

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHOD

A. Research Design

The researcher employed the method of qualitative research in this research. Braun & Clarke, (2013) clarify a qualitative method of research that uses stories as a lens through which to analyze and examine experiences. It focuses on individual narratives to deliver insights into the thoughts, implications, and feelings of participants on a given phenomenon. In line with Ary et al., (2010), human tales are the cornerstone of narrative inquiry. It offers a thorough framework that enables academics to investigate the various ways individuals interpret the world through the narratives they tell. In this specific instance, the researcher uses narrative inquiry as a methodology for research. The way of doing things begins with the events as they are expressed in the lived and told accounts of the people involved.

This research uses narrative inquiry to investigate the challenges and understanding of students' experiences with the use of Mind Mapping strategies in dialogic collaborative learning. The research's method was taken by Creswell & Creswell, (2018). The approaches provided a detailed and reliable step in the execution of this narrative investigation. After then, it was made operational within the research's parameters. Following is a

description of the steps:

Step 1. Identify the phenomenon to explore

In this step, the researcher focused on the participants who have experiences with Mind Mapping strategies in collaborative learning environments. They were selected based on their experience in using mind mapping strategies across various courses. These participants had previously created mind maps as part of learning activities in subjects such as Teaching English as a Foreign Language, Research in ELT, and Morpho-syntax. The researcher employed interview guideline to identify the phenomena.

Step 2. Select one or more participants to study

Participants and those with previous experience with Mind Mapping techniques in group learning settings were among the selection criteria used for the study. A total of six participants (coded as P1 to P6) who represents each Class A, B, and C were involved in this research. Since it aligned with the material covered in class, the selection criteria were Tarbiyah the class of 2022 English Language Education majors and teaching candidates from UIN Antasari Banjarmasin's teacher training faculty as those participating in the research.

Step 3. Collect the story from the participant

This step involves interviews with participants to gather students' narratives and experiences. Their experiences and difficulties with applying Mind Mapping techniques in group learning should be covered in the

interview questions. Additionally, with the participants' permission, record the interviews.

Step 4: Re-story or retell the individual's story

Student interviews were performed by researcher to verify the previously acquired data. If there were any unresolved questions regarding their story, the researcher then asked them to get further details.

Step 5. Collaborate with the participants/storyteller

This step can be carried out through discussions or other collaborative sessions where the researcher and participants share ideas and build deeper stories or ideas together, involving the use of social media and websites that are relevant to the story that the researcher wants to create with the participants. Communicate back with them through follow-up sessions or discussions to provide additional context or clarification regarding the use of Mind Mapping and dialogic collaborative learning experiences.

Step 6. Write a story about the participant's experiences

Researcher write and report their findings using narrative reports. Organize the report by introducing the research questions, explaining the research design and methods, presenting the data analyzed, and discussing emerging themes and implications. Organize findings and analysis into a coherent narrative that describes participants' experiences. Write a narrative that includes key elements such as the use of Mind Mapping, collaborative dialogue, and challenges faced in learning.

Step 7. Validate the report's accuracy

The researcher continuously collaborated with the participants throughout the process, starting with collecting, retelling, and reporting their narratives. Carry out validation to ensure accuracy and consistency between the resulting narrative and initial data from interviews. It may involve return sessions with participants to provide an opportunity for them to provide feedback and ensure that the researcher's interpretations match their experiences of the use of Mind Mapping and dialogic collaborative learning experiences.

B. Research Setting

The research location for this project is the State Islamic University Antasari English Language Education Study Program Banjarmasin, located at Jalan A. Yani No.Km.4.5, RW.5, Kebun Bunga, Kec. Banjarmasin Team., City of Banjarmasin, South Kalimantan 70235. Interviews were used to obtain data during the course of the research. The research was carried out during a two-month period, from January 25th to March 25th, 2025. Throughout this time, the researcher conducted in-depth interviews with participants, transcribed and analyzed the data, and gathered the findings for thesis writing. The duration allowed the researcher to acquire a full understanding of the

participants' experiences and challenges in using mind mapping as a dialogic collaborative learning way.

C. Participants

The students The class of 2022 consists of six participants, each representing classes A, B, and C of UIN Antasari Banjarmasin are the research participants. In the context of this research on for students in the Class of 2022 at UIN Antasari Banjarmasin, the selection of research participants may be based on a number of factors. They were selected based on their experience in using mind mapping strategies across various courses. These participants had previously created mind maps as part of learning activities in subjects such as Teaching English as a Foreign Language, Research in ELT, and Morpho-syntax. Because they are a group that actively participates in using Mind Mapping techniques in classrooms, the students were selected. Furthermore, some ethical thoughts. Lastly, research ethics, such as getting participant consent and guaranteeing the confidentiality of the data collected, are also taken into account during the student selection process.

D. Data

In this research, the data was provided by the research participants and could be gathered from them. These participants were selected purposively based on their experiences and challenges with

the use of mind mapping in collaborative learning settings. Each participant was coded as P1 through P6 to maintain confidentiality. The interviews focused on how participants applied mind mapping in their learning processes, the nature of their interaction and collaboration with peers, the influence on their creativity and critical thinking, and the challenges they faced during the process. The participants' explanations served as narrative data that allowed the researcher to identify themes and patterns using a qualitative approach. The use of narrative inquiry helped capture the personal and contextual experiences of each participant in depth.

E. Technique of Data Collection

1. Interview

One way to obtain qualitative data is by direct interaction between participants and researcher, such as in interviews. In-depth understanding of the participant's experiences, viewpoints, and comments regarding the application of Mind Mapping is obtained through interviews conducted for this research. Interview data can be more thoroughly recorded and analyzed by using audio recordings or transcripts (Creswell, 2009).

One of the most convenient methods to discover or review someone's personal information is to speak with them individually or

conduct interviews. As claimed by (Sayrs, 2019), interviews are drawn-out conversations meant to elicit specific information on a specific issue or trouble. Additionally, they permit for the possibility of phenomena going on and their interpretation within the context of the individual being interviewed. The steps are as follows:

- a. The participant obtained proof from the researcher regarding the goals of the observer.
- b. Interviews are then conducted, during which they may talk for up to an hour. Everyone is free to share about any positive or adverse story they like. The researcher used the participant's voice recorder or transcript to assist the participant relax. Members are free to request additional information if they have any doubts about a question.

Table 3.1. List of Interview

No.	Student/ Class	Day/Date	Time
1.	P1/A	Monday, 3 March 2025	13.00-13.30
2.	P2/B	Monday, 3 March 2025	13.00-13.30
3.	P3/C	Tuesday, 4 March 2025	12.20-13.00
4.	P4/C	Tuesday, 4 March 2025	12.20-13.00
5.	P5/A	Wednesday, 5 March 2025	11.30-12.00
6.	P6/A	Wednesday, 5 March 2025	11.30-12.00

F. Research Instrument

The research use interview guideline as its instrument. The purpose

of the interview guideline is to provide guidance or information to the researcher during student interviews. This guideline's questions are intended to serve as a framework for discussion, giving researcher a comprehensive grasp of students' experiences using Mind Mapping techniques.

Claimed by Wheeldon & Faubert (2009), the use of maps in multistage fact-collection allows for a grounded idea. Rather than asking the researcher to look for codes, concepts, and categories in the data, maps enable participants to pinpoint concepts and relationships depending on how they interpret their experience. As a consequence, the following facts and approaches continue to be founded on codes and concepts validated by participant-generated maps: Record-amassing procedures for human research, together with participant focus groups and interviews, remain viable, but mapping can provide another complimentary strategy. By providing a unique manner of participating, maps can be used to examine the "behind the curtain" of participants' reviews and perceptions, constituting a new strategy that tries to go beyond requesting "a prepared sort of narrative that restricts spontaneity in answers." This way, instead of the researcher searching for codes, concepts, and categories in the data, maps allow for the identification of concepts and connections based on how participants frame their experiences. In the context of research on Mind Mapping in dialogic collaborative learning, this approach is highly relevant because it allows researcher to capture ideas and connections from the participant's

perspective rather than just the researcher's interpretation. The focus group interview is an interview with a small group of participants about a certain issue. Six to ten individuals with comparable backgrounds typically engage in group interviews, which can last up to an hour. Numerous discussion groups will be conducted as part of a particular research in order to collect a range of viewpoints and strengthen confidence in any developing trends. Since numerous consumer decisions are taken in a social setting and frequently result from relationships with other individuals, focus group interviews were created (Patton, 2002).

G. Data Analysis

Researcher use the Interactive Model of Data Analysis, developed by Miles, Huberman, and Saldana's theory to provide an in-depth approach and analysis of the data since this method thoroughly explores and analyzes qualitative data. Miles et al., (2014) pinpointed there are three familiar steps in conducting this data analysis model; data condensation, data display, and conclusion drawing and verification.

1. Data Condensation

Data condensation is the process of selecting, focusing, simplifying, abstracting, and/or modifying the data that are included in the whole corpus (body) of written-up field research notes, interview transcriptions, documents, and other sorts of empirical evidence, as

stated by (Miles et al., (2014). Kiabstracting simplifying and transforming data contained in records field and transcripts in this is study study are are described described as as following:

a. Selecting

Selective action is required by researcher in order to identify which dimensions are more significant, which relationships are more likely to be useful, and, consequently, what data may be gathered and examined.

b. Focusing

Data focus is a type of pre-analyst. Researcher concentrated on information pertaining to the formulation research problem at this point. The data from the selection stage is carried over into this step. Only the formula problem is used by researcher to restrict the data.

c. Abstracting

The process of creating a synopsis of the essential elements, procedures, and declarations that must be upheld in order to stay there. At this point, the acquired data is assessed, specifically in relation to its sufficiency and quality.

d. Simplifying and Transforming

Subsequently, the data in this research are simplified and altered in a number of ways, including classification of the data in a

broader pattern, selection that is limited to summaries or brief descriptions, and so on. The Mind Mapping strategy and dialogic collaborative learning will be used to diagnose and code pertinent charges and snippets related to people's stories. The data will reveal issues and styles, enabling a targeted examination.

2. Data Display

The presentation of information is the act of merely presenting data as words, sentences, narratives, tables, and visuals so that the writer can become proficient in using the gathered data as the basis for making the right conclusions (Miles et al., 2014). Condensed interview data must be presented in an organized and comprehensible way as part of the data display process. The facts can be arranged and graphically represented using a variety of techniques, including charts and concept maps. Finding links, trends, and insights regarding Mind Mapping techniques and dialogic collaborative learning will be made easier with the aid of this visual representation. After analysis, the data should be presented methodically and in detail in an archival manner. To help researcher with future modifications and to attain a certain level of authenticity, the material is still in temporary form for a considerable amount of time. It can go on to the stage of comprehending the earlier conclusions if it turns out that the information has been verified. However, conclusions cannot be made if it turns out that the information presented is not

significant; instead, data reduction must be done once more.

3. Conclusion Drawing and Verification

Miles et al., (2014) pointed out the third stream of analysis activity is conclusion drawing and verification. Drawing conclusions and verifying them are the final stages of data analysis. Someone does a qualitative analysis from the outset of data gathering, noting terms of explanation, potential configurations, propositions, and pros and downsides. The data from this study's conclusion aligns with the problem formulation that was identified. Following the description of the facts, general conclusions are drawn. Based on Miles, Huberman, et al.'s data analysis, all information gathered by the researcher will be organized methodically so that it is simple for both the researcher and others to understand. The results can be evaluated, and motivations or theories about the usefulness of the Mind Mapping strategy for enabling dialogic collaborative learning can appear.

To ensure that the conclusions were valid and grounded in the data, two key strategies were applied:

a. Member Checking:

Participants were given the opportunity to review summaries of their interview responses and the preliminary conclusions. Following the interview process and transcription, the researcher sent the transcript data back to each participant to verify the

veracity and correctness of their answers. Participants were given the opportunity to go over, confirm, and, if needed, revise any statements they had made throughout the interview. Direct connection via digital channel like WhatsApp was used to verify members. Enough time was allotted for participants to go over the transcripts. Participant feedback was taken into account and, if necessary, included in the final data analysis. By making sure that the interpretation of the participants' experiences accurately represented their intended meaning, this stage strengthened the validity of the research findings.

b. Peer Review:

A peer debriefing process was carried out by involving academic peers to review the data analysis process, coding consistency, and the emerging conclusions. This critical feedback helped refine the categorization of themes and ensured that the conclusions were not biased or based on assumptions, but rather on empirical evidence from the participants. The verification stage also included rechecking whether the conclusions aligned with the research questions and theoretical framework. The findings demonstrated a high level of coherence between participants' narratives and the concepts of dialogic collaborative learning and the use of Mind Mapping as a strategy.