Determining Research Participants & Profiles of Research Participants: A Narrative Inquiry Writing Scientific Papers for Doctoral Research in Indonesia

Oktariyani Oktariyani[1*], Yumna Rasyid[2], Ratna Dewanti[3]

[1,] Jakarta State University, Jakarta, Indonesia.
[1] Nahdlatul Ulama University Lampung, Lampung, Indonesia.
[2,] Jakarta State University, Jakarta, Indonesia.
[3,] Jakarta State University, Jakarta, Indonesia.

```
*oktariyani 9906921025@mhs.unj.ac.id;
oktariyani@unulampung.ac.id; yumna.rasyid@unj.ac.id;
               rdewanti@unj.ac.id
```

Abstract. This article describes the procedure for gaining access to study sites through researchers' narrative inquiry investigations. The procedure included the researcher holding three meetings with student and teacher participants, with the help of the school administrator, to explain the research project that had been ethically approved by the Human Research Ethics Review Board, go over informed consent, and hand out consent forms. The author contends that these findings and discussions in this project offer a specific illustration of how to describe the procedure for obtaining research locations so that students can apply them in their methodology section final projects. They are also very likely to be helpful for researchers in Indonesia in particular and researchers worldwide in general.

Keywords: Narrative Inquiry, Ethics research, access negotiation.

1 Introduction

In Indonesia, academics do not know much about ethics in research. Based on the results of a survey by Widodo, (2015) reported that the scientific work of students in Indonesia, both from the undergraduate, master to doctoral levels, their final project, has not fulfilled the principles of research ethics for scientific work. These principles are offered by French (1987) as guidelines for ethical attitudes in research: 1) researchers need to see the importance of issues of justice and freedom in real social science; 2) researchers should be careful about using the term 'scientific'; 3) the researcher should have greater epistemological awareness (as opposed to technical skills), including openness to alternative modes of understanding; 4) pay attention to the impact of research; a deliberate attempt to break down the dichotomy between

theory and practice; 5) and consideration of the possibility of affirmative action in the distribution of resources; 6) consider the benefits of research.

Since this topic hasn't been extensively investigated by academics and researchers in Indonesia, the main focus of this research is a narrative study on how to secure and negotiate access to research venues and identify how to get research participants. The aim of this study is to explain how to acquire and negotiate access to research venues and recruit research participants in accordance with the ethical norms of scientific research. In this study, two questions were posed, namely:Q1: How to obtain and negotiate research site access?

Q2: How to determine research participants & profile of research participants?

These inquiries were made in order to gather a thorough and accurate story that complied with research ethics norms, so they could set an example for academics in Indonesia when it came to producing ethical scientific studies.

2 Theoretical review

2.1 Narrative Inquiry

The study of how people perceive the world is known as narrative studies (Bruce, 2008). Stories show how people learn from experience and take action. We use stories to interpret our experiences and give our life purpose (Chase, 1995). We create stories to describe our lives. Stories sculpt us as well. They play a crucial role in the development of our identities and aid in our self-awareness. We learn from stories, and they also help us make sense of the world. We can access other people's meaning-making processes through their stories (Witherell & Noddings, 1991). Investigators of narratives gather and present tales. They discuss and detail events and life in their writing (O'Toole, 2018). People naturally live storied lives and tell tales about them, but narrative scholars describe such lives, gather and share their stories, and compose narratives of events, as noted by O'Toole (2018).

Due to the connection between life history and learning, narrative inquiry is used in educational research (Atkinson, 2009). According to Craig (2009), narrative inquiry is the study of people's perspectives on people, places, and things from the perspective of the researchers themselves. It is a "multi-layered and widely dispersed form of investigation" as a result. According to Elbaz-Luwisch (2010), inquiry narratives concentrate on the human experience and reflect internally and externally, backwards and forwards, on experiences as they manifest and manifest in context. Implementing narrative inquiry is challenging, and explaining it is equally harder (Morettini, 2019). Therefore, through this narrative inquiry-based research, we attempt to describe the processes of securing and negotiating access to research sites and recruiting research participants—processes that all researchers should be aware of because they include crucial research ethics issues.

3   Discussion

The following are answers to the research questions posed above,

Obtaining and Negotiating Access to Research Sites

Conducting formal research within an organization, such as a school, necessitates negotiating access with the school administrator, who controls access to the site and is a participating social actor who influences power relations and has the authority to decide whether a researcher is permitted to conduct research (Crowhurst, 2013). The gatekeepers in this study are school administrators. School administrators in Indonesia include a principle and four primary deputy principals: (1) curriculum matters, (2) student affairs, (3) human resources, and (4) buildings and infrastructure. These gatekeepers also serve as a bridge between participants and my function as a researcher. With these access agreements, I hope to begin the relationship-building process with the participants from the first encounter in order to establish a research relationship that provides me access to the participants' life (Dickson-Swift et al., 2007).

Initially, in late April 2023, I met with the vice principal and informed him of my fieldwork. He was my first point of contact, and I thought that by supporting my research project, he would be able to provide access to potential volunteers (Crowhurst, 2013). This formal approval is the first step toward gaining access to the venue and participants. I explained how my study project will assist teachers, students, and schools to him. Nonetheless, the vice principal informed me that the research idea would be discussed with the principal and an English teacher coordinator. He stated that because this project includes many parties, we will discuss the prospects and benefits of your research with the school principal and English teacher coordinator. Furthermore, we want you to feel really accepted as a member of our school family." [As we will include various parties in your research, we will explore the prospect of working with you and the potential benefits of your research with the principal and the English teacher coordinator. Furthermore, we would like you to be a part of our school community (personal communication, kick-off meeting, April 23, 2023). This email signaled that the school was hesitant to trust me since I was an outsider. I have no prior relationship with the school, but I am confident that the research project will assist the school because the development of vocational English (VE) materials is part of school-based curriculum innovation. Furthermore, the statement "to be a part of our school community" indicates that the school wishes for me to play an insider role.

The vice principal is viewed as a gatekeeper at the first meeting, with the ability to aid or impede a proposed research project based on his opinions or beliefs about the utility of research. Following the initial meeting, he requested me to meet with the principal and the English teacher coordinator to discuss the proposal. Negotiating access with school administrators as gatekeepers does not always aim for legitimacy in order to manipulate individuals under inquiry. This is because I am well aware that school is a socio-cultural site comprised of diverse groups comprised of individuals, and the goals of the group do not always coincide with the interests of the individuals that comprise it (Levinson, 2010). I met with them a week after my initial contact with the vice principal, and they reviewed the proposal and discussed the viability of the study. We discussed and negotiated the group of kids with whom I would work

during this meeting. For four key reasons, both school administration and teachers suggest that students in the second-year cohort (Term 2) participate in research. The first reason is because they have just completed on-the-job training and thus have work experience in firms or institutions. They will provide relevant and meaningful feedback on workplace English requirements. Second, pupils have adequate vocational knowledge, which can help them study vocational English (VE). The third reason is that first-year students concentrate on learning English for general purposes (EGP) in order to equip themselves with fundamental English skills. Another reason is that school administrators intended this project to have an influence on student learning and teacher professional development because it will run for 6 months. As a result, the school administrator, teacher coordinator, and I decided to choose Year-2 kids. We proceed to set up a meeting to recruit student participants.

Negotiating access to the site admits that schools are viewed as educational institutions with rules that I must adhere to. According to Olive et al. (2012), this negotiation creates a more reciprocal relationship between researchers and empowers research participants to construct shared knowledge throughout fieldwork as they are the real actors involved in the entire study process.

3.1 The Process of Determining Research Participants & Profile of Research Participants

With the assistance of school administrators, I held three meetings with student and teacher participants to explain research projects that had been ethically approved by the Human Research Ethics Review Board, to discuss informed consent, and to disseminate consent forms. These documents are written at an appropriate level of Indonesian to assure full comprehension of the benefits, risks, and viability of the research project. I also require that student participants obtain parental or guardian permission to participate in the study. I also underscore that their participation is entirely voluntary; participants should be informed of their right not to participate in the research if they do not wish to and that their withdrawal will not result in any intentional negative consequences (Beach & Eriksson, 2010). Ethically, research information papers and consent forms serve as legal and written documents to ensure that research participants have access to sufficient and appropriate information about the investigation and its objectives. This pre-study summary informs potential participants of the research project's focus, goals, and objectives, anticipated benefits or contributions to potential participants, level of participation, and fieldwork timelines (Widodo, 2015).

I also talked with the participants on how to use and save research data both during and after fieldwork. The goal of these talks and negotiations was to make sure that the data were representative and available to all pertinent participant groups, not to persuade them to participate for the sake of the study (Tyldum, 2012). As suggested by Flinders (as cited in Beach & Eriksson, 2010, p. 135), research initiatives adhere to ethical guidelines from multiple perspectives. The following is a list of Flinders' ethical guidelines that were adhered to in this study:

Table 1. Ethical Guidelines

	utilitarian	Deontological	relational	Ecological
recruitment	informedconsent	Reciprocity	Collaboration	Cultural sensitivity
Fieldwork	avoidance of harm	avoidance of wrong	avoidance ofimpositions	avoidance of detachment
reporting	Confidentiality	Fairness	confirmation	Responsive communication

The essence of this research is engagement and collaboration to strengthen the relationship between myself and the participants. To recruit participants, therefore, purposive sampling was used (Creswell, 2012). As indicated previously, the recruitment of these participants was based on ethical protocols to ensure that the participants' autonomy to participate was respected. The four categories of study participants are outlined in the table below.

Table 2. A List of Participants

Participants		number
1. School administrators	55-60	2
2. English teachers	34-55	6
3. Vocational subject teachers	28-36	3
4. Students:		
- accounting	16-17	57

Since 2007, school administrators, the principal, and the assistant principal for curriculum had been in charge of the school. They held master's degrees in education and were senior instructors with more than one year of experience at the school. Twenty-five years. They have witnessed the school's growth since its establishment in 1968. They have also been successful in establishing the school as a national benchmark and in obtaining ISO management system certification (ISO 9001: 2000 and 9001: 2008). This school was designated as a new international standard school in 2008, under the supervision of the school's current administrator. This form of school was able to offer secondary English instruction, but the program was discontinued in early 2013 due to criticism for a lack of English-competent subject teachers other than English teachers and students' low English proficiency (see Zacharias, 2013). Nonetheless, school administrators continue to encourage bilingual (Indonesian and English) in-

struction to maximize the use of English. School administrators exhibited exemplary school administration. Researchers recruited school administrators to provide policy-level information in order to better comprehend school programs that support the development and implementation of English curricula. This study included six English instructors. The profiles of the instructors are provided below.

Table 3. A List of Teacher Participants

Participants (Pseudonyms)	age	Years of teaching	Levels of Education	languagesSpoken	TOEFL Scores (ITP)
NO	34	10	Bachelors inEducation	Language Indonesia and Javanese	550
KY	51	20	Masters in Education	Language Indonesia and Javanese	500
YU	40	10	Masters in Education	Language Indonesia and Javanese	520
LI	36	10	Masters in Education	Language Indonesia, Madurese, and Javanese	580
SV	60	20	Masters in Education	Language Indonesia and Javanese	500
W K	45	15	Masters in Education	Language Indonesia and Javanese	520

Every English teacher receives formal and informal curriculum training. Five of the English teachers, with the exception of one, are certified government employees. This certification is granted by institutions of teacher education. Under the current national certification policy for teachers, certification must be obtained through a teaching portfolio assessment or a teacher training program conducted by one of Indonesia's 23 designated teacher education institutions. This national certification program seeks to enhance the quality and well-being of educators (Widodo, 2015). Participating teachers are members of the Subject Teacher Consultation (MGMP), a local

teacher professional organization, and receive pertinent professional training. However, none of the English instructors had specific training in the design of ESP materials. Therefore, the initiative assists them in developing ESP materials for vocational education. This endeavor is also a component of teacher professional development or professional learning at the school level.

Three of the teachers of vocational subjects worked part-time during practicum, but only two of them were program coordinators. They participate in vocational training, on-the-job training, and apprenticeship programs. The three instructors of vocational subjects are fluent in English, Indonesian, and Javanese. They obtain professional certification. This credential demonstrates a professional qualification. Additionally, they are responsible for executing English media instruction and practice. The teachers possess a bachelor's degree in social sciences, but are also certified by the Indonesian Vocational Teachers' Association as having excellent vocational knowledge and competencies. They participate in local and regional groups for the development of vocational teachers. One of the vocational instructors became the provincial editor of the vocational certification. These educators were chosen due to their extensive knowledge of vocational content or fields, which aided in the selection of vocational topics and texts.

Participating students received 11 years of formal English instruction, and their TOEIC (The Test of English for International Communication) paper placement test scores ranged from elementary to intermediate levels. All candidates must take this exam annually. These students were in their second year (Term 2, Class XI) when the fieldwork began. All pupils are proficient in two languages: Indonesian (the national lingua franca) and a regional language (such as Javanese, Madurese, or Balinese). Multiple students were proficient in Javanese, Madurese, and Indonesian. They were raised in a social milieu where members of the community have varied linguistic and cultural backgrounds. Banyuwangi's primary regional languages include Javanese, Osing, Balinese, and Madurese. Students originate from diverse socioeconomic backgrounds (e.g., civil servants, merchants, farmers, teachers, self-employed, and temporary workers).

During my six months on the job, I interacted with all participant groups daily (Monday through Friday, from 6.45 a.m. to 14.45 p.m.), as this is a required school activity. Thus, recruited administrators, instructors, and students are the participants who best represent or are knowledgeable about the research topic (Widodo, 2015).

4   Conclusion and Implications

Narrative Inquiry is a research method utilized in research education to examine lifelong learning. This strategy emphasizes individual experience as the source of knowledge and learning. It is a holistic and non-dualistic field that values subjectivity, reflection, creativity, and the exchange of emotions and experiences. This narrative inquiry highlights the significance of stories as a forum where individuals can articulate their experiences, as well as the fact that stories shape us. It clarifies the connection between personal experience and the structural issues underlying the experience.

It is aware of the force and significance of claiming one's voice and is concerned with awareness-raising. It is an ethical and empathetic research technique geared toward social, professional, and personal liberation. In conclusion, I suggest in this article that narrative inquiry is a research practice in narrating how the process of negotiating access to research sites is depicted through various means, such as involving school administrators, holding three meetings with student participants and teacher participants to describe the research project that was ethically approved by the Human Research Ethics Review Board, discuss informed consent, and distribute consent forms via operat Future researchers can expand upon this investigation, for instance by operationalizing additional research ethics principles.

5 Acknowledgment

References

1. Atkinson, B. (2009). Teachers responding to narrative inquiry: An approach to narrative inquiry criticism. *Journal of Educational Research*, *103* (2), 91–102. https://doi.org/10.1080/00220670903323461
2. Beach, D., & Eriksson, A. (2010). The relationship between ethical positions and methodological approaches: a Scandinavian perspective. *Ethnography and Education*, *5* , 129–142.
3. Bruce, EMI (2008). Narrative inquiry: A spiritual and liberating approach to research. *Religious Education* , *103* (3), 323–338. https://doi.org/10.1080/00344080802053493
4. Chase, SE (1995). *Taking narrative seriously: Consequences for method and theory in interview studies. Pp. 1–16 in The narrative study of lives: Interpreting experience. Vol. 3, edited by A. Lieblich and R. Josselson.* Sage Publications.
5. Craig, CJ (2009). Learning about reflection through exploring narrative inquiry. *Reflective Practice* , *10* (1), 105–116. https://doi.org/10.1080/14623940802652920
6. Creswell, JW (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research (4th edn.).* Pearson Education.
7. Crowhurst, I. (2013). The fallacy of the instrumental gate? Contextualizing the process of gaining access through gatekeepers. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology* , *16* , 463–475.
8. Dickson-Swift, V., James, EL, Kippen, S., & Liamputtong, P. (2007). Doing sensitive research: What challenges do qualitative researchers face? *Qualitative Research, 7* , 327–353.
9. Elbaz-Luwisch, F. (2010). Narrative inquiry: Wakeful engagement with educational experience. *Curriculum Inquiry* , *40* (2), 263–280. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-873X.2010.00481.x

10. French, E. (1987). The political aspect of research ethics in the human sciences. *South African Journal of Sociology* , *18* (1), 14–21. https://doi.org/10.1080/02580144.1987.10520044

11. Levinson, MP (2010). Accountability to research participants: Unresolved dilemmas and unraveling ethics. *Ethnography and Education* , *5* , 193–207.

12. Morettini, BW (2019). Understanding narrative inquiry. *The Journal of Educational Research* , *112* (5), 641–641. https://doi.org/10.1080/00220671.2019.1639449

13. O'Toole, J. (2018). Institutional storytelling and personal narratives: reflecting on the 'value' of narrative inquiry. *Irish Educational Studies* , *37* (2), 175–189. https://doi.org/10.1080/03323315.2018.1465839

14. Olive, R., Grote, E., Rochecouste, J., & Excell, M. (2012). Addressing the language and literacy needs of Aboriginal high school VET students who speak SAE as an additional language. *The Australian Journal of Indigenous Education* , *41* , 229-239.

15. Tyldum, G. (2012). Ethics or access? Balancing informed consent against the application of institutional, economic or emotional pressures in recruiting respondents for research. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology, 15* , 199–210.

16. Widodo, HP (2015). *The Development of Vocational English Materials from a Social Semiotic Perspective : Participatory Action Research . March* , 1–331. https://digital.library.adelaide.edu.au/dspace/bitstream/2440/97910/2/02whole.pdf

17. Witherell, C., & Noddings., N. (1991). *Prologue: An invitation to our readers." Pp. 1–12 in Stories lives tell: Narrative and dialogue in education, edited by C. Witherell, and N. Noddings.* Teacher's College Press.

18. Zacharias, NT (2013). Navigating through the English-medium-of-instruction policy: Voices from the field. *Current Issues in Language Planning, 14* , 93-108.