

## **Chapter Three**

### **Methodology**

This chapter discusses the methodology of this research. In this chapter, it explains the research design that is used. Additionally, this chapter elaborates the data collection procedures.

#### **Research Design**

This research used qualitative method as the purposes of this research. Firstly, to evaluate the textbook whether the textbook correspond to the aims and objectives of curriculum used or not. Secondly, to examine the language skills of the textbook. Qualitative was used since the researcher would like to present the general explanation through “analyzing the data for description and themes using text analysis” (Creswell, 2012, p. 16). Accordingly, the researcher could describe the coincidence and the differences of the evaluation aspects.

In addition, the research design that was used in this study was content analysis under qualitative method. It used content analysis since the textbook was classified in the written text as Ezyy (cited in Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2011) proposed that content analysis commences with a sample of text. Content analysis is “a research technique for making replicable and valid inferences from text (or other meaningful matter) to the contexts of their use” (Krippendorff, 2004, p. 18). Thus, it was done to collect data of the textbook written by pre-service teachers at EED of UMY by analyzing the criteria of the textbooks.

## **Data Collection Procedures**

As discussed in research design, the qualitative content analysis was used in this study. Qualitative content analysis involved a close reading of relatively small quantities of textual matter, exploration of texts into narratives, and engages the interpretation of the texts (Krippendorff, 2004). Hence, the steps in conducting the data collection procedures in content analysis were different from the other research design in qualitative research. Researcher used the procedures in conducting the qualitative content analysis which was developed by Cohen, Manion, and Morrison (2011). The following were the steps that would be done in this study.

**Defining the research questions.** It was important to formulate the research questions since by formulating the problem the researcher could define the purpose of the study. As said by Creswell (2012) the process of research consists of six steps and one of them was identifying a research problem. This study was conducted to know whether the textbook written by pre-service teachers at EED of UMY correspond to the aims and objective in curriculum used or not and acceptable to be implemented in terms of language skills.

**Defining the population.** In a study, researcher had to define the population to facilitate the object of research. According to Creswell (2012) “population is the group of individuals having one characteristic that distinguishes them from other group.” Population was the broadest level in selecting group of research. Generally, population refers to people, but in content analysis the population refers to text. The text might be “newspaper, programs, interview

transcripts, textbooks, conversation, and so on” (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2011, p. 565). In this study, it analyzed textbook. Thus, the population was the textbooks written by pre-service teachers at EED of UMY.

**Defining the sample.** Sample involved the identifying the specific group of participant in a research by selecting the target population. It was necessary to determine the sample size in order to avoid the error margins and confidence level of the data. However, in content analysis there was no set of answer to react how many the sample must be used (Krippendorff, 2004). Hence, the researcher took two textbooks which were written by pre-service teachers at EED of UMY as the sample. Pre-service teachers at EED of UMY wrote two types of textbook which namely textbooks for junior high school and for senior high school. For that reason, the researcher used simple random sampling so that “each member of population under study has equal chance of being selected” (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2011, p. 153). Grade and semester of the textbooks were selected randomly.

**Defining the context of the generation of document.** In content analysis, it should determine the context. According to Cohen, Manion, and Morrison (2011), context of the generation of documents examine ‘who was involved; who was presented; where documents come from; how material was recorded’ (p. 565). The documents in this study were textbooks written by pre-service teachers at EED of UMY. The textbooks were made in the fifth semester. Further, these were printed out as the assignments in material design course.

**Defining the units of analysis.** Sampling units were chosen since the evaluation “vary depending on how the researcher makes meaning” (Stemler, 2001, p. 2). In this research, the units were the aims and objectives and language skills series. The researcher chose the aim and objective to be evaluated since it was the main aspect in creating the material which represents the purpose of English program. Further, through evaluating the aim and objective it could be known how the outcome was measured. Meanwhile, language skills were also chosen since it became the purpose of performative level in English language learning (BNSP, 2006). If the performative level has been achieved, it would make the learners easier to achieve the other level such functional, informational, and epistemic. Then, the language skills were chosen because it could develop the communicative competence of the learners.

**Deciding the codes to be used.** First of all, the researcher reviewed the textbooks in order to make the data become accustomed as suggested by Hammersley and Atkinson (as cited in Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2011). The codes that were applied in this research were categorical response. Through applying this code, the researcher provided selection in two possibilities (yes or no) in evaluating the textbooks based on the checklist evaluation criteria.

**Constructing the categories for analysis.** Herein the sixth procedures, it was crucial to set the domain analysis where the researcher had to prepare the checklist of evaluation. Mukundan, Hajimohammadi, and Nimehchisalem (2011) argued that “a checklist is an instrument that helps practitioners evaluates course book in an effective and practical way” (p. 21). In the textbook itself, the

substantive features could be analyzed from the benefit, role, and purpose of the textbook being used. Additionally, through using the checklist evaluation it could reveal the strength and weakness of the textbooks, and examine the textbook in order to find whether it is acceptable and reliable or needs a modification (AbdelWahab, 2013).

The checklist of evaluation was divided in two parts, the first was demographic information of the textbook and the second was the criteria of evaluation. The criteria of evaluation were also divided in two aspects, which were aims and objectives criteria and language skills criteria. In evaluating textbooks written by pre-service teachers at EED of UMY, the researcher used aims and objectives and language skills evaluation criteria by Cunningsworth (1995) and Garinger (2002). The checklist evaluations by Cunningsworth were used since it had specific and relevant criteria for each aspect. Meanwhile, checklist evaluation by Garinger was used in order to combine the criteria which were not provided by Cunningsworth. The checklist of evaluation was provided in appendix 1. Researcher attached the aims and objectives of school-based curriculum as well after the textbooks that had been selected randomly.

**Conducting the coding and categorizing of the data.** This was the main procedures in evaluating the textbooks since the researcher started to evaluate the textbook. The researcher provided checklist in ‘yes’ column if the checklist evaluation criterion was appropriate with the textbooks. Opposite with it, the researcher would also offer checklist in column ‘no’ if the textbook did not fulfill the checklist evaluation criteria.

**Conducting the data analysis.** Krippendorf (2004) proposed that evaluation was process of observation on how good or bad a phenomenon. He also added that in conducting content analysis, the researcher could use calculation and statistical analysis after coding had been done. Data analysis in this research used the tabulation to identify the frequencies of each unit. Hence, the result of coding was tabulated through descriptive statistic. Descriptive statistic consists of frequencies and percentage, and it was often to be used in describing the numerical presentation of the data in qualitative research. The researcher used the formula to calculate the frequencies and percentage of the evaluation based on Cohen, Manion, and Morrison (2011).

$$C = \frac{\sum F}{N} \times 100\%$$

C = calculation in percentage

$\sum F$  = the total of frequency in one unit

N = the total of checklist evaluation in one unit

The researcher did not only describe the result, but the researcher compared the result of evaluation of each textbooks. Accordingly, the researcher could find the conclusion whether the textbooks written by pre-service teachers at EED of UMY were correspond to the curriculum used and acceptable in terms of language skills.

**Summarizing.** The researcher identified the finding of content analysis through summarizing. By this procedure, the data would be “organized,

processing, ordered, and checking” by researcher (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2011, p. 569).

**Making speculative inferences.** As the last procedure, here the researcher tried to describe the result of the data analysis with the theory. Hence, the researcher could find the result and make a conclusion of the study.