

## **III. METHOD**

In this chapter, the method of the research will be discussed. The parts of methodology such as : design; subject; data; and data analysis will be explained further.

### **3.1. Design**

The present study is an observational case study as the objectives can be achieved through observation. An observational case study is a study that focuses on a particular organisation or some aspect of the organisation, like a specific group of people (Bogdan and Biklen, 1982).

In this research, the group of people who are counted as subjects shares the same characteristics: age; educational background; ethnicity; and capability to use English in daily life communication. From the observation that was done among the subjects, the spoken and written utterances from the subject were elicited. However, for the conversational writing situation, it was impossible to observe the subjects actions. In short, the observation stood only for collecting spoken utterances in interactional speaking.

As the data were obtained through observation, the researcher took a role as a participant-observer because he elicited the data and observed the facts by

interacting with his subjects. The interactions took place in informal situations with the natural setting, because the data were elicited in any possible situation in the daily life.

This research was a longitudinal study. Based on the term proposed by Ingram (1989 in Raja, 2003) that in a longitudinal study, a definitely particular goal has been decided in advance before data collection which may last for quite long period of time. In this research, the goals were set and limited to the similarities based on the previously formulated research questions. The data collection also took quite a period of time. Two months before the proposal of this research was presented in the seminar, the data collection began. The process of data collection was then extended up to four months after the seminar. In total, six months were spent for data collection.

In practice, the researcher was frequently engaged in a conversation with the two subjects. There was no specific timing for data elicitation, so this process went pretty straightforward as how the subjects usually interact in campus life. In the beginning, the researcher wanted to elicit the data as often as possible, but such way was found to be ineffective. Then the elicitation went more steadily, not more than three conversations were done in a week. The basic reason for this is avoiding fabricated language, which is regarded as non-natural language. As hard as possible, the researcher attempted not to elicit the data when the subjects were found to have just read a book or watched a movie in order to avoid utterances that were heavily influenced by them.

In conclusion, this study was planned and done as an observational case study and longitudinal study that aimed at finding the similarities, in the level of words, utterance, and speech acts, between subjects' written and spoken utterances in daily informal interaction.

## **3.2. Subjects**

There were two types of subject in this research, the primary and secondary subjects. The primary subjects involved were students of English Language Education Department of Lampung University with sufficient level of fluency and accuracy in both written and spoken language and actively using English in daily life. The secondary subject in this research was the researcher himself who acted as a participant-observer. Those subjects were chosen through homogenous purposive sampling method that focuses, reduces variation, simplifies analysis, and facilitates group interviewing (Patton, 1990).

### **3.2.1. Primary Subjects**

The first primary subject in this research was a twenty-one-year-old man named L. He had been well known for his well-balanced capability in using English in both spoken and written situation, and importantly, he never hesitates to use the language in every possible situation.

His first language is 'ngoko' Javanese, and his second language was informal Bahasa Indonesia and he speaks English as foreign language. He is

currently a student of English Education Department, together with R (another primary subject) and G (secondary subject, participant-observer), the three are in one class. Another primary subject was R. He acquired the same languages as L. Similar to the first primary subject, this subject also speaks English in every possible situation.

Therefore, the two of them were taken as primary subjects because they shared similarities in backgrounds and capability in using English as foreign language.

### **3.2.2. Secondary Subject**

The secondary subject in this research was the researcher himself. G was born on December 31<sup>st</sup>, 1992. He is a Chinese-Javanese descendant, but he does not speak Chinese. This subject speaks 'ngoko' Javanese as his foreign language and informal Bahasa Indonesia as his first language. Another language he has is English which he got when he was placed in an English course when he was twelve of age. No real problem for him in using this language in both written and oral.

As he had a role to play, as a participant-observer, he was involved in interactions with subjects. He played the role by becoming a talking partner for the primary subjects. Both primary and secondary subjects were involved in many conversations, in canteen, campus, and dorms, also on social media and cell phone short messages whenever possible.

### 3.3. Data

The primary data in this research were subjects' written and spoken utterances. Any components in the utterances that were out of words, average lexical density, phrase, clause, and direct and indirect, literal and non-literal speech acts as response to secondary subject's utterances were not regarded as data. The data were considered to have shown similarities when there have been some patterned and frequent similarities in both written and spoken products during the six month period.

As how people make sense out of their lives is a major concern to qualitative researcher (Fraenkel and Wallen, 2006 : 431), subjects' perceptions of the influence of the conversational writing on their interactional speaking performance were also taken as secondary data. The perceptions stood for the sake of providing a clearer picture that shows the motive behind subjects' tendency or habit in producing utterances.

Another importance was that the subjects' perceptions might show what makes their language in interactional speaking and conversational writing similar. The similarities between written and spoken utterances probably came from two factors, the inability to differ the language or the influence of the settings.

In brief, the similarities covered the grammatical, vocabulary, and speech acts aspects. The perceptions were regarded as valuable additions to support the existence of the primary data.

### **3.4. Data Collection**

In relation to data collection, the setting, instruments, and procedures for collecting the data will be discussed below.

#### **3.4.1. Setting**

The data were collected in informal situations because the subjects were more often involved in informal situation and also to avoid the fabricated unnatural (bookish) language that was produced during the formal situation.

#### **3.4.2. Instruments**

The main instrument in present study was the researcher himself. The presence of researcher as a participant observer made his presence regarded as the primary subjects' friend, not known and as natural as possible according Fraenkel and Wallen (2006). He was also supported by some more instruments, the fieldnotes and the informal interview.

The fieldnotes were used for collecting and recording the data for answering the first, second, and third research questions. The first type of fieldnote is the descriptive fieldnote, in which there will be condensed accounts to be placed on the reflective fieldnotes with expanded account (Spradley, 1979).

The interview was used for collecting the data related to the perceptions. Some informal interviews with spontaneously given questions were done with the subjects in order to get the most natural result as the subjects were not aware that they were being interviewed (Setiyadi, 2006 : 243). Although the questions were given quite spontaneously, there were still some guides used. The questions given were related to subjects' awareness of settings and their planning before producing the utterances.

### **3.4.3. Procedure**

The data were collected in approximately six months. There were no specific procedures as the data elicitation and collection took place in any possible setting.

## **3.5. Data Analysis**

There are some important things to discuss regarding the data analysis : in-field analysis, stages of data analysis, and matrix analysis.

### **3.5.1. In-field Analysis**

In a qualitative research, the data should be analysed during and after the collection (Miles and Huberman, 1984). The assumption is that the researcher

should analyse the data simultaneously and the collected data should later be once again analysed or verified by collecting more data.

### 3.5.2. Stages of Data Analysis

The data analysis consists of four stages : selection which was done in the very beginning, recording of the selected utterances, transcribing the spoken utterances, and codification. In the beginning, every utterance that was considered to be able to constitute data, the meaningful and comprehended ones, was recorded on cell phone, laptop, paper sheets, online message boxes and voice recorder device. The recorded utterances were transcribed. The utterances that do not constitute data such as grumbling and humming were discarded, while the useful ones were put into fieldnotes. The utterances placed in the fieldnotes were coded based on the developed categories and placed on classified cards (see the figure below), however, the number of categories were not increased during the process of data analysis.

The data were put into the table below :

Subject :	
Written Utterance	Spoken Utterance

From the tables, the data were several times coded. In analysing the grammar, every utterance was put into the tables. The token and lexical items were counted for finding out the lexical density by using the formula based on Halliday's (1985) theory, lexical density is the number of lexical items as a proportion of the number of running words, below :

***Lexical Density = Lexical Items : Tokens***

In analysing the vocabulary, no specific formula was applied. The researcher only looked thoroughly at the data, trying to find the frequently used words, phrase, or clause.

In analysing the speech act, font changing was applied. Bold font was for the illocutionary act used for refusing, italic for agreeing. Blue colour was used for marking the locutionary act used for refusing, and red was for the same act used for agreeing.

### **3.5.3. Matrix Analysis**

The very essential principle underlying the matrix analysis was actually a need to provide visualisation. The very process of preparing a visual representation often can help a researcher crystallise his or her understanding of an area, a system, a location, or even an interaction (Fraenkel and Wallen, 2006 : 522).

There are actually two types of matrix, the first is single description and the second is double description. Single description matrix can be used for

analysing and interpreting the data from a single observation (Setiyadi, 2006), this type is the one used in present study as there was no intention to compare any collected data from one group to another.

The utterances from the classified cards will first be placed into the descriptive matrix in order, for the researcher, to find out the average lexical density, phrase, and clause of every utterance, as follows :

Written						Spoken					
U	W	LI	LD	P	C	U	W	LI	LD	P	C

U : Utterance    W : Words    LI : Lexical Item    LD : Lexical Density    P : Phrase  
C : Clause

The utterances were also analysed in order to find out the frequently used words and expression. Those components are considered to be parts of vocabulary. The following matrix was used for analysing vocabulary :

Subject	Frequently Used			
	Spoken		Written	
	Word	Expression/Chunk	Word	Expression / Chunk

For analysing the speech act, the utterances were once again placed into the matrix, as follows :

Subject	Utterances					
	Written			Spoken		
	Act	Meaning	Frequency	Act	Meaning	Frequency
	Direct	Literal		Direct	Literal	
		Non-literal			Non-Literal	
	Indirect	Literal		Indirect	Literal	
		Non-literal			Non-literal	
	Direct	Literal		Direct	Refusing	
		Non-Literal			Agreeing	
	Indirect	Literal		Indirect	Refusing	
		Non-literal			Agreeing	

In order to see a more specified and comprehensible tendency in both writing and speaking activity in summary, the results of analysis in matrixes above were placed into the last matrix (see the sample below).

Subject	Writing Tendency	Speaking Tendency


For the result of the interview, subjects' perceptions, a descriptive matrix below is used for the same purpose as the previous matrix.

<b>Subject</b>	<b>Perceptions</b>

This is the end of discussion in this chapter. Anything related to the methodology of this research such as design, subject, data, data collection, and data analysis were discussed. In the next chapter, the findings and discussion will be presented.