

Research of Mix Methods for Students to Develop Research in the Historical Education

Rizky Kurniawan

Students in Doctor Program of Historical Education at Post-Graduate School of Indonesia
University of Education

Email/Contact: rizkykurniawan0101@gmail.com / 081223572121

ABSTRACT

Research may be a rare field. Research activities for most academics are usually only considered obligations and not necessarily. The reason, of course, is not only because of the difficulty of carrying out research procedures but also the consideration of funds, time and energy. In addition, research methods that are to be used also often lead to a dilemma between qualitative or quantitative. Therefore, an approach that is not merely to mediate the gap between the two very different paradigms but also able to fill every deficiency of each method. This is where the use of mixed research methods as an alternative to help students, especially in the field of historical education in conducting research. In this case it may be necessary to remember that the subject of research in historical education is not a physical thing as natural science and not a social society that demands an analytic criticism but learners and classrooms. So the role of the researcher of history education is needed not only as a field observer but also as an educator.

Keywords: Mixed Method, Qualitative, Quantitative, Historical Education

INTRODUCTION

Compared with the field of education and community service, research is the most underdeveloped area in the implementation of Tri Dharma Perguruan Tinggi. This lag is experienced by almost all universities in the country. Causes of this condition include the ability in the methodology and tradition of researching in the campus environment. Research activities for most lecturers and students are still considered obligations, not necessarily. Many lecturers do research just want to get credit for teaching (KUM) for group increase. Similarly for some students, they do research only to qualify for a bachelor's degree. Seeing such conditions is certainly not enough with only concern, but also need to accelerate efforts in catching up. One of the efforts to develop and improve the quality of research is to improve the capability in the field of methodology (Kurde, 2005).

Efforts to implement this methodology often cause problems. Researchers are often required to carry out some pragmatic considerations concerning research procedures, time for research, institutional networks and other funding related matters. So it is not uncommon among researchers to rush to commit to one of the methods before they take the time to consider the appropriate list of methods in revealing the research issues they are studying (Brannen, 2005). In addition to the issue of consideration of funding, time and energy, many of the researchers assume that one method can not be complementary to other methods because of the vastly different theoretical perspective gap, so attempts to integrate the two methods in taste are almost impossible. Then what about the idea of combining two or more methods ?, whether by combining qualitative and quantitative paradigms in research can streamline funding issues, research time and research effort ?.

Regarding the dichotomy between qualitative and quantitative is actually a fairly long debate. Although actually as Bryman (2005, 96) has pointed out, none of the methods are better than other research methods, because each method does have its own advantages and disadvantages. Indeed it is good, as Burgess (in Brannen, 2005, p. 20) notes, that a researcher should be flexible and should choose a method that suits the problem studied and not base his research on only pragmatic aspects. Some institutions, especially concerning the aspect of research funding, usually require a researcher to be pragmatic, for example, requires only quantitative research because it is felt more accurate and neutral to political and economic interests, while others require qualitative such as educational institutions who want to see the phenomenon of education more natural. In addition, researchers are often troubled by the duration of the study so that quantitative selection is considered a shortcut by ignoring the qualitative data that are actually quite abundant (Miles and Huberman, 2014).

If each study has a weakness in terms of pragmatic considerations, then what about the effectiveness of funds, labor and time for mixed research ?. Regarding the length or the short duration of the study is actually not dependent on what method is used but on how a researcher can develop strategies to collect research data in a shorter time. As for the problem of its research effort, mixed researchers have easy access that is not possessed qualitatively or quantitatively, ie in terms of data collection and processing. Through a mixed method, researchers can more freely to sort out strategies in collecting and processing research data without dizzying by theoretical and paradigmatic barriers. That means, the mixed method researchers can be free to collect research data in both qualitative and quantitative form.

Actually there are many more reasons why the mixed method becomes interesting to use. As Brannen (2005, p. 2) points out, one is the fact that relatively little space is given to this problem in methodological books. Another reason that there are still few studies that use quantitative and qualitative methods in his research, especially in the field of historical education research. A third reason why this issue now draws attention is to the customs among donors, especially in the social policy arenas where there is an increasing concern for qualitative data in addition to the use of quantitative statistical data. The fourth reason concerns recent developments in both the social sciences and the humanities to open not only new developments in empirical research but also the current economic climate that makes up most of the research methods of strategic value. In addition, it would be wise for a researcher to avoid sectarian and puritan tendencies related to discipline, theoretical perspectives and methods.

DISCUSSION

Some definitions of mixed methods (Mix Methods), have emerged after the end of the dichotomy between qualitative and quantitative research. In its development, the mixed method includes various elements of method, research process, philosophy, and research design adapted from both qualitative and quantitative methods. The original definition of mixed methods came from the authors in the field of evaluation, Greene et al. (Creswell and Clark, 2018, p. 3), which emphasizes the integration of qualitative and quantitative methods and paradigms by stating:

In this study, we define the design of mixed methods as designs that include at least one quantitative method (for collecting numbers) and one qualitative method (for collecting words), in which no one type of method is inherently related to particular research paradigm.

Furthermore, Greene also adds that mixed methods are different (from qualitative and quantitative) or specifically have different ways of looking at social phenomena and phenomena by stating:

. . . which actively invites us to participate in dialogue on diverse ways of seeing and hearing, various ways to interpret the social world and varying views on what is considered important and valuable.

Another definition comes from Johnson et al. (in Creswell and Clark, 2018, pp. 5), which concludes mixed research methods as:

The type of research in which the researcher or team of researchers combines elements of quantitative and qualitative approaches (eg using qualitative and quantitative point of view, data collection, analysis, qualitative and quantitative inference) in order to produce breadth and depth in understanding and strength.

In contrast to both Greene and Johnson's definitions, Creswell and Clark (2018, pp. 7), provide their own definition of the mixed method by stating:

Mixed method research is a research design that contains philosophical assumptions and research methods. As a methodology, mixed method research involves philosophical assumptions that guide the direction of data collection and analysis as well as the mixing of qualitative and quantitative approaches in many phases of the research process. As a method, mixed-method research focuses on collecting, analyzing and mixing quantitative and qualitative data in a single study or in a series of studies. The main premise is the use of quantitative and qualitative approaches, in an integrated manner, providing a better understanding of the problem of research than with only one type of approach.

In addition, the definitions of Tashakkori and Tedlie (2010, pp. 29), which may be somewhat different from some previous definitions, he says:

The mixed research method is a pragmatic-paradigmatic product that combines qualitative and quantitative approaches in every stage of its research process.

Furthermore, Tashakkori and Teddlie (2010, pp. 67- 69), citing Denzin further direct the term mixed method with triangulation. Although in its development, the mixed method has its own distinct form of qualitative as well as quantitative. From some of the above definitions it seems understandable that the mixed method is a combination of qualitative and quantitative methods (both in terms of design, procedure and data analysis), which are pragmatic-paradigmatic in view of phenomena and phenomena, which in its development stage have their own distinct forms from both qualitative and quantitative research.

Mixed Research Design

Having understood the notion of mixed methods, the next step required by the researchers is to choose between mixed research designs that are perceived in accordance

with the intent or purpose of the research. According to Creswell (2014, pp. 316 - 325), there are six kinds of designs that can be chosen by researchers in conducting a mixed study including:

a. Sequential explanatory design

A sequential explanatory design is a design that is applied by making quantitative data collection and analysis in the first stage followed by collecting and analyzing qualitative data in the second stage constructed based on preliminary quantitative results. Weight or priority is given to quantitative data. The process of mixing data in this design occurs when the initial quantitative results inform the process of collecting qualitative data. For this reason, these two types of data are separate, but keep in touch. The advantage of this design is that it is easy to describe and report. While the main weakness lies in the length of time in data collection because it must pass two stages separately. In addition, the design will also be weak when two stages of data collection are given a balanced priority.

b. Sequential exploratory design

This design is similar to the previous design, only the data collection and analysis phase is reversed. Sequential exploratory design involves the collection and analysis of qualitative data in the first stage, followed by the collection and analysis of quantitative data in the second stage based on the first-stage results. The weight or priority is more likely in the first stage and the mixing process between the two methods occurs when the researchers connect between qualitative data analysis and quantitative data collection. The superiority of this design is appropriate when used by researchers who wish to explore a phenomenon, but also wish to extend its qualitative findings. The weakness is the same with sequential explanatory, ie the implementation of research becomes longer because it must pass a relatively long time in completing the stages of data collection.

c. Sequential transformative design

The design consists of two distinct data collection phases, one step following another, as well as two previous sequential designs. Sequential transformative design is a two-stage project (either quantitative or qualitative or otherwise) with a particular theoretical perspective (such as gender, race, emancipation and other social theories)

that help shape the procedures within it. The process of mixing methods occurs when researchers combine between two research methods, as is the case in exploratory and explanatory designs. However, unlike exploratory and explanatory, in a transformative design, researchers must use a particular theoretical perspective to guide their research. The advantages of this design is to facilitate researchers to apply, describe and report the results of his research even though it takes quite a long time. While the disadvantage is the difficulty of books or sources that include the design especially about how the transformative vision is used to guide the research method.

d. The design of concurrent triangulation

In the design of concurrent triangulation, researchers collect quantitative and qualitative data concurrently (at a time), then compare the two databases to determine whether there is convergence, differences or some combination. Mixing methods occur when researchers reach the stage of interpretation and discussion. Mixing is done by merging two research data into one (such as transforming one data type into another data type so that both can be easily compared). The advantage of this design is that it can produce substantive and completely validated discoveries. In addition, the data collection process only takes a relatively short time because the quantitative and qualitative data can be collected simultaneously at a time in the research site. While the shortcomings, this design requires the efforts and expertise of the researchers to study the phenomenon with two different methods.

e. Concurrent embedded design

As with any concurrent triangulation design, concurrent embedded design can also be characterized as a mixed-method design that applies one stage of quantitative and qualitative data collection at a time. However, what distinguishes embedded designs with triangulation is that embedded designs comprise both primary and secondary methods, in which less dominant secondary methods are grafted into more dominant methods. Mixing of data occurs when the researcher compiles one data source with another data source, usually this mixing appears in many sections of the discussion. The advantage of this design is that qualitative and quantitative data can be collected simultaneously, so that researchers can gain broader perspectives from different data types in one study. The downside is that researchers must first transform

the data from these two methods into categories so that the data can be combined in the analysis phase.

f. Concurrent transformative design

Like sequential transformative designs, concurrent transformative designs are also applied by collecting quantitative and qualitative data simultaneously and based on specific theoretical perspectives. Such perspectives can be oriented to ideologies such as critical theory, advocacy, participatory research or on a particular conceptual framework. The mixing process in this design occurs when researchers merge, connect or plug two different data. Because these concurrent transformative designs share features with embedded designs and concurrent triangulations, the three designs also share their respective advantages and disadvantages, but concurrent transformative designs have more value because unlike the previous two concurrent designs, concurrent transformative research has been put a mixed method in a transformative framework that makes it seem attractive to researchers who want to use a transformative perspective to guide their research.

Implementation in Historical Education Research

Given that the study in history education is not a purely educational science that demands a possible natural emphasis on the phenomenon of education is also not pure history that sometimes requires accurate data such as Cliometry and Quanto-History. Then mixing qualitative and quantitative data in conducting historical education research may indeed be necessary. Indeed, none of the research methods are superior to other research methods. Each has advantages and disadvantages, so that the choice of a research method is no longer due to a paradigmatic perspective but rather to pragmatic goals. In this case, historical researchers may need to understand that the subject to be examined is not a measurable, compared and generalized natural object as in experimental research. The subject of his research is also not a social society that demands the existence of analytic criticism as well as the transformative roles that stem from critical social theories. Subjects in historical education research are students and natural classrooms who need to also be treated in order to achieve educational goals.

It may be rather difficult for historical education researchers to use two research methods at once. In addition to spending a lot of time, mixed research also requires

executives to have multiple abilities both in terms of qualitative data analysis using many words as well as quantitative analysis that requires numbers. These can be weaknesses for mixed research, but as a method, mixed research offers a variety of designs or designs that historical education researchers can choose to carry out in their research. Where historical researchers can weigh their abilities, a sequential explanatory plan may be the right choice for historical education researchers who master quantitative data so as to make the qualitative data only as a complement or vice versa by using a sequential exploratory plan. For historical education researchers who are happy with the approaches of social theories, sequential or concurrent transformative is the right choice.

CONCLUSION

The research of mixed methods emerged as a third force amid a long debate between qualitative and quantitative research methods. Although in the beginning the mixed methods of research were nothing more than attempts to integrate and reconcile between qualitative and quantitative research methods through triangulation, but in subsequent developments, the method of mixed research found its own distinct form of qualitative and quantitative research. Although up to now researchers from both qualitative and quantitative persuasions have remained adamant to the differences between the two methods, often among their research results which eventually end up polarizing them. Even the paradigmatic theoretical differences among researchers now lead to pragmatic aspects rather than maintaining puritanical attitudes.

The things that are often the main consideration of researchers are not far from the consideration of funding, time and how much effort is done in collecting research data. This problem may be a disadvantage for mixed research but these may actually be addressed through appropriate research strategies and procedures. Several designs in the mixed study, offering a consideration for prioritizing among the quantitative-qualitative, in which they can be given both weight and priority (QUAN-qual or quan-QUAL). For researchers in the field of historical education, mixed research may be a complicated study, since it requires researchers to have multiple skills, but it can still be resolved through several designs on a mixed method in which historical education researchers can choose which method will rank the priority between qualitative and quantitative in its incorporation.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Brannen, J. (2005). “Menggabungkan Pendekatan Kualitatif dan Pendekatan Kuantitatif: Sebuah Tinjauan”, dalam *Memadu Metode Penelitian: Kualitatif dan Kuantitatif*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar. Translated by Kurde, N. A., Safe’i, I. & Noorhaidi, A. H.
- Brannen, J. (2005). “Pendahuluan”, dalam *Memadu Metode Penelitian: Kualitatif dan Kuantitatif*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar. Translated by Kurde, N. A., Safe’i, I. & Noorhaidi, A. H.
- Bryman, A. (2005). “Penelitian Kuantitatif dan Kualitatif: Pemikiran Lebih Lanjut tentang Penggabungannya, dalam *Memadu Metode Penelitian: Kualitatif dan Kuantitatif*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar. Translated by Kurde, N. A., Safe’i, I. & Noorhaidi, A. H.
- Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative and Mixed Methods Approaches*. California: Sage Publications. Translated by Fawaid, A. (2014). *Research Design: Pendekatan Kualitatif, Kuantitatif dan Mixed*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- Creswell, J. W. & Clark, V. L. P. (2011). *Designing and Conducting Mixed Methods Research*. California: Sage Publications. Translated by Lazuardi, A. L. (2018). *Mendesain dan Melaksanakan Mixed Methods Research*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- Tashakkori, A. & Teddlie, Ch. (1998). *Mixed Methodology: Combining Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*. California: Sage Publications. Translated by Priadi, B. P. (2010). *Mixed Methodology: Mengombinasikan Pendekatan Kualitatif dan Kuantitatif*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- Kurde, N. A. (2005). “Sambutan”, dalam *Memadu Metode Penelitian: Kualitatif dan Kuantitatif*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar. Translated by Kurde, N. A., Safe’i, I. & Noorhaidi, A. H.
- Miles, M. B. & Huberman, A. M. (1992). *Qualitative Data Analysis*. California: Sage Publications. Translated by Rohidi, T. R. (2014). *Analisis Data Kualitatif: Buku Sumber tentang Metode-metode Baru*. Jakarta: UI Press