

CHAPTER III

METHOD OF THE STUDY

3. 1. Research Approach

In observing the communicative style produced by the lecturers from the Faculty of Letters English Department in Airlangga University, the writer conducted the research using Conversation Analysis (CA) approach. The reason he decided to use this methodology is because CA paradigm puts its interests in the aspects of conversational interactions; one of them is turn taking (Paltridge, 2000). Therefore, CA is an appropriate approach to be employed in this study. According to Schegloff (2002), CA is a micro-analytical approach that is concerned with paralinguistic features (pitch, stress, sound quality and so forth) and accounts of conduct (gesture, gazing, and interruptions).

The CA approach is different from qualitative and quantitative paradigms. The CA enterprise is different from the quantitative one because CA does not seek the correlation between variables, as the quantitative approach does. Newman (1991) stated that the language of quantitative is a language of variables and ten Have (1999) maintains that CA absolutely does not deal with the correspondence of two attributes. The CA approach is more similar to qualitative one. Ragin asserts that the qualitative approach studies common characteristics that exist across a number of cases and CA attempts to find the universalities occurring in a number of phenomenons (as cited in ten Have, 1999). In addition, the same as the qualitative tradition, CA avoids using a research question before a researcher

gains data. Ten Have states that the CA approach is the same as the qualitative one in terms of avoiding pre-design research question (1999). The preference for avoiding a research question before collecting data in CA is aimed at squeezing any phenomenon that comes out from a study. Psathas (1995) states that a conversation analyst must not close his/her mind to a new fact that possibly appears during the time of conducting a study. In order to hold that principle, this study was started out without any research question.

However, the CA paradigm can be distinguished from the qualitative one also. There is no need for a CA practitioner to gain detailed knowledge about participants' identities, daily routines and beliefs (Cameron, 2001). Quite the opposite, a qualitative analyst must gain knowledge about participants' backgrounds, positions and the like. Qualitative researcher generally uses an interview data and an idealized or invented example (based on researcher's own native institutions). However, a conversation analyst should not gather any data outside the recordings. Heritage and Atkinson stated that all these kind of data as stated above can be manipulated and ruin the analyses (in ten Have, 1999). Moreover, ten Have affirms that a CA practitioner must avoid assumptions about the data that is being studied (1999). In addition, Nevile and Walker recommended that a CA researcher avoid preconceptions of participants' mental, motivational and emotional states (2005). They add that he/she has to ground his/her analyses on the data and not on his/her suppositions. In other words, it is impossible for a CA practitioner to avoid presumptions but he/she must not theorize his/her preconceptions. To make it even clearer, a conversation analyst

attempts to explicate what happens and then, what happens next and ask ‘why that now?’” from the evidences that are provided in the conversations, instead of looking at the evidences from the researcher’s presuppositions.

Furthermore, the distinction between CA and qualitative tradition also takes place in the procedure of choosing a representative set of cases from a much larger cases. The qualitative approach employs ‘factist perspective’ while CA utilizes ‘specimen perspective’ (ten Have, 1999:50). Alaasutari states that the factist sampling is a process of selecting samples in order to represent a reality that is not directly observable (in ten Have, 1999). Therefore, the samples should provide a set of indicators for the population parameter to be estimated. On the other hand, specimen perspective sees a reality/phenomenon to be studied as something that is observable with the specimen at hand. Put in plain words, the factist perspective sees a specimen as a form of research material that is treated as a reflection of the phenomena while the specimen one looks at it as a part of the realities being examined (ten Have, 1999). Therefore, there is no need for a CA researcher to propose a statistical sampling to find valid population parameters.

Different from other research tradition, the paradigm neither employs a theory to organize its argument nor proposes theory of its own (ten Have, 1999). However, CA utilizes logic of induction as qualitative does (ten Have, 1999:31). Ragin stated that the induction is a process of using evidences to formulate or reformulate a general idea (in ten Have, 1999). The same as the qualitative paradigm that employs the logic of induction, CA cannot ignore the negative findings termed ‘deviant cases’ (ten Have, 1999). Mc Call and Simmons stated

that the goal of the analytic induction is to arrive at universal statement for which deviant cases are treated seriously (in ten Have, 1999). In other words, the CA enterprise sees that any deviant case that comes up from a study is a serious challenge.

However, pointing back to the statement above, a CA study is not conducted to develop a theory. On the contrary, it is a qualitative study that is done with the intention of developing a theory or comparing patterns with other theories (Cresswell, 1994). The CA paradigm just attempts to find out the orderliness of conversation. As asserted by Heritage, the bottom line of CA's tasks is to reveal the regularity of conversation (in ten Have, 1999).

3. 2. Subjects and Settings

The data of this study are two interactions at structure and writing class. The writer thinks that it is enough for using two interactions to do this study. The reason for choosing two interactions is because CA utilizes 'specimen perspective' (ten Have, 1999:50). Specimen perspective sees a reality/phenomenon to be studied as something that is observable with the specimen at hand. The specimen looks at it/the phenomenon as a part of the realities being examined. Therefore, there is no need for a CA researcher to propose a statistical sampling to find valid population parameters but at the same time, the result of the study can still be generalized to the whole of the population.

3.2.1. Subjects

The subjects of this study are female and male lecturers of English Department of Faculty of Letters Airlangga University.

3.2.2. Settings

As the writer has stated above, he analyzed the conversation that he recorded at class in Faculty of Letters Airlangga University. The writer recorded the teaching session of male lecturer in writing class. And the teaching session of female lecturer was recorded in structure class.

3. 3. Instrument

The writer used voice recorder from his mobile phone as the instrument to help his record the data and after that he put the data into transcriptions. For each conversation, the writer did not give time limitation; since each participant could take about 2, 3, up to 5 minutes or more to talk.

The data collection took place in the campus of Airlangga University Surabaya in the class of Faculty of Letters. Data transcription is done by following the CA convention as developed by Ochs et al. (in Schegloff, 2000) to show the linguistic features that appeared in the conversation. After the data transcription is finished, the writer began to analyze the data.

3. 4. Data Transcription

There are two reasons why the transcription holds a very important role in CA approach. First, it can help the researcher and readers in attending to the details of the interaction that escapes ordinary listeners (ten Have, 1999). Second, it can assist an analyst in noticing and discovering particular phenomena (Heath & Luff in ten Have, 1999). Due to those statements, the writer transcribed the recorded data. However, the writer did not use all the data he recorded, he chose two that taken in class in Faculty of Letters Airlangga University.

In the process of transcribing the data, the writer paid heed to the subsequent issues:

3.4.1. Quality of Recording

In spite of the fact that there are several difficulties in producing the recording because there were many students in the class and sometimes the students were talking with their friends who sit next to them, but still the writer can catch most of the words of all participants. The mobile phone as the recorder was put right in front of the participants so that it can ensure the quality of the recorded interactions.

3.4.2. Quality of Transcription

Good transcriptions are those that are able to capture and preserve the phenomena that arise from the study (ten Have, 1999). Psathas and Anderson maintain that a transcription is altered by a researcher's ability and limitation (in

ten Have, 1999). Therefore, they recommended that an analyst do the transcription by himself/herself. Due to this recommendation, the writer transcribed the data by himself to gain greater insight into the data, even though the process of capturing, preserving and rendering the phenomena from recorded data into the written form is influenced by his ability and limitation.

3.4.3. Transcription Convention

In CA, the transcription system is specially designed to reveal the sequential feature of talks (ten Have, 1999). Conversation analyst generally transcribes their recordings by means of transcription convention developed and elaborated by Gail Jefferson (1978). This conversation can show not only what has been said but also how it has been said (Nevile & Walker, 2005). Therefore, the writer in this study uses the transcription convention that is elaborated by Ochs, Schegloff & Thompson (in Schegloff, 2000). Ochs, Schegloff & Thompson stated that this convention derives from the one of Gail Jefferson, but it is completed with several features to get better analyses of the data (in Schegloff, 2000). The transcription convention of Ochs et al is provided in appendix 1.

3.4.4. Notes on the Elements of Transcription

Notes on the elements of the transcription of this study are as follows (ten Have, 1999, pp. 78-89):

a. Time, date and place of the recording

These facets are included in the beginning of the transcription of each interaction.

b. Identification of the participants

The writer changed the name of the speakers and the person who's being talked about on the conversation for the sake of the ethics codes. ten Have advises that conversation analysts change the background of the participants (1999).

c. Words as spoken

Psathas and Anderson stated that a CA researcher has to capture the actual words as spoken in written form (in ten Have, 1999). They recommend that one render the words spoken in standard orthography. Nonetheless, the writer does not employ standard orthography in rendering the uttered words. To support his decision, the writer takes the arguments of ten Have. ten Have asserts that the standard orthography may ignore language variations as well as everyday informalities that are relevant for the analysis. ten Have also adds that it cannot squeeze many interesting phenomena coming out from the data (1999). Doing this study, the writer adapts the transcription of Ochs et. al instead (in Schegloff, 2000). The writer decision is the same as what ten Have recommends. ten Have

suggests that a CA practitioner utilize one's transcription style in rendering the spoken words (1999).

d. Sounds as uttered

Sounds are transcribed by means of transcription convention whenever possible. However, when such sounds are not part of the utterances or are non-vocal sounds for the most parts, they are not transcribed but shown in double brackets.

e. Inaudible sounds/words

It is quite frequent that some vocal sounds are out of earshot or indistinct. These sounds are placed between brackets. If it is possible, CA researchers guess the words/sounds by looking at the context and put them between brackets.

e. Spaces/silences/pauses

The writer did not pay much attention to the duration of spaces/silences/pauses because this study focuses on the conversational features that appeared in the data not the turn-taking.

f. Overlapped speech/sounds

Square brackets are used to denote the overlapping speeches and sounds while the ends of the overlapping speeches are marked by using closing brackets.

g. Intonation/stress

The same as the reason for transcribing words, marking intonation/stress is considered problematic. The writer does marking every distinctive intonation/stress even though, this practice depends on her perception greatly and her interpretation of such intonations/stresses.

3.5. Technique of Data Collection

The writer did recording for one time; in the structure and writing class. The writer divided the recorded data into 2 conversations. In conversation 1, the subject or the person was discuss about structure skill, and conversation 2 the subject was discuss about writing skill.

3.6. Technique of Data Analysis

In analyzing the data, the writer did the following steps. First, the writer transcribed the data using Conversation Analysis convention. Second, the writer focused on the presenting of the findings of conversation features which appeared in the conversation, such as minimal responses, hedges, questions, commands and directives. Then the writer analyzed the functions of these conversation features

on the communication style between female and male lecturers of English
Department Airlangga University.