CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This chapter shows the information about research method; participants of the study; time and place of the study; data and instruments of the study; data collection procedures; research design; and data analysis procedures.

3.1 Research method

This study was conducted in English for Academic Communication Class. The teacher used two types of written corrective feedback which is coded CF and direct CF. Descriptive qualitative approach was chosen as the method as the researcher aims to understand the social reality experienced (the effect of coded CF) by participants. Case study was used to investigate errors of grammatical features targeted after students receive coded corrective feedback.

3.2 Time and Place of the Study

The study was started from April to June 2016. The study was conducted in English for Academic Communication Class in English Department in one of state universities in Jakarta.

3.3 Participants of the Study

The participants were 27 English Department students, comprise seven males and twenty females, majoring English Education in one of state universities in Jakarta. The students are average 19 years old. Each student almost had same prior knowledge as they have learned English since Elementary School third grade.

3.4 Data and Data Resources

The data recourses came from students' writing from the tasks and the test. The data of the study are the total number of errors on students' tasks (students' first task until their third task) and new pieces of writing (the test). The data could help the researcher to answer the research questions; whether the feedback given can help students improve their writing and to what extent the improvement occurs as the result of written corrective feedback given. The data can be seen at Appendix 1.

3.5 Research Instrument

The instruments of the study are students' writing, table description of error categories, and table of content score guide. Students' writing is the instrument to collect the data, while table description of error categories, and table of content score guide are the instrument to analyze the data. As stated before, students' writing was analyzed using the error categories proposed by Ferris and

Roberts (2001); verb errors, article errors, noun-ending errors, wrong word, and sentence structures, and was scored using the content score guide by Fathman and Whalley (1990).

3.6 Data Collection Procedure

To collect the data, the researcher firstly asks the Head of English Education Study Program permission to do the research. The researcher tries to explain the Head about what she is going to do in English Education Study Program. The researcher wants to come in to Writing Class to collect students' writing before and after getting coded CF from the teacher. Students in English for Academic Communication Class are randomly chosen as the participants of this study. Secondly, the researcher comes to see the teacher to ask his permission to do the research in his class (English for Academic Communication Class). Then, the researcher and the teacher discuss about the purpose of the study, and the data and the instrument needed to support the study. Thirdly, the researcher comes in to the class to ask the students to participate in this study and to observe the learning process happened for one until two months.

3.7 Research Design

In the beginning, the teacher will prepare some topics for the writing assignments during the class. In the first week of the study, the students are asked to write their own writings under the topic determined and based on the

instructions given by the teacher. The teacher asks the students to do the assignment in the classroom for about 50 minutes. After finish writing, students are asked to collect their writings to the teacher. The teacher will give the students written CF which is coded feedback for each student. Then he will distribute students' writings which have the teacher's feedback on the next meeting.

On the following meeting, students study the feedback given by the teacher and revise their writing in the classroom for about 30 minutes. After that, the students again have to collect their revision to the teacher. Then, the teacher will give feedback again to the students' writings. This activity will be repeated until the students produce their third task revision.

For the test, the students are asked to write a new piece of writing which is similar type as their writings before, but in different context. This test will show the total numbers of errors made by the students and how the indirect CF (coded feedback) affects students' writings, and in what extent the improvement occurs as the result of coded corrective feedback given.

The tasks and the test were given in the different time. For the first task, students were asked to write a text in the tenth weeks. Three days later, their texts were given back with the coded CF provided by the teacher. In the eleventh weeks, students wrote the new pieces of writings and also received their texts back on three days later. In the twelfth week, students were also asked to write their new pieces of writing, and again received their texts back from the teacher on three days later. The duration between the last task and the test was two weeks. In the fourteenth weeks, students were asked to write their final texts. Yet, in a

week ago, the teacher gave them the topic and asked them to write as well as they can with providing a lot of sources to support their texts.

3.8 Data analysis procedures

The data were analyzed by Ferris & Roberts (2001) framework about five grammatical error description, and were scored by Fathman & Whalley (1990) framework about content score guide.

3.8.1   Grammatical errors analysis

The categories of errors in grammatical feature is proposed by Ferris and Roberts (2001) which are verb errors, article errors, noun-ending errors, wrong word, and sentence structures. Table 2.1 is the explanation of Ferris & Roberts (2001) error categories. The analysis of grammatical errors on students' writing used indirect corrective feedback which is coded corrective feedback. Here are some illustrations about how the data were analyzed on students' writing:

Example 1:
      In this era, internet is used almost in every <u>activities</u> (N). You use the internet to reserve a ticket, connect with others, and find information to fulfil your assignments. But, you cannot always get <u>an accurate</u> (Art.) information from the internet. This essay will explain why internet cannot be the best place to find information.
      Firstly, everyone can access the internet and publish the information easily. Internet serves <u>many</u> (WW) information that may not be able to be verified.

Example 2:

Recently, people <u>has</u> (V) been introduced to one of the advancement of technology that is internet. Internet provide many benefits for people such as people can entertain themselves by streaming movies, play online games, chatting with friends and also find any kinds of <u>informations</u> (N) they need.

Example 3:

In this era, internet is commonly known by every people. It is a source of many information. <u>Although there are so many information on the internet</u> (SS). Internet is not the best place to find information. The reasons why internet is not the best place to find information are credibility and reliability; safety; and most of the informations on the internet are outdated. This essay will explain about why <u>can't internet</u> (SS) be the best place for find information.

The example 1, 2, & 3 are the illustrations of how the data were analyzed on students' writing. Each example was taken from different students' writing. The underlined words and the underlined sentences at three examples above are the errors on students' writing. *N* means as noun-ending error, *V* means as verb errors, *Art* means as article error, *WW* means as wrong words, and *SS* means as sentence structure errors.

Table 3.1 is used to calculate the total number of errors existed in students' writing for each task and the test.

Table 3.1
Table of frequency of each type of the grammatical errors (%)

No.	Students	Frequency of each types of errors				
		V	N	Art.	WW	SS
1.	Student 1	22.22	8.51	21.05	4	11.11
2.	Student 2	0	4.41	5	1.80	5
3.	Student 3	3.12	1.88	12.5	2.97	6.25
4.	Student 4	16.67	2.70	0	1.04	9.52
5.	Student 5	23.33	1.78	5.55	2.15	13.33
	Etc.					
Mean						

Notes:
V: Verb errors   WW: Wrong word
N: Noun-ending errors   SS: Sentence structures
Art.: Article errors

The formula to calculate the total number of each error in percentage should be in the form below:

$$\text{Verb errors} = \frac{\text{the total of verb errors}}{\text{the total of verbs exist}} \times 100\%$$

$$\text{Noun-ending errors} = \frac{\text{the total of noun-ending errors}}{\text{the total of nouns exist}} \times 100\%$$

$$\text{Article errors} = \frac{\text{the total of article errors}}{\text{the total of articles exist}} \times 100\%$$

Wrong word= the total of wrong words x 100%
———————————————
the total of words exist

Sentence structure= the total number of wrong sentence structure x 100%
the total number of sentences existed

Table 3.2 is used to summarize the total number of errors that students made to answer the research question which is how coded CF affects students' writing. From the table below, it will show the increasing or decreasing number of errors made by students for each error after receiving coded CF.

Table 3.2
Table of summary of grammatical errors in tasks (%)

No.	Students	First task					Revision					Etc.				
		V	N	Art.	WW	SS	V	N	Art.	WW	SS	V	N	Art.	WW	SS
1.	Student 1	22.22	8.51	21.05	4	11.11	6.67	2.10	37.5	1.46	6.67					
2.	Student 2	0	4.41	5	1.80	5	0	3.12	4.35	0.38	0					
3.	Student 3	3.12	1.88	12.5	2.97	6.25	0	1.85	6.25	0.48	0					
4.	Student 4	16.67	2.70	0	1.04	9.52	6.52	1.37	0	0.69	4.35					
5.	Student 5	23.33	1.78	5.55	2.15	13.33	17.24	0	0	0.73	3.45					
	Etc.															
Mean																

Table 3.3 is used to compare the total number errors made by the students on their tasks and the test (new piece of writing).

Table 3.3
Table of comparison of errors in students' tasks and the test (%)

	Students' tasks (mean from first task until third task)					The test (mean)				
	V	N	Art.	WW	SS	V	N	Art.	WW	SS
Task 1	14.59	3.84	5.32	2.13	11.16	10.26	1.55	8.70	2.75	11.84
Revision	8.35	1.53	5.12	1.65	9.07					
Task 2	11.74	2.44	11.15	2.80	6.40					
Revision	7.91	2.37	21.79	1.95	9.15					
Task 3	18.29	3.13	24.72	3.28	17.15					
Mean										

3.8.2   Content score analysis

Ferris ((2006) in Hyland & Hyland (2006)) found that teachers tend to mark *treatable categories (verb, noun-ending and article)* errors indirectly and mark *untreatable categories (wrong words and sentence structure)* errors directly. This is why feedback given in analyzing content writing is different with feedback given by the teacher in analyzing grammatical error. In analyzing the total number of error on students' writing, teacher used coded CF as feedback. Yet, in analyzing the content writing, feedback given by the teacher is focused CF since feedback given was only focused on content writing. The categories of content score are

proposed by Fathman & Whalley (1990). Table 3.4 is the explanation of

Fathman & Whalley (1990) guidance for content score.

Table 3.4
Table of content feedback scoring guide

Score	Description
16-20	1. Superior paper in all aspects of content 2. Fully developed with outstanding to substantial use of specific details 3. Events unified by transitions 4. No unnecessary repetition 5. Language is fluent, only occasional inaccuracies in idiom and vocabulary mar the paper
11-15	1. Generally well-handled but may have one paragraph or several sentences that are not as focused as those in a 16-20 paper 2. Successful use of detail but not as developed as in a 16-20 paper 3. Narration told accuracy, but with less imagination than for a 16-20 paper 4. Some transitions 5. May be a little repetitive 6. May have an unclear sentence or several words used inappropriately
6-10	1. A vague, general telling of the story 2. Few details 3. Few, if any, transitions 4. Likely to be repetitive 5. One or more sentences may be incomprehensible
1-5	1. Lack of understanding of the story 2. Little development 3. Few or no details 4. No transitions 5. Consistent misuse of vocabulary and/or idiom

(Adopted from Fathman & Whalley (1990)

Here is the illustration about how the content was analyzed on

students' writing.

> Internet is an informal term for the World-Wide communication network of computers (1). The internet is used send information quickly between computers around the world. The internet is used for many things such as file transfer, browsing, interlinked web pages, etc. the biggest use of the internet is to send and receive e-mail. The internet can also be effect negative for people. Information that internet put on the internet is not always checked it, and some may not be true. Some may even be harmful. If, someone sends information through the internet, sometimes other people can read it even when they are not supposed to.

(1) You need to check your topic sentence. Your supported sentences don't suit with the topic sentence

Table 3.5 is used to score the content of students' writings for each task and the test.

Table 3.5
Table of content score

	First draft		
	Rater 1	Rater 2	Mean per student
Student 1	10	10	**10**
Student 2	10	11	**10.5**
Student 3	11	12	**11.5**
Student 4	11	10	**10.5**
Student 5	10	10	**10**
Etc.			
Main average			
Total average			

Table 3.6 is used to summarize content score of students' tasks to answer the research question which is how coded CF affects students' writing. From the table below, it will show the increasing or decreasing content score made by students after receiving coded CF.

Table 3.6
Table of summary of the content score in tasks

	First draft			First draft revision			Etc.		
	Rater 1	Rater 2	Mean per student	Rater 1	Rater 2	Mean per student	Rater 1	Rater 2	Mean per student
Student 1	10	10	**10**	12	11	**11.5**			
Student 2	10	11	**10.5**	13	15	**14**			
Student 3	11	12	**11.5**	15	16	**15.5**			
Student 4	11	10	**10.5**	15	16	**15.5**			
Student 5	10	10	**10**	12	13	**12.5**			
Etc.									
Main average									
Total average									

Table 3.7 is used to compare the content score of students' writings on each task and the test (new piece of writing).

Table 3.7
Table of comparison of content score between students' tasks and test

	Tasks (mean)	Test
Task 1	11.575	**14.45**
Revision	13.6	
Task 2	11.925	
Revision	13.125	
Task 3	8.525	
Revision	10.5	
Mean		

3.8.3 Inter-rater reliability

The content of students' writings were scored by two raters to check inter-rater reliability. The two raters gave the scores separately. The scores given by the two raters were almost the same. The proportion of inter-rater reliability was 85%. There were not any deliberations because the scores given were still in one category of range.