CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHODS

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHODS

This chapter consists of research design, the subjects of the study, the research instruments that the writer uses, procedure of collecting data and procedure of analyzing data.

3.1 Research Design

To find out whether the audiotaped feedback is effective enough to improve students' grammatical performance and ideas in writing, the writer uses a qualitative action research that consists of cycles consisting of planning, acting, observing, reflecting, and suggesting for the next planning, etc. This is focused on trying out ideas in practice as means of improvement and as a means of increasing knowledge. The data are recorded in numerical form, but it is not the decisive tool.

In the planning stage, the writer explains about Audiotaped Feedback (ATF) to the students in order to make them know and understand about it, so they can follow the procedure of feedback well. Then, the writer prepares cassettes for the students and labels them. After that, the writer gives each student one cassette and asks them to record their questions or suggestions about this teachnique on it for the teacher to listen to before responding and giving a feedback. Here, both the students' questions and the teacher's feedback are in English.

In the action, the writer gives a feedback both in error corrections and comments by using audiotaped feedback procedure for the first composition. The important point the writer wants to emphasize is that she deletes the peer's comments. It is caused by the limitation of the medium to record the peer response and also the limitation of time. The first step is that the writer records the error corrections by telling what grammatical mistakes are done by them and comments on their ideas. She also answers the student's questions on the tape. Second, the writer returns their compositions and the cassettes, asks them to revise their compositions and also encourages them to record their questions if they have problems. For the second composition, the writer also gives a feedback both in error corrections and comments by using audiotaped feedback procedure. This will be done continuously until the fifth composition. For the observation activity, the writer looks at the first draft of five compositions of each student and also the final draft as the revised draft of five compositions of each student whether the students make any improvement in their writing skill and then she interviews them at the end of the first half semester.

Next, the writer makes a report of reflection such as the effectiveness of audiotaped feedback to improve students' grammatical performance and idea in writing, the students' progress in the grammatical performance and ideas in writing, and also the students' ability in making reasonable corrections toward their mistakes. The last activity that the writer must do is giving suggestions for the second plan that consists of the improvement of audiotaped feedback approach in giving feedback.

3.2 The Subjects

The subjects of this study are the third semester students taking Writing B in class D of the English Department, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education of Widya Mandala Surabaya Catholic University during the academic year 2002-2003. The reason for taking the third semester students taking Writing B in class D of the English Department of Teacher Training and Education of Widya Mandala Surabaya Catholic University is because they have already got a narrative writing that is needed for making a good and clear description based on what is happening and also the availability of writing subject offered in the odd semester of academic year 2002/2003.

3.3 Research Instruments

The instruments of this study are the writer herself, the students' compositions on descriptions of persons, objects and places and the revisions of them, and also the interview data. The writer herself here has a function as an implementer of the ATF technique and also as a corrector of the students' compositions. The students' compositions and the revisions are used as a tool to see whether the students' grammatical performance and idea improve or not. The interview is about the impression of the students toward audiotaped feedback, the difficulties that the students get in interpreting and understanding the error corrections and the comments using audiotaped, and how the audiotaped feedback helps them in improving their grammar and idea in writing.

3.4 Procedure of Collecting Data

In order to obtain the answers of the statements of the problem stated in Chapter I, the writer follows the procedures below:

1. Planning

First, the writer chooses the participants. Second, the writer decides the class for implementing the audiotaped feedback. Here, she chooses the students in Writing B class D who learn descriptive writing. This descriptive writing is divided into three kinds of description; they are describing a person, describing an object and describing a place. For this study, the writer only takes the data from students' compositions during the first half of the semester. There are five compositions based on three kinds of description during the first half of the semester. Each composition includes a first draft and a final draft as a revision. So, the total number of pieces of writing expected to be submitted by the students is ten; five of which are the first draft and the other five are the final draft. Third, before moving on to the next step, the writer prepares a cassette for the each student, labels it and gives it to the students. Here, the writer also asks the students to record their questions for the teacher to listen to before giving feedback to the students' compositions. The students' questions and the teacher's feedback are in English. Besides, the writer also prepares the interview list. In doing all preparations, the writer is asking the permission from the teacher of the class and also cooperating with her.

2. <u>Action and Observation</u>

The writer gives a feedback both in error corrections and comments by using audiotaped feedback procedure for the first draft of composition. In giving the feedback, the writer collaborates with the other researchers, in this case is the writing teacher of the class and the other researcher. The first step is the writer records the error corrections by telling what the grammatical mistakes are made by them and comments on their ideas. She also answers the student's questions on the tape. Second, the writer returns the assignment and the cassette, and asks them to revise their compositions, also encourages them to ask if they still do not understand about her feedback. For the second assignment, the writer also gives a feedback both in error corrections and comments by using audiotaped feedback procedure. This will be done continuously until the fifth writing assignment.

For the observation, the writer looks at the first draft and the final draft as a revision of each student's composition from the first until the fifth assignment to see whether the students make any improvement in their writing skill and then she interviews them at the end of the first half semester.

3. Reflection

The writer makes a report of reflection such as the effectiveness of audiotaped feedback to improve students' grammatical performance and idea in writing, the students' progress in the grammatical performance and ideas in writing, and also the students' ability in making reasonable corrections toward their mistakes based on the first draft and the revised draft of five compositions of each student and the interview data. At last, the writer gives suggestions for the

second plan that consists of the improvement of audiotaped feedback approach in giving feedback.

3.5 Procedure of Analyzing Data

After collecting the data, the writer analyzes the data. The first analysis is done by checking the first draft of five compositions of each student. What kinds of error made by the students? Then, the writer classifies each error in a table based on the mistakes that are made by the students and counts them. The writer uses the frequent errors made by ESL students that is stated by Walz (1982:35) to analyze the students' compositions. The format of analysis can be seen in Table 3.1. The second analysis is done by checking the revised draft of five compositions of each student. Is there any improvement in their grammar and idea or not? The parameter that the writer uses is the same as the parameter that is used for analyzing the first analysis and this can be seen in Table 3.1. The detail information about the students' mistakes in each assignment both in the first draft and in the final draft can be seen in the *Appendix A - Data Analysis of the Students' Compositions Errors*.

Table 3.1 Data Analysis of Students' Grammatical Performance and Idea in Each Assignment

| Student | _ | The numbers o | | | | | | | | | | | | | | akes | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------|-------------|-----------------------|---|---|----|---|---|---|----------|----|----------------|----|--------------|-----------------------------|---|------|-----|--------------|---|-----|----------|------|----|----|----|------|
| | First Draft | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Fir | ral D | rafi | | | | |
| | - | Kinds of Errors Total | | | | | | | | | | | Total | Final Draft Kinds of Errors | | | | | | | | | | | | Tota |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | .5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | of Errors | 1 | 2 | 3 | . 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 0 |
| 3 | | | | | ļ | | | | <u> </u> | | | | | | | | | | | | - | - | | | | Err |
| 5 | | | | | | | | | | | — | | | | | - | | | | | | | | | | |
| | L | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | - | | <u> </u> | 1 | | | | |

| 9 | T | $\overline{}$ | Т | ī — | т | т | | | , | | | | - ₁ | , | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|----------------|---------------|--|--------------|---------|--|----------------|--------------|----|--|----------------|--|----------------|--------------|----------|--------------|---|--|---|-------|---|--------------|-------|
| 11 | - | | ┼ | | + | - | - | - | | | + | - | | <u> </u> | _ | <u> </u> | ļ | | | | | | |
| 12 | 1 | 1 | | | - | | | - | - | - | ╁┈ | - | ╂ | | - | - | | | | | | | |
| 1.4 | | | | İ | _ | | Τ. | | | | | + | | ╁─╴ | | | | | | | | | - |
| 18 | | \perp | | | | | | | | | 1 | | 1 | \vdash | | | | | H | | | | |
| 19 | | | _ | <u> </u> | \perp | | <u></u> | | | | | | | \vdash | | 1 | | | - | _ | | <u> </u> | |
| | | | ļ | <u> </u> | | | ↓ | <u> </u> | | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | | | | | Ĺ. | | $\overline{}$ | | _ | | <u> </u> | |
| 22 | ╁ | ┿ | ┼— | - | +- | - | ├ — | | | - | _ | ↓ | 4_ | | | | | | | | | | |
| 24 | ┼ | Τ- | + | | + | | ├ | ├- | | - | + | +- | | _ | <u> </u> | ļ | | L. | | | | | |
| | <u> </u> | <u> </u> | | Щ. | т. | 1 | Ь. | <u> </u> | Ь. | 1 | | | ᆚ | <u> </u> | L | | | L | | | Ì | | I |

Note:

Kinds of errors:

1 = Agreement 7 = Prepositions

2 = Articles and Determiners 8 = Punctuation

3 =Comparisons 9 =Sentence

4 = Content 10 = Verbs

6 = Paragraphing 12 = Word choice and word order

The writer also makes an analysis of the interview, to find out whether the audiotaped feedback is effective enough to improve students' grammatical performance and idea in writing, whether audiotaped feedback is able to demonstrate students' progress in the grammatical performance and getting ideas in writing, and also whether audiotaped feedback helps the students in making reasonable corrections in their writing. First, she put the students' answers in six tables. Table one is made based on the answers of question one, while table two is made based on the answers of question two a and b, and this is made until the question six. For the question seven, the writer did not make a table, because the answers of the question are about the students' suggestions. Second, she counts the answers of each item in the interview. Finally, she explains them by using a verbal analysis.