

## **Chapter Three**

### **Methodology**

This chapter discusses the method used in this research. There are some parts of this chapter. Firstly, it discusses the research design used in the study. Secondly, it presents the setting and participant of the study. The next part discusses the data collection method. Finally, this chapter explains the data analysis.

#### **Research Design**

The aim of this study was to reveal supervising teachers' perceptions on EED of UMY's student-teachers' pedagogical competence in an internship program. Qualitative study was used by the researcher as the method of this study. Cresswel (2009) described that qualitative study is suitable to explore the perception, believe or opinion of individuals or groups. Then, Mack, Woodsong, Queen, Guest and Namey (2005) stated that qualitative research is able to provide multifarious textual descriptions about how people experience an issue about humans. Moreover, Dawson (2009) also believed that qualitative research can explore attitudes, behavior and experiences through such methods as interviews or focus groups. This method was appropriate for the researcher to know the perception of supervising teachers.

In collecting the data, case study was used by the researcher. Case study is a main method with different sub-methods, such as interviews, observations, document, record analysis, and work samples (Gillham, 2000). Then, Cresswel (2009) said that case studies are a strategy of inquiry in which researcher explores

in depth a program, event, activity, process on one or more individuals. Moreover, Gillham (2000) stated that case study can investigate the specific answer of research questions and seeks different kinds of evidence to get the best possible answers to the research questions. Hence, by using this method the researcher got the real explanation about EED of UMY's student-teachers' pedagogical competence.

### **Setting and Participant**

**Setting.** This study was conducted in five senior high schools as EED of UMY's partner schools for internship program. The researcher chose the schools randomly to generalize the data. Senior high schools was chosen because of some reasons:

Firstly, senior high school is the last step of EED of UMY's student-teachers in conducting internship program. Therefore, the result of this study can reflect the EED of UMY's student-teachers' pedagogical competence in general before they graduate from EED of UMY.

Secondly, the researcher had done an internship program at senior high school in the third year of education and still found difficulties in dealing with pedagogical problem. It also happened with the majority of EED of UMY's student-teachers who conducted the internship in other schools.

Last, based on the researcher experience and observation, most of supervising teachers at senior high schools have much knowledge and good comprehension on pedagogical competence. It can be seen from their capability when supervise EED of UMY's student-teachers during the internship program.

**Participants.** Purposive sampling was used in choosing the participants of this study. Mcnaill and Chapman (2005) said that purposive sampling is used when a researcher knows the type to be wanted of particular groups or places to study. Moreover, Mack, Woodsong, Queen, Guest and Namey (2005) said that purposive sampling is one of the most common sampling strategies, groups participants according to preselected criteria relevant to a particular research question. Then, Dawson (2009) argued that purposive sample is better to be used if description is the goal of a study. Hence, purposive sampling was appropriate for this study.

The participants of this study was chosen by two criteria. Firstly, he or she was an English teacher who guided EED of UMY's student-teachers in the last EED of UMY's internship program. Then, he or she was the most senior supervising teachers who guided EED of UMY's student-teachers in the last EED of UMY's internship program. Based on the criteria, the researcher involved five participants. They were two male participants and three female participants. All participants have experiences of teaching English more than eight years and have experience of supervising student-teachers more than three times.

### **Data Collection Method**

This study was used interview to collect the data. It was related to the aim of the study which is to reveal the perceptions of participants. This study conducted in-depth interview of face-to-face interview. "In-depth interviews are optimal for collecting data on individuals' personal histories, perspectives, and

experiences, particularly when sensitive topics are being explored” (Mack, et.al, 2005, p. 2). Then, Gillham (2000) believed that the strength of face-to-face interview is the richness of the communication that is possible to do and the answer can be more complex than simply yes or no.

In conducting the interview, the researcher used interview guideline. The guideline helped researcher to more focus with the interview goals. The researcher also made an appointment to meet the before conducting the interview by phone or text message. Before making the appointment, the researcher explained the aim of this study.

During the interview, recorder tool was used by the researcher. That was beneficial to keep the interview data. The researcher chose *Bahasa Indonesia* as the language in the interview, because it was the first language of both, interviewer and interviewee. By using the first language, hopefully there was no misunderstanding in interpreting questions and answers. First language also helped the participants to explore their answers deeper. The interview was conducted around fifteen to thirty minutes.

### **Data Analysis**

After collecting the data by interview, the researcher analyzed the data. This step had a purpose to understand and interpret the data related to the research question and objectives of the study. In analyzing the interview data, there were some steps. The first step was transcribing the interview in the initial language (*Bahasa Indonesia*). Secondly, the researchers did member checking with all

participants to validate the data. In the member checking, all participants clarified that the data have been appropriate with their statements in the interview. Then, after getting the feedback and valid data, the next step was coding, including open coding, axial coding and selective coding. Strauss & Corbin (1990) in Cohen & Crabtree (2006) said open coding is the process of breaking down, examining, comparing, conceptualizing, and categorizing data. Then axial coding is making connection between categories. Last, selective coding is selecting the core category, make it systematic and validate the relationship. After analyzing the data by coding the next step was reporting. In reporting the findings, the researcher used pseudonym to keep privacy and identity of participants. The participants were reported as Ani, Berta, Candra, Dika and Eni.