Chapter Three
Methodology

In this chapter, the researcher discusses the methodology of this research about students’ perceptions on the implementation of formative assessment at English Language Education Department of a Private University in Yogyakarta. This chapter consists of research design, research setting, research participants, data collection method, data collection procedure, and data analysis.

Research Design

In this study, the researcher used the qualitative method. Creswell (2012) stated “qualitative research is best suited to address a research problem in which you do not know the variables and need to explore”. In addition, Cohen, Manion, and Marrison (2011) stated the qualitative method as “an in-depth, intricate, and detailed understanding of meanings from the voices of participants”, which “probes issue that lies beneath the surface of presenting behavior and actions” (p. 201). This means that the qualitative research design can be used when the researcher aims to know in-depth information through the opinions and explanations of participants. The researcher used qualitative method to explore the students’ perceptions on the implementation of formative assessment in English learning at English Language Education Department of a Private University in Yogyakarta. Qualitative research design is suitable for this research because that provided more a more detailed form a data. As a result, this research
captured the perspectives and opinion of the participants regarding the phenomenon of formative assessment.

This research was conducted to find detailed information, so the researcher elected to use descriptive qualitative design. Descriptive design is a qualitative procedure in which researchers describe the lives of individuals, collect, and tell stories about these individuals’ lives and their experiences. In education, these stories often relate to school classroom experiences or activities in school (Cohen et al, 2011). Hence, to know the students’ perceptions at English Language Education Department of a private university in Yogyakarta, the researcher decided to use the descriptive qualitative design.

**Research Setting**

This research was conducted at the English Language Education Department of a private university in Yogyakarta. There are two reasons why the researcher chose the English Language Education Department of this private university in Yogyakarta as the setting of this study. The first is because, based on the researchers’ experience as a student of English Language Education Department of Universitas Muhammadiyah Yogyakarta, some of the lecturers have applied formative assessment in some subjects to assess the students. The second reason is that the researcher is a student of English Language Education Department at a private university where this study conducted, so collecting the data will be easier. These two reasons make it suitable for the researcher to choose the research setting of this study.
**Research Participants**

The participants in this research were four students of English Language Education Department of a private university in Yogyakarta batch 2014. The reason of choosing this batch is because they have more experience of formative assessment in each course than the students who are in the other batches. Furthermore, they are senior students in English Language Education Department of this private university in Yogyakarta. In addition, students of batch 2014 are still in the campus area, which made them more accessible. Additionally, the researcher decided the criteria of the participants. First, students who are informative were selected, because they tend to be more expressive in giving a response. Second, the researcher chose students who have either a high or low academic performance, as long as they are informative, to make sure that the data obtained is fair. Another essential thing is that the researcher chose the participants from the different class because students have different experiences in learning, so the researcher will get many perceptions from different participant. The researcher chose one female student as a participant one (P1) and three male students as participant two, three and four (P2, P3 and P4).

**Data Collection Method**

In this study, the researcher used the interview method to collect the data. The researcher acquired the necessary data through the opinions or experiences of the participants. Cohen et al., (2011) found that “interviews enable participants, be it the interviewers or interviewees to discuss their interpretations of the world in which they live, and to express how they regard situations from their own point of view” (p.409). There are different types of interview that the researcher considered to collect the data.
In the end, the researcher decided on a standardized open-ended interview. According to Cohen et al., (2011), a standardized open-ended interview’s guideline is organized and has a set sequence. The procedure of interview that the researcher used contains open-ended items. There is no limitation to the answers and expressions of participants. The researcher used the indirect form for questions format. For the response, the researcher used unstructured response where the answers of participants are free or no limitation. The interview was held when both the interviewer and interviewee are ready. This made the interviewee feels comfortable to tell their opinions and answer the questions from the interviewer.

**Data Collection Procedure**

The data collection procedure was done through several steps. First, the researcher made the interview guideline before doing the interview with the participants to set the right sequence of the questions addressed to the participants. Second, the researcher made an appointment with the participants to decide the place and the time of the interview. Third, before the interview was carried out, the researcher asked for the participants’ permission to be recorded during the interview. The interview was done in Bahasa Indonesia to minimize any chances that misunderstandings might happen. The interview lasts about 20 to 30 minutes for each participant.

The first interview was done on March 5th 2018 at 10.44 am at UMY, with Participant 1. We spent around 15 minutes to finish the interview. The second interview was done on March 7th 2018 at 11.14 am at UMY, and the researcher
interviewed P2 for around 18 minutes. On that same day, the researcher interviewed P3 at 1.10 pm in the campus office of. The time spent was around 19 minutes. The last interview was conducted on March 9th 2018 at 2.11 pm at Java Market near the campus. The researcher performed the interview with the last participant (P4) which took around 17 minutes to finish the interview.

Data Analysis

After collecting data from the interview, the researcher transcribed it into a written form. Cohen et al., (2011) stated that transcribing is writing down the participants’ answer to gain the point of it. The researcher used verbatim transcription, which means that the researcher did not increase, decrease or change anything the participants have said. To ensure the validity of the data, the researcher checked the transcript of the interview to avoid any mistakes by doing member checking. According to Creswell (2012), member checking is a process in which the researcher asked the participant in the participants in the study to check the accuracy of the account. The researcher did the member checking by showing the data transcript to all participants. The result of the member checking was suitable, but the researcher had some questions which the one of participants answered vaguely. Therefore, the researcher requested additional explanations from P1.

Afterwards, the researcher analyzed the data by coding. According to Cohen et al., (2011), the simple code, a name or label that the researcher gives to a piece of text that contains an idea or a piece of information. Coding enables the researcher to identify similar information (Cohen et al., 2011). There are four steps to analyze the data of interview, namely open coding, analytical coding, axial coding and selective
coding. First, the researcher did the open coding, which labels all points mentioned by the participants. Cohen et al., (2011) stated that open coding can be performed on sentence by sentence. Analytical coding means that the researcher makes groups from the texts that contain similar meaning. Cohen et al., (2011) said that an analytical code might derive from the theme of the research. The next step is axial coding, where means the researcher categorizes the statement from open coding into one topic. According to Cohen et al., (2011), “axial coding connects to related codes and sub categories into large categories of common meaning that is shared by the group of codes in question (thereby creating a hierarchy in which some codes are subsumed into the large axial category); an axial code, as its name suggest, is a category or axis around which several codes revolve”. (p. 562). The last step is selective coding, which means that the researcher had to select the same categories between open and axial coding into bigger categories.