

CHAPTER III

METHOD OF THE STUDY

3.1. Research Approach

In analyzing the conversation among the English department students of faculty of humanities, Airlangga University, the writer uses Conversation Analysis (CA) approach. This method is quite similar with qualitative approach but it can be differentiated from qualitative approach. Anita Pomerantz and B.J. Fehr, (1997, p.66) made a differentiation about CA into three ways. First differentiation is CA avoids using researcher's theory and concept that occur in research question. In this case, the researcher is not allowed to establish the theory or concept in research question and also some hypothesis about what will happen before analyzing the data. In CA the researcher should start from the data, such as what the researcher can find and make an interpretation from the data that relevant with the theory. On the other side, the researcher still can not avoid having some assumption before she or he analyzes the data, since CA does not allow him or her to use that assumption as the basic theory applied in analyzing the data.

Second, CA focuses on the temporally organization of talk in interaction. The researcher tries to analyze how the structure of talk occurs in the social interaction. What participants themselves orient during their talk and how far the participants aware about the rules applied in their interaction.

Third, the rule concept in CA is different from the other research approach, CA does not create an assumption first about the conversation, it is

really what is happened and occurred in the social action. CA tries to understand the conversation that occurs around a locally managed situation (pomerantz&fehr, 1997).

They also added that CA prefers working from the records to be analyzed, since the data are in the spoken conversation form. As certain features of the details of actions in interaction are not recoverable in any other way, from recording the data, it is impossible for the researcher to play and replay the interactions, and then from recording, he or she can also check a particular analysis against the materials and return to an interaction that the researcher is interested to analyze.

The differentiation between CA with the qualitative research is in qualitative research generally uses participant observation and unstructured interview which permit access to individual meaning on the context of ongoing daily life (Burns, 2000, p.388). On the other hand, CA does not require the detail knowledge of participants' identities, their routines or their beliefs, but the talk itself is very pleasure as containing everything relevant for analysis (Cameron, 2001, p.88).

3.2. Subject and Setting

In this study, the important thing to analyze is the structure of the conversation. Therefore, the writer only focuses on the structure of the interaction in conversation. The subjects of this study are the English Department students in faculty of humanities, Airlangga University. The writer took the data on October

2010. The subjects or participants are not only male students but also female students, the conversation occurred between two students or in group. The writer does not limit the number and the gender of the participant that included in conversation because the writer should get the data naturally, so the writer lets what would be occur in conversations naturally as well. However, the writer limits the participants' social background by only recording the writer's friends because it is the writer surroundings and emphasizes that the conversation is naturally occurring between friends. The writer took a conversation that occurred in the waiting seats in the first, second and third floor in the faculty of Humanities. The conversation occurred when the students were waiting for a class.

3.3. Data Transcription

According to Schegloff for CA the first observation is that we start not from the names of types of action, not from classes of actions but from singular bit of data. Each in its embedding context, seek out what-in that instance- the speaker appeared to be doing, and what in the talk and other conduct underwrote or conveyed that was what being done (p.8, 2007). Therefore the writer tries to do the same thing as Schegloff did. Since data transcription is very important in this research, it has to have detail transcription. The writer transcribed the data by using Schegloff's CA transcription which is developed by Gail Jefferson.

3.3.1 Quality of Recording

There are several difficulties in recording the data since the writer needs to get natural data. Therefore, in collecting the data the writer did not tell the participants that their conversation would be recorded. Especially in the waiting seats, there are so many students in this place and also very crowded therefore it makes the sound of the surrounding area sound louder than the speaker or there was an overlap between the back sound and the speaker's sound (participant) so the writer should get closer and put right the mobile phone in front of the participant. However, the writer was still being able to get the speaker's utterances. Recording is very important also in Conversation Analysis, Anita Pomerantz and B.J Fehr state several reason; first, certain features of the details of actions interaction are not recoverable in any other way. Second, a recording makes it possible to play and replay the interaction which is important both for transcribing and for developing an analysis. Third, a recording makes it possible to check a particular analysis against the materials, in all their detail, that were used to produce the analysis, finally, a recording makes it possible to return to an interaction with new analytic interests.

3.3.2 Quality of Transcription

The writer transcribed the data by herself because with doing this, the writer can catch the words easier and can interpret the situation of the conversation. According to Ten Have good transcription are those that are able to capture and preserve the phenomena that arise from the study (1999). Therefore,

when the writer found difficulties in transcribing the data, the writer might confirm it with the speaker (participant). Beside, the quality of the recording is still influenced by the writer's ability and limitation. As according to Psathas and Anderson (1999), a transcription is altered by a researcher's ability and limitation.

3.4. Technique of Data Collection

The writer chose the participants who were the students of Airlangga University and the students also used Indonesian language when they made a conversation. The writer also had chosen her friends that she was familiar with. The writer recorded the conversation secretly; since she needs a natural conversation for her data. First the writer joined the group which gathered in the hall of faculty of humanities, second floor and the third floor outside the classroom, second the writer recorded the conversation while the writer was observing and listening to the conversation. After recording, then the writer asked participant's permission to use the recording for data analyzing in her thesis. At the first time the writer use Audiovisual recording but then it was changed into Audio recording of mobile phone feature. The first time the writer took a record, the writer use Audiovisual recording because the writer thought it can be useful for the writer in transcribing the data, since the writer can see the speaker from the video. The writer used ETI Camcorder from her mobile phone to record the conversation. Actually, using audiovisual recorder makes the recording more difficult because the writer should not only focus on the conversation but also to the participant. The writer can not sit or stand closer to the participant because she

should get the face of the participant. After the writer tried to hear the recording, the sound of the participant is not very clear so for the next recording the writer only focus on the conversation by using sound recorder without taking their video. In the recording the writer was not involved in the conversation because in CA the data should be natural, so the writer thought if she was involved in the conversation it would make the conversation unnatural because the writer knows about the theory. And to make the conversation more natural at the first time the writer did not tell the participant that their conversation was being recorded but after that the writer told them and ask their permission to use the conversation record. Regarding the time of the recording session, the writer does not give limitation because the writer tries to take a conversation naturally so the recording sometimes running until 2 minutes or more for each conversation.

Actually, the writer was not included in the conversation since the writer wants to obtain natural conversation. According to Pomerantz and B.J Fehr (1997) when the writers does an observation, a researcher may or may not be a participant/observer in the scene and/or may or may not use a recording device. However the writer observes conduct, it is important to consider whether and how the writer's and/or the recording device's presence may be related to the observed conduct (Anita Pomerantz and B.J Fehr, 1997). The writer did not ask the participants' permission to record their conversation in order to be natural. However, the writer asked the participant's permission to analyze their conversation after recording. The participants were not only consists of the writer's close friends, but also the writer's extended friends. The relationship still

influence the way of the writer chooses the participant but does not influence the result of the data analysis, because the analysis focuses on the data transcriptions. Almost the conversation is done in informal language because this conversation was done between close friends but it is possible for the participant to make the conversation in formal language. In this research the writer focuses on the conversation that used Indonesian language.

3. 5. Technique of Data Analysis

First, the writer transcribed the data conversation using CA transcription from Atkinson & Heritage's (1984). Second, the writer classified the data based on theory proposed by Schegloff about sequences organization (offers and requests) and made table to ease the classifications, and then tried to find which the significance feature to be written down. Third, after classifying the data, the writer interpreted the data based on Schegloff's theory. Then, according to the theory the sequence organization that occurred in the conversation will be explored and analyzed. Finally, the writer will compare the conversation to find the differences and the similarities pattern of the sequences organization (offers and request) based on Schegloff and the result of this analysis will be reported in this paper.

CHAPTER IV

DISCUSSION