

CHAPTER III RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This chapter covers the research design, site, and participants of the study, data collection, and data analysis.

3.1 Research Design

To answer the research questions, this study used a case study design. It is qualitative research because it concerns the quality of a certain event and not on how frequent something happens (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2009). It is stated that a case study supports an in-depth and more detailed investigation of present circumstances within its real-life context that provides answers to ‘how’ and ‘why’ questions (Yin, 2009; Rowley, 2002); which was in line with the purposes of this study. Moreover, Yin (2009) proposes three conditions that a researcher needs to fulfill before conducting a case study: a) the type of research questions posed, b) the extent of control an investigator has over the investigated event, and c) the degree of focus on contemporary as opposed to historical events. In this present study, the researcher had little or no control over the investigated event, nor had a power to manipulate behavioral events and the focus was more into present event since the study investigated an ongoing program, the actual setting in which it was implemented. Therefore, a case study design was relevant in conducting the present study.

In addition, a case study has at least three main strengths compared to other research designs; it involves detailed holistic investigation, it can use a number of data gathering techniques as long as it is appropriate to conduct the investigation, and it is contextual because the data is collected in natural setting without any interventions from the researchers (Malik & Hamied, 2016).

3.2 Research Site

This research took place in a modern *pondok pesantren* which is known as one of the biggest *pesantrens* in Subang, Indonesia. This *pondok pesantren* was classified as a modern *pesantren* because there is an integration between *pondok pesantren* and *madrasah* as a modern Islamic education system offered by the

government (Azra & Afrianty, 2005). It cannot be separated from the history of the *pesantren*. The *pesantren* was built by three generations of a family. It started with the first two generations who were well known as *ajengan* (Sundanese term for preachers). They actively became preachers and used to teach people how to read al-Quran and learn Islamic textbooks. The eldest son of the third generation was sent to one of the biggest modern *pesantrens* in East Java. Once he came back and continued his study to one of the Islamic universities in Bandung, these three generations started to build a *pesantren* and a madrasah within the *pesantren*.

Since the beginning, in 1985, this *pesantren* has been declared itself as a modern *pesantren* by conducting a formal system of education. The curriculum of this *pondok pesantren* was adapted from at least two systems, traditional *pesantren* and the modern *pesantren*, in which the eldest son graduated from. They conducted the teaching of Islamic textbooks (*kitab kuning*) in classes and gave different textbooks for different grades. The textbooks were arranged in tiers. General subjects such as mathematics, English, social and natural sciences were also taught because the students should follow National Final Learning Evaluation or Evaluasi Belajar Tahap Akhir (EBTANAS) conducted by the government as a requirement to get a certificate of completion of secondary levels. It is something that has never been done by the modern *pesantren* that the eldest son graduated from because this *pesantren* has been an independent school, they issued their own graduation certificates.

From this brief history, it can be assumed that this modern *pesantren* where this study took place, integrated the curriculum of the oldest modern *pesantren* and the national curriculum of Indonesia for *madrasah*. This was not the end since it did not give any description of what kind of integration this modern *pesantren* presented or what curriculum they have; in this case, it is the English curriculum. In other words, they must have been constructing their own English curriculum because the national curriculum of English only covers formal education during school hours.

In addition, this modern *pesantren* teaches English into several subjects such as Language, Reading, Conversation, Composition, and Grammar. These subjects were developed from the oldest modern *pesantren*'s English curriculum

with some adaptations. In terms of the number of English subjects, this site has five subjects, while the original curriculum has only three subjects, Reading, Grammar, and Composition. This information was obtained from the researcher's experiences.

3.3 Research Subject

The subjects of the research were nonrandom or purposive subjects or participants. The purposive participants were selected based on researchers' judgment that it is believed, based on prior information, that they were able to provide the data the researchers need (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2009) or in other words, the participants were selected based on who they were and what they knew (Malik & Hamied, 2016).

Since this study was intended to investigate the English curriculum profile of the modern *pesantren* where this study took place, the participants were those people who were close to the curriculum; the curriculum developer, in this case the *kyai* or the leader of the *pesantren*, English teachers who are always in contact with the English curriculum, and alumni who had experiences and somehow got affected by the curriculum.

Kyai is not a position but it is usually given by the people to those whom they believed are pious and have a broad knowledge of Islam. In the *pesantren* tradition, *kyai* usually is the founding father of the *pesantren* he leads that has prerogative right to make any decision including curriculum developments. *Pondok pesantrens* are shaped by rules, decisions, and policies issued by the *kyais*. Therefore, involving the *kyai* in order to investigate the construction of the English curriculum in the *pesantren* he leads was needed.

There were four English teachers involved in this study. There was not any special consideration in taking these teachers to be involved in this present study. The only consideration was the teachers should be teachers from different subjects of English in order to give different perspectives on English teaching and learning processes in this modern *pesantren*. These four teacher names were changed into codes in order to protect their identity; they are MSH who taught Language in year 1, MSD who taught Reading in year 2, MSF who taught Conversation in

Year 1 Int, and MRH who taught Grammar in year 2. Unfortunately, there was not a Composition teacher who could participate in this study since the teacher had no schedule when the data were collected.

The last participants were alumni of the modern *pesantren*. it was hard to find alumni who fulfilled three requirements applied for this group of purposive participants; 1) the alumni who graduated their senior high school level at the *pesantren*; 2) they continued their study majoring English, either English education or English literature; and 3) they should be on their first or second year of university. However, the researcher managed to find twelve alumni who fulfilled the three requirements. Unfortunately, there were only five people who responded and agreed to participate when they were contacted. They are English students from five different universities located in Subang, Karawang, Bandung, and Jakarta. These alumni were labeled as A1, A2, A3, A4, and A5. The number was based on who gave faster responses on the first contact.

3.4 Data Collection

In collecting the data, there were three instruments used in this research, in-depth interview, document and observation. Interview was considered to be the main data, whereas the document and observation were considered to be supporting data of the research. These three instruments are considered as the main techniques for gathering qualitative data (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2009).

3.4.1 Interview

The interview was conducted in the form of a semi-structured interview with open-ended questions written in interview schedules. It was a one-on-one interview, where the interview was conducted with an interviewee or subject one at a time. There were two methods that were used in collecting interview data; interviews were recorded by using voice memos application on a cellphone and then the recordings were transcribed into words (Cresswell, 2012) and the interview was conducted by sending interview schedule to the participants then it was followed up by confirmation through chatting applications whenever it was needed.

The interview schedules were developed in order to conduct an in-depth interview to get a detailed insight into the English curriculum at a modern *pesantren* and to listen to the subjects' voices. The interviews were conducted to purposive participants in order to answer the first and second research questions.

The interview schedules for the first research questions were guided by Posner's Curriculum Analysis Framework that covers curriculum document and origin, curriculum proper, the curriculum in use and curriculum critique. Since an interview schedule on the Posner's framework was hardly found, the questions were adapted from Raihani's work (2001) on Curriculum Construction in the Indonesian *pesantren*. There were three different interview schedules used for three different groups of purposive participants, a *kyai* of the modern *pesantren* interview schedule that consisted of 28 questions, an English teacher interview schedule that consisted of 15 questions and an alumni interview schedule that consisted of 21 questions (see Appendices). There are four English teachers involved in this study, who were teaching different English subject i.e. Language, Reading, Conversation, and Grammar. The interviews were conducted in Bahasa Indonesia in order to avoid misunderstanding and to gain detail information from the interviewees.

Table 3.1

Interview Timeline

No.	Position	Interviewee	Date
1.	The <i>pesantren</i> leader	The <i>Kyai</i>	23 Nov 2018
2.	Language teacher	MSH	24 Nov 2018
3.	Reading teacher	MSD	24 Nov 2018
4.	Conversation teacher	MSF	24 Nov 2018
5.	Grammar teacher	MRH	24 Nov 2018
6.	Alumnus 1 (A1)	Chat. app	14 Nov 2018
7.	Alumnus 2 (A2)	Chat. app	15 Nov 2018
8.	Alumnus 3 (A3)	Phone	14 Nov 2018
9.	Alumnus 4 (A4)	Phone	14 Nov 2018
10.	Alumnus 5 (A5)	Chat. app	14 Nov 2018

The second interview schedule was intended in order to gather data for the second research question. The schedule is an adapted interview schedule from the work of Kirkpatrick & Kirkpatrick (2006), *The Kirkpatrick's Four-Level of Training Evaluation*. It was given to modern *pesantren* alumni who continue their studies at English major with three requirements. The first was the alumni who graduated their senior high school level at the *pesantren*, the second was these alumni took English studies as their major in higher education level, and the third was they have to be on their first or second year to make sure that they still have a good memory about their experience in the *pesantren*.

3.4.2 Documents

The first pile of documents used in this research was all the available documents of English at the modern *pondok pesantren*. The documents were the curriculum documents of English, the time table of English subject and English activities, the lesson plans, the textbooks used by the teachers, the module used in the English activities in this *pesantren*. These documents were retrieved from the teachers in charge of the curriculum development and the teachers who involve in English teaching and learning processes at the *pesantren*. These documents were used to describe the English curriculum profile of a modern *pesantren*. The documents became the starting point of an analyzing process.

The data collection of the documents was gathered by using different theories in the form of checklists. The curriculum documents data was gained by using the six-common concept of the curriculum (Posner, 1992:10), scope and sequence, syllabus, content outline, textbook, course of study, and planned experiences for the curriculum documents. The data of lesson plan was collected by using adapted essential elements of a lesson plan (Brown, 2001:149-151), goal(s), objectives, materials and equipment, procedures, evaluation, and extra-class work. The data of the textbook was retrieved by using an adapted textbook evaluation criteria (Brown, 2001:142) because it consists of both general and specific criteria of textbook analysis and it covers important factors of foreign language teaching (Radic-Bojanic & Topalov, 2016). See Appendices.

3.4.3 Observation

The observation was conducted to investigate the implementation of the English curriculum in this modern *pondok pesantren*; either in a formal setting or a non-formal setting outside the classroom. The observation covered the objective of the activities, the content of the teaching, teaching methods that were used by the teacher/instructor, and how the activities were evaluated. It was conducted in the form of a checklist and video-taped. The observation was aimed at understanding the natural setting without manipulating it in order to see the true condition lived by participants (Malik & Hamied, 2016).

This observation was a non-participant observation in which the researchers did not participate in the activity directly or became a passive observer (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2009; Kumar, 2011). What the researcher did was observing and recording how the activity was conducted without getting involved in the activity (Cresswell, 2012). The observation was aimed to investigate whether the teaching and learning processes of English were in line with the instruction given in the modern *pesantren*'s curriculum. The observations were conducted in four classes of English and activities that support *santris*' English skills. They were conducted prior to the interviews. The observation checklist is presented in Appendices.

Table 3.2

Observation Timeline

No.	Observation Site	Teacher/Tutor	Date
1.	Language Class	MSH	24 Nov 2018
2.	Reading Class	MSD	24 Nov 2018
3.	Conversation Class	MSF	24 Nov 2018
4.	Grammar Class	MRH	24 Nov 2018
6.	Conversation Practice	Tutor	24 Nov 2018
7.	Public Speaking Practice	Tutor	25 Nov 2018
8.	Daily Vocabulary	Tutor	24 Nov 2018
9.	Vocabulary repetition	Tutor	24 Nov 2018

3.4.4 Procedure

The procedure of collecting the data were employed differently for the first and the second research questions. To answer the first research question, the first step was to analyze the existing documents related to the English curriculum to get information about the English curriculum used in a modern *pasantren* according to a modification of Posner's and Porter's curriculum framework (Sundayana, 2016). At this first step, what the researcher do was to answer as much as guided questions in the analysis framework. It is also to see whether the English curriculum is well documented.

The second step was to conduct in-depth semi-structured interviews with the purposive participants, the *Kyai* which was conducted before classroom observations and with the English teachers after conducting classroom observations. So, the interviews were conducted to those who develop the English curriculum and to those who implement the curriculum in the classroom. These three interviews were conducted to get an insight into the full-frame design of English in an integrated curriculum of *pondok pasantren* and the implementation of the curriculum.

The third or the last step was to conduct an observation on the implementation of the English curriculum in *pondok pasantren*. The observation was conducted in all activities that promote English.

The procedure of collecting data for the second research question was to conduct semi-structured interviews with alumni. First, the researcher contacted the alumni and ask for their readiness. Once they were ready, the location and time were decided.

3.5 Data analysis

Data analysis in qualitative research meant making meaning of the data gathered during the data collection process (Malik & Hamied, 2016). It meant that the analysis of the data took place during the data collection, simultaneous activities (Creswell, 2012:238). Furthermore, Malik and Hamied argued that the process of data analysis and interpretation of the data is critical since it is going to be the result of the research. Therefore, the researchers are challenged to use every

possible angle to make meaning or interpretation of the data (Creswell, 2012) since there are no fixed guidelines to follow. An interpretation of the same data might be different from one researcher to another because the researchers tend to bring their own perspective in interpreting the data, which is acceptable in qualitative research.

This study followed Creswell's data analysis and interpretation process (2012:236) that has six steps, namely preparing and organizing the data, transcribing the data, exploring and coding the data, exploring and coding the database, describing findings and forming categories, representing and reporting findings, interpreting the meaning of findings, and validating the accuracy of the findings.

The first two steps were conducted before data analysis took place because they were a preparation stage. The data collection was organized according to the instruments used in gathering the data (documents, interviews, and observations). In addition, non-text data or interview recordings were transcribed by playing, pausing, and replaying the recordings until they are fully transcribed on a computer document. Observation field notes were also converted into text to make it readable.

The first step of data analysis was exploring and coding the data. Exploring the data means to get general senses of the data as a whole and to add or reduce ideas to the existing data before coding them. To code is to make a label of identified segments and then narrow them into categories and eliminate data that were not suitable for any categories. The next step is to analyze the coded data in order to describe findings and forming general categories. These general categories were the four sets of Posner's curriculum analysis framework (Posner, 1992).

The next step was to represent and report findings according to research questions. Creswell suggested presenting the findings in the form of narrative discussion, a detailed summary of the findings by giving descriptions of chronology, figures, themes, settings, or cuts of interviews to support the findings. The fourth step was to interpret the meaning of the findings or presenting a discussion part of the data. This study was intended to investigate the English

curriculum profile of a modern *pesantren*; so, the discussion part reviewed the major findings which were compared and contrasted with the literature in Chapter II and conveying personal reflection of the researcher.

The last step is to validate the accuracy of the findings by conducting a triangulation (Cresswell, 2012:259). It was conducted to make sure that the data gained from different data collection methods gave similar results on the matter under investigation in order to enhance the accuracy of the study.

All the gathered data described the curriculum profile of English of modern *pesantren* according to the framework. The findings were represented and reported per set, so there were four sets of findings. They are the purpose, the content, the process, and the evaluation of the English language curriculum of this investigated modern *pesantren*. After that, the findings were interpreted to get a meaning, the whole idea of the curriculum profile. The last was to validate the accuracy of the findings by conducting a triangulation as suggested by Creswell (2012) with the interview as the main data and the other two as the supporting data.

The second research question was to find out alumni's perspective on the English curriculum of modern *pesantren* that focused on the four components of the curriculum. It was analyzed by applying the same Creswell's framework of analyzing data. The results were also used in supporting the process of triangulating the data.

3.6 Concluding Remarks

This chapter has explained the research design, research participant and site, data collection and data analysis. This study employs a case study research design because it focuses on one particular case; that is the English curriculum in a modern *pesantren*. Purposive participants are involved in the study. Interview, documents, and observations are used in collecting the data from the site. This chapter is ended by explaining how the data are analyzed.