CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY OF THE RESEARCH

In this chapter, the methodology of the research used in conducting this study is presented. Unlike previous research (e.g., Kamimura, 2006; Zeng, 2006; Kurt and Atay, 2007), which conducted to investigate peer feedback impact on the students’ writing, this research intended to look the gradual development achieved by the students. Previous researches, as mentioned above, preferred to use certain “calculation” to look the decrease of the error and the increase of the correction students made during writing with peer feedback.

Since it is suggested that (peer) feedback is a main component in process oriented writing (Harmer, 2007; Hyland, 2005; Bartels, 2003), gradual development is seen by comparing students’ texts, as whole (Emilia, 2010) and not fragmented part, therefore following methodology is assumed as appropriate.

Hyland (2007:197), in exploring text genre analysis, mentions that different types of research methods lead to different types of understanding. The other side of the coin, it can be said that to gain different types of understanding, different types of method is used.

Following discussion attempts to address respects in connection with the research design, techniques of data collection and data analysis, and research site and participant. Each component of the methodology, as mentioned in sequence, is in accordance with the purpose of the study. The following used research methodology is to gain understanding of peer feedback from two perspectives:
students’ narrative writing development and students’ responses toward peer feedback.

3.1. Research Design

This part discusses the design of the research in the frame of its importance and function as helping the researcher to obtain responsible conclusion to the investigated problems (Oppenheim, 1982:7). This study is designed as a qualitative case study. Case study is appropriate to be employed since this research treated peer feedback as the single case that is investigated (Cresswell, 1997:61, Silverman, 2005:126). In relationship with the reason, case study also characterizes this study due to the fact that this research was carried out in a “single case,” that is what development the students achieve in writing narrative through peer feedback. Another reason is that this research employed more than one data collection techniques: document and interview; which is one of the characteristics of the qualitative case study (Cresswell, 1997).

This current study also attempted to investigate peer feedback as the case in a system bounded by time and place. Time here refers to the process of writing whereas place here refers to the level of the participant (university students). Therefore, the result of the study is not generalizable. Simply, this study was conducted to investigate the impact of peer feedback in a limited number of participants and limited subject (narrative writing).
3.2. Research Site and Participant

The site of the research was in a university in Bandung, Indonesia, involving 15 English department undergraduate students. The recruitment of the participant was performed by employing *purposive sampling* that is available for a case study (Cresswell, 1997:62; Moleong, 2008). These undergraduate students were purposively chosen by respecting considerations as follow:

a. They are learning English as a second language
b. They have been taught English writing
c. They have been introduced to narrative genre
d. They are ready to spend time and energy during the study
e. They will work cooperatively during the process of the study

Those considerations were taken into account in hoping that peer feedback, as the studied case, can be implemented in writing narrative in English. Although peer feedback was originally formulated to be used in English as L1 (Hyland and Hyland, 2006), teachers and researchers (e.g., Williams, 2005; Hyland, 2005; Spear, 1988; Kamimura, 2007, and Zeng, 2006) were optimistic that peer feedback might be valuable in ESL writing classroom if the students are well trained (Williams, 2005; Lim, 2007) and have sufficient knowledge of what and how to do it (Clark, 2003). In line with those assumptions, the above criterions were taken into consideration to perform the participant recruitment.

3.3. Techniques of Data Collection

This research attempted to find out evidence that peer feedback has a positive impact on the students’ narrative writing, and the students’ responses
toward peer feedback activity in ESL writing classroom. To collect the data, this research needed students’ texts and their perceptions. Therefore, documentation and interview were used to obtain the data. Each technique and its steps performed are elaborated below.

**Documentation**

There were some steps done in collecting students’ texts. The procedure used in this technique is by following Liz (in Hyland and Hyland, 2006:145) that was the students’ texts are collected through *peer feedback cycle*. Those steps are mentioned as follow:

1. Students were taught narrative and peer feedback.
2. Students were asked to write a narrative (1st draft).
3. Students’ shared their narrative to their peer, with peer feedback sheet.
4. Each student read and gave feedback on the draft they had been given.
5. Each commented draft was returned to the owner for being revised.
6. Students revised their narrative after read their peer’s draft, and after their draft was read by their peer (2nd draft).
7. Each student returned to do draft sharing, with peer feedback sheet.
8. Each student read and gave feedback on the draft they had been given (similar draft).
9. Each commented draft was returned to the owner for being revised.
10. Students revised their narrative after 2nd draft sharing (3rd draft).
11. Students collected their drafts, with the peer feedback sheet.
By doing those steps above, students’ narrative drafts were collected in portfolio. There were three drafts each student wrote and those drafts are compared as discussed in the next chapter.

The steps done above can be illustrated in the diagram below:
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**Figure 3. Cycle of Students’ drafts collection**

Those steps are addable or can be repeated again if teacher (or researcher) intends to collect more drafts. Two peer feedback sessions were used in this research because this research intended to employ three drafts for each student. This diagram is adopted from Liz (in Hyland and Hyland, 2006:145) with certain adjustments.

*Interview*

Interview was the second data collection technique used in this research. The use of interview was to capture students’ responses or opinions, or comments, or perceptions toward peer feedback activity in their ESL writing classroom. The interview was conducted at the end of the research process, and one-on-one
interview was used by respecting their privacies in answering questions as suggested by Cresswell (1977:124).

All the students (15) were interviewed in one day, and each student was interviewed in ± 8-10 minutes. 15 questions were asked, but actually only 5 were found relevant and therefore are discussed in the next chapter. The questions of the interview are adopted from Hirose (2009), for complete detail see interview transcription in appendix.

Interviews were performed to obtain their response toward peer feedback activity they have been engaged earlier. Those questions are broken down into five themes:

1. Students’ responses on being involved into peer feedback activity.
2. Students’ responses on giving comments to their peer.
3. Students’ responses on receiving comments from their peer.
4. Students’ responses on the peer feedback effectiveness.
5. Students’ responses on the peer feedback difficulties.

The researcher used recording device like a portable sensitive microphone which was connected to a notebook. The students’ answers were recorded by using recording software installed in the notebook. Students’ answers were “saved” in MP3 (MP3 is a format of audio files available to be listened electronically) and this was to make the transcription process more easily.

After collecting students’ answers in audio files, the researcher transcribed those interviews into text by listening the files with certain audio software installed in the notebook and then wrote the answers by using word processor
manually. This way was found easier than using another recorder, because by using this way, students’ answers could be heard and repeated for many times, and more secured from being broken.

3.4. Techniques of Data Analysis

The data analysis was performed through certain techniques in accordance with the types and purpose of the data. The discussion of the techniques used in analyzing data was divided into two parts: analysis of the students’ drafts and analysis of the data from interview. Each part of data analysis was based on its purpose of being collected, as described in turn.

3.4.1. Analysis of the students’ drafts

The analysis of the students’ drafts is theoretically categorized as content analysis, which is Busha and Carter (1980) mention as a research tool focused on actual content and internal features of media. Content analysis is said to determine the presence (or absence) of certain words, concepts, themes, phrases, characters, or sentences within the text (or sets of texts).

The internal features, in this research, are mistakes and revisions made in the students’ texts. Identified, commented, and corrected mistakes are discussed thoroughly and then discussing the revisions that could be made based on both feedback from peer and self-awareness. Simply, this research, in analyzing students’ texts, investigates the changes occur in the students’ texts (narrative drafts), which, whether or not, the changes are able to consider as development.
Students’ texts were analyzed to see the development of the students’ drafts in two aspects: organization and grammaticality. As displayed in the next chapter, organizational development is firstly discussed and then the grammatical development.

To do this analysis, some steps were performed systematically as simply called *students’ texts comparison* (Liz, in Hyland and Hyland, 2006:146-151; Clark, 2003). Those steps are:

1. Students’ portfolio was separated according to the owner’s name, and was set in sequent (1st draft, 2nd draft, and 3rd draft).

2. Reading the 1st draft and discussing mistakes found (identified by the responder, and unobserved mistakes), and then discussing the feedback given by the responder for each mistake.

3. Discussing changes or revisions (in the 2nd draft) made by the writer; looking for the connection between the revisions and the feedback in earlier draft (1st draft).

4. Discussing the mistakes found (identified by the responder, and unobserved mistakes) in the revised version (2nd draft) and further feedback from the responder.

5. Discussing further changes or revisions (3rd draft) made by the writer; looking for the connection between the further revisions and feedback in earlier draft (2nd draft).


Comparing students’ narrative drafts written in peer feedback sessions is appropriate to be used, since this research attempted to observe gradual
developments achieved by the students, reflected through the “betterment” occurred in draft to drafts.

As mentioned in the earlier section, that students were asked to write their narrative, draft comparison is likely to occur if, and only if, the compared drafts are the *revised versions* and not a new draft or new narrative. Each long discussion category is summarized at the end to keep the crucial point found in the data analysis. This type of analysis was performed to answer the first research question, that is to see to what extent do the students’ narrative writing develop through peer feedback.

**3.4.2. Analysis of the data from interview**

The analysis of the data from interview was done to understand the students’ responses toward peer feedback activities in ESL writing classroom where the students were engaged. Furthermore, the purpose of the interview in this research was to understand how the students value or give meaning toward peer feedback after experiencing it (Seidman, 2005:9). Some steps were done to reach this purpose as mentioned below:

1. Students’ responses on interview questions were listened carefully and then described into text.
2. Students’ responses were then divided into themes: involvement, giving comment, receiving comment, effectiveness, and difficulties.
3. Students’ responses in each theme were translated and then interpreted in relationship with theories regarding the students’ responses toward peer feedback as covered by previous researchers.
4. The interpretation was based on the students’ verbal expressions.
The analysis of the interview data, through those steps, was performed to answer the second research question. In interpretation, data was reduced as many as needed through abstraction (Seidman, 2009; Moleong, 2008:247) to make the analysis more relevant and significant. The data, after being categorized, was then interpreted with content analysis, focusing at linguistic form used by the participants in responding interview questions (Busa and Carter, 1980) and this is one of the semiotic analysis branches (Moleong, 2008).

The results of the previous researches in this regard are the base of the significance of the conclusion. Therefore, the findings from the data from interview are then compared with previous researches finding in this regard. However, again, the result of this research is not intended to be generalized.