

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

A. Research Design

This study employs a qualitative research design, specifically a multiple-case study approach. Case study research is appropriate when the researcher seeks to understand a complex phenomenon within its real-world context and when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly distinct (Yin, 2018). In the present study, the phenomenon of interest, the relationship between MBTI personality type and English speaking performance, is inseparable from the particular classroom context in which it occurs, making a case study design appropriate.

The multiple-case structure allows for both within-case analysis, examining each participant's personality profile and speaking experience in depth, and cross-case analysis, in which patterns across participants with similar or contrasting MBTI types can be identified and compared. This dual analytical movement is essential for building toward transferable insights without sacrificing the contextual richness that individual cases provide.

A qualitative approach is also justified by the nature of the research questions themselves. Questions about how students experience speaking, what challenges and strengths they associate with their personality type, and how personality affects confidence and motivation are inherently questions about meaning, perception, and lived experience, domains that resist reduction to numerical scores and that require the kind of nuanced, interpretive engagement that qualitative methods are uniquely equipped to provide.

B. Research Setting and Participants

The study was conducted at the English Education Department (Tadris Bahasa Inggris) of Antasari State Islamic University (UIN Antasari), Banjarmasin, South Kalimantan, Indonesia. The specific context was the Public Speaking course, a required course for English Education students that focuses on developing oral communication skills in formal English. Data collection took place during the course's mid-term speaking assessment (Ujian Tengah Semester / UTS), in which each student delivered an individual speech in English on a self-selected topic.

Participants consisted of two groups. The primary participant group comprised students from two Public Speaking classes, totaling approximately forty students. Prior to the speaking assessment, all students had completed the MBTI test to determine their personality types. The full MBTI distribution across the two classes included representatives of twelve of the sixteen possible types; the four types not present in either class were ENTJ, ESTJ, ESFJ, and ESFP, whose absence reflects the naturally occurring distribution of types within this particular cohort rather than any deliberate exclusion. For the interview component, twelve students were selected through purposive sampling guided by three explicit criteria: (1) MBTI type diversity, ensuring that both introverted and extroverted orientations were represented, and that variation within each orientation (across the S/N, T/F, and J/P dimensions) was captured; (2) observational salience, prioritizing students whose classroom performance during the speaking assessment provided particularly clear or instructive illustrations of type-predicted or type-unexpected patterns; and (3) willingness to participate, all selected students provided informed consent and expressed genuine willingness to engage in the interview process.

The number of interview participants was fixed at twelve for three main reasons. First, twelve was sufficient to represent three-quarters of the sixteen possible MBTI types present in the two classes, giving the study meaningful breadth across personality profiles without diluting the depth of a qualitative case study. Second, a sample of this size allowed the researcher to conduct in-depth, semi-structured interviews with each participant and to cross-reference every interview against that student's individual classroom observation data, a level of detailed triangulation that would not have been feasible with a substantially larger sample. Third, by the time data collection reached the twelfth participant, responses within each type-orientation cluster (introverted and extroverted) were converging on recurring, recognizable patterns, indicating that thematic saturation had been reached and that additional interviews were unlikely to yield substantially new insights.

The resulting sample of twelve includes eight introverted types (INFP, INFJ×2, INTJ, ISFP, ISTP, ISTJ) and four extroverted types (ENFJ×2, ENFP, ENTP, ESTP), a distribution that reflects both the higher proportion of introverted students in the cohort and the study's particular interest in the underexplored experiences of introverted speakers. The students who participated in interviews were: FS (INFP), AP (ENFJ), JA (INFJ), GH (ESTP), NH (ISFP), VI (ENFP), IK (INTJ), ED (INFJ), MA (ISTP), FD (ENTP), MG (ENFJ), and AW (ISTJ).

The secondary participant group comprised one lecturer who taught the Public Speaking course. The lecturer's interview provided an experienced pedagogical perspective that complemented and enriched the student data, allowing for triangulation across two distinct vantage points.

C. Data Collection Methods

1. Classroom Observation

Structured observation was conducted during the mid-term speaking assessment. The researcher observed each student's performance using a standardized observation checklist that covered fourteen aspects: participation level, speaking style (spontaneous or structured), confidence, clarity of voice and articulation, body language and facial expressions, eye contact with the audience, signs of anxiety, use of speaking strategies such as notes or cue cards, time management, content relevance, vocabulary and grammar, alignment with personality type, and comparative progress. Observer field notes in Indonesian were recorded alongside the checklist to capture qualitative impressions that the checklist format alone could not accommodate.

Observation data were collected for all approximately forty students across the two Public Speaking classes, providing a comprehensive behavioral dataset that served as the empirical foundation for subsequent interview analysis. The combination of structured checklist and open-ended field notes enabled the researcher to move between quantifiable behavioral indicators and richer interpretive commentary.

2. Semi-Structured Interviews with Students

Following the observation, semi-structured interviews were conducted individually with twelve selected students over the period of May 5-10, 2025, in the English Department Study Room. Each interview lasted approximately fifteen minutes. The interview protocol was designed to elicit students' reflective accounts of their speaking experiences, exploring

how they perceived the influence of their MBTI type on their preparation strategies, in-class performance, confidence levels, and responses to challenges. The semi-structured format ensured comparability across participants while allowing the interviewer to probe interesting or unexpected responses.

3. Lecturer Interview

A semi-structured interview was conducted with the Public Speaking course lecturer on May 12, 2025, in the lecturer's office, lasting approximately thirty minutes. The interview explored the lecturer's observations of personality-based differences in speaking behavior, their current assessment practices, their familiarity with and attitudes toward MBTI, and their views on the feasibility and value of incorporating personality awareness into speaking instruction and assessment. The lecturer's perspective provided an authoritative pedagogical lens through which to interpret the student data.

D. Research Instruments

Three primary instruments were used in data collection. First, the MBTI self-assessment instrument administered by the institution prior to the speaking test classified students into their respective personality types, providing the baseline categorical data needed for grouping and comparison. Students completed the MBTI through the official 16Personalities platform (based on the MBTI framework) as part of a departmental program conducted prior to this study; results were self-reported to the researcher. It is important to acknowledge the psychometric limitations of this instrument as used here: the version employed was an online adaptation rather than the formally licensed Myers-Briggs assessment, and no independent verification of type accuracy was conducted.

As discussed in Section C of the Theoretical Framework, MBTI has known test-retest reliability concerns. Accordingly, type classifications in this study are treated as heuristic self-descriptions that participants themselves accepted as meaningful, rather than as definitive psychological diagnoses. The interpretive value of MBTI in this study lies in participants' own identification with their type profiles, an identification that itself shaped how they made sense of their speaking experiences, regardless of the instrument's psychometric properties.

Second, the classroom observation checklist, developed for this study, operationalized speaking performance across fourteen behavioral dimensions. Each dimension was assessed using a three-option format (for example, High / Moderate / Low for confidence, or Within time / Too fast / Too long for time management), supplemented by observer notes. This instrument was designed to be practically usable in a real-time classroom observation while also generating systematic, comparable data across participants.

Third, separate semi-structured interview protocols were developed for students and for the lecturer. The student protocol centered on five core questions addressing confidence, perceived personality influence, strategy use, challenges, and the learning environment. The lecturer protocol addressed five corresponding areas: observed personality differences in speaking behavior, type-specific challenges, current instructional strategies, feasibility of MBTI integration, and pedagogical recommendations. Both protocols were piloted informally before use to ensure clarity and appropriate length.

The interview data needed for this study were, specifically, participants' own explanations of the experiences that lay behind their observable speaking behavior: how they interpreted their nervousness, why they prepared the way they did, how they made sense of their MBTI type in relation to speaking, and what meaning they attached to moments the observer had flagged, such as a fading voice, a long pause, or a sudden burst of energy. This kind of data cannot be captured through observation alone, because observation records what a behavior looks like from the outside but not why it occurs or what it means to the person producing it. The interview was therefore the instrument responsible for supplying the emic, first-person perspective that a case study of this kind requires, and it served as the primary basis for the thematic analysis described in Section E. The lecturer interview, in turn, was needed to supply a complementary, cross-case pedagogical perspective, informed by exposure to many students over time, on which behavioral patterns co-occur with which personality types, how those patterns are currently assessed, and whether MBTI-informed adjustments to teaching and feedback would be practically feasible. Without this second vantage point, the study would only have access to how individual students experienced their own speaking; the lecturer's account was necessary to connect those individual experiences to actual classroom practice and assessment.

E. Data Analysis

Data were analyzed using thematic analysis, following the six-phase process described by Braun and Clarke (2006): familiarization with the data, generation of initial codes, searching for themes, reviewing themes, defining and naming themes, and

producing the final analysis. This approach is appropriate for qualitative interview and observation data because it is both flexible and rigorous, allowing themes to emerge inductively from the data while still maintaining analytical transparency.

In the first phase, interview transcripts were read multiple times to develop a thorough familiarity with the content. In the second phase, initial codes were generated by annotating the transcripts to mark recurring ideas, patterns, and significant passages. In the third phase, these codes were grouped into candidate themes, broader conceptual categories that captured meaningful patterns across multiple participants.

Cross-case analysis compared themes across participants grouped by MBTI type, with particular attention to the introversion-extroversion dimension. Observation data were analyzed separately and then integrated with interview themes to produce triangulated findings. The lecturer's interview was analyzed using the same thematic procedure and integrated as a third analytical strand. Where data sources converged, findings were treated as more robust; where they diverged, the divergences were examined for their own interpretive significance.

F. Data Trustworthiness

The trustworthiness of qualitative research is conventionally evaluated across four criteria: credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

Credibility was established through methodological triangulation, the use of three distinct data collection methods (observation, student interview, and lecturer interview) to address the same research questions from different angles. Member checking was also conducted informally, with interview findings shared with selected participants to verify the accuracy of interpretation. This combination of strategies follows established procedures for verifying the trustworthiness of qualitative data (Setiawan, 2020), which similarly emphasizes triangulation and member checking as core techniques for establishing credibility in qualitative inquiry.

Transferability is supported by the thick description provided throughout this study, detailed accounts of the research context, participant characteristics, and data collection procedures that allow readers to assess the applicability of findings to their own settings. While the study does not claim statistical generalizability, the findings are presented with sufficient contextual detail to enable informed judgment about their relevance elsewhere.

Dependability is addressed through a detailed audit trail, including documentation of all data collection procedures, analytical decisions, and interpretive choices. The systematic coding process and the use of a structured observation instrument contribute to the replicability of the analytical approach.

Confirmability is maintained through sustained reflexivity throughout the research process. The researcher occupied a dual position as both a member of the academic community at UIN Antasari and as an investigator of that same community, creating a proximity to participants that carries both advantages and risks. As a fellow student in the English Education Department, the researcher shared institutional context with

participants, which facilitated rapport and interview depth; however, this proximity also raised the possibility of social desirability bias, that is, participants may have provided responses that they perceived as favorable or academically appropriate rather than fully candid. To mitigate this risk, interview questions were framed in open, non-evaluative language, and participants were explicitly reminded at the outset that there were no correct or incorrect answers and that their candid reflection was more valuable than any particular response.

Additionally, the researcher was not the course lecturer or any participant's direct evaluator, which reduced hierarchical pressure on disclosure. A second reflexivity concern arises from the researcher's prior familiarity with MBTI theory. Awareness of type-specific predictions created the risk of confirmation bias, interpreting observed behavior and interview responses in ways that selectively supported expected patterns. This risk was managed through deliberate attention to disconfirming evidence: cases that did not fit predicted type profiles were actively sought out and prominently reported (see Section B.3, Mixed and Unexpected Patterns), rather than minimized or omitted. The use of a structured observation checklist, completed in real time during the speaking assessment, before interview data were analyzed, also provided a layer of behavioral data that was independent of the researcher's theoretical expectations.

These procedural safeguards do not eliminate reflexivity concerns entirely, but they represent a good-faith effort to ensure that the findings reflect participants' actual experiences rather than the researcher's theoretical presuppositions.

G. Ethical Considerations

Ethical clearance for this study was obtained through standard institutional procedures at UIN Antasari Banjarmasin. All participants, both students and the lecturer, provided informed consent prior to data collection. The purpose, procedures, and intended use of the research were explained clearly, and participants were informed of their right to withdraw at any time without penalty.

Confidentiality of data was maintained throughout. The lecturer requested anonymity and is referred to in this study by role only. Student participants' names are used with their consent; where a student's responses might be considered sensitive or potentially embarrassing, additional care was taken in reporting.

The researcher endeavored to maintain neutrality during interviews by avoiding leading questions and by refraining from offering evaluative feedback on students' speaking performances. Field notes were kept factual and descriptive rather than judgmental.