

## **Chapter Three**

### **Research Methodology**

This chapter explains how the research is conducted and how the data is collected. It covers the research design, research setting, research participant, data collection technique, data collection procedure, and data analysis. Research design is used to investigate the appropriate research of this study. Setting and participant of this research describes where is the study will be conducted, when is the time to conduct this study, and who is the participants of this study. In the data collection technique and procedure, the researcher explains how the data is gathered. In data analysis, the researcher presents the steps of analyzing the data.

#### **Research Design**

This study employed a qualitative approach. Creswell (2012) described qualitative approach as a means for investigating and comprehending the individual perception, experiences or characteristic of a group to a phenomenon and human problems. The process of research in qualitative includes developing questions and ways; gathering data in the participant setting; analyzing the data; categorization the data from specific to general themes; making interpretations of the data (Creswell, 2009). The reason to use qualitative approach was because the researcher wants to explore detailed information about the perception of peer observation.

Furthermore, this research used descriptive qualitative design. It was because the result of this research was a description of the phenomenon. According to Lambert and Lambert (2012) descriptive qualitative provides brief summarization, in every day term of particular condition that is experienced by

individuals or a group of individuals. In addition, the researcher reported the findings of the study based on the data collected before. It is in line with the aims of this study.

### **Research Setting**

This research was conducted at an English department in a private university in Yogyakarta. There were two reasons why the researcher chose this English department in a private university in Yogyakarta as the research setting. Firstly, this department has implemented peer observation. Secondly, there was no previous research that discussed about the teachers' perception on the implementation of peer observation in their teaching and learning process in the department.

This department applied peer observation in order to improve self-mutual reflection on good practice. Then, the selection of peers for observation in the department was done randomly. In addition, all of the teachers at the department have been involved in peer observation. The implementation of peer observation in this department consisted of three steps. The first step was pre-observation. In this step, the observee and observer made an agreement about time, and date about the observation. Moreover, they also have a short meeting and provide both of them some information such as the objective, students' background and lessons' context. The second step was observation phase. In this step, the observer observed all of the activities that carried out by the observee. In addition, in this phase the observer keeps quiet and not interrupt or interfere during he/she observing the teacher. The last step was feedback meeting. In this step the teachers shared a short of vital information about the observation. Additionally, in

this phase the students in the class also gave feedback to the teacher. After that, the result of this program was collected to the head of this department. Then, the head of this department called the teacher one by one and did brief interview to ask some questions based on the result. The head of this department did this in order to show that they were aware about students' and teachers' feedback.

This research started from March 2019. March 2019 was chosen because the new semester has already been started in February 2019. Thus, it facilitated the researcher to meet the participants. Therefore, the researcher is interested in investigating the perceptions of parties that are involved in this program.

### **Research Participant**

The participants of this research were teachers of the English department in a private university in Yogyakarta who were involved in the peer observation. Three teachers were selected in this study. The researcher used purposive sampling for this research. Cohen, Manion and Morrison (2011) argued that purposive sampling is used to explore 'people's knowledge', who have in-depth knowledge of certain issues, based on their professional roles, strength, access to the network, skills or experience. From the aforementioned statement, the participants were chosen because the participants were involved in peer observation. In addition, all of the participants in this research have two roles. The first role was becoming observer. The second role was being observed.

The participants have different teaching period at this department. First, the participant has 6 years teaching period at this department. In addition, the first participant had 3 years of teaching experience before the peer observation was held. Then, during peer observation, the first participant had one year and a half of

teaching experience. Second, the participant has 9 years teaching period at this department. Then, before the peer observation was held, the second participant had 6 years of teaching experience. Moreover, the second participant had one year and a half of teaching experience during peer observation. Third, the participant has 4 years teaching period. Therefore, the third participant had 1-year teaching period before the peer observation was conducted. Moreover, throughout peer observation, the third participant had one year and a half of teaching experience. Therefore, the researcher chose the teachers who have different teaching period in order to get various data and rich data.

Then, the researcher made sure that the identity of the participants was classified. Hence, the researcher used pseudonym for the participants in this study. Pseudonym can be called as a fictitious name, pen name or alias.

Table 1.1 *Participants*

No	Name	Gender	Length of teaching
1	Raja	Male	6 years
2	Ratu	Female	9 years
3	Putri	Female	4 years

### **Data Collection Technique**

The researcher used interview as technique to collect the data. Cohen, Manion, and Morrison (2011) mentioned that the purpose of interview is to collect rich data from the participants consisting of their perspectives, beliefs, and experiences. Creswell (2009) explained that qualitative interview includes unstructured and open-ended questions in a few numbers and planned to gain opinions and views from the participants. The researcher made interview in order

to explore teachers' perception on the implementation of peer observation at English language education department.

The in-depth interview was selected in order to explore the teachers' perception on the implementation of peer observation at English language education department especially the advantages and disadvantages according to their perception. Guion, Diehl, and McDonald (2001) stated that in depth interview is conducted to deeply explore the views and opinions of the participants. In-depth interview is not only asking questions, but recording and documenting the responses systematically to investigate for deeper meaning and understanding (Guion, Diehl, & McDonal, 2001).

Interview guideline was used in this study as the instrument of the research. The researcher interview participants based on the interview guideline and followed up question. Interview guideline consist of questions that were made based on the aims of this study. Then, the interview spent approximately 15-20 minutes for each participant.

This research employed standardized open-ended interviews. According to Cohen, Manion and Morrison (2011) there are several strengths of standardized open-ended interviews. First, participants answer the same questions, thus increasing comparability of responses. Second, it reduced the interviewer's influence and bias. Third, it facilitated organization analysis and can depth information of the data. In line with the aforementioned statement, the researcher wanted to obtain depth information in order to achieve the purpose of this study.

Particularly, this study used direct questions because the researcher wanted to produce specific answer. Cohen, Manion and Morrison (2011) stated that direct

question is more likely to produce with a precise answer. Furthermore, in this study, the researcher applied response mode of participant according to Tuckman as cited in Cohen, Manion, and Marison (2011) who said that unstructured response enables the participants to give their answer in the manner in which they pick. The researcher chose an unstructured response mode because it allows participants to provide answers in whatever way they choose.

Additionally, the researcher used some tools when doing interview in order to help gathering the data. Firstly, the researcher used mobile phone to record the participants' voice in the interview. Secondly, the researcher used note and a pen to write an important information and additional information while the interview was taking place.

### **Data Collection Procedure**

In data collection procedure, the researcher carried out several steps in collecting the data. First, the researcher and the participants made an agreement to arrange an appointment for the interview. Next, the researcher contacted the participants via WhatsApp application. Then, the researcher asked the participants about their free time. Then, the interview was conducted when the interviewees set the date. To ease the communication, the researcher used Indonesian language in the interview. The reason of using Indonesian language was because Indonesian language is the native language of researcher and participants. Furthermore, the researcher chose Indonesian language in the interview is to make interviewees comfortable and interviewees can express all their thought.

## **Data Analysis**

In data analysis, the researcher analyzed the data that was already collected before in order to answer the research questions. In this research there were some steps that were employed to analyze the result of this interview. The steps were transcribing the data, member checking, and coding.

The first step was transcribing the data. After the data from interview was collected, the researcher transcribed the data. Cohen, Manion, and Morrison (2011) stated that transcribing is a process of change the result of voice recorder into a set of sentences in written text without changing the meaning. From the aforementioned statement the researcher transcribed the data without taking sides. It means that the researcher was in neutral position. Furthermore, the researcher transcribed the data into written text genuinely without adding or deleting word. The researcher used transcription to ease in analyzing and summarizing the data.

The next step was member checking. Cohen, Manion, and Morrison (2011) stated that one of the steps to ensure validity in qualitative research is by member checking. The researcher showed the result of transcription to the participants to make sure the validity of the data. In member checking, the participants are requested by the researcher to make sure that the transcription data are appropriate to their answer whether there are any changes or not or if the researcher is not really sure about the answer on the interview. After all of the participants agreed about the data, the researcher continued to analyze the data.

The last step was coding. There are four types of coding i.e. open coding, analytical coding, axial coding, and selective coding (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2011). The researcher was analyzed the data using coding based on

Cohen, Manion, and Morrison (2011). Therefore, Saldana (2009) stated that coding is a way of getting words or phrases that determining the existence of prominent psychological facts, capturing the essence of facts, or marking a strongly emerging psychological attribute of a number of languages or visual data sets.

The first step in coding was open coding. Open coding is a process of marking or labeling the text with simple code to categorize it (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2011). In open coding, the researcher gave the codes or labels to the participant's answer; identified participant's answer to the main point; translated it into English. The code that the researcher used in this research were Raja, Ratu, and Putri. In addition, each code has different labels. Then, the researcher also organized participants' answer to two main points. The second step in coding was analytic coding. Cohen, Manion, and Morrison (2011) stated that analytical coding is over than a descriptive, it turns into more interpretative. In this step, the researcher categorized each answer that has been obtained into the topic. Then, the researcher also made the statement of the participants more academically. The third step in coding was axial coding. Axial coding is a process of grouping the point into small groups (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2011). In this step, the researcher gathered the similar point into same group. The last step is selective coding. Selective coding is an activity of classify the main categories of text data, incorporating them into form of theory (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2011). In this step, the researcher decided the findings of this research sourced on the result of selective coding. In addition, the researcher decided to choose twelve topics written in chapter 4.