CHAPTER III

METHOD OF THE STUDY

3. 1. Research Approach

In observing the activity of conversation among the students of English Department Faculty of Humanities Airlangga University, the writer conducted the research using Conversation Analysis (CA) approach. The writer thinks that 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).

3. 2   Subjects and Settings

The data of this study was one interaction at the cafeteria of Faculty of Humanities Airlangga University on October 15, 2008 from 13.30 until 13.35 which was done by the writer and friends. The writer thought it was enough to use only one interaction to do this study. The reason for choosing only one interaction was because CA utilizes 'specimen perspective' (ten Have, 1999:50). Specimen perspective sees a reality or phenomenon to be studied as something that is observable with the specimen at hand. The specimen looks at 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.

The data is a conversation consists of the writer and his three close friends as the participants. In the conversation they talk about many topics because the context of the utterance is in informal situation.

3.2.1 Subjects

The subjects of this study were female and male students of English Department of Faculty of Humanities Airlangga University. At the beginning the writer was planning to record only female students and each group of conversation may consist of 2, 3, 4 or even more female students. But it was not appropriate with the theory which has to be analyzed. The writer had recorded two conversations with total 10 subjects but he decided to use one conversation which was taken at the cafeteria of Faculty of Humanities Airlangga University because the conversation attached with the "Invitation" sequences, "Offer" sequences and "Request" sequences pattern. All the subjects were the writer's friends and even close friends. The reason for choosing close friends was because formal or informal conversations mostly happen among them. The closer the relationship is the more personal the topic that can be brought up. The writer thought that talking about other's people business is a very personal topic, so it can be achieved only when the participants have a very close relationship. In this case, the mother language of all participants is Indonesian but the languages used in conversation are varied from Indonesian and also Javanese.

3.2.2 Settings

Conversation is a kind of informal interaction which mostly happened in the informal place. As the writer had mentioned earlier, at the beginning of recording of the data, the writer recorded two interactions which happened around the building of Faculty of Humanities such as in cafeteria, reading room, and the waiting seats in second floor. These three places are places where students usually interact and socialize with others in campus. As it can be expected, we can find many the activity of gossiping done by the students.

As stated above, the writer only analyzed the conversation that he recorded at cafeteria in Faculty of Humanities Airlangga University on October 15, 2008 from 13.30 PM until 13.35 PM.

3.3. Instrument

The writer used voice recorder from his mobile phone as the instrument to record the data and after that he put the data into transcriptions. However, the writer always involve in the conversation, since the writer used his own friends as the participants and they did not know that their conversations were being recorded. The reason for not letting the subjects know that the conversation was being recorded was because the writer thought that knowing it would make the conversation unnatural. Being an active participant enabled the writer to observe the context of the situation, to get better understanding of any conversational behaviour that happened during the interaction. 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 at canteen of Faculty of Humanities Airlangga University. All the data have not been transcribed by the writer into English in order to make the data analysis looks natural although it is not easy to understand. 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 recorded, the writer only chooses the one that was taken at canteen of Faculty of Humanities Airlangga University on 15, 2008 from 13.30 P.M until 13.35 P.M which done by the writer and his three friends. The interaction also had many different topics and the speakers developed the topic every time when the other participants start to gossiping or talking about someone's business. If the writer recorded in longer time, the differences are only in the number of the subjects are talked about. Due

to the specimen perspective on sampling as adopted by CA, they follow the same pattern of interaction, thus it is not necessary to prolong the recording time.

3.4.1. Quality of Recording

In spite of the fact that there were several difficulties in producing the recording because of there were many people in the second floor and sometimes the people in the surrounding area sound louder than the speaker, 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 from 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 used 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.

3.5. Technique of Data Collection

The writer did the recording for three times; in the reading room, in the classroom, and in canteen of Faculty of Humanities one times each place. After listening to all the conversation, he decided to use the conversation which was taken in canteen because it attached the sequence theory that used by the writer. The writer used his mobile phone as the recorder to tape the conversation.

3.6. Technique of Data Analysis

After the data is complete, the data will be analyzed using Conversation Analysis theory by Schegloff. First, the recording will be examined to find the significance features to be written down. The data that is going to be analyzed is

the written data taken from the recording. The written data will contain the information about the conversation features clearly. Then, the sequences organizations in the conversation are being explored and analyzed. After the data being analyzed, the writer compared the conversation to find the differences of the sequences pattern organization. The result will be reported in this paper in the form of words. The written data is also shown to make the reader comprehend the analysis clearly. Last, the conclusion is drawn based on the findings.

To sum up, the data are analyzed with steps below:

1. Recording the conversation.

2. Examining the recording.

3. Interpreting the data in written form.

4. Analyzing the sequence organization pattern in the recorded conversation

5. Comparing between recorded conversation (Javanese conversation) and English conversation in order to find the similarities and differences of sequence pattern used.

6. Concluding the findings.

CHAPTER IV

DATA PRESENTTATION AND ANALYSIS