

# Critical Analysis on the Contribution Made By Qualitative Research to English Language Teaching

Dewi Satria Elmiana

Queen's University Belfast-UK

*delmiana01@qub.ac.uk*

**Abstract:** The primary objective of this paper is to assert the contribution of qualitative research in ELT. This paper has presented qualitative theories and features advantages and limitations, the criteria of good qualitative research, and analysis of two articles based on Tracy's model. The analysis result showed that both articles have some limitations such as the uncovering of potential resources and perspectives on how effective extensive reading programs should be implemented in tertiary education in Indonesia. However, most of the criteria that Tracy established were found in these articles, such as relevance of the area of study, timeliness and significance; sufficient, abundant, appropriate and complex use of theoretical constructs, as well as data collection and analysis processes.

**Keywords:** Qualitative Research, English Language Teaching, Tracy's model.

## INTRODUCTION

There has been an increase in the volume of research undertaken using qualitative research methods since the 1960s when this approach to research began to gain legitimacy within the social sciences (Tavallaei and Talib, 2010). Qualitative research is viewed as a useful method for many diverse subjects, including education, sport, business and management, health, and social sciences (Atkinson, 2012; Bogdan & Biklen, 1997; Bruce & Berg, 2001; Camic *et al*, 2003; Holloway & Wheeler, 2013; Myers, 2013; Ritchie *et al*, 2013; Sherman & Webb, 2004; Willig, 2013). According to Richard (2009)

qualitative research has contributed much to the methodology of language assimilation. Moreover, in the field of language education studies, ELT researchers are now tending to use qualitative methods (Richards, 2009).

This paper will examine the contributions of qualitative research to ELT in Indonesia. It is divided into three key parts: (a) the first part will describe the definition and historical background of qualitative research, its key features, its strengths and weaknesses and its underpinning theories and will draw on theoretical debates in interpretivism ; (b) the second part will be evaluating the criteria of qualitative research ; (c) the third part will analyse two published articles and present how qualitative research contributes to ELT. Finally the conclusion will present the benefits of using qualitative research in ELT.

## **WHAT IS QUALITATIVE?**

Providing a clear definition of qualitative research is not straightforward as the concept is both multifaceted and subjected to a range of different theoretical influences (Ritchie *et al*, 2013). However, Denzin and Lincoln offer a useful insight into the complexity of the approach:

“Qualitative research is difficult to define clearly. It has no theory and paradigm that is distinctively its own...nor does qualitative research have a distinct set of methods or practices that are entirely its own (Denzin and Lincoln, 2011, p.6)”.

As the statement above shows, qualitative research encompasses variety of methods in a variety of subject areas. In this respect qualitative research might be regarded as an overarching research approach that embraces a wide range of methods which are focused on examining the meaning that underpins the issues under investigation.

Qualitative research has a long tradition in the social sciences and has been a key method within educational research. In education, qualitative research can assist the researcher to explore the meaning of students and teachers' lives focusing on their 'real' world. Work such as that carried out by Dominic Murray in NI which sought to examine how students and teachers in Catholic and Protestant schools constructed and interpreted their own and others' cultural identity (Murray, 1983) and Paul Willis's (1990) work on the subcultures of boys within comprehensive schools in NI exemplify the benefits of qualitative research in so far as they offer distinct and unique insights into how individuals construct and interpret the world of which they are part.

Qualitative research is still in debates between interpretivism (Altheide and Johnson, 1994; Kuzel and Like, 1991; Secker et al., 1995) and constructivism (Guba and Lincoln, 1994). The term "interpretivism" emerged in the early part of the 20<sup>th</sup> century and is most associated with the Chicago school of Sociology. "The emphasis of this new wave of sociologists argued that as the natural sciences and social sciences were fundamentally different they therefore demanded very different research approaches" (Rahman, 2014, p.4). The prevailing and dominant theory of positivism was open to critique by sociologists (Blumer, 1969; Goffman, 1967; Mead, 1934) who argued that researchers needed to generate different kinds of knowledge than that which could be gathered through experiments or large scale surveys. Furthermore, Max Weber's social action theories in the late of 19<sup>th</sup> century emphasised the need to look for meaning and motivation underpinning behaviour. In this matter, social researchers are essential to practice that they should seek to *understand* rather than just to describe behaviours. Moreover, dissatisfaction with the ways of generating knowledge from positivist research was a main reason for the development of interpretivist perspectives (Sanberg, 2005). Interpretivists understand that the research activities in which they are involved will influence them or be influenced by them and the relationship between the two will

naturally develop. Livesey (2006) points out that the methodology of interpretivism leans towards qualitative data collection and the unstructured interview method together with the observation of participants to provide this kind of data. Also, interpretivists believe that it is necessary for conducting good research when the researchers analyse how social actors interpret their activities and it can be obtained by methods other than those used by the positivists. In terms of how reality is perceived, the interpretivist, in contrast to the positivist, sees reality as fluid and subjective; in this sense there is not a reality to be discovered but rather reality exists in the mind of the individual (Berger and Luckmann, 1966). In terms of the way that knowledge is produced, interpretivists hold to a concept that knowledge is constructed socially and not independent in those who generate that knowledge (Smith, 1983). The findings created through interaction between the researcher and the context of the data in the setting that they operate (Denzin and Lincoln, 1994; Guba and Lincoln, 1994). It poses the idea that reality does not exist before the investigation of activities, and it has existed once we do not put any consideration of it (Smith, 1983). The importance of qualitative research is on its meaning and process. Techniques employed in qualitative research comprise participant observation, focus group and in-depth interview do not represent spacious populations (Sale *et al*, 2002). Somewhat, small, determined sample of articulate respondent is used since they provide information significantly. It is not because they are demonstrative of a bigger group (Reid, 1996).

In contrast, quantitative research is influenced by positivist perspectives when science to be accounted by empirical research and all phenomena are included as empirical indicators that represent the truth (Sale *et al*, 2002). Positivism is usually thought of as a scientific approach with clear and precise methods, which can be measured and are founded on approaches managed by scientific planning which involves studying actions in their normal surroundings. In addition, there is only one truth in quantitative research based on one ontological position. Also, the existence of objective reality is

independently in human perception (Sale, 2002). Epistemologically, the researcher and research are independent entities (Creswell, 2008). Thus, the researchers are able to study the phenomena without giving their influence or being influenced by it. "Inquiry takes place as through one way mirror" (Guba and Lincoln, 1994, p. 110). The aim of quantitative analysis is to weigh causal relationship which bounded by variable of value free framework (Denzin and Lincoln, 1994). The technique to assure quantitative analysis embrace blinding, highly structured protocols, randomization, and orally or written directed questionnaire with a limitation of predetermined response. In terms of the sample size, quantitative has bigger than qualitative because of it; the statistical methods can be practiced to certify that sample are statistically relevant (Carey, 1993).

The underlying distinction assumptions of qualitative and quantitative approach are beyond philosophical and methodological debate. The approaches have significant contribution to different methods, capability, and funding sources. Also, dissimilarities in scientific language used to define them. As an example, "the term 'observational work' may refer to case control studies for quantitative researcher, but to a qualitative researcher it would refer to ethnographic immersion in a culture" (Sale et al, 2002, p. 45). Validity in quantitative research means that findings correspond to how things really are, whilst to qualitative researchers, validity means description or interpretation in which one agrees (Smith and Heshusius, 1986). In the same vein, the phrase 'the result of the research indicate' or 'research has shown' refer to an accurate reflection of reality to the quantitative researchers, however to qualitative researchers, it means an interpretations that itself become reality (Smith and Heshusius, 1986).

Furthermore, qualitative research is a family of approaches rather than a single approach. There are numerous and distinct qualitative methodologies or stances, for example, constructivism, post-positivism, and critical theory. Each approach is dissimilar in underlying ontological and epistemological assumptions (Lincoln,

Lynham, and Guba, 2011). However, certain features, limitation and strengths are differentiating qualitative research from quantitative research (Creswell, 1994).

The features of qualitative research may be defined in relation to their philosophical foundations, methodological assumptions and research methods. Qualitative researchers perceive reality as a multiple and constructed phenomenon psychologically and socially, where the investigator and the investigated are inseparably connected to one another, whilst quantitative researchers perceive reality as single and concrete, where the investigator and the investigated are measured as independent and moderately separated (Gelo *et al* 2008). Additionally, qualitative research adopted idiographic methodology, which comprises of the picture of an individual event of singular, temporally limited reality as comprehensively as possible with the recording objective, and understanding it in its factuality, however, quantitative research (nomothetic methodology) comprises of the establishment, collection and facts assimilation with the exclusive purpose of identifying and formulating law that is always and in every circumstances unchallengeable and universally relevant (Lamiell, 1998).

In terms of research methods, qualitative research makes almost exclusive use of purposive sampling strategies, and allows to choosing rich information being studied comprehensively (Patton, 1990). In contrast, sampling in quantitative research chooses individuals that are representative of a population, so that the results can be generalized (Gelo *et al*, 2008). To some point, the differences between qualitative and quantitative research is an over-simplification, and might not essentially be a predominantly helpful form of terminology (Griffin, 2004). In the exacting point, qualitative and quantitative approaches have different sets of research techniques for data collection and analysis. One of the most difficulties in quantitative methods with the rigid adherence in a positivist framework is the assumption that only phenomena which can be recorded and observed directly in numerical ways, which are

valuable in scientific study. "Any aspects of human life that are not amenable to such direct observation, quantitative coding and analysis is defined as beyond the bounds of psychological research" (Griffin, 2004, p. 7).

Educational study would place drawback of the study we would do. It would create a complex research and a contrary meaning for particular phenomena for certain groups of participant's difficulty, if it is not impossible. Nevertheless, qualitative research is generally focus on meaning and predominantly how people make sense of the world and how participants experience events from their perspective (Willig, 2001). Qualitative method, particularly in longitudinal studies, comprises systematic observation and informal semi-structured interview that can reflect inconsistency and contradiction within individual's account as it is important for analysis, and the benefit of discourse analysis (Burman and Parker, 1993). Also, qualitative method is able to allow researcher to be flexible for conducting specific research, aids the sensitive examination or difficult topic if a trust relationship is developed between research and researcher, and allows researcher to create links between different aspects of people's lives; such as the employment, leisure time and domestic sphere (Griffin, 1986). Additionally, qualitative research usually contains moderately small numbers of participants, and this likely to be taken seriously by other educational researchers or by practitioners and policy makers. For instance, the study conducted by Griffin (2004) showed that qualitative was discounted by council officer since they needed to be able to quote statistical evidence in council convention in order to convey political change; such as elevating the council provision for young black people. Likewise, qualitative research finding cannot be extended to varied populations with the same degree of certainty that quantitative analyses can, as the findings of the research are not appraised for statistical significance.

## **EVALUATING THE CRITERIA OF QUALITATIVE RESEARCH**

One criticism that has been raised at qualitative approach is that they allegedly lack of credibility and scientific rigor allied with traditionally accepted quantitative approach, in which inquiry is presumed to occur in a value free framework and it depends on the measurement and analysis of causal relationship between variables (Horsburg, 2003). The idea that quantitative approach is impartial, objective and value neutral has been created a question by some researchers (Denzin and Lincoln, 1994; Coffey, 1999; Guba and Lincoln, 1995; Mishler, 1990;) regarding to the evaluation criteria of quantitative research. For example, validity and reliability are applicable in an identical format for appraisal of qualitative research is similarly debatable (Koch, 1994; Morse, 1999a; Popay *et al*, 1998; Sandelowski, 1993; Strauss and Corbin, 1990; Webb,1992).It is arguable that the accurate means used to appraise research should differ liable on the question of the study and how it is addressed, the essential principles of any evaluation process are similar. The fidelity and acceptability of the researchers' accounts are evaluated, as the research's potential or concrete significance to recent and future theories and practices.

It has been persuasively argued that the criteria for judging qualitative research and in particular its reliability and validity are unsuitable in the appraisal of qualitative research, as the focus and purpose of the research are not directly comparable (Lincoln and Guba, 1995). It is suggested that the used of quantitative criteria for a purpose for which they are unsuited and not devised, have the potential to generate impression which qualitative research did not contain a rigorous approach academically, at least in comparison to quantitative methods (Horsburgh, 2002). However, it is similarly unsuitable to accept that criteria which are appropriate for evaluation of qualitative research are unattainable, or unavailable. It can be seen from the investigation of the research conducted by Popay *et al* (1998), that academically rigorous criteria are accessible and available for

evaluation of qualitative research. Research required a systematic and rigorous approach to design and employ the study, the data collection, the analysis, and the interpretation and reporting of finding (Fossey et al, 2002). However, particular methods or procedures in and of themselves are insufficient to ensure the research quality (Popay, et al, 1998; Smith, 1990). Evaluation criteria need to be reliable with the philosophical position (paradigm) and purposes informing the research methods.

Quantitative research is best assessed against its own purposes which are accurate, objective measurement, and generalizability of the findings to a population beyond the context of research (Buston et al, 1998). Therefore, the validity and reliability of instruments used is important to assessing of the measurements and accuracy, whilst, in the data collection procedures, the generalizability of findings are determined by the sample representativeness and the replicability. Lincoln and Guba (1985) delineated criteria for assessing qualitative research trustworthiness (credibility, transferability, dependability and confirmability) that parallel internal and external validity, reliability and objectivity, correspondingly. Even though these criteria are still significant in qualitative research, it has been contended that qualitative research should be assessed against criteria more consistent with its certain philosophical stance and purpose (Guba and Lincoln, 1989; Robinson, 1985).

In contrast, qualitative research purposes to give privilege to research participants' perspective to "illuminate the subject meaning, actions and context of those being researched" (Popay et al, 1998, p.345). Thus, the main quality of qualitative research is whether the interpretations made from information gathered (authenticity) and participants' perceptions have been authentically represented in the research process and also the findings are comprehensible with social context and data from which they were derived (Fossey et al, 2002). "The importance of the power relations between the researcher and researched, and the need for transparency (openness and honesty) of data collection, analysis, and presentation implied here highlight the

extent to which criteria for quality profoundly interact with standards for ethics in qualitative research" (Lincoln, 1995 in Fossey, 2002, p. 723).

Ethical considerations are principal in all study from its design to conclusion. The distinction between paradigms above suggested different ethical issues may become significant related to researchers' position. Whilst, Fossey *et al* (2002) stated that the ethical values of informed consent and minimizing harm can be implemented to all study, how they infiltrate and are interpreted the research procedure may differ. As Lincoln (1995) indicated that:

"Readers are directed to National Health and Medical Research Council's (1995) information paper for fuller discussion of ethical issues in qualitative research. As an example, in research within the critical paradigm, stakeholders (parties with an interest in the research issue), who are likely to include participants, hold greater control over the development of research questions and method used. As this also may serve to enhance authenticity in the way that participants' views are represented this example illustrated the interconnectedness of ethics and rigor in qualitative research" (p. 725).

The evaluating criteria of the quality of qualitative research (Stiles, 1999) contain criteria focused on good practice to administer data of the research (methodological rigor) together with criteria allied with the trustworthiness of interpretations made (interpretive rigor). It should be bear in mind that not all are applicable and equally important, in every qualitative study, given the different social science traditions and philosophical inform qualitative inquiry. Consistent with paradigms focused on contested meanings and socially constructed, what makes for good qualitative research also is contested, even though this debate cannot be covered here (Guba and Lincoln, 1989; Lincoln, 1995; Popay *et al*, 1998; Stiles,1999).

## THE CONTRIBUTION OF QUALITATIVE RESEARCH TO ELT

One of the challenges that the qualitative community faces is the domination of quantitative research in understanding scientific validity (Cheek, 2007). Several authors' mention that the criteria of best qualitative research consist of *catalytic validity* which is the degree to which a given research study allows and provides purpose for community of the research; (Lather, 1986). *Empathetic validity* is "the potential of practitioner research in its processes and outcomes to transform the emotional dispositions of people towards each other, thus creating greater empathy and regard" (Dadds, 2008, p. 283). *Crystallization* is the practice that is motivated by performative assumptions and encourages researchers to use a number of theoretical frameworks of data and numerous types of methods (Richardson, 200b; Ellingson, 2008). *Tacit knowledge* is considered as, "largely unarticulated, contextual understanding that is often manifested in nods, silences, humour, and naughty nuance" (Altheide and Johnson, 1994, p. 492). *Transferability* is "the responsibility of the researcher to make sure that sufficient contextual information about the fieldwork sites is provided to allow the reader to make such a transfer" (Lincoln and Guba, 1985, p. 347).

Qualitative research experts suggest that the criteria for goodness must consist of paradigms, theories, or qualitative community (Denzin, 2008; Ellingson, 2008; Golafshani, 2003; Guba and Lincoln, 2005). To address the challenges, a model created by Tracy (2010) outlines eight criteria of quality in qualitative research: worthy topic; rich rigor; sincerity; credibility; resonance; significant contribution; ethics; and meaningful coherence. This model is used to analyse the quality of qualitative research from two articles taken from international journals in area of ELT:

### *Article 1*

The title of the article is "**Teachers' Questioning in Reading Lessons: A Case Study in Indonesia**". This study examined the practice of teachers' questioning and teaching reading in secondary

schools in Indonesia. Data was gathered from the teachers through observations, interviews, and textbook analysis. This study provided important information about the practice of questioning strategies in a foreign language context in Indonesia and puts forward implication for changes in reading lessons.

### *Article 2*

The title of the article is **“Investing in Academic Speaking through Guided Extensive Reading (GER): A Case Study in Extensive Reading Class at English Department Mataram University Indonesia”**. This study provided valuable insight and pedagogic implication for educator who wants to implement extensive reading in their classroom. The researchers proposed that the ER class could be a source of language development through guided extensive reading (GER). This study reports how participants used their potential to invest in academic speaking in English through GER. The data of this study was obtained from observation and semi-structured interviewed related to reading motivation and investment strategies.

To examine the quality of the aforementioned articles it is necessary to begin with the first criterion from the eight qualities of qualitative research proposed by Tracy (2010) which is *worthy topic*, when the awareness of systematic rules will require the researcher to choose topic that are worthy of study. For instance, both articles raised awareness in ELT, particularly in regard to reading skills. In article one, it verified the teaching reading phenomena that teachers' quality question contributed to developing students' existing thinking and reasoning skill in secondary school while, in article two, it verified reading program at tertiary school level by investigating students' potential to invest in academic speaking in English through extensive reading. However, there was a limitation in both articles regarding the reading context, especially teachers' questioning in Indonesia, and uncovered potential resources on how effective

extensive reading program should be implemented at tertiary education level in Indonesia.

The second criterion is *rich rigor*: the study should use sufficient, abundant and appropriate theoretical construct, data and time in field, sample, context, and data collection method as well as an analysis process. As an example, these articles showed that the study followed qualitative research procedures such as classroom observation and semi - structured interviews to collect the data. In addition, some reading theories which related to the aim of the research were provided to generate rich explanation about the research topic. Article one investigated teachers' quality in teaching reading activities with the study sample being teachers, whilst article two tried to explore how extensive reading allowed students to make investments in academic speaking.

The third criterion is *sincerity*, which is characterized by self - reflexivity about subjective value, biase, and inclination of the researcher. It also deals with the issue of transparency in the methods used. By looking at these articles, the study in article one contained no information about the researchers' position, how schools and teachers were selected as participants, or the selection of the place to conduct the research. Framework for data analysis challenges was also not stated. In contrast, the study in article two provided the information on how researchers picked participants and gave an explanation about their position as teachers in extensive reading courses.

The fourth criterion *credibility* requires that the research be marked by concrete detail, thick description, and triangulation. These articles provides concrete detail on the phenomena of reading programs in Indonesia by looking at school curricula and the current condition of English learning and teaching. They explored issues which formed part of participants' common sense, as well as giving detailed descriptions of each study site. In article one, the study employed triangulation when analyzing the data. When the analysis of each site has been completed, the researchers searched for a cross-site differences and similarities. Conversely, in article two, the study

did not use triangulation to verify the information and evidence from other data sources.

The fifth criterion of Tracy's model is *resonance*, which investigates how the research influence, affect, or move particular reader or audience through aesthetic, evocative representation, naturalistic generalization and transferable finding. In article one, where the study investigated how teaching reading in Indonesia that can be implemented in other countries through employment of the same theories, the researchers did not create specific situations during research. Meanwhile article two investigated particular happenings in specific situations by selecting specific topics and situations in study extensive reading. This, as a result, meant less transferability.

The sixth criterion, *significant contribution* provides a significant contribution by looking at the research conceptually, theoretically, practically, morally, methodologically and heuristically. The study in article one showed that the existing theory of social development studies (Vygotsky) and second language learning are used to discover learning phenomena in reading. This study shed light on some problems in teaching reading: teachers did not transfer critical questions; there was a lack of suggestion on the way teachers should manage students' reading skills through high - level questions in the classroom. Furthermore, in this study, the research was not looked at heuristically. However, the study in article two revealed that the reading program was affected by students' motivation and how students used their own potential to invest in academic speaking through GER. This study discovered a motivational problem in reading skill learning and encouraged students to improve their speaking ability through GER activities. The heuristic part of this study can be summarized thus:

"The majority of these studies are quantitative with a focus on whether a particular extensive reading program is beneficial to learners. Very few of them provide a clear picture of the efforts of the students make to achieve the

language learning goal as well as their strategies to respond textual factors (Lestari and Yusra, 2014, p. 412).

The seventh criterion concern *ethics*, which are not just a means, but rather constitute a universal goal of qualitative quality itself despite paradigm. A variety of practices attend to ethics in qualitative research, including procedural, situational, relational, and existing ethic. However, there is no information provided about the ethical consideration employed by these two articles. It showed research limitation due to the reader not knowing how to measure ethics, which are an important part of the research.

The last criterion is *meaningful coherence*, “when the research achieves what it purports to be about, uses methods and procedures that fit its stage goal and meaningfully interconnects literature, research questions, findings and interpretations with each other” (Tracy, 2010, p. 848). For example, the phenomena that article one tried to discover (teachers’ questions in teaching reading) was relying on textbooks and exposed low level questioning. Based on the phenomena, the study result revealed that textbooks hold an important role in helping teachers teach reading skills in class, so that “questions in textbooks should challenge students’ thinking by asking high order as well as low order questions to lead to deeper levels of learning” (Sunggingwati and Nguyen, 2013, p. 93). However, article two dealt with the phenomena of students’ motivation in extensive reading. One principle of extensive reading stated by Day and Bamford (2002) has pointed out that extensive reading should be oriented to help students become self – motivated readers by giving them freedom to choose reading materials that interest them. Similarly, article one and two employed observation and semi-structured interviews to collect data from participants.

As far as the above discussion about the quality of research is concerned, both articles are qualitative in nature. The appropriateness of qualitative research to investigate the ELT problems is now being

considered. Qualitative research is suitable to discover problems allied with ELT. There are some reasons why this can be claimed.

Firstly, by employing qualitative research, the researcher can have direct interaction with participants who can share their experiences. Therefore, the researchers can understand deeply the problem that participants come across. For instance, both articles showed that direct interaction with the participants (teachers and students) can bring out the problems related to reading practices in ELT, such as low self-motivated students' in reading lessons and teachers' challenges in generating high-level questions in reading classes.

Secondly, qualitative research implemented in classroom settings are generally concerned with instructional behaviour, interaction, and teaching-outcome related activities in the classroom. It can be seen from the research aim of both articles that they investigate teaching and learning activities particularly in reading lessons: teachers provide certain questions during reading classes; students' develop strategies to invest in academic speaking through extensive reading classes; valuable insight and pedagogic implication are offered for educator who want to implement reading practice effectively.

Thirdly, some ELT researchers are applying qualitative research to discover problems related to ELT (Alqady, 2013; Fordham, 2006; Gerot, 2000; Klinger and Boardman, 2007; Madya, 2007; Nur, 2004; Tan, 2007). This suggests that the analysis of both articles reveals problems in ELT by using qualitative research practice rather than any other research practices. Furthermore, qualitative research pinpoints difficulties in language learning and provides more insights than using quantitative research (Cummins, 1994). As an example, the issues in ELT are influenced by cultures and environments across the world, hence, ELT is dynamic rather than static. The use of qualitative research rather than quantitative research is therefore more suitable for investigating problems related to ELT.

## **CONCLUSIONS**

The primary objective of this paper is to assert the contribution of qualitative research in ELT. This paper has presented qualitative theories and features advantages and limitations, the criteria of good qualitative research, and analysis of two articles based on Tracy's model. The analysis result showed that both articles have some limitations such as the uncovering of potential resources and perspectives on how effective extensive reading programs should be implemented in tertiary education in Indonesia. There was limited research within reading contexts, especially teachers' questioning in Indonesia. No information was given about the researchers' positions nor how schools and teachers were selected. A framework data analysis challenges was not stated. The methods used in article two were not clearly stated and did not use triangulation. Heuristic criteria were not employed in article one. No information could be found for ethics criteria in both articles.

However, most of the criteria that Tracy established were found in these articles, such as relevance of the area of study, timeliness and significance; sufficient, abundant, appropriate and complex use of theoretical constructs, as well as data collection and analysis processes. The studies are marked by thick description, concrete detail, explication of tacit knowledge and showing rather than telling. They influence, affect, and move particular readers or audiences through aesthetic, evocative representation, and transferable findings. They furthermore provide significant contributions by looking at the subject matter conceptually, theoretically, practically, and methodologically. The studies achieve what they purport to be about, use methods and procedures that fit their stage goals and meaningfully interconnect literature.

In short, this paper concludes that qualitative research does have a contribution to make to ELT by claiming that it assists in investigating problems in ELT study. Some qualitative benefits can be described in various ways. For example, qualitative research can be used for detailed descriptions of phenomena. It can investigate

reality. Researchers can harvest participants' subjective experiences and the conclusions from the results are insightful and meaningful. However, this paper has some limitations showing that these issues need to be examined more thoroughly.

## REFERENCES

- Alqadi, K.R., & Alqadi, H.M. 2013. The effect of extensive reading on developing the grammatical accuracy of the EFL freshmen at Al- Bayt University. *Journal of Education and Practice* (4), 106-111.
- Altheide, D.L., & Johnson, J.M. 1994. Criteria for assessing interpretive validity in qualitative research. In N.K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds), *Handbok of qualitative research* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed., p. 485-499). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Atkinson, E. 2012. Thinking outside the box: An exercise in heresy. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 10, 111 - 129.
- Berger, P.L., & Luckmann, T. 1996. *The social construction of reality: A treatise in the sociology of knowledge*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.
- Blumer, H. 1962. Society as symbolic interaction. In: Rose AM (ed.) *Human Behavior and Social Processes*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co.
- Blumer, H. 1969. *Symbolic Interactionism: Perspective and Method*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Bogdan, R.C., & Biklen, S.K. 1997. *Qualitative research for education: an introduction to theory and methods* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Carey, J.W. 1993. Linking qualitative and quantitative methods: Integrating cultural factors into public health. *Qualitative Health Research* (3), 298 - 318.

- Cheek, J. 2007. Qualitative inquiry, ethics, and politics of evidence: working within these spaces rather than being worked over by them. *Qualitative Inquiry* ( 13), 1051-1059.
- Creswell, J.W. 1994. *Research design: qualitative and quantitative approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Creswell, J.W. 2008. *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions (2<sup>nd</sup> ed)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Creswell, J.W. *et al* (2011). *Best practices for mixed methods research in the health sciences*. Retrieved from National Institutes of Health. [http://obsr.od.nih.gov/mixed\\_methods\\_research](http://obsr.od.nih.gov/mixed_methods_research).
- Cumming, A. 1994. Alternative in TESOL research: descriptive, interpretive, and ideological orientations. *Tesol Quarterly*, (4), 673-703.
- Dadds,M. 2008. Empathetic validity in practitioner research. *Educational Action Research* (16), 279- 290.
- Denzin, N.K.,& Lincoln, Y.S. 1994. *Handbook of qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Denzin,N.K. 2008. The new paradigm dialogs and qualitative inquiry. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education* (21), 315 – 325.
- Ellingson, L.L. 2008. *Engaging crystallization in qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Fordham, N.W. 2006. Crafting questions that address comprehension strategies in content reading. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, (5), 390-396.
- Gelo *et al*. 2008. Quantitative and qualitative research: beyond the debate. *Integrated psychology behaviour* ( 42), 266-290.
- Goffman, E. 1967. *Interaction Ritual*. Chicago: Aldine

*Elmiana, Critical Analysis on the Contribution Made by Qualitative Research to English Language Teaching*

- Griffin, C. 2004. The advantages and limitations of qualitative research in psychology and education. *Scientific annals of the psychological society of Northern Greece* (2), 3-15
- Guba, E.G., & Lincoln, Y.S. 1989. *Fourth generation evaluation*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Guba, E.G. & Lincoln, Y.S. 1994. Competing for paradigms in qualitative research. *Handbook of Qualitative research*.
- Guba, E.G., & Lincoln, Y.S. 2005. Paradigmatic controversies, contradictions, and emerging confluences. In Denain, N.K., & Lincoln, Y.S. (Eds). *The sage handbook of qualitative research* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed, p. 191-216). Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Halloway, I., & Wheeler, S. 2013. *Qualitative research in nursing healthcare*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Klingner, J.K., Vaughn, S., & Boardman, A. 2007. *Teaching reading comprehension to students with learning difficulties*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Koch, T. 1994. Establishing rigour in qualitative research: the decision trail. *Journal of Advanced Nursing* (19), 976 - 986.
- Lather, P. 1986. Issue of validity in openly ideological research: between a rock and a soft place. *Interchange*, 17 (4), 63-84.
- Lestari, Y.B., & Yusra, K. 2014. Investigating in academic speaking through guided extensive reading : A case study in extensive reading class at English department Mataram University Indonesia. *TEFLIN International Conference* (61), 412- 415.
- Lincoln, Y.S., & Guba, E.G. 1985. *Naturalistic inquiry*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Lincoln, Y.S. 1995. Emerging criteria for quality in qualitative and interpretive research. *Qualitative Inquiry* (1), 275-289.

- Liversey, C. (2006). The relationship between positivism, interpretivism and sociological research methods. AS sociology. <http://www.sociology.org.uk>. (accessed: 30 September 2016)
- Madya,S. 2007. Searching for an appropriate EFL curriculum design for the Indonesian pluralistic society. *TEFLIN Journal*, 18 (2), 206 – 229.
- Mead, G.H. 1934. *Mind, Self, and Society from the Standpoint of a Social Behaviorist*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Morse,J.M. 1991. Approaches to qualitative – quantitative methodological triangulation. *Nursing Research* (40), 120-123.
- Murray, D.1983. Rituals and symbols as contributors to the culture of Northern Ireland primary schools. *Irish Educational Studies*, 3(2), pp.238-255.
- Murray, D.1985. Identity: a covert pedagogy in Northern Irish schools. *Irish Educational Studies*, 5(2), pp.182-197.
- Nur, C. 2004. English language teaching in Indonesia: Changing policies and practical constraints. In W.K.Ho & R.Y.L.Wong( Eds), *English language teaching in East Asia today*. Singapore: Eastern University Press.
- Popay, J., Rogers, A., & Williams, G. 1998. Rationale and standards for the systematic review of qualitative literature in health services research. *Qualitative Health Research* 8 (3), 341 – 351.
- Porter, S. 1993. Nursing research conventions: objectivity or obfuscation? *Journal of Advanced Nursing* (18), 137 – 143.
- Rahman, M.S. 2014. The contribution made by qualitative research to TESOL. *International Journal of English Language Teaching*, 3(2), 1-14.

*Elmiana, Critical Analysis on the Contribution Made by Qualitative Research to English Language Teaching*

- Reid, A.J. 1996. What we want: qualitative research. *Canadian Family Physician* (42), 387 – 389.
- Richardson, L. 2000b. Writing: a method of inquiry. In Denzin N.K., & Lincoln, Y.S. ( Eds), *Handbook of qualitative research* ( 2<sup>nd</sup> ed, p. 923 – 948). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Robinson,R.S. 1998. Qualitative research – A case for case studies. In G.J. Anglin (Ed), *Instructional tecjology: past, present, and future* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed., p. 330 – 339). Englewood, CO: Libraries Unlimited.
- Sale, *et al.* 2002. Revisiting the quantitative – qualitative debate: implications for mixed-methods research. *Quality and quantity* (36), 43-53.
- Sanberg, J. (2005). How do we justify knowledge produced within interpretive approaches? *Organizational Research Methods*, 8(1), 41-68.
- Sandelowski, M. 1986. The problem of rigor in qualitative research. *Advance in Nursing Science* (8) 27-37.
- Sandelowski, M. 1993. Rigor or rigor mortis: the problem of rigor in qualitative research revisited. *Advances in Nursing Science* 16 (2), 1-8.
- Strauss, A.L., & Corbin, J.M. 1990. Grounded theory methodology: an overview. In Denzin,N.K, & Lincoln, Y.S ( Eds), *Handbook of qualittative research* ( pp. 273- 285). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Smith, J.K. 1983. Quantitative versus qualitative research: an attempt to clarify the issue. *Educational Researcher* (12), 6-13.
- Smith, J.K., & Heshusius, L. 1986. Closing down the conversation: the end of quantitative – qualitative debate among debate among educational inquirers. *Educational Researcher*, 15(1), 4-12.
- Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. 1988. *Basics of qualitative research*. London: SAGE Publications.

- Stiles, W.B. 1999. Evaluating qualitative research. *Evidence – Based Mental Health* (2), 99 – 101.
- Sunggingwati, S., & Nguyen, H.T.M. 2013. Teachers' Questioning in Reading Lessons: A Case Study in Indonesia. *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, 10 (1), 80-95.
- Tan, Z. 2007. Questioning in Chinese University EL classrooms: What lies beyond it? *RELC Journal* (38), 87 – 103.
- Tavallaei, M., & Talib, M.A. 2010. A general perspective on role of theory in qualitative research. *Journal of International Social Research* (3), 570-577.
- Tracy, S. J. 2010. 'Qualitative quality: eight "Big Tent" criteria for excellent qualitative research.' *Qualitative inquiry*, 16, 837-851.
- Willig, C. 2001. *Introducing qualitative research in psychology: adventures in theory and method*. Buckingham, UK: Open University Access.
- Willis, P. E. 1990. *Common culture: Symbolic work at play in the everyday cultures of the young*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.
- Yin, R.K. 2010. *Qualitative research from start to finish*. Guilford Press.