' instead of *'me and my brother'*.
Sentence structure	The errors made by students in writing sentences because the sentences consist of missing and unnecessary words and phrases and word order problems. Example: Students write '*We have to went home now*' instead of '*We went home now*'.
Mechanic	The errors made by students related to the use of capitalization, punctuation, and spelling. Example of error in the use of capitalization: Students do not write '*I*' in capital letter. Example of error in punctuation: Students do not put period (.) at the end of their sentences. Example for error in spelling: Students write '*fot*' instead of '*for*'.
Content	The errors made by the students which contain the ideas of the text, the details, and the length of the text. Example: Students write their recount text with the length less than the teacher instructed.

After analyzing the feedback on the students' writings using the first rubric, the researcher continued analyzing the numbers of the feedback based on the students' errors in

writing which were categorized and counted following the framework as follows. For more detailed samples of the feedback, see Chapter IV.

Table 3.2 Teacher's categories of written feedback analysis rubric

Feedback type	Description
Lexical Feedback	Feedback highlighted the students' errors in a form of misspelling and incorrect word choice. (See example in Table 3.1 in the category of error type: Mechanic).
Grammatical Feedback.	Feedback highlighted the students' errors in a form of verb tense, pronoun, article, and preposition. (See example in Table 3.1 in the category of error type: Verb tense, Pronouns, and Articles).
Structural Feedback	Feedback highlighted the students' errors in a form of punctuation, sentence fragments, comma splices (etc.) (See example in Table 3.1 in the category of error type: Mechanic).
Content Feedback	Feedback highlighted the students' errors relating to details and ideas. (See example in Table 3.1 in the category of error type: Content).
General Comments	Feedback by teachers in a form of words of praise or encouragement. (Example: The teacher writes on the students' paper some praises such as 'great', 'good job', 'excellent', etc.).

As explained previously, the interviews were conducted after the researcher finished analyzing the students' writing assignment and its feedback. The interviews were held for the teacher and the three students. The questions in the interviews were delivered in Bahasa in order to avoid misunderstanding and to help the researcher to get more detailed answers from the participants included. Since the form of the interviews were a semi-structured one, the

interviewer could ask questions which were out of the lists. The samples of the questions which asked out of the lists can be seen in the Appendix 2 page 65.